

Dear Sir/Madam

### Notification and Submission to Proposed Plan Change 114 Landscapes

Thank you for taking the time to provide comments on draft district plan text for landscapes plan change PC114. These comments were taken into consideration when finalising the proposed plan change. The main themes of written feedback are attached for your information.

Written and verbal comments made during the consultation phase were reported to the Council Planning Committee on 21 June 2016, along with the recommended changes to the draft plan change text. In response to this feedback, changes to the draft provisions included:

- Lower consent requirements for development on existing approved building platforms or within Living 3 Environment.
- Strengthening policy regarding incentives and partnerships for landowners who actively protect outstanding natural landscapes (ONLs) or natural features (ONFs).
- Amendment of land preparation rules for ONFs.
- Clearer provision for network utilities, maintenance and minor upgrading of infrastructure including local roads.
- Provision for papakāinga development on Maori land (new objective, policy and rules).

However, for legal reasons, recommended site specific changes to the ONL boundaries, as mapped by the Northland Regional Council in the operative Regional Policy Statement 2016, are not able to be included in the Plan Change prior to notification. Such changes can only be made through the formal submission process.

To address this aspect, a technical report will be provided to Council on boundary changes considered justified and this report will then be included in a submission on the Plan Change. Please note that the submission will only address those locations that have been reviewed via a site visit during the pre-notification consultation, and where that technical review supports an adjustment to the mapped ONL boundary.

Unfortunately, we cannot pre-empt that process by pre-circulating the recommended map changes. Those landowners involved are therefore advised to still make an individual submission to Proposed Plan Change 114 which will be submitted to the independent commissioner/s who will be appointed to hear and recommend to Council upon the Plan Change submissions.

Proposed Plan Change 114 Landscapes will be open for submission from the **10<sup>th</sup> of August to 4th October 2016**. Should you wish to continue to be involved with this plan change process, you will need to prepare a written submission and forward this to the Council within the submission period. Further details on the process after the close of submissions will be made available when Plan Change 114 is notified.

We expect that a lot of people will be interested in this and other plan changes to be notified and will be trying to call Council to find out more. To help manage enquires, in the first instance please view our website [www.wdc.govt.nz/planchanges](http://www.wdc.govt.nz/planchanges) on or after 10 August 2016. If you then still have questions, please do not hesitate to contact the District Plan team on 09 430 4200 or email [mailroom@wdc.govt.nz](mailto:mailroom@wdc.govt.nz) and we will endeavor to respond as soon as possible.

Kind regards,

**District Plan Team**  
**Policy and Monitoring Department**

Lisa McColl

Support Assistant - Policy | Whangarei District Council

Private Bag 9023 | Whangarei 0148 | [www.wdc.govt.nz](http://www.wdc.govt.nz)

P: 09 430 4230 ext 8907 | DDI: 09 945 4337 | E: [lisa.mccoll@wdc.govt.nz](mailto:lisa.mccoll@wdc.govt.nz)

PLAN CHANGE 114: LANDSCAPES

# PRENOTIFICATION CONSULTATION REPORT



Prepared for Whangarei District Council  
June 2016





# WHANGAREI DISTRICT PLAN: PLAN CHANGE 114 LANDSCAPE)

## Pre-Notification Consultation Report

10 June 2016

### Introduction

Following presentation of the draft PC114 at a Council workshop on 8 March 2016, it was agreed that the draft plan change and maps should be circulated to affected landowners for initial comment. In late March/early April written information was sent to around 1600 landowners inviting them to provide comment by 13 May 2016. The opportunity was also offered to have consultants visit to their property to discuss the implications of the plan change on site.

Letters were also sent to hapu groups within the Whangarei District.

Over 200 landowners subsequently contacted the Council asking for further details or requesting a site visit. A significant number were able to be addressed by phone or email follow-up including those whose property bordered on an ONF or ONL but were not actually within the mapped area.

Between 22 April and 3 June 2016, 90 individual site visits were undertaken throughout the District. Four off-site meetings were also held with landowners.

82 written comments from landowners were received and analysed and several key changes to PC114 planning provisions were made as a result.

The purpose of this report is to provide an outline of the feedback received from site visits and in written comments.

### Site Visits

Details of site visits is provided here as many landowners who were met with provided verbal comments but did not ultimately provide written comment either because their concerns were satisfied or they felt their points had been made verbally.

A summary of the sites visited and the comments made is attached ([Attachment 1](#)).

Site visits typically began with a discussion of the mapping of ONFs and ONLs which respect to the affected property. The background to the mapping, undertaken by the Northland Regional Council in 2012, was first explained as was the fact that the key focus of this round of consultation was on the policies and rules that would apply within the mapped areas. However, it became apparent in many cases that when the mapped ONL boundaries were viewed at the scale of individual properties, there were areas included around the margins that did not meet the required criteria.

In total, ONL or ONF boundaries on 41 properties were considered to warrant minor adjustments. Such adjustment is allowed for under Regional Policy Statement provisions. It is recommended that these adjustments be made by way of Council staff submission once PC114 is publically notified.

## Written Comments

A summary of written comments provided by landowners is attached ([Attachment 2](#)). Of the 82 comments received 17 (21%) were in clearly support of PC114, 25 (30%) were in opposition and 40 (49%) did not specify a position. Many of those who were in opposition were challenging specific rules within PC114 as they affected their property rather than challenging the plan change as a whole.

The main general concerns raised were (in order of number of comments made):

- Lack of provision for papakainga and the special circumstances surrounding Maori Land which leads much of it to currently be in a largely natural state.
- Loss of private property rights
- Lack of any provision for compensation for restrictions of private land use for something of public benefit
- Negative effects of land resale values
- Lack of sufficient consultation and/or time to digest and respond the draft provisions

Specific concerns were also raised around the potential effects of the draft rules on land use and/or development. These included:

- The permitted activity thresholds for buildings, earthworks and vegetation clearance
- The non-complying activity status for landuse and subdivision within the Coastal Area
- The proposal that all non-complying activities within the Coastal Area be publically notified
- The lack of allowance for building on previously approved building platforms or within Living 3 Environment areas.
- The lack of clear provision for local road and reserve maintenance and repair
- The restriction on land preparation as it applies to the Whatitiri ONF
- Confusion over proposed rules for forestry harvesting and replanting

## Recommended Changes to Draft PC114

As a result of the consultation undertaken and the written comments received the following changes are recommended prior to public notification:

1. Inclusion of express provision for papakainga development on Maori Land including a new objective (LAN.1.2.6), policy (LAN.1.3.12) and rules (LAN.3.3.1 & 3.4.3).
2. Inclusion of reference to community facilities in Policy LAN.1.3.9 and associated permitted activity rules for the maintenance and minor upgrading of these facilities (LAN.3.1.2.4 and 3.1.3(c)). Community facilities is a term used in the Local Government Act and includes local reserves and roading.
3. Expansion of Policy LAN.1.3.16 to provide detail on regulatory incentives and non-regulatory methods for promoting landowner management of ONF and ONLs.
4. Amendment to the permitted activity rule for earthworks (LAN.3.1.3.1) to apply to either earthworks below specified area and volume limits or associated with specified activities (previously had to be both).
5. Inclusion of the provision and maintenance of walking or cycling tracks less than 3m wide amongst the specified activities in the amended permitted activity rule LAN.3.1.3.1.

6. New rules allowing earthworks, vegetation clearance and building on an approved building platform as a controlled activity (LAN.3.2).
7. Amendment of the permitted activity area threshold for indigenous vegetation clearance in Rule 3.1.4.1 to match that for earthworks (150m<sup>2</sup>).
8. New rule allowing the construction of a residential unit as a discretionary activity within the Coastal Area (previously non-complying) if this is on undeveloped land or within the Living 3 Environment (LAN.3.4.2).
9. Inclusion of height limit threshold for buildings and structure on ONFs outside the Coastal Area (LAN.5 Table 1).
10. Allowance of fencing for protection of an ONF as a permitted activity (LAN.5 Tables 1 and 2).
11. Deletion of the land preparation area limit and amendment to rule to only apply to volcanic cones (LAN.5 Table 1).
12. Shift of Hikurangi and Parakiore volcanic cones to ONF Category A (Large Landforms). (LAN.8 ONF Schedule)
13. Shift of two small soda springs from ONF Category C (Dynamic Landforms and Features) to Category D (Smaller, More Fragile Landforms). (LAN.8 ONF Schedule)



**Attachment 1 Site Visit Summary**



Last Name	First Name	Location	Zone	Date of meeting	Map edit?	Summary of comments / issues
Vitali	Alison	57 Puketotara Road Whangarei 0173	ONF	11/05/2016	No	Disagrees with NRC ONF boundary (as differs from existing WDP ONF boundary). Concerned that ONF policies and rules will limit saleability of subdivided lot.
Lawton	Raymond	127 Hailes Road, Whananaki	ONL	14/05/2016	Yes	ONL includes some areas of woodlot, orchard and olive grove. Also some open grassed spurs and an area of grassland in a valley floor. Much of the property is covenanted and more protection is planned. Recommend adjustment of ONL boundaries to exclude production areas and valley floor, but not to the full extent proposed by the owner.
Broughton	Diane	207 Three Mile Bush Road	ONL/ONF	13/05/2016	Yes	Property lies at foot of Hurupaki ONL/ONF. After explanation of intent and draft provisions of ONL, owners generally supportive and comfortable. An adjustment to the ONL boundary to exclude a low-lying embayment of pasture is proposed.
Weissing	John	326 & 412 Whatitiri Road	ONF	16/05/2016	No	Concerned that building and earthworks controls, particularly land preparation rule, would limit normal horticultural (avocado growing) activity. Several hectares of avocado orchard included within ONF boundary. Is intending to replant using mound and hollow technique which would be caught by land prep. rules. Blanket building consent requirement also an issue. Should allow for large equipment sheds in modified orcharding environment.
Routley	Dave	48 Whatitiri Road	ONF	16/05/2016	No	Concerned that the earthworks limits will prevent use of mound and hollow system when avocado areas are replanted. Mound and hollow system raised tree root system above groundwater level and promotes better crop growth and tree health.
Forsythe	Kathleen	Waipu Caves Estate Drive Lot 8 DP 385534	ONL/ONF	18/05/2016	Yes	Concerned that ONL may impact upon building on vacant site. Adjustment of ONL boundary recommended to remove formerly grazed margins and gorse infestation. Appear generally supportive of overall intent of ONL, but question status in immediate area.
Shortland	Annette	Mountain View, Hikurangi Lot 3, DP176543	ONL	4/05/2016	No	Long, narrow property with established pine plantation. ONL applies only to a narrow corner of the site and to a grove of native trees at the western extent. No mapping changes proposed.
Allen	Kevin	82 Kara Road.	ONL/ONF	3/06/2016	No	Majority of site (elevated as flank of Maunu) identified as both ONL and ONF. Concerned about consenting, property values, impact upon future building (property does not have a conventional house established on it). Mapping adjustment not justified.
Hollings	Trevor	115 Memorial drive	ONL	13/05/2016	No	ONL applies to block of native vegetation on rear of property that is contiguous with the Parihaka ONL vegetation pattern. After explaining draft provisions and lack of impact upon low key management measures intended, owner was relaxed about the ONL proposals. No mapping adjustment recommended.
Tukupua	Cameron	2094 Whangarei Heads Road	ONL	8/05/2016	Yes	Neighbours also present. Concerned that PC114 will unduly limit building of residential unit on recently purchased bare lots. Recommend boundary adjustment to remove formed driveway.
Murdoch	Dan	507 Prescott Rd	ONL	9/05/2016	Yes	General unease about ONL provisions, regulation, costs etc. Also influenced by current WDP/consent restrictions on land use resulting from adjacent quarry site. Very proactive in pest control and discussed provisions for funding of this and also further covenanting. Some minor adjustment of ONL considered to be justified. Also met neighbour from adjoining property (#492 - Lot 5, DP 313809) who had similar concerns and states he is already negatively affected by being within Wilsons Dam water supply catchment. Mapping on that neighbouring site is considered to require greater refinement and is strongly recommended.
Binns	Jeff	629A Owhiwa Rd	ONL	8/05/2016	No	Owner passionate about the forest, actively involved in pest control and wishes to build on an existing cleared site. After describing the provisions, was generally comfortable and appeared reasonably supportive of intent. No mapping changes proposed.
Salter	Utta	28 Whatiriri Road	ONF	16/05/2016	No	Generally comfortable with PC114 rules given that the property is already fully developed and the existing house and equipment sheds are outside mapped area.
Kierman	Warran	846 SH 14	ONL/ONF	30/05/2016	No	Concerned regarding the implications of PC114. After finding that only a small steep section of property was involved, concerns were largely allayed.
Roughan	David	end of Roughan Road (off Millington Rd Maunu)	ONF/ONL	19/05/2016	Yes	Concerned about ONL boundary in relation to formed accessway. Slight adjustment to the boundary recommended to follow bushline and more clearly show accessway is outside ONL. Also raised issue around the application of landscape protection rules to housing within ONLs, e.g. colour restrictions.
Hart	Ngaire	851 Owhiwa Road	ONL	8/05/2016	Yes	ONL incorporates an area of pine and blackwood plantation. Owners otherwise supportive of ONL principles. Recommended adjustment of ONL boundary to exclude woodlot.
McCallum	Max	102 Dip Road	ONL/ONF	13/05/2016	No	ONL/ONF applies to upper bushclad part of property which landowners don't intend to develop. Generally comfortable with rules but highlighted own efforts to control weeds and pest animals.
Blaygrove	Robert	64 Tangihua Rd	ONF	17/05/2016	No	Disagrees with ONF mapping given area is developed as avocado orchard. However, only small steep back section of property included within ONF and unlikely to be developed.

White	Neil	107 Ormiston Rd	ONL	27/04/2016	Yes	Generally supportive of the intent of the ONL, but wary of impacts upon future management and harvest of woodlots within the margin of the ONL (along with a small dam) as currently mapped. A minor realignment of the ONL boundary to remove the pond, redwoods and eucalyptus is proposed.
Cameron	Joan	48 Franklin Rd, Parua Bay	ONL	8/05/2016	Yes	Uneasy about the potential impact of ONL provisions upon land use, and Council regulatory functions more generally, but after explanation those initial concerns appear to have abated. Refinement of mapping to more closely align to vegetation patterns relative to grazed areas.
Cherrington	Pita	80 Henare Road, Pipiwai	ONL	31/05/2016	No	ONL applies to back of property in bush area rarely visited. After explanation of provisions and applying only to that part of the site, owner was unconcerned. Discussion focussed more upon adjacent land under Maori title which is also ONL.
Smith	Carol	41 Mountain View Rd, Hikurangi	ONL	4/05/2016	No	ONL assigned to an area that has a crop of pine about to be harvested. Despite disparity of vegetation cover, the cone landform of Hikurangi is considered the prevailing element and the pines are on an elevated portion of the flank. No change to ONL boundary proposed. After having the draft rules explained, the owner was unconcerned and intends planting the plantation area with indigenous species following harvest.
Richards	Penny	2307 Whangarei Heads Road	ONL	8/05/2016	Yes	Generally supportive of ONL concept but concerned that whole property is within ONL. Concern about the effect of ONL rules on future subdivision for retirement income. Site inspection confirmed that ONL extends a little too far into the top of a grazed paddock in the south western sector of the property and adjustment is therefore proposed.
Keith	Ron	264 Prescott Rd Ruakaka	ONL	9/05/2016	Yes	Discussed issues on behalf of unwell son (landowner of block visited). ONL includes an area where a shed has been established and a place where small volumes of hardfill are periodically taken from. Minor adjustments to the ONL boundary are recommended to respond to these influences, maintaining the core areas of indigenous forest within the ONL.
Dobbs	Moira	2487 Whangarei Heads Road	ONL	6/05/2016	Yes	Broad ranging issues ranging from loss of private land use rights, land value impacts, justification, consistency and NRC RPS processes were raised, amongst a spectrum of other matters. The statutory basis and rationale for the ONL mapping were described, along with an outline of draft provisions and how those may influence land use. A site inspection confirmed that parts of the lower portion of the site is developed such that it is inconsistent with the prevailing characteristics of the main body of the ONL and mapping refinements are recommended accordingly.
Jay	Diane	132 Simons Road, Poroti	ONF	16/05/2016	No	House and orchard already fully developed so no major issues with draft rules.
Brijs	Alfons	Our Rd/1853 Whangarei Heads Rd	ONL	6/05/2016	No	Generally supportive of the intent of the ONL and interested to more fully understand the implications of provisions. Has no plans for development or land use change and seemed unconcerned once draft rules were described. No mapping changes proposed.
Rushton	Arthur	11 Patiki Street	ONL	13/05/2016	Yes	Considers that ONL comes too far down hill and includes a couple of old pines and former clearing/slip now dominated by weeds. Very minor adjustment to ONL in slip area recommended.
Wood	Hamish	61 Puketotara Rd	ONF	11/05/2016	No	Concerned that ONF policies and rules as they apply to house building on recently purchased bare lot.
Taylor	Mike	543 Kaiikanui road	ONL/ONF	4/05/2016	No	Issues of ownership and stewardship rights, mapping consistency, boundary effects, and principle. Considers pasture area included and should not be. Recommended change of ONL boundary to exclude modified areas.
Jones	Alan	139 Simons Rd	ONF	16/05/2016	No	House and grounds already fully developed so no major issues with draft rules. Majority of property which is avocado orchards is now owned by separate company.
Pardington	Alex	181 Robinson Road, Ocean Beach	ONL	22/04/2016	Yes	Contains area of backdune pasture, exotic weedy growth and informal camping area. Very similar to Jagger just a little to the north. Recommend change ONL boundary to align to DoC boundary fenceline.
Newman	Frank	370 Matapouri Rd (184 Waipouri Lane) Tutukaka	ONL	4/05/2016	No	Wishes to ensure that ONL does not apply to area occupied by the house and related outdoor living spaces (which it doesn't). Expressed reservations about impacts upon landuses and private property rights.
Beatee	Ian	840 Old Russell Road	ONL	4/05/2016	No	Wide ranging discussion about the wider area, particularly from a geological perspective. Very actively involved in habitat management, pest control etc. Wishes to see wide ranging ecological provisions applied to address matters like kauri dieback and forest health. Also considers that many other areas justify recognition as ONF e.g. Hururiki cone and Tutamahoe.

Meyer	Terry and Margaret	310 Whau Valley Road	ONL	13/05/2016	Yes	Applies to a steep slope disconnected from residential part of the site. Mainly interested in general terms and not unduly concerned, as bush thought to be covenanted and no intention to modify. Minor adjustment to margin recommended to take out a small wedge of pasture and a couple of exotic trees.
McInnes	Leanne	Jubilee Road		4/05/2016	Yes	Met in conjunction with son-in-law Mike Brown. Expressed issues with impact upon farming activities, de facto "reserves" and accuracy. Extensive site viewing led to recommendations for a number of minor mapping adjustments around bush edges and excluding a more extensive area of isolated pasture that is surrounded by forest but large enough to be discrete in its own right/
Cook	Ngairi	85 McAdam Rd, Waipu	ONL	9/05/2016	Yes	ONL applies to finger of vegetation at the back of property in a bush area rarely used and unsuitable for development. After explanation of provisions and applying only to that part of the site, owner was generally relaxed about ONL, but some minor tweaks to the boundary are recommended to better reflect vegetation cover.
Bell	Dave	40 Grant Road, Waipu	ONL	22/04/2016	Yes	Has protected bush over much of the property and enjoyed observing it regain stature. Wishes to remove ONL from a small farm quarry site and an area of margin that contains some gorse and scattered pine interspersed with young native colonising species. Revisions to ONL boundary to achieve those outcomes is recommended.
Hawkins	Emma	408 Whatitiri Road, Poroti	ONF	16/05/2016	No	Recently purchased large grassland property and have built a new house and driveway on it. Have plans to add further house on it in the future but generally comfortable with rules.
Leonard	Sandra	Chesterfield Place Lot 9 DP375294	ONF/ONL	10/05/2016	No	Have recently purchased lot with dense stand of mature native trees. Are proposing to build a house within stand which will involve some tree removal and earthworks. Concerned about additional costs of landscape assessment that will be required under PC114 rules.
Millington	Sue	316 Three Mile Bush Rd	ONL	14/05/2016	Yes	Not concerned about steep, bushclad portion of land associated with Pukenui Forest being within ONL, but request that it be removed from closely associated house and shed. Minor tweaks to map recommended in accordance.
Waldron	Melanie	57A Riverside Drive	ONL	13/05/2016	No	Confirmed that ONL applies to an area that under an existing covenant and not to the area occupied by the owner's house and living areas. No plans for change in the ONL area and satisfied once matters were fully described. No proposal for change to mapping.
Williams	John	(no number) Ody Road	ONL	15/05/2016	Yes	Wished to better appreciate the implications of the ONL and impacts upon farming activity generally. Area in question one of a number of similar fingers projecting from the toe of steeper terrain, predominantly with a cover of 30-40 year old kanuka with some emergents. Reads as a continuation of Manaia range vegetation, but with a less diverse canopy. Some refinement of the ONL boundary is recommended.
Dudley	Lisa	12 Kara Rd	ONL/ONF	13/05/2016	No	ONL applies to rear of property where slope ascends Maunu. After outlining the draft rules, particularly in relation to buildings, the owner was generally unconcerned by the impact of the overlay as they have no intention to develop that part of the property and harvesting of established pines is unaffected. No changes to mapping recommended.
Somner	Tracey	33C Keith Road	ONL	27/04/2016	Yes	Property lies on the margin of an extensive tract of indigenous cover. Whilst the property has some groves of kahikatea associated with a stream corridor that warrant retention within the ONL, much of the balance of the ONL cover applied to this property is unjustified due to high quotient of invasive exotic species amongst vegetation cover and inconsistency with prevailing them of balance of ONL. Adjustment of
Stebbings	Graham	111 Church Rd Kamo	Not in ONF	31/05/2016	No	Has already been through Council process to establish accessway and building sites including fencing of bush. Second building site has yet to be developed and does not want to be put through a costly consent process again to build retirement home on it.
Church	Sue	115A Memorial Drive	ONL	13/05/2016	No	Has cross lease over larger Hollings property to rear. Once situation described and noted that ONL applies only to rear of overall site which is not used by the owner, then any concern evaporated. No mapping change.
Mackay	Kerry	Cove Rd, Waipu Cove	ONL	27/04/2016	No	ONL applies only to a small portion of a discrete section of title associated with a wetland to the east of the main road. Owner has no intention of modifying or developing that portion of his site. Explained draft provision and no concerns resulting.
Tucker	Grant	Part Lot 2 DP 66760 Reotahi	ONL	8/05/2016	Yes	Owner overseas but considered ONL mapping inaccurate given it is old quarry site with little natural values. A site visit confirmed that the property contained three grassed benches that reflected past quarrying and therefore inconsistent with main body of ONL. Amendment of ONL boundary recommended.
Vendt	Danny	19 Rockie Heights	ONF	16/05/2016	No	No major concerns after rules explained. Property is already developed. Local stormwater runoff raised as a concern.

McKerrow	Malcolm	Barge Show Grounds	ONL	19/05/2016	No	Concerned about implications for barge showgrounds as public facility. However, concern allayed when found that only area of steep bush at back of grounds, adjoining Pukenui Forest ONL, is affected.
Ringer	Mim	852 Matapouri Road	ONL	4/05/2016	No	ONL applies only to a tiny portion of the property. Owner supportive of that application and of the principles of the ONL generally.
Beats	Rob	854 Matapouri Road	ONL	4/05/2016	Yes	Owner undertaking a wide range of restoration activities and is generally favourably inclined towards ONL matters. Wishes to see boundary more closely aligned to a covenant margin in the eastern sector of the site and removed from a mixed exotic planting on the western side of the land. Both refinements are considered to be justified and mapping adjustments are proposed accordingly.
Torrie	James	1067 Cove Road	ONF	9/05/2016	No	Concerned about implications of ONF for subdivided lot but found on visit that the ONF was within esplanade reserve area and not on landowners property.
Wilson	Graham	Lot 1 DP 184166, next to 2120 Whangarei Heads Rd	ONL	8/05/2016	Yes	ONL projects onto rear of property where native vegetation associates with a substantial rock formation. Some refinement of the ONL boundary proposed for the
Asplin	Dave	Ocean Beach Road	ONL	6/05/2016	Yes	Asplin property abuts Bream Head reserve and boundary runs up into the steep, native vegetated flanks of that landform. The draft ONL provisions were outlined and the owner appeared satisfied that these would have no impact upon his current farming activities or future plans for the land. There is one area where a minor realignment of the ONL boundary is warranted to better reflect the margin of the vegetation pattern.
George	Rangi	Lot 3 Martin Road, Bland Bay	ONL	14/05/2016	No	Has a developed house site in the midst of the property which is, in turn, well established amidst the body of the ONL. Described how the provisions of the draft ONL chapter may influence a resource consent application for a building. No change to ONL boundary in relation to this property is recommended.
Merrideth	Reva/Casey	Rockell Road (no number)	ONL	20/05/2016	Yes	Generally supportive of the principles of the ONL mapping and provisions, but wants to ensure that it does not affect long term intentions to manage and harvest 20+ year old woodlots established on the land. Some refinement of the ONL boundary to avoid those woodlots and related access corridors is justified.
Sanson	Bob	81 Puketotara Rd	ONF	11/05/2016	No	Generally supportive of the principles of the ONF mapping and provisions. No major issues raised. Active interest in Maori archeology of the area.
Sinnock	Michael	end of Papakauri Rd, Whangaruru	ONL	14/05/2016	Yes	Uneasy about the potential impact of ONL provisions upon land use, particularly in relation to wood lot creation and building of a house. Also considers that much of the land is not justified to be recognised as ONL. A tour of part of this extensive property confirmed that areas of exotic weed invasion, valley grassland and neighbouring pines, do not meet the criteria for ONL and adjustment of mapped boundaries is therefore recommended.
Lydiard	Anthony	2108 Whangarei Heads Rd	ONL	25/04/2016	No	Concerned about implications of ONL building and subdivision restrictions having recently brought lot within Living 3 area for residential development. Considers that he should have advised of the ONL mapped area as part of LIM process. Raised the potential for using an average lot approach to subdividing property with an ONL over part of it.
Kiro	Cynthia	75 Our Road McLeod Bay	ONL	6/05/2016	No	Interested to understand the implications of the ONL provisions, particularly in relation to a consented new house. Involved in pest management and landscape management measures, and appeared supportive of ONL principles generally.
Aherns	Andrew	991 Tangihua Rd (note property extends back to ONL)	ONL	18/05/2016	No	Property spans over the ridge to Kaipara District and it is there that the ONL is predominantly found. The portion of the land that is within Whangarei District and affected by the ONL is thought to be extremely nominal. Discussion about draft provision had on site regardless, but area in question is extremely inaccessible and was not visited.
Parker	Scott	41 Landowners Lane	ONL	4/05/2016	No	Applies only to coastal flank and very steep. Owner comfortable when extent was clarified and noted that provisions would not apply to the balance of the site.
Abplanalp	Ben	118 Jordan Valley Rd, Hikurangi	ONL	4/05/2016	Yes	The northern edge of this property leads into a stream course that drains from Hikurangi. Native vegetation prevails in this triangular segment of the title, but there are also pockets of exotic timber trees. It is recommended that the ONL be adjusted to exclude those trees. After an explanation of the draft ONL provisions, the owner appeared comfortable with those rules, subject to adjustment of the ONL as mentioned above.
Cartwright	Neil	427 Maungakahia Rd, Whatitiri	ONF	16/05/2016	No	Concerned about effects on private property rights and rule implications for future land development. Raised specific concern over consent requirement for buildings that can't be seen from public road.

Scarrott	Peter	681 Cullen Road	ONL	9/05/2016	No	Whilst passionate about the bush and character of the area, the owner is concerned about possible regulatory burden, costs and complexity, particularly for people on low incomes. Also concerned about effects on house extensions and future land resale value. ONL boundary considered to be appropriately positioned.
Halse	Phil	122 Yovich Road, Mata	ONL	27/04/2016	Yes	Farmed property runs up into the foothills of the Waipu Forest and includes extensive covenanted areas with native forest cover. An area of low-lying pasture with some gorse infestation is unjustifiably captured by the ONL and amendment of the boundary is recommended accordingly.
Bowkett	Robin	1439 Cove Road	ONL	22/04/2016	Yes	Was eager to understand the implication of draft ONL provisions, particularly in relation to foot tracks for maintaining and/or enjoying the bush in the identified ONL. Minor adjustment to ONL boundary proposed where it comes into lawn and garden bed area.
LaBonte	Robin	995 Cove Road, Waipu Cove	ONF	22/04/2016	Yes	Concerned that the ONF boundary encroaches beyond exposed rock shoreline onto private land and that draft rules could prevent walkway fencing, dead tree branch removal and provision of wooden steps to access CMA. H&S concerns also raised. ONF boundary adjustment recommended to more closely follow back of fringing pohutukawas.
Jagger	Murray	181 Robinsons Road, Ocean Beach	ONL	22/04/2016	Yes	Contains area of backdune pasture, exotic weedy growth and informal camping area. Very similar situation to Pardington situation, found a short distance to the south. Recommend change ONL boundary to align to DoC boundary fenceline.
Biddle	Warren	9 Rangikorero Place McLeod Bay	ONL	6/05/2016	Yes	ONL extends into garden area and incorporates the site of a small shed. Formerly influenced by a adjacent block of pine plantation and margins of gorse extending from native cover. ONL boundary warrants adjustment to better reflect the line of established indigenous vegetation. Applies particularly to site immediately to the west (Lovatt) who are based offshore and have been communicating with MF by email after notification by Mr Biddle.
Mark	Robinson	171 Cemetery Road, Maunu (2D2)	ONL	9/05/2016	No	Involves a block of Maori land where a finger of ONL extends from Otaika Valley. Wide ranging discussion about implications for land use, cost of consenting, barriers to development of Maori land etc. No change to mapping considered to be justified.
Pulman	Bruce	4 Loop Road	ONL	5/05/2016	No	Runs existing quarry operation and concerned that ONF mapping and associated restriction on mineral extraction will effectively limit if not prevent plans for future quarry expansion.
Taueki	Gail	Henare Road Piiwai PT KAIKOU 3 NO 32	ONL	6/05/2016	No	ONL covers whole property. Generally concerned that PC114 will prevent any whanau development of property which is ancestral Maori land. Seven families involved.
Arseneault	Melissa	Bream Bay Head Lodge- 310 Ocean Beach Road	ONL	6/05/2016	No	Owner wished to understand rules and implications more fully. Generally supportive of ONL principles and provisions. Has invested considerably in restoring native plant cover to site. No change to ONL boundaries proposed.
Steinberg	Maree	12 Umurangi Way, Whangaumu	ONL	20/05/2016	Yes	Property partially covenanted and subject to a relatively tight regime of consent conditions arising from its creation through subdivision. Minor refinements to the ONL boundary are proposed to better relate to site conditions as now established.
Clements	Murray	Western Hills Quarry	ONL	10/05/2016	Yes	Impact upon consented quarry and future management and development of balance of title/s (a large block). Minor adjustment recommended for less elevated part of land.
Whiting	Dennis	723 Whangarei Heads Road	ONL	15/05/2016	Yes	Property lies in a valley floor with extensions of wider patterns projecting into the margins of the site. Whilst wary of the ONL provisions, the owner was generally supportive of the principles provided they were applied appropriately to his land. Some detailed adjustments to mapping are recommended accordingly.
Davis	Evar	74 Forest View Road	ONL	13/05/2016	No	ONL applies to back of property where an area of bush area is contiguous with Pukenui. After explanation of provisions and applying only to that part of the site, owner was unconcerned. No mapping changes proposed.
Child	Murray	567 Tangihua Road	ONL	18/05/2016	No	Expressed concern about property rights, Council overlooking ecological efforts elsewhere on property, impact of regulatory controls on farming activity, etc. Portion of ONL in question is very steep, bushclad and appeared unlikely to be suitable for development as pastoral land or forestry if cleared. Also expressed as an integral part of Tangihua ONL. No mapping change proposed.
Mayo	Jan	57 Craig Road Lot 1 DP 167789	ONL	15/05/2016	No	Initially concerned about potential impact upon future subdivision opportunity, but clarified that an envisaged future building site is outside the ONL. Involved in weed and pest control, generally caring for and valuing the ONL area. Supportive of principles of ONL. No mapping changes recommended.
Woolhouse	Grant	33 Leslie Road, Maungakaramea	ONL	18/05/2016	Yes	Private property status and impact upon farming activities expressed as concerns. Change to mapping recommended to exclude area of gorse, young regrowth and scattered pockets of grassland.
Emanuel	Peter	110 Langman Lane	ONL	25/05/2016	Yes	ONL covers area that was cleared some years ago and has been consented as a small title with provision for a building (with stringent consent conditions). Minor adjustment to map recommended accordingly. Otherwise supportive of principles underlying ONL.

Scott	Duncan	adjacent to Russell Road/Hodgson Road intersection	ONL	25/05/2016	Yes	Questions application of ONL to small area of vegetated flank directly associated with long-standing quarry site. Also areas of broad, grassed spur that are relatively inconspicuous and used for periodic grazing and annual silage/hay cut.
Edge	Grant	37 Reotahi Road	ONL	1/06/2016	No	ONL covers entire site (Living 3). Questions weed invasion, equity etc. Mapping adjustment not justified.
Fraser	Don	1953 SH1 Mata	ONL	27/04/2016	Yes	Questioned the accuracy of ONL mapping at northerneastern end. Also unsure about the ONF shown adjacent to Skull Creek. General concern about private property rights and potential restrictions on farm operations including quarrying for farm road and race metal. Mapping amendment to ONL recommended.
Pita	Whanau	940 Whangaruru North Rd, Bland Bay	ONL		No	ONL covers part of property which is allocated to particular whanau member. Generally concerned that PC114 will prevent housing development on this part of property which is ancestral Maori land.
Pitman	June	603 Whangarei Heads Road	ONL	6/05/2016	No	ONL covers multiple properties which are collectively ancestral Maori land. Generally concerned that PC114 will prevent building of a marae, whare hui or papakainga development on property to provide for needs of hapu and whanau.

**Attachment 2 Summary of Written Comments**



Sub No	Surname/ Company	First Name/ On Behalf Of	Key Points
FB-114-01	Holt	Miles and Angela	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not directly affecting their property of 205 Pompallier Estate Drive.</li> <li>• No objections to neighbouring property to being an ONF/ONL.</li> </ul>
FB-114-02	Dwane	Tony	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not believe any of the proposed changes will affect operations at Taumata Plantations Ltd</li> <li>• No ONF/ONL within forests.</li> </ul>
FB-114-03	Twose	Adam Andrew	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do not want restrictions applied to their property.</li> <li>• ONF area is only a small part of their property, already fenced off to stock.</li> </ul>
FB-114-04	Southwell	Sarah Maree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding is the rules will only apply to the specific areas identified as ONF/ONL, not areas on property adjacent to the ONF/ONL.</li> </ul>
FB-114-05	Taiharuru Farms Lodge	Grant Faber	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Want coastal boundary line realigned with the ONL boundary for his property.</li> <li>• Wants a common restriction within all ONL of 50m2 building area, including rural production areas.</li> <li>• Wanting to build replacement building of 32m2 within ONL.</li> </ul>
FB-114-06	Hutchinson	Iris	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Endorses wholeheartedly" draft policies within ONLs and ONFs.</li> <li>• Supports protecting ONLs and ONFs from development.</li> </ul>
FB-114-07	Annette Shortland	Shane Costain and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Property is mainly forestry pines.</li> <li>• Want to log pines in future.</li> <li>• Waste of Council time and ratepayers money.</li> </ul>
FB-114-08	Beattie	Ian and Dianne	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wants further areas included as ONF/ONL areas.</li> </ul>
FB-114-09	Honey	Robert	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wants to be able to mill pines on half of his property.</li> <li>• Wants to clear a track to a house site.</li> </ul>
FB-114-10	Farrell	Brett Alan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wants to build a farm race in future.</li> <li>• ONL is not clear enough, requests a more detailed map.</li> </ul>
FB-114-11	Langdon	Glen David	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• After studying the map, thinks his property is within an ONL or ONF.</li> </ul>
FB-114-12	Weisheit	Elizabeth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports preservation of bush and eradication of pests and preserving the natural landscape.</li> <li>• Questions if there are plans to preserve space for coastal roading should an alternative be required.</li> </ul>
FB-114-13	Gillespie	Kevin and Pam	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wants further areas included as ONF/ONL areas.</li> <li>• Concerned about housing in Teal Bay and Helena Bay.</li> <li>• Concerned about noxious plants in Helena Bay valley.</li> <li>• Thinks cave sites listed should be separate as many are significant to Maori.</li> </ul>
FB-114-14	Stebbeings	Graham Ross	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wants to build a second dwelling as discussed with Council prior to purchase, and has made financial investments for this on his property.</li> <li>• New draft provisions form major financial barriers to complete these plans.</li> </ul>
FB-114-15	McKay	Eric William	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern about erosion adjacent to Karoro South, One Tree Point.</li> <li>• Concern about the One Tree Point boating ramp.</li> </ul>
FB-114-16	Smith	Brent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thinks this is another "land grab" by Council.</li> <li>• Unhappy with map quality.</li> <li>• Unsure if his pine forest is an ONL or ONF due to map quality.</li> <li>• Has been unable to contact Council about his concerns.</li> <li>• Concerned about unauthorised staff on his property.</li> <li>• Concerned about DOC land being neglected behind his property.</li> <li>• Plans to seek legal advice.</li> </ul>

Sub No	Surname/ Company	First Name/ On Behalf Of	Key Points
FB-114-17	Morris	Wayne and Suzanne	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generally happy with the intention of the proposal.</li> <li>• Wants the plan to be amended to include properties already being developed prior to the new rules being final.</li> <li>• Wants a "Limited Notification" clause to allow activities that are minor to not trigger a full notification.</li> </ul>
FB-114-18	Wild	Allan and Valerie	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ONL on their land has pine trees which they want to harvest.</li> <li>• Strongly opposes any restrictions preventing them managing their land, and any further costs imposed on them.</li> <li>• Unhappy with the timeframe to respond to the proposal.</li> </ul>
FB-114-19	Rivers	J A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned that proposed draft provisions will prevent future development of the family land and incur greater costs.</li> </ul>
FB-114-20	Radford	Arthur S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has since sold properties to new owners.</li> </ul>
FB-114-21	Sanders	Mark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wants pine trees excluded from the new boundary so they can be removed.</li> <li>• Happy to protect part of their property and may need Council grants to help with fencing etc.</li> <li>• Wants to know how wildlife will also be protected and pests controlled.</li> </ul>
FB-114-22	Bowkett	Robin and Graeme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wants earthworks/vegetation clearance to be permitted within an ONL for the purposes of walking/mountain bike tracks and campsites.</li> </ul>
FB-114-23	Darby	Chris	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to boundary of ONL and coastal area on northern area of his property.</li> <li>• New boundaries in northern part of property do not reflect landscape values.</li> <li>• Wants new residential units to be not listed as non-complying as it is restrictive and adds unnecessary costs to consent applications.</li> <li>• Wants amendments to rules regarding subdivision to be a restricted discretionary activity.</li> <li>• Supports the policies and rules as they apply to ONFs.</li> </ul>
FB-114-24	Pitman	June E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maori land should be a separate category.</li> <li>• A lot of land listed as significant is regenerated scrub and "rubbish".</li> <li>• Land has potential for development of marae/whare hui/papakāinga.</li> <li>• Not in agreement with draft landscape plan change provisions.</li> <li>• Want to meet/discuss amendments with Council.</li> </ul>

Sub No	Surname/ Company	First Name/ On Behalf Of	Key Points
FB-114-25	Landowners Coalition Inc	Frank Newman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not want ONL/ONF/Coastal boundaries to be expanded.</li> <li>• Does not want landowners rights to rehabilitate land to be limited, and rates remissions be considered for landowners who rehabilitate land.</li> <li>• Buildings/homes to not be included as a non-complying activity but as a restricted discretionary/discretionary activity limited to landscaping requirements.</li> <li>• Negative visual effect of human activities has been overstated.</li> <li>• The term "visual effect" needs clarification.</li> <li>• "Cumulative adverse effects" and "Potential adverse effects" terms to be removed from the policies as they are imaginary/subjective.</li> <li>• "Inappropriate subdivision" to be defined, subdivision enhances landscapes.</li> <li>• Incentivising landowners the best way to promote "conservation, enhancement and rehabilitation" of ONLs.</li> <li>• Policy 19 of Lan 1.2 to allow forestry to be replanted.</li> <li>• Objects to non-complying activities that require public notification.</li> <li>• Permitted floor requirements for non-habitable buildings are too low. Construction/repair of non-habitable buildings should be a permitted activity with same rules as non ONL/ONF areas. Object to colour restrictions.</li> <li>• Objects to restrictions on extension/alteration of existing buildings.</li> <li>• Objects to earthworks restrictions.</li> <li>• Rule 2.2.3 - permitted limits too low and too restrictive. If limits are imposed, they need to be extended.</li> <li>• Forestry operations should not be restricted.</li> <li>• All references to customary rights should be removed. Race does not dictate the effect.</li> <li>• All property owners should be permitted to build a dwelling as of right. If not permitted then local authorities should have to purchase the property.</li> <li>• In general no issue with control of "significant" activities within ONF/ONL boundaries. Issue is with classification of minor activities as significant.</li> <li>• Does not want significant costs/uncertainty for owners.</li> <li>• Draft rules with significantly restrict landowners rights and transfer property rights to general public and impose additional costs.</li> </ul>
FB-114-26	Seakins	Mark Eric	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned that rules for subdivision will effect whole property, not just the small portion of ONF.</li> <li>• Wants confirmation that proposed ONF rules will not affect subdivision of the entire lot.</li> <li>• Unhappy with NRC including the small portion of land in the ONF.</li> <li>• Happy with other ONF rules as they only appear to apply within the ONF area.</li> </ul>
FB-114-27	Robinson	Mark Gregory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maunu 2D2 is owned by multiple owners (Maori Land), wants all shareholders (around 780) to be able to have a say.</li> <li>• Thinks any changes to Maori Land should only be made through the Maori Land Court.</li> <li>• Wants house sites agreed to through an Occupation Order agreement to still stand, and access to the sites to be allowed.</li> <li>• Family has had stewardship of the property for nearly 60 years, have maintained the condition of land and bush, requests help with pest control.</li> </ul>
FB-114-28	Lister	Rosemary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted the enlarged ONF area, but happy to accept the change.</li> </ul>
FB-114-29	Wiseman	Andrew	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Individual land owners are not offered financial assistance to investigate the effects of the proposed plan change on their property.</li> <li>• Landowners rights and land use opportunities will be reduced by the change with no compensation being offered.</li> <li>• Wants reasonable costs incurred by an affected land owner met by the authority imposing the change.</li> <li>• Requests that Council assists to cover costs of professional fees to investigate effects of plan change on planning, valuation and legal advice.</li> <li>• Wants Council to offer reasonable compensation based on before and after valuations.</li> </ul>

Sub No	Surname/ Company	First Name/ On Behalf Of	Key Points
FB-114-30	Karin Debeer	Grant Edge and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acknowledges the principles of conservation and preservation, but "the devil... resides in the details".</li> <li>• They purchased their property under a Living 3 Environment, but now if the property is changed to a ONL every activity will become non-complying and publicly notifiable. They believe this is too heavy handed and financially punitive.</li> <li>• Concerns about the invasive foreign weeds (20% of their property), and wanting to devote resources to fighting the weeds as opposed to unnecessary Council fees.</li> <li>• Already have plans for the property and are worried they will be unable to carry them out in the future. Building sites are at a similar elevation to existing nearby dwellings. Don't want to have to publicly notify, don't have financial resources for more fees.</li> <li>• Want to have the draft amended as it would apply to their property.</li> </ul>
FB-114-31	Sedgley	Nicola	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wants construction of a dwelling on already approved building platforms as part of a subdivision consent to be a permitted activity.</li> <li>• Thinks it is unfair for landowners to go through the consent process again if the process has already happened at the time of subdivision.</li> <li>• Questions passing a s32 assessment being the best option to ensure adverse effects are not created.</li> <li>• Suggests instead adding additional development criteria to allow a building to be permitted, such as a recessive building colour, low reflectivity glass, maximum height limit of 8.5m and maximum floor area of 225m<sup>2</sup>.</li> <li>• Alternatively the Council could make a dwelling on an approved building platform in an ONL a restricted discretionary activity on a non-notified basis. Suggests it may be most effective to use existing restricted discretionary criteria currently in the District Plan in the coastal countryside area, such as scale and bulk of building in relation to the site, the built characteristic of the locality, the extent height effects can be mitigated, effects on the landscape values, effects of daylight availability, effects on amenity values. Still think however that fairest situation is dwellings on approved building platforms in an ONL be a permitted activity as the visual effects would have already been assessed in the consent process.</li> <li>• Concerns over earthworks being limited to less than 150m<sup>2</sup> in a 12 month period, ie only 75m of a 2m wide farm track. Suggests instead sediment controls or notifying the Council 7 days in advance.</li> <li>• Requests that "the construction of a dwelling on an approved building platform" is added to permitted activities for vegetation clearance due to vegetation regenerating on platforms after a small time. To get another resource consent after effects had already been assessed at the time of subdivision consent should be unnecessary.</li> <li>• Alternatively an activity standard regarding vegetation removal related to the construction of dwellings on an approved building platform could state no vegetation with a girth greater than 500mm shall be removed so that only young regenerating bush could be removed.</li> </ul>
FB-114-32	Trustpower	Trudy Richards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Primary interest relates to their Bream Bay 9MW diesel peaking station.</li> <li>• Supports District Plan containing maps of ONL/ONF areas identified in draft document.</li> <li>• Supports objectives (1-4) in LAN1.2, they reflect the RMA requirements, in particular section 6, matters of national importance.</li> <li>• Supports Policy 1 in LAN1.3 requiring location and extent of ONL/ONFs identified on District Plan Resource Maps. Also supports the landscape assessment worksheets as per Policy 2. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports Policies 3, 4, and 8 in LAN1.3.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Supports Policy 7 in LAN1.3.</li> <li>• Supports Policy 11 in allowing for adverse effects arising from new regionally significant infrastructure and the consenting of existing operations in ONL in specified circumstances, with effects being adequately managed to be no more than minor.</li> <li>• Supports guidance provided by LAN2.1 regarding application of landscape rules against rules of the underlying environment classification, providing clarity and certainty for those using the plan.</li> <li>• Supports this plan change and seeks provisions commented on are retained in the Proposed Plan Change.</li> </ul>

Sub No	Surname/ Company	First Name/ On Behalf Of	Key Points
FB-114-33	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Bill Edwards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the inclusion of new district plan objectives policies and methods including maps of ONL and ONF which gives effect to the Northland Regional Council Proposed RPS.</li> <li>• Concerned about the division between natural and historic values.</li> <li>• Supports the plan change in principle, suggests a stand-alone Landscapes chapter, the inclusion of places and areas within the Resource Areas overlays, and subjecting places and areas to objective, policies and rules intend to protect and enhance ONF be retained.</li> <li>• Suggests an extra paragraph in LAN.1.1 be inserted regarding Pukenui Forest and Parihaka and other natural landscapes that have cultural values, myths, natural history and historic heritage. Natural landscapes also have archaeological values.</li> <li>• Suggests that LAN.6 Landscape Assessment Criteria be modified to include recorded or unrecorded historic heritage including archaeology protected by HNZ Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 in the specific characteristics of the application site.</li> <li>• The insertion of the above wording in LAN.6 would allow historic heritage to be considered in all applications for land use and development activities within ONL and ONF areas.</li> </ul>
FB-114-34	Hunt	Ngairi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Property is scheduled to be zoned an ONF area, however most of the land is planted in pine/blackwood and is not native bush.</li> <li>• The only native/natural area is a small riparian strip along a small creek at the lowest lying area of the land.</li> </ul>
FB-114-35	Harrison	John Boyd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requests an on-site meeting.</li> <li>• Wants to discuss the RMA Court ruling.</li> <li>• Concerns over a second hill that does not have any designation, yet is higher than their hill.</li> <li>• Note: he is overseas until July so please contact his lawyer listed on the bottom of his submission form.</li> </ul>
FB-114-36	LaBonte	Andre and Robin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council's GIS map incorrectly identifies seaward boundary being further inland than the elevation of MHWS.</li> <li>• Map No. 60 also shows incorrect location of same seaward boundary. Scale of the map also makes it hard to be precise.</li> <li>• Landward boundary extends landward beyond the ONF feature onto pasture in some areas.</li> <li>• May be required to erect fencing to protect stock in the future as part of their land has been allowed to be used as part of a public walkway. Does not want to have to apply for a resource consent and have additional costs to do this as a result of this being a Discretionary Activity for ONF within the Coastal Area.</li> <li>• Timber steps or other steps may have to be installed in the future to allow the public/owners to access the area more safely (two people already rescued with broken limbs from the rocks). This would require a notified consent under the proposed plan change. For a minor structure they believe the non-complying classification and notified consent is overly restrictive and would incur significant costs.</li> </ul>

Sub No	Surname/ Company	First Name/ On Behalf Of	Key Points
FB-114-37	Northland Regional Council	Justin Murfitt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comments contained are contained within staff views, not endorsed by council.</li> <li>• Supports in general the objectives and policies that seek to protect ONF/ONLs, considers intent of plan change is consistent with the RPS for Northland and NZ Coastal Policy Statement.</li> <li>• Wants some synergies between policy and draft rules in Draft PC114 and Draft PC87 Coastal Area. ONL, ONF and ONC areas all need to "avoid adverse effects" under the NZCPS, with similar effects from activities. Similar consent thresholds could be considered.</li> <li>• A large amount of Maori land in Whangarei is located within ONL areas along the Coast, therefore there are concerns about Maori be able to develop or exercise cultural or traditional activities on land in their ownership. A policy could be that papakāinga may be appropriate in an ONL if there are no other suitable locations.</li> <li>• Policy LAN1.3 (11a) is supported as consistent with Policy 5.3.3 of the RPS.</li> <li>• Regarding building and structures rules, the limit on the size of buildings should not relate to whether the building is habitable or not as there appears little obvious relationship with the potential for adverse effects. Underlying zone rules would manage other effects i.e. traffic, residential intensity.</li> <li>• Point (b) from rule 2.3.1. (2) - not projecting above nearest ridgeline, should be incorporated into the contents of rule 2.3.1 (1) for consistency.</li> <li>• Earthworks rule appears unduly restrictive regardless of the purpose of the works. Recommends Clause (b) and (c) be separated by "or" rather than "and". Sand dune restoration projects should retain a limit.</li> <li>• Concerned with earthworks rules also being unduly restrictive and out of line with Rule 2.3.1 (2). Suggests deleting (a) altogether, or amending vegetation clearance area threshold to match earthworks rule (150m2), or limiting clearance to a 12 month period per site if ONL covers multiple properties. This would simplify the activity rules.</li> <li>• If current structure regarding the above is retained, the list items in LAN 2.4(4) and LAN 2.5(4) should all end in "or" not "and" as this would trigger the need for a consent.</li> <li>• The requirement to get a resource consent for new buildings and structures in large landforms outside the coastal area is considered duly onerous and inconsistent with Policy 1.3(3) as some features cover very large areas which are already heavily modified by horticulture/farming etc. Underlying zone controls should already protect these areas adequately.</li> <li>• Requirements for resource consent for stock fencing and grazing on some ONFs is also overly restrictive and could potentially stop indigenous vegetation/freshwater bodies from being adequately protected. ONF areas may require to be protected from the effects of stock. It would also impede implementation of national regulations signalled by central government which would require stock to be excluded from freshwater bodies on less than a 15 degree slope. Stock fencing is a minor effect and can have positive benefits.</li> <li>• Maintenance and repair of existing roads, tracks and driveways should be a permitted activity across the board as this is inconsistent with RPS Methods 4.6.3(4)(i) and (ii), and LAN1.2(4) and LAN1.3(19) and LAN1.3(20).</li> <li>• LAN2.5(3) could be a discretionary activity.</li> </ul>
FB-114-38	Kordia Ltd	Pip Carroll	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Owns Broadcasting and Telecommunications facility at O'Carroll Rd, Horokaka Hill.</li> <li>• Understands site will not be subject to provisions and rules of draft PC as designation will continue to override these rules, which means no need for resource consents for works within the designation with only an outline of works required by Council for site upgrades or installation of new infrastructure.</li> <li>• Suggests the addition of this in the rules of the plan change, i.e. that the rules shall not apply to network utility activities, buildings or structures occurring on sites designated for that activity under the DP.</li> <li>• Suggests that Objective LAN.1.2.4 be altered to recognise and provide for existing land use and development including regionally significant infrastructure within ONF and ONL.</li> <li>• Policy LAN.1.3.11 to be altered to have clause (b) removed.</li> <li>• Suggests that thresholds and referencing be reviewed to be consistent regarding permitted and discretionary activities, with some activities being permitted but also falling into discretionary activity status.</li> </ul>
FB-114-39	Trustees of 2M2K Trust	Kirsten Appleton, Marlene Gentry, Kerry Gentry and Matthew Gentry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States the ONL line should be amended to finish in line with the current clearings (they removed toitoi and weeds in relation to building sites on the subdivision).</li> <li>• LAN.2.5 proposed changes makes building a residential unit within the subdivision a non-complying activity which extends costs, time and resources, compliance and delays and allows "recidivist objectors" to have an unnecessary say. Suggests building a residential unit within ONL be made a discretionary activity at most.</li> </ul>
FB-114-40	Scott	Duncan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States the ONL line across his property is shown in the wrong place. Requests a site visit to resolve the issue.</li> </ul>

Sub No	Surname/ Company	First Name/ On Behalf Of	Key Points
FB-114-41	Woolhouse	Grant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• After meeting with Mike Farrow and Glenn Mortimer, they agreed that proposed land did not meet the criteria.</li> <li>• Wants it noted that above consultation and meeting took place on the 18th of May, not allowing enough time to put in a detailed submission.</li> </ul>
FB-114-42	Sinnock	Michael William	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to the severe restrictions on forestry in ONLs.</li> <li>• Forestry is maintained and detracts from natural landscape, protects against erosion, is a carbon sink, wood is less energy input than other building materials.</li> <li>• Wants to plant engineering timbers and doesn't want to pay for resource consents as much of his property is ONL. Most of this ONL contains gorse and tobacco weed. Requests a significant boundary change to turn these areas into forest and gain control over the weeds.</li> <li>• Land was purchased with private earned income, concerned that land could be locked up as an ONL depriving of the potential to earn a profit or recover costs of the land. No guarantee a resource consent would be granted for his desired activities on his own land.</li> <li>• Criteria for deciding an ONL is unclear.</li> <li>• Enclosed a map showing what he thinks would be a reasonable ONL area.</li> </ul>
FB-114-43	TPA Holdings	A M Vitali	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Owns several titles of land as part of a subdivision.</li> <li>• Two titles are almost completely within the proposed ONF area. Development costs so far have been significant. Rates have also been paid. The further building restrictions included in the ONF will make the land impossible to sell. They have already complied with all the rules and regulations required by WDC in creating the titles. Questions what compensation will be available to compensate for policy changes they have opposed and are beyond their control?</li> <li>• Concerned about the mapping of the titles regarding the criteria around native bush and the inclusion of farm land within the ONF.</li> <li>• An archaeological inspection in October 2003 supports their view that the area shouldn't be included as part of an ONF. The NZ Archaeological Association completed records in 1977 that do not mention of the land on the western side of the hill which is owned by TPA Holdings.</li> <li>• Believes that the geopreservation maps are not an accurate reflection of the surrounding land as it exists today.</li> <li>• The location of the land on a private, no exit road has protected the site over many years and this would not change.</li> <li>• Supports the ONF boundary and Scheduled area as shown on the 2011 WDC Operative Planning Map 34.</li> </ul>
FB-114-44	Cliff	Ngairie	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lives on Whatitiri Mountain, thinks rules are "ridiculous".</li> <li>• The Mountain has remained the same for thousands of years.</li> <li>• Owns the land and has no input, nobody listens if they do say something.</li> <li>• Doesn't want anyone stopping them from putting in drains, shifting dirt. There are already rules for buildings, they don't need anymore.</li> </ul>
FB-114-45	Pardington	Alexandra	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met with experts at property of 181 Robinson Road.</li> <li>• Experts agreed the small area of ONL on draft plan on corner of property did not have features to be considered ONL.</li> <li>• Wants boundary of ONL to be amended to the line of the paper road as per the attached map.</li> </ul>
FB-114-46	Lyon	Lois	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Property at Ngunguru Ford Road.</li> <li>• Agrees with the need to protect the environment, however the draft plan will have an adverse affect on the value of the property.</li> <li>• Questions compensation for the reduction of the property value.</li> <li>• Questions reduced taxes to reflect the reduced property value.</li> <li>• Suggest the waiving of any property taxes to compensate for the loss of property value.</li> </ul>
FB-114-47	Kartheus	Philipp	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bought property prior to DP review with intention to build a house on Site 1, or if not possible, Site 2.</li> <li>• Land is very steep with limited availability of a house site.</li> <li>• Proposed ONL is very small on the property, but will make it difficult if not impossible to build a home.</li> <li>• Proposes the ONL areas be removed/excluded from the proposed restrictions.</li> </ul>

Sub No	Surname/ Company	First Name/ On Behalf Of	Key Points
FB-114-48	Thomson	Janet Stenhouse	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wants classifications greatly increased in strength and stringency, showing explicitly that damage is not acceptable and with suitable penalties due to past experience regarding the building of the Waipu walkway and damage to trees and rocks.</li> <li>• Wants education available to publicise the importance and value of the coastal strip between Langs Beach and Waipu Cove.</li> <li>• Wants the rare coastal pancake rocks to be protected, pohutukawa trees to be not damaged or excessively pruned, and that in general native plants and trees of regenerating coastal bush are fully protected (existing farming land use still appropriate however).</li> <li>• The coastal strip between Langs Beach and Waipu Cove to be given additional special and very significant protective classification and category of its own.</li> </ul>
FB-114-49	Wiessing	John	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned the proposed rules could restrict soil preparation for horticultural crops which relates to orchards on Whatitiri Mountain.</li> <li>• Examples of this would be ploughing/rotary cultivation for vegetable crops, ridging/mounding for tree crops such as avocado which make up a significant portion of the included ONL area in Whatitiri.</li> <li>• Suggests earthworks should be a permitted activity provided they are less than 1 metre in depth irrespective of the surface area.</li> <li>• Draft rules for earthworks would only equate to 5cm depth for an area of 1 hectare. Also only 1000m<sup>2</sup> is permitted which is 0.1 hectares. This is inadequate for horticultural land use.</li> </ul>
FB-114-50	Jagger	Murray	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wants part of the ONL line removed from his property as the area is wilding pines which have been left unfelled. Wants the line taken back to the paper road boundary on the attached map.</li> <li>• Had a meeting with Council staff in 2012 who agreed at the time it was inconsistent and should be changed.</li> <li>• Glen Mortimer and Mike Farrow also met on site and agreed this is not ONL and should be pushed back to the paper road boundary.</li> <li>• ONL is part of the farm business, and will become an issue in the future if left as an ONL.</li> </ul>
FB-114-51	Richards	Penelope Mary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unhappy with the poor quality of the maps.</li> <li>• Supports the idea of protecting the land, but does not support the lines drawn on a map with no thought of the implications for the land owners.</li> <li>• May wish to subdivide in the future to support her retirement, this may make this not possible.</li> <li>• Requests the paddock block have ONL boundary moved back towards Manaia. It is a grazing paddock with nothing outstanding or significant on it.</li> <li>• Requests the small triangle at the back of the property is adjusted also. It is surrounded by farmland and has no significant trees or contour and is now mainly gorse.</li> <li>• Is passionate about her land and has been careful to protect and regenerate it.</li> </ul>
FB-114-52	Meyer	Terry and Margaret	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wants proposed boundary to be aligned with the covenant boundary.</li> </ul>
	Routley	David	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Avocados require mounding or ridges in order to avoid trees declining due to lack of drainage.</li> <li>• A limit of 500m<sup>3</sup> would restrict earthworks for land preparation to 0.1 of a hectare. Most avocado blocks are much greater than this.</li> <li>• An avocado orchard has a very large list of machinery and equipment, as well as machinery and equipment for households living on the property. Therefore the limit of 50m<sup>2</sup> in total for buildings and structures is overly restrictive.</li> </ul>
FB-114-54	Pita	Kathy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questions if there was adequate notification given to the Ngatiwai Trust Board and land owners directly affected by their lands being included in the mapping area, and of the RPS changes about to become operative.</li> <li>• Concerns about ONL/ONF areas in Bland Bay on Ngatiwai land blocks which have potential for future development/housing. Concern that the Landscape rules will apply to any Papakainga development.</li> <li>• Concern that Maori land blocks have been included but neighbouring land blocks with a General title appear to be excluded from the proposed policies.</li> <li>• Concern that most of the policies are detrimental to Ngatiwai, not allowing scope or consideration to the relationship Maori have with their ancestral lands. Statistics show more families are returning to their ancestral lands to build homes/create initiatives for their economic future, with constraints and restrictions likely if draft PC114 changes are approved.</li> <li>• Concern that there hasn't been enough time or adequate or appropriate consultation undertaken by Council with Maori and Iwi Authorities.</li> </ul>

Sub No	Surname/ Company	First Name/ On Behalf Of	Key Points
FB-114-55	Stevens	Michael	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unhappy with being unable to communicate with WDC (numerous phone calls made with no calls returned), no copies of previous land surveys provided as per their request.</li> <li>• Proposed changes would dramatically affect the land value of the Trust's property and would limit the family's ability to use the land as per their deed(s). Therefore the Stevens Family Trust would expect reparations to compensate for a massive loss of future family income and sustainability.</li> <li>• The land is neither coastal or of any particular ONL value. Definitions in proposal are ambiguous and vague, needs more clarification to understand the limitations Council will put in place.</li> <li>• Whole-heartedly objects to the current plan, does not accept the terms and affects this would have on his family going forward.</li> </ul>
FB-114-56	Manaia Gardens	Neil Dobbs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Purchased the Manaia Gardens property 5 years ago. The draft PC114 proposal affects approximately 80% of the total land area of the property.</li> <li>• Asks that the current WDC map be adjusted to take into account the decision from the Northland Regional Council relating to the RPS mapping process which established that only HNC (High Natural Character) had been applied to the land.</li> <li>• A notice of complaint has been made to NRC CEO regarding the incorrect mapping of ONL over the land, seeking it to be removed.</li> <li>• Have raised this concern with two representatives of WDC, tried to contact WDC staff leaving a number of messages. Has not had a reply to date which is unacceptable and limits ability to respond.</li> <li>• Strongly objects to any restriction by WDC based on NRC RPS. Would be essentially stealing land rights, causing finance loss and recreational limitations.</li> <li>• WDC shouldn't limit land use based on inconsistent information by the NRC, and would compound mistakes already made.</li> <li>• If WDC limits land use it must negotiate compensation with individuals affected.</li> <li>• Likely that land owners will take whatever action to prevent the limit of the effects of the restrictions, and future areas not allowed to regenerate in fear restrictions will be applied. Current proposal promotes a choice of environmental destruction or loss of land rights.</li> <li>• Do not agree a small group of consultants should have such a strong influence of the outcome of regional and district policy. Do not believe current WDC land restrictions should be based on 20 year old study.</li> <li>• Formally objects to any restriction on family land based on NRC mapping by WDC. As a NZ Maori, considers the current proposal another land grab. Will vigorously defend his right to do what he can do on his land and will challenge any person or body that seeks otherwise.</li> </ul>
FB-114-57	Wallis	Craig	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Phoned to ask for a site visit, spoke to a consultant who promised to set one up. This never happened. Therefore is unable to fully take part.</li> <li>• Bought property in November 2015 with no mention anywhere of the rules changing.</li> <li>• Intention is to maintain the beauty of the features on the property, but to increase the size of the existing dwelling to make it a family home and to add a garage to the site so it can function as a home. This would require more than 50m2 allowed in the proposal but would not impact on the features of the property.</li> <li>• Will be severely disadvantaged, unfairly, if the proposal goes ahead.</li> </ul>
FB-114-58	Belinda Hindmarsh	Andrew Lambert and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dedicated to ensuring the preservation of land owned at Waipu Estate purchased in 2010. Have planted natives and want to increase the biodiversity of the land.</li> <li>• Both members of NZ Speleological Society and Cave Search and Rescue, and want to create low impact on the land both in physical and visual terms.</li> <li>• Are in favour of sensible provisions to protect ONF/ONL areas which do not effectively prohibit or unduly restrict uses of the property based on the existing rules.</li> <li>• The proposals should not unnecessarily restrict the current permitted or discretionary activities. Seems like the proposals are so restrictive in part that they effectively prohibit use or development rather than controlling such activities as least without very significant effort and compliance costs.</li> <li>• May wish to be able to make a detailed submission when the Plan Change is open for public submissions.</li> </ul>

Sub No	Surname/ Company	First Name/ On Behalf Of	Key Points
FB-114-59	Refining NZ	Steve Mutch	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Operates NZs only Oil Refinery, producing 70% of country's fuel requirements. Also owns the Refinery to Auckland Pipeline (RAP). The RAP is subject to designations over its entire length.</li> <li>Refining NZ is a "lifeline utility" Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002, and is recognised as a regionally significant infrastructure in the RPS.</li> <li>No ONL or ONF in Refinery, but several nearby. The RAP however traverses Brynderwyn Ranges and Bush Margins ONL near the Kaipara District.</li> <li>Supports the identification and mapping of ONF and ONLs. But regionally significant infrastructure also needs to be recognised and provided for.</li> <li>Concern that future upgrading/development may have some level of effect on nearby ONF/ONL areas, policies should recognise and provide for the continued operation of established regionally significant infrastructure. Policies need to be strengthened in this regard.</li> <li>Concern for works that may be required outside of the RAPs designated corridor. Rules need to recognise and provide for this.</li> <li>Concern about additional clarity needed in LAN.1, with it not clear if the provisions apply within an ONL/ONF or apply to the District, i.e. Policy 13, and in LAN.1.1 it being clear that it applies within ONL and ONF areas only.</li> <li>LAN.1.1 needs to recognise regionally significant infrastructure. A suggestion is made of alternative wording.</li> <li>Generally supportive of Objective 4, however should also recognise and provide for the continuing operation, maintenance and upgrading of regionally significant infrastructure and provide for regionally significant infrastructure nearby to ONL/ONF areas.</li> <li>Policies 5 and 6 should recognise the operation, maintenance and upgrading of regionally significant infrastructure, it is to restrictive for infrastructure like the RAP.</li> <li>Policy 11 should be changed recognise development going beyond "re-consenting" may be necessary. Policy 11 should not only refer to regionally significant infrastructure within ONLs, "greatest extent practicable" should be revised, and it is unclear if the policy relates to ONF as well as ONL. Policy 11 needs its own heading, and clarity is needed regarding effects on ONLs/ONFs as opposed to effects generally.</li> <li>Concern that policies 19 and 20 favour landscape protection over existing landuses ( regionally significant infrastructure).</li> <li>Policy 20 amended to state it relates to adverse effects on ONLs and ONFs specifically, and to state that its standards do not apply to adverse effects of regionally significant infrastructure.</li> <li>Concerns with Rules not allowing for RAP upgrading works that may be outside of the RAPs designated corridor.</li> <li>Minor upgrading of underground network utilities should be a permitted activity.</li> <li>LAN2.2 and LAN4.2 notification rules should be deleted.</li> </ul>
FB-114-60	Ngatiwai Trust Board - Resource Management Unit	Dane Karapu	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opposed to proposed changes in PC114. Proposed changes may impede on future aspirations of Maori development within the Ngatiwai Rohe and also the cultural values of Ngatiwai tangata whenua.</li> </ul>
FB-114-61	Watene	Andrew Ngere	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Oppose to land included in proposed PC114. Mapping includes part of land which is Maori land and bypasses neighbouring properties which are general land (which is made up of the same natural features).</li> <li>Not their intention to remove large amount of trees or do any major excavations, but do have aspirations of Papakainga housing for children and grandchildren in near future which will be hampered by this.</li> <li>Want map line moved to the East side of Whangaruru North Road.</li> </ul>
FB-114-62	Taylor	Michael N	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned that ONL term is so subjective, needs clarification of the criteria applied.</li> <li>Current RMA legislation is difficult enough without further restrictions applied on farming businesses.</li> <li>Do not agree with large area of property assessed as ONL. Feels landscape is less significant than many other sites. Is just common bush type that has not regenerated naturally (has been modified by logging, pests and weeds before their ownership). Bush is not seen from the road, therefore no amenity value for public.</li> <li>Mapping does not treat properties equally. Similar properties nearby are excluded. Feels the treatment needs to be fair and equal.</li> <li>Has always been owners intention to care for the property regarding conservation and sustainability. For 40 years has gone to considerable expense to hunt/trap and minimise large number of pests and predators, adding fencing and controlling stock. Councils need to recognise huge effort landowners put in to care for the environment and to make a living on the land.</li> </ul>

Sub No	Surname/ Company	First Name/ On Behalf Of	Key Points
FB-114-63	Brown	Janice Margaret	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned that bush blocks are being randomly picked out to be an ONL.</li> <li>Concerned about native bush being cut down in Tikipunga for a subdivision when there are already empty sections on Corks Road to be built on.</li> <li>Have been looking after bush on their farm for over 40 years, so think they can manage it for many more years without having to pay for consents when something needs to be done.</li> <li>Suggests every farm and lifestyle block owner should have to plant an area of native trees to protect birdlife and landscape.</li> </ul>
FB-114-64	Thompson	Catherine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Against the proposed plan change PC114 including her whenua.</li> <li>Restricts whenua from using land to accommodate future generations.</li> </ul>
FB-114-65	McInnes	Leanne	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Needs clarification on why a particular property is included as an ONL or ONF and not neighbouring properties.</li> <li>A great proportion of grassland has been included in the maps.</li> <li>Most property owners take care to maintain native bush areas without having rules imposed.</li> </ul>
FB-114-66	Sowry	Mark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Currently farming beef on the property.</li> <li>Most of the property is not seen from the road.</li> <li>A large fire on the property 60 years ago mean very few trees exceed this age, and goat farming on the property previously means that light scrub is also young.</li> <li>Proposal is economically punitive. Restrictions on track building and maintenance make it uneconomically viable to maintain or construct fencing/carry out predator control/control wandering stock.</li> <li>Restrictions on building reduces ability to care for property and make a living, and it encourages illegal building due to the extra expense and difficulty to get resource consents to build/develop existing building sites.</li> <li>Does not wish to have activities/development planned to be at Councils discretion. Does not want to become a criminal when cutting a load of firewood, clearing a track, fencing.</li> <li>Resource consent process is laborious, expensive and with an unassured outcome.</li> <li>He owns the property and funds the care and maintenance of it. The assessment of his property is "broad brush strokes and not much crack".</li> <li>DOC already has 8.6 million hectares of land, suggests they need to maintain their property before trying to turn his property into a visual park funded by him.</li> </ul>
FB-114-67	Forsythe	Andrew and Kathleen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned and opposed to proposed changes to ONL/ONF designations.</li> <li>Original documentation did not include any specific advice regarding the potential impact of the proposed plan change. The map was unlabelled and indecipherable. Requested a site visit, but this did not occur until 18 May, therefore comments are late.</li> <li>Concerned boundaries were assigned using low resolution aerial photographs without involving a site visit. The site visit resulted in the boundaries for the ONL being resketched to follow scattered totara which had regenerated. These are old field trees and not natural landscape specimens. Council representatives did not visit the whole of the property and did not recognise the preponderance of exotics and very limited extent of mature native vegetative cover. Now feel attempt to remove exotics and release native species damaged their investment and aspiration for sensitive site development.</li> <li>No consideration of the topography and actual opportunity for persons not on their section to actually see the area affected. It is private land. Only potential "benefactors" would be the owners, the rule change is unwarranted.</li> <li>Tentative building site falls within proposed ONL section. This is now possibly unlikely.</li> <li>Concern about constraint on cut and fill activities. In previous suitability report by Cook Costello for the proposed building site, he stated that less than 1000cu m would be required for the construction of the site access and other associated development work.</li> <li>Concern about proposed changes in designation effecting value of property and ability to quietly enjoy that property.</li> <li>If change is permitted, will have distinctly chilling effect on private efforts to restore native flora, with no one wanting to affect the commercial value of their property by including native species in any reforestation plans.</li> <li>Concern about not being able to undertake site works for the benefit of the property, i.e. terracing or contouring for storm water management, retaining walls) which would help with erosion and maintaining the integrity of the underlying cave system.</li> <li>The proposed plan changes have little if anything to do with preserving the best of Whangarei's landscape features and much to do with revenue generation and micromanagement.</li> </ul>

Sub No	Surname/ Company	First Name/ On Behalf Of	Key Points
FB-114-68	Kobylarz	Vincent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regarding Whatitiri Mountain, all resource consent fees should be waived where they would not be payable if not for the new ONF or ONL zonings.</li> <li>Wants earthworks for the establishment or reestablishment of orchards shall be allowed to the depth of 1 metre over the orchard area, not limited to 500m<sup>3</sup> or 1000m<sup>2</sup>.</li> <li>This would allow for best practice of planting on mounds to facilitate drainage, essential for avocados. Many orchards are experiencing severe tree decline and replanting these orchards will be essential if they are to continue being successful businesses.</li> <li>Whangarei District benefits from significant regional income and employment that orchards generate.</li> </ul>
FB-114-69	Maungatapere Water Company Ltd		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has concerns proposed plan changes for ONL/ONF will have on existing activities and land use in Whatitiri area.</li> <li>Company has extensive infrastructure which includes a number of reservoirs within the ONF area, Whatitiri shield volcano.</li> <li>Concern about rules regarding construction of buildings, network facilities, and land preparation/earthworks being restricted discretionary activities.</li> <li>Unable to ascertain the differentiation between restricted discretionary activities as they apply to ONLs vs ONFs, but either way the proposed designation would be inappropriate for the Whatitiri shield volcano area.</li> <li>Area is already extensively modified, developed for horticulture and other extensive land uses that rely on the Maungatapere Irrigation Scheme.</li> <li>It is inappropriate to change the designation of this land apart from the Whatitiri cone, which is already a designated protected reserve. To change the designation would result in a severe impact on the economic activity within the area.</li> </ul>
FB-114-70	Quinn	D B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opposes the inclusion of Whatitiri as an ONF. The cone already is a protected area. The rest of the area designated Whatitiri shield volcano is already a fully commercialised and modified environment.</li> <li>Does not want any further restrictions on land use, and would consider the changes an acquisition of property right by the Council and would expect to be compensated for the loss of those rights.</li> </ul>
FB-114-71	Brown	Michael and Hayley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unsure why some properties have been included and others excluded, i.e. neighbouring properties.</li> <li>Unsure of criteria for ONL/ONF.</li> <li>Concern about large proportion of grassland incorporated in the maps.</li> <li>Most property owners maintain and take care of native bush areas without rules imposed.</li> <li>Has already gifted bush to QEII Trust voluntarily.</li> <li>Landowners have paid rates for many years, for what benefit if they have no rights to do what they wish on their own private land?</li> <li>Questions if the proposal includes Maori land.</li> </ul>
FB-114-72	Child	Murray J	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Family has sustainably farmed this land for 150 years. Disappointed about new rules of what can and can't be done on the land.</li> <li>Area is significant only because family over generations has treated it as such.</li> <li>Wants a boundary change so a significant area can be purchased at a significant price by Council who have imposed restrictions on legal land owners.</li> <li>Will not be paying rates or any other services on the significant area as they do not have total control over what can be done with it.</li> <li>Wants consideration for compensation for the significant area that has been maintained in its present state to this stage.</li> </ul>
FB-114-73	Freeman	Morgan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed changes of PC114 are unnecessarily onerous, and applied to a vast area of the district without considering the balance between protecting natural landscapes and the impact to growth and development of the region.</li> <li>Current WDC provisions are capable of protecting and managing the landscape.</li> <li>Plan change will unfairly impact landowners and create uncertainty.</li> </ul>

Sub No	Surname/ Company	First Name/ On Behalf Of	Key Points
FB-114-74	I & S, Whangarei District Council	Gemma Sands	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WDC is required to provide core services for the District and Community. This includes infrastructure and services. Some of these services are not defined as "regionally significant" and therefore may not be sufficiently provided for under the new draft PC114.</li> <li>• Unhappy that no consultation with I &amp; S took place before the document was released to the public.</li> <li>• Did not receive a copy of the draft plan change when it was distributed to affected parties, would like to be included on the list of affected parties. However wants to be involved before plan changes go to the public.</li> <li>• Wants greater recognition of the critical role of core infrastructure, and to recognise that WDC is charged with the responsibility of delivering the core services set out under the LGA. It is critical that WDC can deliver these core services efficiently, effectively and appropriately, not unduly constrained.</li> <li>• Concerned that the definition of regionally significant infrastructure does not include roads (already established land uses within ONF/ONL). Provisions impose a no complying (publically notified) activity status for the maintenance of existing roads/parking areas within ONFs. The policy should provide for ongoing maintenance within appropriate criteria.</li> <li>• The definition of regionally significant infrastructure does not include infrastructure provided by Parks and Recreation to enable people to access and enjoy ONFs/ONLs (toilets, rubbish bins, walking tracks, signage, lookouts, fencing, car park areas and park benches/picnic tables). Under the rule a resource consent process would be required to provide a park bench at Parihaka. Seeks more consideration of permitted activity criteria for small scale works for infrastructure.</li> <li>• Suggests a separate section for infrastructure may make a clear rule hierarchy for network utilities and other core infrastructure.</li> <li>• Wants further information about routine operation and maintenance by I &amp; S within ONFs and ONLs.</li> <li>• Wants to undertake a detailed examination of WDC assets where they are located within an ONF/ONL and provide a direct comment for each feature or landscape, and to correct potential mapping conflicts.</li> </ul>
FB-114-75	Sarah Hirst	Antony Lydiard and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Purchased property in 2015 with view to future retirement based on zoning being Living 3 and the opportunity to subdivide.</li> <li>• Performed due diligence by meeting with Council and Council planners to discuss, and ordered a LIM prior to purchase.</li> <li>• There was no mention of an ONL and no mention of this in the LIM as this would have directly impacted on the value of the property and their reasons for purchase.</li> <li>• The bush on the ONL is of low value, being a high percentage of weed species. Therefore some bush should be removed and not protected.</li> <li>• Disagree with LAN2.5 - construction of a residential unit should be a permitted activity under the current Living 3 zoning and allows for subdivision and building.</li> <li>• LAN.3.4 - subdivision in a coastal environment should be a permitted activity as it is in Living 3 environment.</li> <li>• LAN.2.32 - earthworks should be altered to allow 500m2 in any 12 month period, and vegetation removal to 500m2 in any 12 month period to allow for buildings in a living zone.</li> <li>• Any ONL land held in 1 title for the benefit of the public should be able to be built on.</li> <li>• Rules governing ONL are contrary to the rules of the existing zone being Living 3.</li> </ul>
FB-114-76	Kathleen Lee	Harold van Blommestein and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LAN.1 - suggests a clear articulation of the expectations of national, regional and district perspectives.</li> <li>• Wants clear statements.</li> <li>• Wants a clearer description of the word "outstanding", and to be able to know what the threshold is.</li> <li>• Suggests that there are outstanding landscapes not included in the maps, and also areas included in the maps that are not outstanding.</li> <li>• Suggests an inclusion of a provision for a review or re-assessment.</li> <li>• Suggests a policy to expedite improvements and enhancements within ONLs.</li> <li>• LAN.2.3 - wants earthworks in an ONL increased in area and volume, as fences, driveways, etc are generally already larger than that, suggests 250m2 and 250m3.</li> <li>• Permitted vegetation clearance needs to include fencing maintenance, and suggests different rules for "virgin landscape" from "already modified" landscape.</li> <li>• LAN.2.3 - suggests tables similar to those in LAN.4 for ONLs.</li> <li>• LAN.6 - questions if same criteria to be applied to rural landscapes adjacent or close to ONLs.</li> </ul>

Sub No	Surname/ Company	First Name/ On Behalf Of	Key Points
FB-114-77	Williams	Edwin J	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strongly objects to ONL line shown on map.</li> <li>• Has attached a map to show where area should extend to as North East of the line is low scrub and gorse and grass areas.</li> <li>• The South West side is taller, older and more diverse and worthy of protection.</li> <li>• States that part of Mt Aubrey should also be classified as ONFs.</li> </ul>
FB-114-78	MacKay	Kerry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has concerns regarding selecting a driveway location on the property. The property has potential to be subdivided into 2, possibly 3 parts.</li> <li>• Feels there should be an allowance within the plan to select 2/3 entry points onto land to maintain access and protect the identified ONL.</li> <li>• The alternative is to construct an access over the ONL which would disrupt the landscape.</li> </ul>
FB-114-79	Taueki	Gail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States that what Council considers Natural may hold a different meaning to Maori land owners, and can even differ hapu to hapu.</li> <li>• Questions what expert advice Council obtained to identify the areas.</li> <li>• Wants to know how a land owner can put forward a case to dispute or recommend a natural landscape or feature.</li> <li>• Questions how resource consent and how this is measured.</li> <li>• Questions costs towards protection.</li> <li>• Questions if there is access to funds to remedy effects on ONL/ONF under papakāinga development.</li> </ul>
FB-114-80	Paraku	Erin William Paul	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States that what Council considers Natural may hold a different meaning to Maori land owners, and can even differ hapu to hapu.</li> <li>• Questions what expert advice Council obtained to identify the areas.</li> <li>• Wants to know how a land owner can put forward a case to dispute or recommend a natural landscape or feature.</li> <li>• Questions how resource consent and how this is measured.</li> <li>• Questions costs towards protection.</li> <li>• Questions if there is access to funds to remedy effects on ONL/ONF under papakāinga development.</li> </ul>
	Tairua	Mark A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States that what Council considers Natural may hold a different meaning to Maori land owners, and can even differ hapu to hapu.</li> <li>• Questions what expert advice Council obtained to identify the areas.</li> <li>• Wants to know how a land owner can put forward a case to dispute or recommend a natural landscape or feature.</li> <li>• Questions how resource consent and how this is measured.</li> <li>• Questions costs towards protection.</li> <li>• Questions if there is access to funds to remedy effects on ONL/ONF under papakāinga development.</li> </ul>