

Sub No	Sub Point	Surname/ Company	First Name/ On Behalf Of	Support/ Oppose	Submission Topic	Relief Sought	Reasons	Wish to be Heard?
PC94B-08	a	Northpower	Sarah Brownie	Support	Access	Ensure that appropriate access is available to identified sites to ensure that reticulation is a viable option for Papakāinga housing proposals.	Northpower would like to support iwi to develop papakāinga housing in an effective and efficient manner.	Yes
PC94B-16	a	Harrison	John	Not Stated	Access	Clause included: Before any papakāinga developments proceed the legal must be formed and in use.	Existing situation at Pataua South where there is a legal paper road but whanau use an illegal track over DOC land for the last 35 years.	Not Stated
PC94B-25	b	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Bill Edwards	Support with Amendment	Additional Controls	That PKA.1.5 and PKA.1.6 be modified as follows (or words to the effect): 1.a.vii. The location of any recorded or unrecorded historic heritage including archaeology that is protected by the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014. 1.a.viii. The PDP is accompanied by an assessment from a suitably qualified and experienced professional regarding the protection of any historic heritage in consultation with Heritage New Zealand. 2.d.vii. The location of any recorded or unrecorded historic heritage including archaeology that is protected by the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014. 2.d.ix. The PDP is accompanied by an assessment from a suitably qualified and experienced professional regarding the protection of any historic heritage in consultation with Heritage New Zealand.	All development by anyone should comply with Council's regulations and requirements. This provides the nexus between the stated objectives and policies with the rules of the proposal in so far as it relates to historic heritage. This would also highlight the need to comply with other legal requirements (namely the HNZPTA).	Yes
PC94B-29	a	Oberholster	Dirk and Nicci	Seek amendment	Additional Controls	Environmental issues need addressing - particular water and wetland preservation and native bush and bird habitat preservation:	It is conflicting to suggest vegetation clearance in a bush area of 1ha or more is limited to 500m. If there is no limit on housing and other construction it is conflicting to suggest there are environmental safeguards in place. Grave concerns for native birds. No restrictions or controls in place for bush and wetland protection.	No, would consider a joint hearing
PC94B-31	c	Nielsen	Shane	Oppose	Additional Controls	All controls need to be researched more thoroughly so that they fit the needs of a papakāinga in a coastal, rural and residential environment.	The proposed plan change provisions cannot guarantee preservation of existing environments, preservation of existing settlement or rural character, the amenity values for those who live within or adjacent to Maori ancestral land.	No

PC94B - Papakāinga
Summary Of Submissions by Topic

Sub No	Sub Point	Surname/ Company	First Name/ On Behalf Of	Support/ Oppose	Submission Topic	Relief Sought	Reasons	Wish to be Heard?
PC94B-34	b	Nielsen	Tania	Oppose Seek Amendment	Additional Controls	Current environment rules retained with an addition added to each environment concerning papakāinga development that allows for permitted activity for a maximum of five residential buildings (including existing) providing it meets all the rest of the environment rules, all servicing requirements and additionally specifies for density and placing of those units, whilst taking into consideration the adjoining environments. Specific example for Coastal Countryside Environment: On Māori freehold land as defined in the Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993, residential papakāinga developments are a permitted activity provided that: 1) it does not exceed a maximum of five individual residential units (including existing units) in each Papakāinga area, and have a density of one unit per 2000m2, and 2) they meet all other requirements (setbacks, daylight angles, max building heights, of the environment rules for the location in which it is sited, and 3) have met all access, roading, water, wastewater and storm water in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Environmental Engineering Standards 2010, and 4) provide landscaping on boundaries for a width of 2m, and where network utilities are located, to mitigate visual amenity of the landscape.	PC94B provisions do not give adequate controls regarding density and placement, height, setbacks, coverage, landscaping to maintain the amenity values and landscape character of the coastal countryside environment. This way the location of Māori land is taken into account. There is too much scope in terms of development. For places of assembly, it does not give any controls on traffic movement, and par parking, this would result in a loss of amenity and safety for pedestrians and road users. For places of commercial or industrial activities, it does not give any controls on the type of commercial/industrial activity permitted, hours of operation, traffic movement or car parking.	No
PC94B-36	c	Bates	Stan	Oppose	Additional Controls	All controls need to be researched more thoroughly so that they fit the needs of a papakāinga in a coastal, rural and residential environment.	The proposed plan change provisions cannot guarantee preservation of existing environments, preservation of existing settlement or rural character, the amenity values for those who live within or adjacent to Māori ancestral land.	No
PC94B-38	d	Cregeen	Philip	Oppose	Additional Controls	Add PKA.1.5.1.a.vii: The plan has been notified to all adjacent residential property owners. Typo PKA.5.1 should be PKA.1.5 Add PKA.1.6.2.d add viii: The plan has been notified to all adjacent residential property owners Typo 2. and 2c - PKA.6.1 should read PKA.1.6	So that adjacent property owners are aware and have opportunity to comment on plans that may affect their neighbourhood.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-43	c	Evans	Gwyn	Seek amendment	Additional Controls	Add PKA.1.5.1.c as follows: c. The following conditions are met i. Residential Papakāinga developments are not adjacent (within 250m) to any existing established settlements. ii. Commercial Papakāinga developments are not adjacent (within 1000m) to any existing established settlements. iii. Other Papakāinga development are not adjacent (within 500m) to any existing established settlements. iv. The Papakāinga developments are not on land of significant natural and historic heritage.	It is not appropriate for places of assembly and commercial activities to be treated the same, and to be covered by a PA status especially when adjacent to existing communities or within environmentally sensitive areas.	Yes, would also consider joint

PC94B - Papakāinga
Summary Of Submissions by Topic

Sub No	Sub Point	Surname/ Company	First Name/ On Behalf Of	Support/ Oppose	Submission Topic	Relief Sought	Reasons	Wish to be Heard?
PC94B-46	c	Creegen	Pamela	Oppose	Additional Controls	All controls need to be researched more thoroughly so that they fit the needs of a papakāinga in a coastal, rural and residential environment.	The proposed plan change provisions cannot guarantee preservation of existing environments, preservation of existing settlement or rural character, the amenity values for those who live within or adjacent to Māori ancestral land.	No
PC94B-47	c	Klenner	Robert and Monica	Oppose	Additional Controls	All controls need to be researched more thoroughly so that they fit the needs of a papakāinga in a coastal, rural and residential environment.	The proposed plan change provisions cannot guarantee preservation of existing environments, preservation of existing settlement or rural character, the amenity values for those who live within or adjacent to Māori ancestral land.	No
PC94B-48	c	Simonsen	Patti	Oppose	Additional Controls	All controls need to be researched more thoroughly so that they fit the needs of a papakāinga in a coastal, rural and residential environment.	The proposed plan change provisions cannot guarantee preservation of existing environments, preservation of existing settlement or rural character, the amenity values for those who live within or adjacent to Māori ancestral land.	Yes
PC94B-48	d	Simonsen	Patti	Oppose	Additional Controls	Meeting house / commercial building to be 200m from existing coastal community. Limit houses.	Existing community is affected and should remain as low intensity development.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-49	c	Simonsen	Andrew	Oppose	Additional Controls	All controls need to be researched more thoroughly so that they fit the needs of a papakāinga in a coastal, rural and residential environment.	The proposed plan change provisions cannot guarantee preservation of existing environments, preservation of existing settlement or rural character, the amenity values for those who live within or adjacent to Māori ancestral land.	No
PC94B-49	d	Simonsen	Andrew	Oppose	Additional Controls	Meeting house / commercial building to be 200m from existing coastal community. Limit houses.	Existing community is affected and should remain as low intensity development.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-50	c	Ross	Noeleen and Sonny	Oppose	Additional Controls	All controls need to be researched more thoroughly so that they fit the needs of a papakāinga in a coastal, rural and residential environment.	The proposed plan change provisions cannot guarantee preservation of existing environments, preservation of existing settlement or rural character, the amenity values for those who live within or adjacent to Māori ancestral land.	Yes
PC94B-51	c	Oxenham	Trent	Oppose	Additional Controls	All controls need to be researched more thoroughly so that they fit the needs of a papakāinga in a coastal, rural and residential environment.	The proposed plan change provisions cannot guarantee preservation of existing environments, preservation of existing settlement or rural character, the amenity values for those who live within or adjacent to Māori ancestral land.	No
PC94B-52	c	Ryder	R N	Oppose	Additional Controls	All controls need to be researched more thoroughly so that they fit the needs of a papakāinga in a coastal, rural and residential environment.	The proposed plan change provisions cannot guarantee preservation of existing environments, preservation of existing settlement or rural character, the amenity values for those who live within or adjacent to Māori ancestral land.	No
PC94B-55	c	Stables	Gary	Oppose	Additional Controls	All controls need to be researched more thoroughly so that they fit the needs of a papakāinga in a coastal, rural and residential environment.	The proposed plan change provisions cannot guarantee preservation of existing environments, preservation of existing settlement or rural character, the amenity values for those who live within or adjacent to Māori ancestral land.	Yes
PC94B-59	a	Martin	Kerry	Seek amendment	Additional Controls	Approve, but only with improved standards.	The proposed provisions are lacking sufficient detail to meet good design and planning to address stormwater, sewerage, access, roading standards in these areas.	No

Sub No	Sub Point	Surname/ Company	First Name/ On Behalf Of	Support/ Oppose	Submission Topic	Relief Sought	Reasons	Wish to be Heard?
PC94B-61	c	Gallagher	Natalie	Oppose	Additional Controls	All controls need to be researched more thoroughly so that they fit the needs of a papakāinga in a coastal, rural and residential environment.	The proposed plan change provisions cannot guarantee preservation of existing environments, preservation of existing settlement or rural character, the amenity values for those who live within or adjacent to Māori ancestral land.	No
PC94B-62	c	Frische	Lee	Oppose	Additional Controls	All controls need to be researched more thoroughly so that they fit the needs of a papakāinga in a coastal, rural and residential environment.	The proposed plan change provisions cannot guarantee preservation of existing environments, preservation of existing settlement or rural character, the amenity values for those who live within or adjacent to Māori ancestral land.	No
PC94B-63	c	Frische	Paul	Oppose	Additional Controls	All controls need to be researched more thoroughly so that they fit the needs of a papakāinga in a coastal, rural and residential environment.	The proposed plan change provisions cannot guarantee preservation of existing environments, preservation of existing settlement or rural character, the amenity values for those who live within or adjacent to Māori ancestral land.	No
PC94B-64	c	Brooke	Anthony	Oppose	Additional Controls	All controls need to be researched more thoroughly so that they fit the needs of a papakāinga in a coastal, rural and residential environment.	The proposed plan change provisions cannot guarantee preservation of existing environments, preservation of existing settlement or rural character, the amenity values for those who live within or adjacent to Māori ancestral land.	No
PC94B-65	c	Green	Brian	Oppose	Additional Controls	All controls need to be researched more thoroughly so that they fit the needs of a papakāinga in a coastal, rural and residential environment.	The proposed plan change provisions cannot guarantee preservation of existing environments, preservation of existing settlement or rural character, the amenity values for those who live within or adjacent to Māori ancestral land.	No
PC94B-66	c	Green	Leanne	Oppose	Additional Controls	All controls need to be researched more thoroughly so that they fit the needs of a papakāinga in a coastal, rural and residential environment.	The proposed plan change provisions cannot guarantee preservation of existing environments, preservation of existing settlement or rural character, the amenity values for those who live within or adjacent to Māori ancestral land.	No
PC94B-67	c	de Beer	J G	Oppose	Additional Controls	All controls need to be researched more thoroughly so that they fit the needs of a papakāinga in a coastal, rural and residential environment.	The proposed plan change provisions cannot guarantee preservation of existing environments, preservation of existing settlement or rural character, the amenity values for those who live within or adjacent to Māori ancestral land.	No
PC94B-68	c	Laing	Michael	Oppose	Additional Controls	All controls need to be researched more thoroughly so that they fit the needs of a papakāinga in a coastal, rural and residential environment.	The proposed plan change provisions cannot guarantee preservation of existing environments, preservation of existing settlement or rural character, the amenity values for those who live within or adjacent to Māori ancestral land.	No
PC94B-69	c	King	Janet	Oppose	Additional Controls	All controls need to be researched more thoroughly so that they fit the needs of a papakāinga in a coastal, rural and residential environment.	The proposed plan change provisions cannot guarantee preservation of existing environments, preservation of existing settlement or rural character, the amenity values for those who live within or adjacent to Māori ancestral land.	No
PC94B-70	c	Crosbie	S	Oppose	Additional Controls	All controls need to be researched more thoroughly so that they fit the needs of a papakāinga in a coastal, rural and residential environment.	The proposed plan change provisions cannot guarantee preservation of existing environments, preservation of existing settlement or rural character, the amenity values for those who live within or adjacent to Māori ancestral land.	No

Sub No	Sub Point	Surname/ Company	First Name/ On Behalf Of	Support/ Oppose	Submission Topic	Relief Sought	Reasons	Wish to be Heard?
PC94B-71	c	Pool	John	Oppose	Additional Controls	All controls need to be researched more thoroughly so that they fit the needs of a papakāinga in a coastal, rural and residential environment.	The proposed plan change provisions cannot guarantee preservation of existing environments, preservation of existing settlement or rural character, the amenity values for those who live within or adjacent to Māori ancestral land.	No
PC94B-72	c	Pattinson	Shelley	Oppose	Additional Controls	All controls need to be researched more thoroughly so that they fit the needs of a papakāinga in a coastal, rural and residential environment.	The proposed plan change provisions cannot guarantee preservation of existing environments, preservation of existing settlement or rural character, the amenity values for those who live within or adjacent to Māori ancestral land.	Yes
PC94B-73	c	Larkin	Elaine	Oppose	Additional Controls	All controls need to be researched more thoroughly so that they fit the needs of a papakāinga in a coastal, rural and residential environment.	The proposed plan change provisions cannot guarantee preservation of existing environments, preservation of existing settlement or rural character, the amenity values for those who live within or adjacent to Māori ancestral land.	No
PC94B-74	c	Alast	Shirley	Oppose	Additional Controls	All controls need to be researched more thoroughly so that they fit the needs of a papakāinga in a coastal, rural and residential environment.	The proposed plan change provisions cannot guarantee preservation of existing environments, preservation of existing settlement or rural character, the amenity values for those who live within or adjacent to Māori ancestral land.	No
PC94B-80	c	Spencer	Nicola	Oppose	Additional Controls	Amend PKA.1.5.1.b.i as follows: The setback of buildings from ALL boundaries (including road boundaries) should be the same as the required setback for developments on adjoining land (i.e. the same side yard, rear yard and front yard setbacks that would apply and the height in relation to boundary requirement.) Delete PKA.1.5.1.a.iii. and make it clear that any commercial element of a papakāinga development is discretionary. This should include activities further than 100m from boundaries and smaller than 500m ² g.f.a (places of assembly, education facilities can still be included within these thresholds) oppose that this can include commercial activities If the activity is to be permitted, there needs to be more performance standards. However restricted discretionary status is far preferred so that suitable conditions can be imposed.	Requiring developments only to comply with the height in relation to boundary setback that applies in the residential zone would significantly compromise the character and amenity of adjoining sites. Additional standards should apply to ensure that proposals are more compatible with the surrounding sites and that the amenity of neighbours are not unduly affected. The section 32 report does not assess the effects of papakāinga developments on existing communities at all.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-82	a	Flynn	Myles	Not Stated	Additional Controls	Consideration be given to the protection of many nesting sites of migratory birds and native birds.	Specific concerns about a property at Ngunguru which contains a small pond that has been an attraction for many years for visiting birds and native species. Further to this we have no objection to the considered development of ancestral Māori land, providing all of the statutory requirements of council are met, especially suitable access ways, water wastewater and stormwater run offs, roading and driveways.	No, would consider joint case

Sub No	Sub Point	Surname/ Company	First Name/ On Behalf Of	Support/ Oppose	Submission Topic	Relief Sought	Reasons	Wish to be Heard?
PC94B-83	c	Ross	Lawrence and Elaine	Oppose	Additional Controls	All controls need to be researched more thoroughly so that they fit the needs of a papakāinga in a coastal, rural and residential environment. <u>Add additional control to PKA.1.5.1.b as follows: That a buffer zone of 200 metre is created between privately owned land and any future papakāinga development.</u>	The proposed plan change provisions cannot guarantee preservation of existing environments, preservation of existing settlement or rural character, the amenity values for those who live within or adjacent to Māori ancestral land. A 200m buffer would help ensure all residents retain quiet enjoyment of their individual properties, thus minimising the impact on peoples everyday lives.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-85	b	Henriette Politano	David Martin and	Oppose	Additional Controls	Consider the impact of any development on the landscape, amenity value and public infrastructure. Vegetation clearance to be limited to 500m ² per 1ha overall.	Concerned about the inadequacy of the section 32 report which does not adequately consider the impact of the development on public infrastructure and the amenity and character values in the surrounding environment.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-89	b	Gardner	Elizabeth Ann	Oppose	Additional Controls	Decline the plan change.	Matapouri is an inappropriate location for any activities which may create trade waste. Papakāinga developments have the potential to generate significant traffic movements. An ITA should be required to accompany any PDP. There should be a limitation on the GFA of any place of assembly which have potential to generate significant traffic movements. PKA.1.5.1.b.x will not adequately address the above effects. Policy 1.4.2 is irrelevant to a permitted activity. Development under a PDP should be scrutinised for its effects on the local and wider roading network.	No, but would consider joint case
PC94B-91	a	Visser	Dr Ingrid	Oppose	Additional Controls	Delete PKA. 1.5.1.b.i. and replace with the following (or similar): The natural environments, especially sensitive coastal zones, should be given the highest levels of protection, regardless of the historic or current owner(s), be they crown private or Māori and as such any development must be met with restrictions that reflect the highest levels of protection for flora and fauna and to also protect intrinsic (including visual) value.	Māori should have the right to maintain and enhance their traditional and cultural relationship with their ancestral land, however other people should not be adversely affected by developments. Natural environments should be given the highest level of protection. We are all New Zealanders and we all should be involved in protecting precious flora and fauna.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-102	c	King	Neville	Oppose	Additional Controls	All controls need to be researched more thoroughly so that they fit the needs of a papakāinga in a coastal, rural and residential environment.	The proposed plan change provisions cannot guarantee preservation of existing environments, preservation of existing settlement or rural character, the amenity values for those who live within or adjacent to Māori ancestral land.	No
PC94B-106	c	Lorimer	Elizabeth	Oppose	Additional Controls	All controls need to be researched more thoroughly so that they fit the needs of a papakāinga in a coastal, rural and residential environment.	The proposed plan change provisions cannot guarantee preservation of existing environments, preservation of existing settlement or rural character, the amenity values for those who live within or adjacent to Māori ancestral land.	Yes
PC94B-107	c	Lorimer	Stuart	Oppose	Additional Controls	All controls need to be researched more thoroughly so that they fit the needs of a papakāinga in a coastal, rural and residential environment.	The proposed plan change provisions cannot guarantee preservation of existing environments, preservation of existing settlement or rural character, the amenity values for those who live within or adjacent to Māori ancestral land.	Yes

Sub No	Sub Point	Surname/ Company	First Name/ On Behalf Of	Support/ Oppose	Submission Topic	Relief Sought	Reasons	Wish to be Heard?
PC94B-114	a	Debbie Bidlake	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Support, Seek amendment	Additional Controls	That WDC amend the objectives, policies and rules in PC94B to provide appropriate setbacks for any Papakainga developments from boundaries adjoining agriculture, horticulture and forestry land.	Federated Farmers generally supports PC94B, but is keen to ensure that adverse impacts (in particular reverse sensitivity) of Papakainga development on adjoining land are appropriately managed. Setback distances within the boundary of the Māori Land should be established to avoid possible conflict with existing lawfully established agricultural, forestry and horticultural activities on adjoining properties. Papakainga dwellings and habitable buildings should be setback at least 30 m from boundaries. These setbacks may need to be greater depending on the location of intensive livestock farm buildings (e.g. milking sheds, poultry sheds etc.) and the kind of Papakainga development that is proposed.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-13	e	Landowners Coalition Inc	Frank Newman	Oppose	Commercial and Industrial activities	Commercial or industrial activities should be treated as a non-complying activity subject to public notification.	We strongly oppose the policy permitting commercial and industrial activities of any scale. We find it ironic that this plan change permits commercial and industrial activities if the gross floor area is less than 500m ² , while Plan Change 114 Landscapes prohibits such activities. Environmental issues should be considered by all landowners, regardless of race.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-17	d	Reed	Ivan and Karen	Oppose	Commercial and Industrial activities	Commercial or industrial activities should not be permitted without resource consents and district plan provisions, or the notification of adjoining landowners.	Environmental issues should be considered by all landowners, regardless of race.	Would consider a joint case
PC94B-56	e	Marshall	Ivan	Oppose	Commercial and Industrial activities	Commercial or industrial activities should be treated as a non-complying activity subject to public notification.	We strongly oppose the policy permitting commercial and industrial activities of any scale. We find it ironic that this plan change permits commercial and industrial activities if the gross floor area is less than 500m ² , while Plan Change 114 Landscapes prohibits such activities.	Would consider a joint case
PC94B-108	b	Heard	Leonard	Oppose	Commercial and Industrial activities	Keep papakāinga developments to housing only.	There is no need or requirement for any commercial or industrial development on papakāinga developments. The purpose is to provide opportunities for Māori landowners to live on their ancestral land e.g. housing.	No
PC94B-109	c	Muriel Newman	New Zealand Centre for Political Research	Oppose	Commercial and Industrial activities	That PC94B be withdrawn.	The potential impact not only on neighbours, but also the wider community, of enabling the owners of Māori ancestral land to establish multiple housing units or commercial or industrial developments - which could well be leased out to third-party businesses, who would probably pay handsomely for the opportunity to establish their ventures without having to go through the normal resource consent process – as a permitted activity, are profound. The risks to landowners and the community are too great.	Not Stated

Sub No	Sub Point	Surname/ Company	First Name/ On Behalf Of	Support/ Oppose	Submission Topic	Relief Sought	Reasons	Wish to be Heard?
PC94B-60	a	Sol Williams, Tari Williams, Storm Williams, Wana Williams and Rakau Williams	Neeta Kingi,	Oppose	Control of Māori Land	There should be no control of Māori land.	We should be able to do what we want on our land. It was given to us by our Tupuna and you have no right to have a say, why pay rates when we can't utilise our own land.	No
PC94B-90	j	Far North District Council		Seek amendment	Corrections	Amend references in PKA.1.5.2 and PKA.1.6.2.	Reference to specific rule should read PKA.1.5 not "PKA.5.1". Reference to specific rules should read PKA.1.6a and PKA.1.6b not "PKA.6.1a" and "PKA.6.1b".	No
PC94B-02	d	Tairua	Mark	Not Stated	Definitions	Clarity sought as to what is constituted to be Papakāinga?	Wants to know if a small cabin used occasionally would constitute papakāinga. What rights to Council have to determine what can be erected on the submitters land?	Not Stated
PC94B-04	a	Darby	Chris	Support	Definitions	Clarity being provided to Ancestral Link and that this be better defined in a way that requires uninterrupted ownership be proven for General Land owned by Māori.	Owens 170ha of land at 732 Rockell Road, Whananaki that abuts General land owned by Māori.	No
PC94B-23	d	Taueki	Gail Diane	Not Stated	Definitions	Clarity sought as to what is constituted to be Papakāinga.	Would a small cabin used occasionally would constitute papakāinga. What rights to Council have to determine what can be erected on the submitters land?	Not Stated
PC94B-30	d	Cherrington	Betty	Not Stated	Definitions	Clarity sought as to what is constituted to be Papakāinga?	Wants to know if a small cabin used occasionally would determine what can be erected on the submitters land?	Not Stated
PC94B-11	a	Braithwaite	Lee	Oppose	Effects on Neighbouring Properties	That the residents directly affected by this plan change will not be detrimentally affected by the change of use of land to papakāinga developments thus devaluing their properties.	Concerned that the plan change could render home unliveable from all the permitted activities next door.	No
PC94B-13	d	Landowners Coalition Inc	Frank Newman	Oppose	Effects on Neighbouring Properties	Where an activity would not be permitted under the underlying Environmental provisions, that activity should be treated as a discretionary activity requiring notification to adjoining and affected landowners.	The adverse effects on adjoining landowners may be potentially significant, and impact on social and economic well-being.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-14	a	Wood	Edward	Oppose	Effects on Neighbouring Properties	That the plan change be rejected and the status quo maintained.	Owens and operates a farm next to Māori land and is constantly dealing with wild cattle, roaming dogs and unemployed youth. Opposes the changes which will allow the possibility of any of the above to eventuate especially if they have special rules and resource conditions.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-17	a	Reed	Ivan and Karen	Oppose	Effects on Neighbouring Properties	Consultation with adjoining landowners and the requirements of all consents and government regulations should be adhered to.	Adjoining landowners should be able to have a say on any papakāinga developments on adjoining land. The proposed provisions create two separate laws for Māori and non-Māori.	Would consider a joint case
PC94B-18	b	Wyeth	Mike and Cynthia	Not Stated	Effects on Neighbouring Properties	Any building should be at least 60m from all boundaries. Strict earthworks restrictions should apply. Requirement that public can view papakāinga development plans.	Specific concerns about earthworks undertaken on adjoining site causing effects on their property. A development plan complying with environmental and engineering standards needs to be available to be sighted by the public and notice given accordingly.	No, but would consider presenting a joint case

PC94B - Papakāinga
Summary Of Submissions by Topic

Sub No	Sub Point	Surname/ Company	First Name/ On Behalf Of	Support/ Oppose	Submission Topic	Relief Sought	Reasons	Wish to be Heard?
PC94B-21	b	Trewhella	Dennis and Pam	Not Stated	Effects on Neighbouring Properties	Greater clarity and specificity around what is or is not permitted should be provided.	The potential impact on neighbouring properties presents a potential risk associated with the character and quality of these developments.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-22	a	Martin	Glenn and Katie	Seek amendment	Effects on Neighbouring Properties	Amend the provisions to provide more certainty for adjoining and neighbouring landowners. In particular, more guidance is required on density expectations, bulk and location provisions (particularly for external boundaries), design / layout, notification guidelines / rules.	The rules and policies do not provide enough certainty about the types of development and its effect on adjoining landowners. Restricting development potential through the physical characteristics of the land is too open ended.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-32	a	Buckland	James	Oppose	Effects on Neighbouring Properties	Council reconsider PC94B and include safeguards for property owners and communities along side Māori Ancestral land that take into account all the requirements of the RMA.	PC94B does not address the impact of papakāinga on existing adjacent residential communities, such as ours or provide any safeguards.	Not Stated
PC94B-33	c	Evans	Nicole	Oppose	Effects on Neighbouring Properties	Council reconsider PC94B and include safeguards for property owners and communities along side Māori Ancestral land that take into account all the requirements of the RMA.	PC94B does not address the impact of papakāinga on existing adjacent residential communities, such as ours or provide any safeguards.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-34	d	Nielsen	Tania	Oppose	Effects on Neighbouring Properties	Council reconsider PC94B and include safeguards for property owners and communities along side Māori Ancestral land that take into account all the requirements of the RMA.	PC94B does not address the impact of papakāinga on existing adjacent residential communities, such as ours or provide any safeguards.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-43	f	Evans	Gwyn	Oppose	Effects on Neighbouring Properties	Council reconsider PC94B and include safeguards for property owners and communities along side Māori Ancestral land that take into account all the requirements of the RMA.	PC94B does not address the impact of papakāinga on existing adjacent residential communities, such as ours or provide any safeguards.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-46	b	Cregeen	Pamela	Oppose	Effects on Neighbouring Properties	Council reconsider PC94B and include safeguards for property owners and communities along side Māori Ancestral land that take into account all the requirements of the RMA.	There could be a wide range of adverse effects on local residents which could be significant.	No
PC94B-47	b	Klenner	Robert and Monica	Oppose	Effects on Neighbouring Properties	Council reconsider PC94B and include safeguards for property owners and communities along side Māori Ancestral land that take into account all the requirements of the RMA.	There could be a wide range of adverse effects on local residents which could be significant.	No
PC94B-48	b	Simonsen	Patti	Oppose	Effects on Neighbouring Properties	Council reconsider PC94B and include safeguards for property owners and communities along side Māori Ancestral land that take into account all the requirements of the RMA.	There could be a wide range of adverse effects on local residents which could be significant.	Yes
PC94B-48	f	Simonsen	Patti	Oppose	Effects on Neighbouring Properties	Resource consents should be required with local resident involvement.	Concerned about noise, stability, parking and increased traffic effects for adjacent community.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-49	b	Simonsen	Andrew	Oppose	Effects on Neighbouring Properties	Council reconsider PC94B and include safeguards for property owners and communities along side Māori Ancestral land that take into account all the requirements of the RMA.	There could be a wide range of adverse effects on local residents which could be significant.	No
PC94B-49	f	Simonsen	Andrew	Oppose	Effects on Neighbouring Properties	Resource consents should be required with local resident involvement.	Concerned about noise, stability, parking and increased traffic effects for adjacent community.	Yes, would also consider joint

PC94B - Papakāinga
Summary Of Submissions by Topic

Sub No	Sub Point	Surname/ Company	First Name/ On Behalf Of	Support/ Oppose	Submission Topic	Relief Sought	Reasons	Wish to be Heard?
PC94B-50	b	Ross	Noeleen and Sonny	Oppose	Effects on Neighbouring Properties	Council reconsider PC94B and include safeguards for property owners and communities along side Māori Ancestral land that take into account all the requirements of the RMA.	There could be a wide range of adverse effects on local residents which could be significant.	Yes
PC94B-51	b	Oxenham	Trent	Oppose	Effects on Neighbouring Properties	Council reconsider PC94B and include safeguards for property owners and communities along side Māori Ancestral land that take into account all the requirements of the RMA.	There could be a wide range of adverse effects on local residents which could be significant.	No
PC94B-52	b	Ryder	R N	Oppose	Effects on Neighbouring Properties	Council reconsider PC94B and include safeguards for property owners and communities along side Māori Ancestral land that take into account all the requirements of the RMA.	There could be a wide range of adverse effects on local residents which could be significant.	No
PC94B-55	b	Stables	Gary	Oppose	Effects on Neighbouring Properties	Council reconsider PC94B and include safeguards for property owners and communities along side Māori Ancestral land that take into account all the requirements of the RMA.	There could be a wide range of adverse effects on local residents which could be significant.	Yes
PC94B-56	d	Marshall	Ivan	Oppose	Effects on Neighbouring Properties	Where an activity would not be permitted under the underlying Environmental provisions, that activity should be treated as a discretionary activity requiring notification to adjoining and affected landowners.	The adverse effects on adjoining landowners may be potentially significant, and impact on social and economic well-being.	Would consider a joint case
PC94B-61	b	Gallagher	Natalie	Oppose	Effects on Neighbouring Properties	Council reconsider PC94B and include safeguards for property owners and communities along side Māori Ancestral land that take into account all the requirements of the RMA.	There could be a wide range of adverse effects on local residents which could be significant.	No
PC94B-62	b	Frische	Lee	Oppose	Effects on Neighbouring Properties	Council reconsider PC94B and include safeguards for property owners and communities along side Māori Ancestral land that take into account all the requirements of the RMA.	There could be a wide range of adverse effects on local residents which could be significant.	No
PC94B-63	b	Frische	Paul	Oppose	Effects on Neighbouring Properties	Council reconsider PC94B and include safeguards for property owners and communities along side Māori Ancestral land that take into account all the requirements of the RMA.	There could be a wide range of adverse effects on local residents which could be significant.	No
PC94B-64	b	Brooke	Anthony	Oppose	Effects on Neighbouring Properties	Council reconsider PC94B and include safeguards for property owners and communities along side Māori Ancestral land that take into account all the requirements of the RMA.	There could be a wide range of adverse effects on local residents which could be significant.	No
PC94B-65	b	Green	Brian	Oppose	Effects on Neighbouring Properties	Council reconsider PC94B and include safeguards for property owners and communities along side Māori Ancestral land that take into account all the requirements of the RMA.	There could be a wide range of adverse effects on local residents which could be significant.	No
PC94B-66	b	Green	Leanne	Oppose	Effects on Neighbouring Properties	Council reconsider PC94B and include safeguards for property owners and communities along side Māori Ancestral land that take into account all the requirements of the RMA.	There could be a wide range of adverse effects on local residents which could be significant.	No
PC94B-67	b	de Beer	J G	Oppose	Effects on Neighbouring Properties	Council reconsider PC94B and include safeguards for property owners and communities along side Māori Ancestral land that take into account all the requirements of the RMA.	There could be a wide range of adverse effects on local residents which could be significant.	No

PC94B - Papakāinga
Summary Of Submissions by Topic

Sub No	Sub Point	Surname/ Company	First Name/ On Behalf Of	Support/ Oppose	Submission Topic	Relief Sought	Reasons	Wish to be Heard?
PC94B-68	b	Laing	Michael	Oppose	Effects on Neighbouring Properties	Council reconsider PC94B and include safeguards for property owners and communities along side Māori Ancestral land that take into account all the requirements of the RMA.	There could be a wide range of adverse effects on local residents which could be significant.	No
PC94B-69	b	King	Janet	Oppose	Effects on Neighbouring Properties	Council reconsider PC94B and include safeguards for property owners and communities along side Māori Ancestral land that take into account all the requirements of the RMA.	There could be a wide range of adverse effects on local residents which could be significant.	No
PC94B-70	b	Crosbie	S	Oppose	Effects on Neighbouring Properties	Council reconsider PC94B and include safeguards for property owners and communities along side Māori Ancestral land that take into account all the requirements of the RMA.	There could be a wide range of adverse effects on local residents which could be significant.	No
PC94B-71	b	Pool	John	Oppose	Effects on Neighbouring Properties	Council reconsider PC94B and include safeguards for property owners and communities along side Māori Ancestral land that take into account all the requirements of the RMA.	There could be a wide range of adverse effects on local residents which could be significant.	No
PC94B-72	b	Pattinson	Shelley	Oppose	Effects on Neighbouring Properties	Council reconsider PC94B and include safeguards for property owners and communities along side Māori Ancestral land that take into account all the requirements of the RMA.	There could be a wide range of adverse effects on local residents which could be significant.	Yes
PC94B-73	b	Larkin	Elaine	Oppose	Effects on Neighbouring Properties	Council reconsider PC94B and include safeguards for property owners and communities along side Māori Ancestral land that take into account all the requirements of the RMA.	There could be a wide range of adverse effects on local residents which could be significant.	No
PC94B-74	b	Akast	Shirley	Oppose	Effects on Neighbouring Properties	Council reconsider PC94B and include safeguards for property owners and communities along side Māori Ancestral land that take into account all the requirements of the RMA.	There could be a wide range of adverse effects on local residents which could be significant.	No
PC94B-83	b	Ross	Lawrence and Elaine	Oppose	Effects on Neighbouring Properties	Council reconsider PC94B and include safeguards for property owners and communities along side Māori Ancestral land that take into account all the requirements of the RMA.	There could be a wide range of adverse effects on local residents which could be significant.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-95	a	Jewell	Ross and Elizabeth	Oppose	Effects on Neighbouring Properties	The provisions should comply with those that relate to our property. 1. Quality of building (building code), 2. Sanitation, 3. Preservation of light corridors, 4. Density of use.	Property next to Māori land. We have to comply with all Council resource act and building provisions.	No
PC94B-99	a	Wood	Ben and Jan	Oppose	Effects on Neighbouring Properties	Change the activity status in PKA.1.5 from permitted to restricted discretionary. Require applications to consider effects on the surrounding environment on adjoining landowners.	The proposed rules do not require any consideration of the surrounding environment. This is at odds with the intent and purpose of the RMA.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-102	b	King	Neville	Oppose	Effects on Neighbouring Properties	Council reconsider PC94B and include safeguards for property owners and communities along side Māori Ancestral land that take into account all the requirements of the RMA.	There could be a wide range of adverse effects on local residents which could be significant.	No
PC94B-106	b	Lorimer	Elizabeth	Oppose	Effects on Neighbouring Properties	Council reconsider PC94B and include safeguards for property owners and communities along side Māori Ancestral land that take into account all the requirements of the RMA.	There could be a wide range of adverse effects on local residents which could be significant.	Yes

PC94B - Papakāinga
Summary Of Submissions by Topic

Sub No	Sub Point	Surname/ Company	First Name/ On Behalf Of	Support/ Oppose	Submission Topic	Relief Sought	Reasons	Wish to be Heard?
PC94B-107	b	Lorimer	Stuart	Oppose	Effects on Neighbouring Properties	Council reconsider PC94B and include safeguards for property owners and communities along side Māori Ancestral land that take into account all the requirements of the RMA.	There could be a wide range of adverse effects on local residents which could be significant.	Yes
PC94B-116	a	Langton	Rod	Oppose	Effects on Neighbouring Properties	Council reconsider PC94B and include safeguards for property owners and communities along side Māori Ancestral land that take into account all the requirements of the RMA.	PC94B does not address the impact of papakāinga on existing adjacent residential communities, such as ours or provide any safeguards.	Not Stated
PC94B-117	a	Major	Nick	Oppose	Effects on Neighbouring Properties	Council reconsider PC94B and include safeguards for property owners and communities along side Māori Ancestral land that take into account all the requirements of the RMA.	PC94B does not address the impact of papakāinga on existing adjacent residential communities, such as ours or provide any safeguards.	Not Stated
PC94B-118	a	Major	Rachel	Oppose	Effects on Neighbouring Properties	Council reconsider PC94B and include safeguards for property owners and communities along side Māori Ancestral land that take into account all the requirements of the RMA.	PC94B does not address the impact of papakāinga on existing adjacent residential communities, such as ours or provide any safeguards.	Not Stated
PC94B-119	a	Gamley	Tony	Oppose	Effects on Neighbouring Properties	Council reconsider PC94B and include safeguards for property owners and communities along side Māori Ancestral land that take into account all the requirements of the RMA.	PC94B does not address the impact of papakāinga on existing adjacent residential communities, such as ours or provide any safeguards.	Not Stated
PC94B-120	a	Gamley	Heather	Oppose	Effects on Neighbouring Properties	Council reconsider PC94B and include safeguards for property owners and communities along side Māori Ancestral land that take into account all the requirements of the RMA.	PC94B does not address the impact of papakāinga on existing adjacent residential communities, such as ours or provide any safeguards.	Not Stated
PC94B-121	a	Clark	Brione	Oppose	Effects on Neighbouring Properties	Council reconsider PC94B and include safeguards for property owners and communities along side Māori Ancestral land that take into account all the requirements of the RMA.	PC94B does not address the impact of papakāinga on existing adjacent residential communities, such as ours or provide any safeguards.	Not Stated
PC94B-122	a	Jones	Wendy	Oppose	Effects on Neighbouring Properties	Council reconsider PC94B and include safeguards for property owners and communities along side Māori Ancestral land that take into account all the requirements of the RMA.	PC94B does not address the impact of papakāinga on existing adjacent residential communities, such as ours or provide any safeguards.	Not Stated
PC94B-123	a	Jones	Evan	Oppose	Effects on Neighbouring Properties	Council reconsider PC94B and include safeguards for property owners and communities along side Māori Ancestral land that take into account all the requirements of the RMA.	PC94B does not address the impact of papakāinga on existing adjacent residential communities, such as ours or provide any safeguards.	Not Stated
PC94B-124	a	Tait	J K	Oppose	Effects on Neighbouring Properties	Council reconsider PC94B and include safeguards for property owners and communities along side Māori Ancestral land that take into account all the requirements of the RMA.	PC94B does not address the impact of papakāinga on existing adjacent residential communities, such as ours or provide any safeguards.	Not Stated
PC94B-125	a	Tait	J	Oppose	Effects on Neighbouring Properties	Council reconsider PC94B and include safeguards for property owners and communities along side Māori Ancestral land that take into account all the requirements of the RMA.	PC94B does not address the impact of papakāinga on existing adjacent residential communities, such as ours or provide any safeguards.	Not Stated
PC94B-126	a	McSherry	G	Oppose	Effects on Neighbouring Properties	Council reconsider PC94B and include safeguards for property owners and communities along side Māori Ancestral land that take into account all the requirements of the RMA.	PC94B does not address the impact of papakāinga on existing adjacent residential communities, such as ours or provide any safeguards.	Not Stated

PC94B - Papakāinga
Summary Of Submissions by Topic

Sub No	Sub Point	Surname/ Company	First Name/ On Behalf Of	Support/ Oppose	Submission Topic	Relief Sought	Reasons	Wish to be Heard?
PC94B-127	a	Heape	Shayne	Oppose	Effects on Neighbouring Properties	Council reconsider PC94B and include safeguards for property owners and communities along side Māori Ancestral land that take into account all the requirements of the RMA.	PC94B does not address the impact of papakāinga on existing adjacent residential communities, such as ours or provide any safeguards.	Not Stated
PC94B-128	a	Austin	Michael & Barbara	Support, seek amendment	Effects on Neighbouring Properties	With regard to development of PT Oakura F1 that boundaries Te Kapua Creek: Any buildings proposed to be built be subjected to resource and building consent and publically notified That the ground level not be allowed to be raised as this will affect flood prone areas bounding Te Kapua Creek as per the WDC Flood plans. Ensure that land and access has the carrying capacity to cope with the proposed papakāinga development likewise sewerage, water, electricity telephone. That all roading and retaining meet council requirements All drainage requirements put in place.	Concerned about the specific effects of development on PT Oakura F1 on their property at Lot 2 DP101864 at 22 Kapua Street.	No
PC94B-12	b	Greenhalgh	Audrey	Not Stated	Engineering Matters		Not stated.	No
PC94B-24	b	Grafton	John and Sandra	Not Stated	Engineering Matters		Sewage and drainage is a major concern from multiple housing in Church Bay. Requirements required to protect the pollution of Church Bay.	Would consider a joint case
PC94B-07	a	Warne	Ronald	Oppose	Fairness	That Council reject the plan change so far as it relates to the Oakura F1 Block, the Oakura F2B 1C Block and the Paremata-Mokau F2A Block.	If adopted the plan change will create favoured less stringent set of rules which will apply to certain ratepayers but not others. Development without standard controls will make for ghetto development where anything goes. There are already examples in Oakura. The northern portion of Oakura F1 Block is a wetland and subject to flooding. It is note in anyway suitable for residential development.	Yes
PC94B-12	a	Greenhalgh	Audrey	Not Stated	Fairness	The proposed provisions should be applied to all landowners.	The proposed provisions are consistent with seeking to minimise the cost of compliances and unnecessary resource consenting barriers. Great idea when applied to all Northland landowners. The proposed provisions favour Māori, thus forgetting we are all one race New Zealanders. Council rules, regulations and resource consents must remain universal and applied to all including Māori and Papakainga development.	No
PC94B-13	a	Landowners Coalition Inc	Frank Newman	Oppose	Fairness	That the plan change be rejected.	We make the general comment that there is an unacceptable irony that under the proposal non-Māori have to ask iwi for consent when developing their land, but Māori do not have to ask non-Māori. We do not disagree with the notion that issues regarding housing on ancestral land should be addressed. But the issues with papakāinga housing are the very same issues that arise in the wider community when a family has a close attachment to land - for example, land settled by ancestors or land that may be intended as a legacy property in the future. The papakāinga provisions should apply to all properties, or they should not apply at all. Ones connection to land and environmental effects are, after all, not defined by race.	Yes, would also consider joint

PC94B - Papakāinga
Summary Of Submissions by Topic

Sub No	Sub Point	Surname/ Company	First Name/ On Behalf Of	Support/ Oppose	Submission Topic	Relief Sought	Reasons	Wish to be Heard?
PC94B-26	a	Steward	David	Oppose	Fairness	Cancel PC94B.	No party (especially selected by race) should be exempt unless all land owners have the same powers.	No
PC94B-27	a	Tomlin	Barry	Oppose	Fairness	Delete the whole plan change.	It would be ugly racism and race-based separatism and would be bad for Whangarei and for NZ.	No
PC94B-28	a	Williamson	Justin	Oppose	Fairness	Reject PC94B in its entirety.	There is no logical reason for these organisations on the basis of their history or nature or racial origins to affect the need for consent. It would appear racist, illogical, embarrassing and unnecessary.	No
PC94B-29	c	Oberholster	Dirk and Nicci	Seek amendment	Fairness	Many would love the benefits of being offered this proposed plan change.	Double standards, even though we live in the same place and have similar needs it can never happen.	No, would consider a joint hearing
PC94B-31	a	Nielsen	Shane	Oppose	Fairness	The same controls should apply to all properties and land owners within the District.	All community groups should have the same policies and rules to follow in putting in planning applications to the Council, especially affecting the environment.	No
PC94B-32	b	Buckland	James	Oppose	Fairness	Council reconsider PC94B and include safeguards for property owners and communities along side Māori Ancestral land that take into account all the requirements of the RMA.	Object to Council making provision for any individual group of individuals to be able to bypass the provisions of the RMA in order to carry out development of any land within our community.	Not Stated
PC94B-33	d	Evans	Nicole	Oppose	Fairness	Council reconsider PC94B and include safeguards for property owners and communities along side Māori Ancestral land that take into account all the requirements of the RMA.	Object to Council making provision for any individual group of individuals to be able to bypass the provisions of the RMA in order to carry out development of any land within our community.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-34	e	Nielsen	Tania	Oppose	Fairness	Council reconsider PC94B and include safeguards for property owners and communities along side Māori Ancestral land that take into account all the requirements of the RMA.	Object to Council making provision for any individual group of individuals to be able to bypass the provisions of the RMA in order to carry out development of any land within our community.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-35	a	Cliff	Ngairi	Not Stated	Fairness	There should be the same rules for Māori and the same for white people.	This change sounds like racism. Concerned about rates payment and rubbish collection fees. Concerned that will devalue land.	No
PC94B-36	a	Bates	Stan	Oppose	Fairness	The same controls should apply to all properties and land owners within the District.	All community groups should have the same policies and rules to follow in putting in planning applications to the Council, especially affecting the environment.	No
PC94B-37	a	Turnock	Trevor	Oppose	Fairness	That Māori land be subject to any and all Council planning rules and policies.	PC94B is race based. Māori should not have special dispensation. This discriminates against the rest of the population of New Zealand.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-39	a	Beer	Andrew	Oppose	Fairness	Delete any rule changes that give planning (zoning) rules for papakāinga land that differ from the rules that apply to all other land.	Potentially this may have significant effects on landowners adjoining Māori land. Leaving aside the issue of equality, adverse environmental effects are adverse effects regardless of the race of the person that causes them. To regulate the environmental effects of one community group and not another is simply unacceptable.	No
PC94B-40	a	Buchan	George	Oppose	Fairness	Whangarei District Council and Māoris have no grounds upon which to establish racist rights unavailable to other New Zealanders and proposed exclusive racial rights within the RMA should be declined as well as any other racist right already established.	English Law is a level playing field, fact. The Treaty of Waitangi is not New Zealand's true founding document. The Queen Victoria Royal Charter of 16-11-1840 ratified on 03-05-1841 is. It does not provide Māori exclusive rights. Cannot be proved that Māori are indigenous to New Zealand, this was declined as well as Māori intellectual Rights to their culture by the International Court.	No

Sub No	Sub Point	Surname/ Company	First Name/ On Behalf Of	Support/ Oppose	Submission Topic	Relief Sought	Reasons	Wish to be Heard?
PC94B-43	g	Evans	Gwyn	Oppose	Fairness	Council reconsider PC94B and include safeguards for property owners and communities along side Māori Ancestral land that take into account all the requirements of the RMA.	Object to Council making provision for any individual group of individuals to be able to bypass the provisions of the RMA in order to carry out development of any land within our community.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-44	a	Messham	Raewyn	Not Stated	Fairness	There should be no difference to Papakāinga Māori land to any other land in the Whangarei area. There should not be any discretionary activities by right. All activities outside the Resource Consent should be notifiable as it is now.	There should be no difference to Papakāinga Māori land to any other land in the Whangarei area. We all should have to comply with the current zoning rules of the day as set out in the Whangarei District Plan. There should not be one group that can regulate the environmental effects of one community group and not another is simply not acceptable. We should all be treated equally the same.	Not Stated
PC94B-45	a	Thomson	Pamela	Oppose	Fairness	Not stated.	The proposal is unacceptable. It is undemocratic, open for corruption, is racist, unfair and biased to a minority group and will have potentially huge effects on RATEPAYING citizens.	Not Stated
PC94B-50	d	Ross	Sonny and Noeleen	Oppose	Fairness	Ancestral land should not have laws different to residential environments.	The same controls and provisions should apply to all properties and land owners. Concerned about impact of uncontrolled buildings and impact on safety and wellbeing.	Yes
PC94B-53	a	Smith	Dennis	Oppose	Fairness	That the proposed provisions be totally withdrawn.	The provisions contravene the common law. One person one vote - all to be treated equally.	No
PC94B-54	a	Smith	Pamela	Oppose	Fairness	That the proposed provisions be totally withdrawn.	The provisions contravene the common law. One person one vote - all to be treated equally.	No
PC94B-56	a	Marshall	Ivan	Oppose	Fairness	That the plan change be rejected.	We make the general comment that there is an unacceptable irony that under the proposal non-Māori have to ask iwi for consent when developing their land, but Māori do not have to ask non-Māori. We do not disagree with the notion that issues regarding housing on ancestral land should be addressed. But the issues with papakāinga housing are the very same issues that arise in the wider community when a family has a close attachment to land - for example, land settled by ancestors or land that may be intended as a legacy property in the future. The papakāinga provisions should apply to all properties, or they should not apply at all. Ones connection to land and environmental effects are, after all, not defined by race.	Would consider a joint case
PC94B-57	a	Ross	Leona	Oppose	Fairness	Delete Permitted Activities PKA1.5 and any other clauses which discriminate against other ratepayers.	The papakāinga provisions should apply to all properties, or they shouldn't apply at all. Ones connection to land and environmental effects are not defined by race.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-58	a	Ross	John	Oppose	Fairness	Delete Permitted Activities PKA1.5 a.	The papakāinga provisions would adversely affect property values for neighbours and in fairness to all ratepayers, the rules should be the same for us all.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-76	a	Grieve	Robin	Oppose	Fairness	Apply this change to all land so that we all have equal opportunities under the law regardless of our race.	If this change is applied, it should be applied to all landowners, irrespective of race. If the Council does not apply this to everyone, then this is racist and a breach of the human right to equality under the law.	Yes, would also consider joint

Sub No	Sub Point	Surname/ Company	First Name/ On Behalf Of	Support/ Oppose	Submission Topic	Relief Sought	Reasons	Wish to be Heard?
PC94B-78	a	Yates	Peter	Oppose	Fairness	The WDC must not allow this proposal to proceed any further.	There is one law for all New Zealanders. If radical developments such as this are approved by one local government authority, it is likely that other councils will follow suit. The Treaty of Waitangi is not a Partnership Agreement between the Crown and Māori. Māori have no more rights than anybody else in this country.	No, would consider joint case
PC94B-81	a	Thorburn	Brian	Oppose	Fairness	Not agree to the proposed plan change.	There should be no discrimination between Māori and Pakeha with respect to resource consent and district plan provisions.	No
PC94B-84	a	Gilbert	Helen	Oppose	Fairness	Maintain the status quo where all land owners are treated equally and go through the same process for applying for resource consents where applicable.	Owens land which shares a boundary with ancestral Māori land in general title. Concerned about the ability to be heard in respect to resource consent applications on this property. Also concerned about Councils ability to monitor breaches of papakāinga provisions, given that Council only responds to complaints.	No
PC94B-85	a	Henriette Politano	David Martin and	Oppose	Fairness	Individual resource consent to be required for any specific activity. Any deviation from the District plan should be considered on a case by case basis.	Housing on Māori freehold land would become a permitted activity and not subject to the provisions of the District Plan. The provisions of the District Plan should apply to all developments equally. Concerned that the Council has seen fit to only notify landowners within 50m of the subject site. The effects of PC94B are far reaching.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-88	a	Groves	Alfred	Oppose	Fairness	Leave the rules as they are.	Why should one group be exempt from rules that apply to everyone else. This would NOT promote racial equality and is totally unacceptable.	No
PC94B-92	a	Mackenzie	Fiona	Oppose	Fairness	Make the changes if they are needed, but extend the inherent rights to all citizens.	Oppose any move away from treating citizens equally. Legal privilege based on race leads to grave injustices. Environmental needs management and protection from all development - no matter which ethnic group is benefiting from it.	No
PC94B-93	a	Lessels	Brian	Oppose	Fairness	Drop the proposal.	One set of rules for all.	No
PC94B-94	a	Jones	Sheena	Oppose	Fairness	Decline the plan change.	Why the one rule for one and not the other, surely that is racist. The process is all wrong.	Not Stated
PC94B-96	a	Ross	Hayden	Oppose	Fairness	That the Plan Change be deleted.	When did the powers that be decide this sort of racial inequality could be legislated into, or by local government. Do we not live in a democracy? If this ludicrous change goes ahead, will I as a fourth generation heir be able to develop my aforementioned ancestral land in any way I see fit?	Yes
PC94B-100	a	Wheeler	Brian and Judith	Oppose	Fairness	Delete the proposed plan change.	We consider that there should be 1 law for all and not based on racial preferences. This is a dangerous move and highly divisive. If approved it would mean that the Māori party could cause usage problems to adjoining neighbours against which there would be no redress. The issue of conflict of interest is a vital area and this is contrary to natural justice.	No

PC94B - Papakāinga
Summary Of Submissions by Topic

Sub No	Sub Point	Surname/ Company	First Name/ On Behalf Of	Support/ Oppose	Submission Topic	Relief Sought	Reasons	Wish to be Heard?
PC94B-103	103 a	Donelley	Simon	Not Stated	Fairness	No objection so long as WDC rules are followed like everybody else.	Sewerage water and roading are dealt with - so long as everybody is treated the same and can do the same to our properties under the same rules.	No
PC94B-108	108 a	Heard	Leonard	Oppose	Fairness	Council must not allow 2 sets of rules.	Māori and non-Māori must pay all the same rates, development charges, resource consent charges. Council should work with Māori and the Māori land court to free up land to allow development rather than allowing lenient and bent rules for papakāinga development.	No
PC94B-109	109 a	Muriel Newman	New Zealand Centre for Political Research	Oppose	Fairness	That PC94B be withdrawn or applied to all landowners equally.	By enabling one group of landowners to avoid the legal and administrative provisions of the District Plan, essentially because of their ancestral connections, PC94B undermines the Rule of Law, which requires that all citizens are treated equally.	Not Stated
PC94B-111	111 a	Whitehead	Saskia	Not Stated	Fairness	Not Stated.	Concerned that this change which appears racially biased in favour of Māori will interfere with the rights of people including ourselves. We have already had direct experience of Whangarei District Council applying different standards to our property and not having the bottle to apply its own rules and regulations to Māori property adjacent ours.	Not Stated
PC94B-116	116 b	Langdon	Rod	Oppose	Fairness	Council reconsider PC94B and include safeguards for property owners and communities along side Māori Ancestral land that take into account all the requirements of the RMA.	Object to Council making provision for any individual group of individuals to be able to bypass the provisions of the RMA in order to carry out development of any land within our community.	Not Stated
PC94B-117	117 b	Major	Nick	Oppose	Fairness	Council reconsider PC94B and include safeguards for property owners and communities along side Māori Ancestral land that take into account all the requirements of the RMA.	Object to Council making provision for any individual group of individuals to be able to bypass the provisions of the RMA in order to carry out development of any land within our community.	Not Stated
PC94B-118	118 b	Major	Rachel	Oppose	Fairness	Council reconsider PC94B and include safeguards for property owners and communities along side Māori Ancestral land that take into account all the requirements of the RMA.	Object to Council making provision for any individual group of individuals to be able to bypass the provisions of the RMA in order to carry out development of any land within our community.	Not Stated
PC94B-119	119 b	Gamley	Tony	Oppose	Fairness	Council reconsider PC94B and include safeguards for property owners and communities along side Māori Ancestral land that take into account all the requirements of the RMA.	Object to Council making provision for any individual group of individuals to be able to bypass the provisions of the RMA in order to carry out development of any land within our community.	Not Stated
PC94B-120	120 b	Gamley	Heather	Oppose	Fairness	Council reconsider PC94B and include safeguards for property owners and communities along side Māori Ancestral land that take into account all the requirements of the RMA.	Object to Council making provision for any individual group of individuals to be able to bypass the provisions of the RMA in order to carry out development of any land within our community.	Not Stated
PC94B-121	121 b	Clark	Brione	Oppose	Fairness	Council reconsider PC94B and include safeguards for property owners and communities along side Māori Ancestral land that take into account all the requirements of the RMA.	Object to Council making provision for any individual group of individuals to be able to bypass the provisions of the RMA in order to carry out development of any land within our community.	Not Stated
PC94B-122	122 b	Jones	Wendy	Oppose	Fairness	Council reconsider PC94B and include safeguards for property owners and communities along side Māori Ancestral land that take into account all the requirements of the RMA.	Object to Council making provision for any individual group of individuals to be able to bypass the provisions of the RMA in order to carry out development of any land within our community.	Not Stated

PC94B - Papakāinga
Summary Of Submissions by Topic

Sub No	Sub Point	Surname/ Company	First Name/ On Behalf Of	Support/ Oppose	Submission Topic	Relief Sought	Reasons	Wish to be Heard?
PC94B-123	b	Jones	Evan	Oppose	Fairness	Council reconsider PC94B and include safeguards for property owners and communities along side Māori Ancestral land that take into account all the requirements of the RMA.	Object to Council making provision for any individual group of individuals to be able to bypass the provisions of the RMA in order to carry out development of any land within our community.	Not Stated
PC94B-124	b	Tait	J K	Oppose	Fairness	Council reconsider PC94B and include safeguards for property owners and communities along side Māori Ancestral land that take into account all the requirements of the RMA.	Object to Council making provision for any individual group of individuals to be able to bypass the provisions of the RMA in order to carry out development of any land within our community.	Not Stated
PC94B-125	b	Tait	J	Oppose	Fairness	Council reconsider PC94B and include safeguards for property owners and communities along side Māori Ancestral land that take into account all the requirements of the RMA.	Object to Council making provision for any individual group of individuals to be able to bypass the provisions of the RMA in order to carry out development of any land within our community.	Not Stated
PC94B-126	b	McSherry	G	Oppose	Fairness	Council reconsider PC94B and include safeguards for property owners and communities along side Māori Ancestral land that take into account all the requirements of the RMA.	Object to Council making provision for any individual group of individuals to be able to bypass the provisions of the RMA in order to carry out development of any land within our community.	Not Stated
PC94B-127	b	Heape	Shayne	Oppose	Fairness	Council reconsider PC94B and include safeguards for property owners and communities along side Māori Ancestral land that take into account all the requirements of the RMA.	Object to Council making provision for any individual group of individuals to be able to bypass the provisions of the RMA in order to carry out development of any land within our community.	Not Stated
PC94B-75	a	Donaldson	Les	Oppose in part, seek amendment	Lack of Clarity	Clarify the following rules and amend as appropriate: PKA.1.5.1 PKA.1.5.1.b.ii PKA.1.5.1.b.vii PKA.1.5.1.b.x Ensure that the provisions do not result in wholesale removal of native bush as a permitted activity.	These rules are ambiguous or the justification debatable for the following specific reasons outlined in full in paragraph 6.5 of the submission: PKA.1.5.1 - There is no requirement for the PDP to be approved. This means no consideration for the surrounding environment. This does not give effect to the supporting objectives and policies and do not achieve sustainable management. PKA.1.5.1.b.ii - It is not clear if this control is cumulative. PKA.1.5.1.b.vii - It is not clear if this control is cumulative. PKA.1.5.1.b.x - It is not clear if this control is cumulative.	Yes
PC94B-77	b	Shepherd	D and K	Oppose in part, seek amendment	Lack of Clarity	Clarify the following rules and amend as appropriate: PKA.1.5.1 PKA.1.5.1.b.ii PKA.1.5.1.b.vii PKA.1.5.1.b.x Ensure that the provisions do not result in wholesale removal of native bush as a permitted activity.	These rules are ambiguous or the justification debatable for the following specific reasons outlined in full in paragraph 6.5 of the submission: PKA.1.5.1 - There is no requirement for the PDP to be approved. This means no consideration for the surrounding environment. This does not give effect to the supporting objectives and policies and do not achieve sustainable management. PKA.1.5.1.b.ii - It is not clear if this control is cumulative. PKA.1.5.1.b.vii - It is not clear if this control is cumulative. PKA.1.5.1.b.x - It is not clear if this control is cumulative.	Yes

Sub No	Sub Point	Surname/ Company	First Name/ On Behalf Of	Support/ Oppose	Submission Topic	Relief Sought	Reasons	Wish to be Heard?
PC94B-79	a	Zodiac Holdings Ltd		Oppose in part, seek amendment	Lack of Clarity	Clarify the following rules and amend as appropriate: PKA.1.5.1 PKA.1.5.1.b.ii PKA.1.5.1.b.vii PKA.1.5.1.b.x Ensure that the provisions do not result in wholesale removal of native bush as a permitted activity.	These rules are ambiguous or the justification debatable for the following specific reasons outlined in full in paragraph 6.5 of the submission: PKA.1.5.1 - There is no requirement for the PDP to be approved. This means no consideration for the surrounding environment. This does not give effect to the supporting objectives and policies and do not achieve sustainable management. PKA.1.5.1.b.ii - It is not clear if this control is cumulative. PKA.1.5.1.b.vii - It is not clear if this control is cumulative. PKA.1.5.1.b.x - It is not clear if this control is cumulative.	Yes
PC94B-90	e	Far North District Council		Seek amendment	Lack of Clarity	With regard to PKA.1.5.1.a.vi, better define what a suitably qualified and experienced professional may be i.e. Chartered Professional Engineer. This may be achieved by providing examples.	The term 'suitably qualified and experienced professional' is ambiguous and may cause issues for both Council and potential applicants in terms of how this standard is determined. There may be a benefit in providing examples in this instance as this portion of the PDP is arguably the most important in terms of Council providing approval of a papakāinga development as a permitted activity.	No
PC94B-90	f	Far North District Council		Seek amendment	Lack of Clarity	With regard to PKA.1.5.1.b.ii clarify the intent of the threshold and make necessary amendments in line with intent. Provide advice note or similar for better understanding of other district wide rules which may apply.	The intention of the control is not clear. Clarify if the control is cumulative or not. Thought should also be given to outdoor areas that are typically used as part of a commercial or industrial activity. It is assumed that other controls related to aspects such as amenity, noise, and hours of operation are managed through district wide provisions. While this is stated in PKA.1.2 it is considered worthwhile to examine those particular district wide rules that could apply and mentioning them as an advice note or similar.	No
PC94B-90	g	Far North District Council		Seek amendment	Lack of Clarity	With regard to PKA.1.5.1.b.vii, consider the effects of alteration to indigenous wetlands and introduce as part of control.	Alteration of wetlands should also be considered as part of this control. Substantial alteration of a wetland could be permitted under the current rule.	No
PC94B-90	h	Far North District Council		Seek amendment	Lack of Clarity	With regard to PKA.1.5.1.b.viii, revisit the term 'predominantly' or remove the term completely. Clarify the intent of the threshold and make necessary amendments in line with intent.	Predominantly' can cause issues for both Council and land owners. This particular term should be revisited or removed completely. It is not clear if the 500m ² threshold is cumulative or not.	No
PC94B-90	i	Far North District Council		Seek amendment	Lack of Clarity	With regard to PKA.1.5.1.b.x, either amend the control to enable the mentioned development or solely rely on the PDP and accompanying professional statement as evidence for site specific stormwater management.	This control may preclude a papakāinga development which includes multiple houses and roading infrastructure, or large community facilities such as whare hui, whare kai, kohanga reo, particularly if the definition of impermeable surfaces includes aggregate. This seems at odds with the intent of the proposal.	No
PC94B-17	c	Reed	Ivan and Karen	Oppose	Landscapes	Council be responsible for environmental issues.	Environmental effects of papakāinga developments on environmentally sensitive sites should be considered.	Would consider a joint case

Sub No	Sub Point	Surname/ Company	First Name/ On Behalf Of	Support/ Oppose	Submission Topic	Relief Sought	Reasons	Wish to be Heard?
PC94B-97	l	c/- Juliane Chetham	Patuharakeke Te Iwi Trust Board	Support	Landscapes	Amend to PKA.1.2.1 as follows: The District Wide and Resource Area objectives, policies and rules in the District Plan <u>shall not apply</u> to papakāinga developments under the papakāinga provisions below. OR Consider making activities which are permitted on Māori land a restricted discretionary activity within ONL's, ONF's and Coastal overlays.	Māori land will be disproportionately affected by the proposed Outstanding Natural Landscapes (ONL), Outstanding Natural Features (ONF) and Coastal overlays, because the land has remained undeveloped while surrounding land has been cleared and built on. In addition, much of the district's Māori land is in coastal areas, and is subject to further conditions. The provisions of these overlays will conflict with the desire to develop Māori land and in our view will substantially limit (if not render completely redundant) the efficacy of the PKA provisions.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-112	l	Jared Pitman	Te Huinga	Support	Landscapes	Amend to PKA.1.2.1 as follows: The District Wide and Resource Area objectives, policies and rules in the District Plan <u>shall not apply</u> to papakāinga developments under the papakāinga provisions below. OR Consider making activities which are permitted on Māori land a restricted discretionary activity within ONL's, ONF's and Coastal overlays.	Māori land will be disproportionately affected by the proposed Outstanding Natural Landscapes (ONL), Outstanding Natural Features (ONF) and Coastal overlays, because the land has remained undeveloped while surrounding land has been cleared and built on. In addition, much of the district's Māori land is in coastal areas, and is subject to further conditions. The provisions of these overlays will conflict with the desire to develop Māori land and in our view will substantially limit (if not render completely redundant) the efficacy of the PKA provisions.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-97	m	c/- Juliane Chetham	Patuharakeke Te Iwi Trust Board	Support	Other Barriers	WDC should consider the following: Being an active facilitator of papakāinga developments. Providing relief from financial contributions. Developing a strategy approach to providing and/or funding specialist advice to assist in Papakāinga developments.	Being an active facilitator of papakāinga developments (as opposed to passive receivers of applications) will provide a service to mana whenua recognising Treaty of Waitangi responsibilities and historical breaches as well as the holistic benefits of quality Māori housing solutions both for hapū and for the wider community. Providing relief from financial contributions and funding for specialist advice for applicants will assist and encourage Papakāinga developments.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-112	m	Jared Pitman	Te Huinga	Support	Other Barriers	WDC should consider the following: Being an active facilitator of papakāinga developments. Providing relief from financial contributions. Developing a strategy approach to providing and/or funding specialist advice to assist in Papakāinga developments.	Being an active facilitator of papakāinga developments (as opposed to passive receivers of applications) will provide a service to mana whenua recognising Treaty of Waitangi responsibilities and historical breaches as well as the holistic benefits of quality Māori housing solutions both for hapū and for the wider community. Providing relief from financial contributions and funding for specialist advice for applicants will assist and encourage Papakāinga developments.	Yes, would also consider joint

Sub No	Sub Point	Surname/ Company	First Name/ On Behalf Of	Support/ Oppose	Submission Topic	Relief Sought	Reasons	Wish to be Heard?
PC94B-113	h	Pita	Rihi Ngaroimata Kathleen	Support, Seek amendment	Other Barriers	Papakāinga development on Māori land should be classed as a permitted activity in terms of development contributions.	One of the main obstacles for Māori to implement papakāinga on their land is the development contribution fee that is charged by Council for additional buildings erected. That additional cost, on top of infrastructure, construction and fitting-out costs can prove unaffordable for Māori to own their own home or develop their ancestral lands for future generations. Although the purpose for development contributions are reflected in the Local Government Act 2002, consideration of financial contributions charged for housing development needs to be based upon the house-hold income, living costs and affordability of the families wanting to build on their whenua.	No, would reconsider if requested by Iwi Authority
PC94B-38	a	Cregeen	Philip	Oppose	PKA.1.1 Description and Expectations	Add to paragraph 4. ... standards are met and that adjacent residential communities are not adversely affected. Delete Paragraph 6 and 7.	PC94B does not adequately safeguard the interests and address the concerns of communities who live alongside or near Māori Ancestral Land. Council cannot abrogate its responsibility for decision making on matters that impact the wider community. There could be more thought and explanation given to outlining the process and interconnection between Council and the Māori Land Court, either directly within the section or through other methods such as guidelines. Medium to large scale papakāinga typically needs NRC consent under their Regional Water & Soil Plan, particularly for shared/communal wastewater systems. There seems to be no reference to this aspect unless it is envisaged that these provisions will be addressed through the Papakāinga Development Plan (PDP) process? Thought should also be given to cross boundary issues that may arise from differing resource management regimes, particularly for those Māori land blocks which intersect and border both Districts. There is also scope to reference matters considered in the Regional Policy Statement particularly Appendix 2 matters relating to regional form, urban design and Māori design principles.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-90	b	Far North District Council		Seek amendment	PKA.1.1 Description and Expectations	To include a paragraph outlining the process and interconnection between the Council and the Māori Land Court or give reference to the potential use of a guideline to better inform of the process. Also reference NRC's role in terms of Regional Water & Soil Plan provisions, regional form and urban design and references to cross boundary issues and how these might be better addressed.	No	
PC94B-97	b	c/- Juliane Chetham	Patuharakeke Te Iwi Trust Board	Seek amendment	PKA.1.1 Description and Expectations	Include the background section provided in section 2.5 of the Operative regional Policy Statement for consistency. Paragraph 27 of the s32 report should be inserted.	This section has been pared down and while we do not object to the removal of the explanatory notes, there is a lack of context around the challenges to developing Māori land.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-112	lb	Jared Pitman	Te Huinga	Oppose	PKA.1.1 Description and Expectations	Include the background section provided in section 2.5 of the Operative regional Policy Statement for consistency. Paragraph 27 of the s32 report should be inserted.	This section has been pared down and while we do not object to the removal of the explanatory notes, there is a lack of context around the challenges to developing Māori land.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-97	k	c/- Juliane Chetham	Patuharakeke Te Iwi Trust Board	Support	PKA.1.10 Advice Note	Retain PKA.1.10.1.	The advice clause is useful and supported.	Yes, would also consider joint

Sub No	Sub Point	Surname/ Company	First Name/ On Behalf Of	Support/ Oppose	Submission Topic	Relief Sought	Reasons	Wish to be Heard?
PC94B-112	k	Jared Pitman	Te Huinga	Support	PKA.1.10 Advice Note	Retain PKA.1.10.1.	The advice clause is useful and supported.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-13	b	Landowners Coalition Inc	Frank Newman	Oppose	PKA.1.2 Eligibility	Amend PKA.1.2.2 to state: The underlying Environment provisions <u>shall</u> apply to papakāinga developments.	Environmental effects are effects regardless of the race of the landowner that causes them. It is harmful to the environment to regulate the environmental effects of one community group and not another. Allowing an outright exemption from the underlying Environment provisions would conceivably permit intensive housing and commercial and industrial activities in areas of outstanding natural landscapes and on outstanding natural features. This is simply unacceptable from an environmental effects perspective. Furthermore, adjoining landowners may find their amenity adversely affected but be denied any opportunity to be treated as an affected party. For example, they would have no opportunity to have a say on the intensity of housing next door. Conceivably any number of dwellings could be built creating what in effect would be a camping ground on their doorstep; or an industrial activity.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-31	b	Nielsen	Shane	Oppose	PKA.1.2 Eligibility	Amend PKA.1.2.2 to state: The underlying Environment provisions <u>shall</u> apply to papakāinga developments.	Object to Council making provision for any individual group of individuals to be able to bypass the provisions of the RMA or council plans.	No
PC94B-33	a	Evans	Nicole	Oppose	PKA.1.2 Eligibility	Amend PKA.1.2.2 to state: The underlying Environment provisions <u>shall</u> apply to papakāinga developments.	No groups can be exempt as the environmental damage effects everyone now and in the future. Papakāinga developments need to be sympathetic to the existing communities so the character of the settlement remains intact. Housing intensity needs to reflect the neighbouring settlement. Adjacent properties need to be informed of papakāinga developments so that they can be prepared for the effects.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-34	c	Nielsen	Tania	Oppose Seek Amendment	PKA.1.2 Eligibility	If PC proceeds, oppose PKA1.2.2, PKA.1.5 and PKA1.5.	This plan change does not adequately take into consideration the effects of development on adjoining environments, especially where it is an interface of differing environments.	No
PC94B-36	b	Bates	Stan	Oppose	PKA.1.2 Eligibility	Amend PKA.1.2.2 to state The underlying Environment provisions shall apply to papakāinga developments.	Object to Council making provision for any individual group of individuals to be able to bypass the provisions of the RMA or council plans.	No
PC94B-38	b	Cregeen	Philip	Oppose	PKA.1.2 Eligibility	Delete PKA.1.2.2.	If underlying environmental provisions apply to all other land then they should apply to Papakāinga developments too.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-39	b	Beer	Andrew	Oppose	PKA.1.2 Eligibility	That the underlying planning (zoning) rules for papakāinga land shall be exactly the same as for all other land covered within the Whangarei District Council.	The underlying environment provisions in the District Plan should apply to all developments and all people equally, including papakāinga developments and Māori.	No
PC94B-43	a	Evans	Gwyn	Seek amendment	PKA.1.2 Eligibility	Amend PKA.1.2.2 to state: The underlying Environment provisions <u>shall</u> apply to papakāinga developments.	The prevention of adverse amenity effects on those who live within or adjacent ancestral Māori land cannot be guaranteed, as there are not sufficient controls or restrictions stipulated and defined.	Yes, would also consider joint

Sub No	Sub Point	Surname/ Company	First Name/ On Behalf Of	Support/ Oppose	Submission Topic	Relief Sought	Reasons	Wish to be Heard?
PC94B-46	a	Cregeen	Pamela	Oppose	PKA.1.2 Eligibility	Amend PKA.1.2.2 to state: The underlying Environment provisions <u>shall</u> apply to papakāinga developments.	All community groups should have the same policies and rules to follow in putting in planning applications to the Council, especially affecting the environment.	No
PC94B-47	a	Klenner	Robert and Monica	Oppose	PKA.1.2 Eligibility	The underlying Environment provisions <u>shall</u> apply to papakāinga developments.	All community groups should have the same policies and rules to follow in putting in planning applications to the Council, especially affecting the environment.	No
PC94B-48	a	Simonsen	Patti	Oppose	PKA.1.2 Eligibility	Amend PKA.1.2.2 to state: The underlying Environment provisions <u>shall</u> apply to papakāinga developments.	All community groups should have the same policies and rules to follow in putting in planning applications to the Council, especially affecting the environment.	Yes
PC94B-49	a	Simonsen	Andrew	Oppose	PKA.1.2 Eligibility	Amend PKA.1.2.2 to state: The underlying Environment provisions <u>shall</u> apply to papakāinga developments.	All community groups should have the same policies and rules to follow in putting in planning applications to the Council, especially affecting the environment.	No
PC94B-50	a	Ross	Noeleen and Sonny	Oppose	PKA.1.2 Eligibility	Amend PKA.1.2.2 to state: The underlying Environment provisions <u>shall</u> apply to papakāinga developments.	All community groups should have the same policies and rules to follow in putting in planning applications to the Council, especially affecting the environment.	Yes
PC94B-51	a	Oxenham	Trent	Oppose	PKA.1.2 Eligibility	Amend PKA.1.2.2 to state: The underlying Environment provisions <u>shall</u> apply to papakāinga developments.	All community groups should have the same policies and rules to follow in putting in planning applications to the Council, especially affecting the environment.	No
PC94B-52	a	Ryder	R N	Oppose	PKA.1.2 Eligibility	Amend PKA.1.2.2 to state: The underlying Environment provisions <u>shall</u> apply to papakāinga developments.	All community groups should have the same policies and rules to follow in putting in planning applications to the Council, especially affecting the environment.	No
PC94B-55	a	Stables	Gary	Oppose	PKA.1.2 Eligibility	Amend PKA.1.2.2 to state: The underlying Environment provisions <u>shall</u> apply to papakāinga developments.	All community groups should have the same policies and rules to follow in putting in planning applications to the Council, especially affecting the environment.	Yes
PC94B-56	b	Marshall	Ivan	Oppose	PKA.1.2 Eligibility	Amend PKA.1.2.2 to state: The underlying Environment provisions <u>shall</u> apply to papakāinga developments.	Environmental effects are effects regardless of the race of the landowner that causes them. It is harmful to the environment to regulate the environmental effects of one community group and not another. Allowing an outright exemption from the underlying Environment provisions would conceivably permit intensive housing and commercial and industrial activities in areas of outstanding natural landscapes and on outstanding natural features. This is simply unacceptable from an environmental effects perspective. Furthermore, adjoining landowners may find their amenity adversely affected but be denied any opportunity to be treated as an affected party. For example, they would have no opportunity to have a say on the intensity of housing next door. Conceivably any number of dwellings could be built creating what in effect would be a camping ground on their doorstep; or an industrial activity.	Would consider a joint case
PC94B-61	a	Gallagher	Natalie	Oppose	PKA.1.2 Eligibility	Amend PKA.1.2.2 to state: The underlying Environment provisions <u>shall</u> apply to papakāinga developments.	All community groups should have the same policies and rules to follow in putting in planning applications to the Council, especially affecting the environment.	No
PC94B-62	a	Frische	Lee	Oppose	PKA.1.2 Eligibility	The underlying Environment provisions <u>shall</u> apply to papakāinga developments.	All community groups should have the same policies and rules to follow in putting in planning applications to the Council, especially affecting the environment.	No
PC94B-63	a	Frische	Paul	Oppose	PKA.1.2 Eligibility	Amend PKA.1.2.2 to state: The underlying Environment provisions <u>shall</u> apply to papakāinga developments.	All community groups should have the same policies and rules to follow in putting in planning applications to the Council, especially affecting the environment.	No

PC94B - Papakāinga
Summary Of Submissions by Topic

Sub No	Sub Point	Surname/ Company	First Name/ On Behalf Of	Support/ Oppose	Submission Topic	Relief Sought	Reasons	Wish to be Heard?
PC94B-64	a	Brooke	Anthony	Oppose	PKA.1.2 Eligibility	Amend PKA.1.2.2 to state: The underlying Environment provisions shall apply to papakāinga developments.	All community groups should have the same policies and rules to follow in putting in planning applications to the Council, especially affecting the environment.	No
PC94B-65	a	Green	Brian	Oppose	PKA.1.2 Eligibility	Amend PKA.1.2.2 to state: The underlying Environment provisions shall apply to papakāinga developments.	All community groups should have the same policies and rules to follow in putting in planning applications to the Council, especially affecting the environment.	No
PC94B-66	a	Green	Leanne	Oppose	PKA.1.2 Eligibility	Amend PKA.1.2.2 to state: The underlying Environment provisions shall apply to papakāinga developments.	All community groups should have the same policies and rules to follow in putting in planning applications to the Council, especially affecting the environment.	No
PC94B-67	a	de Beer	J G	Oppose	PKA.1.2 Eligibility	Amend PKA.1.2.2 to state: The underlying Environment provisions shall apply to papakāinga developments.	All community groups should have the same policies and rules to follow in putting in planning applications to the Council, especially affecting the environment.	No
PC94B-68	a	Laing	Michael	Oppose	PKA.1.2 Eligibility	Amend PKA.1.2.2 to state: The underlying Environment provisions shall apply to papakāinga developments.	All community groups should have the same policies and rules to follow in putting in planning applications to the Council, especially affecting the environment.	No
PC94B-69	a	King	Janet	Oppose	PKA.1.2 Eligibility	Amend PKA.1.2.2 to state: The underlying Environment provisions shall apply to papakāinga developments.	All community groups should have the same policies and rules to follow in putting in planning applications to the Council, especially affecting the environment.	No
PC94B-70	a	Crosbie	S	Oppose	PKA.1.2 Eligibility	Amend PKA.1.2.2 to state: The underlying Environment provisions shall apply to papakāinga developments.	All community groups should have the same policies and rules to follow in putting in planning applications to the Council, especially affecting the environment.	No
PC94B-71	a	Pool	John	Oppose	PKA.1.2 Eligibility	Amend PKA.1.2.2 to state: The underlying Environment provisions shall apply to papakāinga developments.	All community groups should have the same policies and rules to follow in putting in planning applications to the Council, especially affecting the environment.	No
PC94B-72	a	Pattinson	Shelley	Oppose	PKA.1.2 Eligibility	Amend PKA.1.2.2 to state: The underlying Environment provisions shall apply to papakāinga developments.	All community groups should have the same policies and rules to follow in putting in planning applications to the Council, especially affecting the environment.	Yes
PC94B-73	a	Larkin	Elaine	Oppose	PKA.1.2 Eligibility	Amend PKA.1.2.2 to state: The underlying Environment provisions shall apply to papakāinga developments.	All community groups should have the same policies and rules to follow in putting in planning applications to the Council, especially affecting the environment.	No
PC94B-74	a	Alkast	Shirley	Oppose	PKA.1.2 Eligibility	Amend PKA.1.2.2 to state: The underlying Environment provisions shall apply to papakāinga developments.	All community groups should have the same policies and rules to follow in putting in planning applications to the Council, especially affecting the environment.	No
PC94B-83	a	Ross	Lawrence and Elaine	Oppose	PKA.1.2 Eligibility	Amend PKA.1.2.2 to state: The underlying Environment provisions shall apply to papakāinga developments.	All community groups should have the same policies and rules to follow in putting in planning applications to the Council, especially affecting the environment.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-90	c	Far North District Council		Seek amendment	PKA.1.2 Eligibility	Amend proposal to align with RPS mapping and policy direction.	Further consideration needs to be given to the integration of the RPS policy direction and mapping of particular sites as 'resource areas' have the potential to be a significant constraint upon papakāinga development.	No
PC94B-97	c	c/- Juliane Chetham	Patuharakeke Te Iwi Trust Board	Oppose	PKA.1.2 Eligibility	Amend to PKA.1.2.1 as follows: The District Wide and Resource Area objectives, policies and rules in the District Plan shall not apply to papakāinga developments under the papakāinga provisions below Retain PKA.1.2.2	This effectively contradicts the intent of the policy. WDC was singled out as a council looking to provide appropriate flexibility in the auditor general's 2011 report on Māori housing -this follow-up report from 2014 highlights some of Auckland Councils approach.	Yes, would also consider joint

Sub No	Sub Point	Surname/ Company	First Name/ On Behalf Of	Support/ Oppose	Submission Topic	Relief Sought	Reasons	Wish to be Heard?
PC94B-101	b	Rebecca Eng	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	Support	PKA.1.2 Eligibility	Retain PKA.1.2.1.	Papakāinga includes a residential land use component and other activities which fall in to the definition of sensitive activities in relation to the National Grid, and this is important where papakāinga developments are proposed on land that is within close proximity to National Grid assets. In addition, new papakāinga developments can trigger the need for earthworks which are also subject to controls under the NTW provisions to protect the National Grid. Transpower's submission therefore supports rule PKA.2.1 which states that the NTW rules (among others) shall apply to papakāinga developments.	Yes, would not consider joint
PC94B-102	a	King	Neville	Oppose	PKA.1.2 Eligibility	Amend PKA.1.2.2 to state: The underlying Environment provisions <u>shall</u> apply to papakāinga developments.	All community groups should have the same policies and rules to follow in putting in planning applications to the Council, especially affecting the environment.	No
PC94B-106	a	Lorimer	Elizabeth	Oppose	PKA.1.2 Eligibility	Amend PKA.1.2.2 to state: The underlying Environment provisions <u>shall</u> apply to papakāinga developments.	All community groups should have the same policies and rules to follow in putting in planning applications to the Council, especially affecting the environment.	Yes
PC94B-107	a	Lorimer	Stuart	Oppose	PKA.1.2 Eligibility	Amend PKA.1.2.2 to state: The underlying Environment provisions <u>shall</u> apply to papakāinga developments.	All community groups should have the same policies and rules to follow in putting in planning applications to the Council, especially affecting the environment.	Yes
PC94B-112	c	Jared Pitman	Te Huinga	Oppose	PKA.1.2 Eligibility	Amend to PKA.1.2.1 as follows: The District Wide and Resource Area objectives, policies and rules in the District Plan <u>shall not</u> apply to papakāinga developments under the papakāinga provisions below. Retain PKA.1.2.2.	This effectively contradicts the intent of the policy. WDC was singled out as a council looking to provide appropriate flexibility in the auditor general's 2011 report on Māori housing -this follow-up report from 2014 highlights some of Auckland Council's approach.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-13	c	Landowners Coalition Inc	Frank Newman	Oppose	PKA.1.3 Objectives & PKA.1.4 Policies	Amend PKA.1.3 to state: Allow maximum flexibility for Māori to develop their ancestral lands, while ensuring appropriate health, safety, amenity and environmental standards are met. Amend PKA.1.4 to state: To require the maximum intensity and scale of papakāinga development to be determined by the sustainable servicing capacity of the land and the surrounding environment, <u>and the environmental effects of the proposed development.</u>	The adverse effects on adjoining landowners may be potentially significant, and impact on social and economic well-being.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-33	b	Evans	Nicole	Oppose	PKA.1.3 Objectives & PKA.1.4 Policies	Amend PKA.1.4.2 as follows: To require the maximum intensity and scale of the papakāinga development to be determined by the sustainable servicing capacity of the land, the surrounding environment, <u>the environment effects of the development, and the character of the current settlement.</u>	No groups can be exempt as the environmental damage effects everyone now and in the future. Papakāinga developments need to be sympathetic to the existing communities so the character of the settlement remains intact. Housing intensity needs to reflect the neighbouring settlement. Adjacent properties need to be informed of papakāinga developments so that they can be prepared for the effects.	Yes, would also consider joint

Sub No	Sub Point	Surname/ Company	First Name/ On Behalf Of	Support/ Oppose	Submission Topic	Relief Sought	Reasons	Wish to be Heard?
PC94B-38	c	Creegen	Philip	Oppose	PKA.1.3 Objectives & PKA.1.4 Policies	Amend PKA.1.3.2 as follows: Provide for papakāinga development on ancestral land in a manner which is sensitive to tikanga Māori and the sustainable management of the land resource and local community aspirations. Add new PKA.1.3.6 as follows: 6. Safeguard the amenities of adjacent land owners to Māori Ancestral land. Amend PKA.1.4.4 as follows: To provide for non-residential activities of a scale, character, and intensity that are compatible with the values of Māoritanga, character of the environment and the sustainable servicing capacity of the locality and aspirations of the local community. Add new PKA.1.4.6 as follows: 6. All the above policies to consider the impact of papakāinga development on existing adjacent residential communities.	So that due consideration is given to the whole community in a given location and to avoid adverse impact on adjacent property owners.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-41	a	Cooke	Kristy and Paul	Seek amendment	PKA.1.3 Objectives & PKA.1.4 Policies	Retain the following words in PKA.1.4.2: and the surrounding environment. Amend PKA.1.4.3 as follows: To require the location and extent of built development to be determined by the physical characteristics of the land and tikanga Māori <u>and the avoidance of adverse effects on adjoining land and communities.</u> Retain the following words in PKA.4.4: character of the environment.	It should be more than just limited by the physical characteristics of the land.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-43	b	Evans	Gwyn	Seek amendment	PKA.1.3 Objectives & PKA.1.4 Policies	Amend PKA.1.3.3 to state: Allow maximum flexibility for Māori to develop their ancestral lands, while ensuring appropriate health, safety, environmental and amenity standards are met. Add PKA.1.4.6: To require the intensity, extent and charter of residential developments to reflect that of any adjacent established village/settlement.	Potential adverse effects on the environment cannot be prevented, there are no environmental controls. Potential adverse effects on the charter of long establish adjacent rural settlements cannot be guaranteed, as there are no controls or restrictions defined which take this into account.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-56	c	Marshall	Ivan	Oppose	PKA.1.3 Objectives & PKA.1.4 Policies	Amend PKA.1.3.3 to state: Allow maximum flexibility for Māori to develop their ancestral lands, while ensuring appropriate health, safety, amenity and environmental standards are met. Amend PKA.1.4.2 to state: To require the maximum intensity and scale of papakāinga development to be determined by the sustainable servicing capacity of the land and the surrounding environment, <u>and the environmental effects of the proposed development.</u>	The adverse effects on adjoining landowners may be potentially significant, and impact on social and economic well-being.	Would consider a joint case

Sub No	Sub Point	Surname/ Company	First Name/ On Behalf Of	Support/ Oppose	Submission Topic	Relief Sought	Reasons	Wish to be Heard?
PC94B-80	a	Spencer	Nicola	Oppose	PKA.1.3 Objectives & PKA.1.4 Policies	Retain the following words in PKA.1.4.2: To require the maximum intensity and scale of papakāinga development to be determined by the sustainable servicing capacity of the land and the surrounding environment . Amend PKA.1.4.3 as follows: To require the location and extent of built development to be determined by the physical characteristics of the land and tikanga Māori and the <u>avoidance of adverse effects on adjoining land and communities</u> . Retain the following words in PKA.1.4.4: To provide for non-residential activities of a scale, character, and intensity that are compatible with the values of Māoritanga, character of the environment and the sustainable servicing capacity of the locality.	It is important to facilitate Māori land owners living on their land but it should be done in a manner which does not compromise the amenity values of existing communities of the quality of the natural and built environment.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-97	d	c/- Juliane Chetham	Patuharakeke Te Iwi Trust Board	Support	PKA.1.3 Objectives & PKA.1.4 Policies	Retain the objectives and policies. Clarification is sought regarding the definition of 'surrounding environment'	PTB continue to support the objectives and policies. Noted that reference to Te Ture Whenua Māori Act may be redundant with amendment to the Act likely in the near future.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-110	b	Jade Kake	Ngati Hau Trust Board	Support, seek amendment	PKA.1.3 Objectives & PKA.1.4 Policies	Amend PKA.1.4.1 as follows: To limit papakāinga development to ancestral Māori land that is administered under Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993, <u>or</u> under General Title where an <u>ancestral link</u> has been identified.	The 8 acre Pehiāwari Marae block (remnants of the original 289 acre block, along with a number of other blocks under Māori freehold title) was converted to General Title by the Anglican Church in the 1930s. This land was formally returned to us in 1981 through a private act of parliament. We support the proposal that papakāinga provisions extend to ancestral land under General Title, however we feel that this would be strengthened through explicit reference in policy statement 1.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-112	d	Jared Pitman	Te Huinga	Support	PKA.1.3 Objectives & PKA.1.4 Policies	Retain the objectives and policies.	We continue to support the objectives and policies. Noted that reference to Te Ture Whenua Māori Act may be redundant with amendment to the Act likely in the near future. Clarification is sought regarding the definition of 'surrounding environment'.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-113	b	Pita	Rihi Ngaraimata Kathleen	Support	PKA.1.3 Objectives & PKA.1.4 Policies	Retain objectives and policies as is.	I support the implementation of the PC94B objectives and recommendations into the District Plan because they are for the betterment of Māori and will allow Māori whanau to manage and develop their ancestral lands for Papakainga initiatives.	No, would reconsider if requested by Iwi Authority

PC94B - Papakāinga
Summary Of Submissions by Topic

Sub No	Sub Point	Surname/ Company	First Name/ On Behalf Of	Support/ Oppose	Submission Topic	Relief Sought	Reasons	Wish to be Heard?
PC94B-41	b	Cooke	Kristy and Paul	Seek amendment	PKA.1.5 Permitted Activities	Make Papakāinga developments restricted discretionary, with discretion limited to scale and intensity, number and size of residential units, effect on neighbouring amenity particularly daylight and privacy, noise and effects, operating hours, effective servicing, traffic safety particular access on roads. Commercial activities should not be able to be included in papakāinga developments. Amend PKA.5.1.b.i to state that the setback of buildings from ALL boundaries should be the same as setback required for adjoining land.	Controls proposed should ensure compatibility with the natural qualities and character of the surrounding environment. Concerned that PC94B goes too far in easing up on development boundaries. This could unnecessarily affect the character of a community.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-41	b	Cooke	Kristy and Paul	Seek amendment	PKA.1.5 Permitted Activities	Make Papakāinga developments restricted discretionary, with discretion limited to scale and intensity, number and size of residential units, effect on neighbouring amenity particularly daylight and privacy, noise and effects, operating hours, effective servicing, traffic safety particular access on roads. Commercial activities should not be able to be included in papakāinga developments. Amend PKA.5.1.b.i to state that the setback of buildings from ALL boundaries should be the same as setback required for adjoining land.	Controls proposed should ensure compatibility with the natural qualities and character of the surrounding environment. Concerned that PC94B goes too far in easing up on development boundaries. This could unnecessarily affect the character of a community.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-75	b	Donaldson	Les	Oppose in part, seek amendment	PKA.1.5 Permitted Activities	Change the activity status in PKA.1.5 from permitted to either controlled or restricted discretionary (the preference being restricted discretionary) and addition a specific requirement (matter for control or RDA matter) to consider effects on the surrounding environment in the overall design and location of the development. OR As an alternative to the above, retain the permitted activity status, but add a more appropriate permitted development threshold that goes at least some way to protecting the landscape, ecological and amenity values of the subject land, and the wider environment, after which discretionary or restricted discretionary consent is required.	As drafted, the provisions are ambiguous and do not achieve sustainable management in accordance with Part 2 of the RMA. The proposed permitted activity rules in PKA.1.5 do not require any consideration or cognisance of the surrounding environment. This is a major divergence from the intent and purpose of the RMA. The section 32 is inadequate and does not address the surrounding environment, and this is borne out in the highly permissive nature of the proposed rules. The Auckland Unitary Plan, Tauranga City and Western Bay of Plenty District Plans, specify a limit on the number of dwellings and typically require consent as a controlled activity. If approval is to be required, it is not appropriate for this approval to be a pre-requisite for a permitted activity. Accordingly, if a PDP is to be submitted for approval, either the activity status should be something other than permitted. As drafted the requirement for a PDP is toothless and has no sustainable management purpose.	Yes

Sub No	Sub Point	Surname/ Company	First Name/ On Behalf Of	Support/ Oppose	Submission Topic	Relief Sought	Reasons	Wish to be Heard?
PC94B-77	c	Shepherd	D and K	Oppose in part, seek amendment	PKA.1.5 Permitted Activities	<p>Change the activity status in PKA.1.5 from permitted to either controlled or restricted discretionary (the preference being restricted discretionary) and addition a specific requirement (matter for control or RDA matter) to consider effects on the surrounding environment in the overall design and location of the development.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>As an alternative to the above, retain the permitted activity status, but add a more appropriate permitted development threshold that goes at least some way to protecting the landscape, ecological and amenity values of the subject land, and the wider environment, after which discretionary or restricted discretionary consent is required.</p>	<p>As drafted, the provisions are ambiguous and do not achieve sustainable management in accordance with Part 2 of the RMA. The proposed permitted activity rules in PKA.1.5 do not require any consideration or cognisance of the surrounding environment. This is a major divergence from the intent and purpose of the RMA.</p> <p>The section 32 is inadequate and does not address the surrounding environment, and this is borne out in the highly permissive nature of the proposed rules.</p> <p>The Auckland Unitary Plan, Tauranga City and Western Bay of Plenty District Plans, specify a limit on the number of dwellings and typically require consent as a controlled activity. If approval is to be required, it is not appropriate for this approval to be a pre-requisite for a permitted activity. Accordingly, if a PDP is to be submitted for approval, either the activity status should be something other than permitted. As drafted the requirement for a PDP is toothless and has no sustainable management purpose.</p>	Yes
PC94B-79	b	Zodiac Holdings Ltd		Oppose in part, seek amendment	PKA.1.5 Permitted Activities	<p>Change the activity status in PKA.1.5 from permitted to either controlled or restricted discretionary (the preference being restricted discretionary) and add a specific requirement (matter for control or RDA matter) to consider effects on the surrounding environment in the overall design and location of the development.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>As an alternative to the above, retain the permitted activity status, but add a more appropriate permitted development threshold after which discretionary consent is required, and add a rule requiring a minimum 100m separation from existing commercial and industrial uses in the surrounding environment as a qualifying criterion for permitted activity status.</p>	<p>As drafted, the provisions are ambiguous and do not achieve sustainable management in accordance with Part 2 of the RMA. The proposed permitted activity rules in PKA.1.5 do not require any consideration or cognisance of the surrounding environment. This is a major divergence from the intent and purpose of the RMA and the reverse sensitivity effects that could arise.</p> <p>The Auckland Unitary Plan, Tauranga City and Western Bay of Plenty District Plans, specify a limit on the number of dwellings and typically require consent as a controlled activity. If approval is to be required, it is not appropriate for this approval to be a pre-requisite for a permitted activity. Accordingly, if a PDP is to be submitted for approval, either the activity status should be something other than permitted. As drafted the requirement for a PDP is toothless and has no sustainable management purpose.</p>	Yes

PC94B - Papakāinga
Summary Of Submissions by Topic

Sub No	Sub Point	Surname/ Company	First Name/ On Behalf Of	Support/ Oppose	Submission Topic	Relief Sought	Reasons	Wish to be Heard?
PC94B-80	b	Spencer	Nicola	Oppose	PKA.1.5 Permitted Activities	Make papakāinga developments restricted discretionary, with discretion limited to scale and intensity, number and size of residential units, effect on neighbouring amenity particularly daylight and privacy, noise and effects, operating hours, effective serving, operating hours, effective servicing, traffic safety particularly access onto roads. Controls proposed should ensure compatibility with the natural and built qualities and character of the surrounding environment. Commercial activities should not be able to be included in papakāinga developments. These aspects of a proposal should be Discretionary. Resource consent applications for RD activities could be free and Māori groups should be encouraged to prepare their own applications without the need to hire experts. This method would address the costs issue but still allow Council to appropriately assess developments and apply suitable conditions.	Additional standards should apply to ensure that proposals are more compatible with the surrounding sites and that the amenity of neighbours are not unduly affected. Permitted activities cannot have conditions on them, and having conditions as to how an activity operates is important to control level of effects, particularly when relating to commercial or business activities, or to developments of higher intensity than the surrounding area. This method would address the costs issue but still allow Council to appropriately assess developments and apply suitable conditions.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-89	a	Gardner	Elizabeth Ann	Oppose	PKA.1.5 Permitted Activities	Decline the plan change.	Papakāinga developments shouldn't be permitted activities. Should be assessed as a restricted discretionary activity.	No, but would consider joint case
PC94B-90	d	Far North District Council		Support	PKA.1.5 Permitted Activities	Retain broad intent and approach of this section.	The Far North District Council supports the robust process regarding siting, design and site servicing capacity as a means to enable papakāinga developments on Maori land. In our experience, residential intensity and exclusive use provisions have been one of the biggest barriers to Māori land development.	No
PC94B-97	e	c/- Juliane Chetham	Patuharakeke Te Iwi Trust Board	Support	PKA.1.5 Permitted Activities	Retain requirement for PDP and stipulated contents in PKA.1.5.1.a.	The requirement for a Papakāinga Development Plan and the stipulated contents of the plan are supported.	Yes, would also consider joint

Sub No	Sub Point	Surname/ Company	First Name/ On Behalf Of	Support/ Oppose	Submission Topic	Relief Sought	Reasons	Wish to be Heard?
PC94B-97	f	c/- Juliane Chetham	Patuharakeke Te Iwi Trust Board	Oppose	PKA.1.5 Permitted Activities	Remove the controls in PKA.1.5.1.b.	At a general level the controls required for permitted activity status seem to contradict the intent of the policies. The 'impermeable surface requirement' is an example of this - conflicting with the main assessment method of the papakāinga provisions i.e. what the whenua can sustain. This requirement is opposed by PTB and more discussion is needed. Some parcels of Māori land in Takahiwai are likely to be within 500m of Mineral Extraction Areas, however the quarries are either on whanau owned land or an existing relationship exists with the quarry owners and operators and more flexible solutions could be agreed to between whanau and the quarry owner/ operators. The vegetation clearance requirements also seem to contradict the intent of the PKA policies. Encouraging retention of such vegetation without essentially saddling Māori with another planning burden is what is needed. Above all else all of these controls negate the flexibility envisaged in the policies.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-110	c	Jade Kake	Ngati Hau Trust Board	Support, seek amendment	PKA.1.5 Permitted Activities	Amend PKA.1.5.1 as follows: On Māori freehold land as defined in Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993, and on land under General Title where an <u>ancestral link has been identified</u> , papakāinga developments are a permitted activity.	Papakāinga development on ancestral land under General Title should be a permitted, rather than discretionary activity, due to the compliance costs and notification process associated with obtaining resource consent.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-112	e	Jared Pitman	Te Huinga	Support	PKA.1.5 Permitted Activities	Retain requirement for PDP and stipulated contents in PKA.1.5.1.a.	The requirement for a Papakāinga Development Plan and the stipulated contents of the plan are supported.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-112	f	Jared Pitman	Te Huinga	Oppose	PKA.1.5 Permitted Activities	Remove the controls in PKA.1.5.1.b.	At a general level the controls required for permitted activity status seem to contradict the intent of the policies. The 'impermeable surface requirement' is an example of this - conflicting with the main assessment method of the papakāinga provisions i.e. what the whenua can sustain. This requirement is opposed. The vegetation clearance requirements also seem to contradict the intent of the PKA policies. It also needs to be acknowledged that Māori land provides a significant contribution to the remaining areas of indigenous vegetation in the district and the amenity values and ecosystem services it provides. Encouraging the retention of such vegetation without essentially saddling Māori with another planning burden is what is required.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-113	c	Pita	Rihi Ngaroimata Kathleen	Support	PKA.1.5 Permitted Activities	Retain PKA.1.5 as is.	Support and welcome the implementation of this change.	No, would reconsider if requested by Iwi Authority

Sub No	Sub Point	Surname/ Company	First Name/ On Behalf Of	Support/ Oppose	Submission Topic	Relief Sought	Reasons	Wish to be Heard?
PC94B-02	a	Tairua	Mark	Not Stated	PKA.1.6 Discretionary Activities	In respect to identifying an ancestral link for General land owned by Māori, who in Council would confirm the connection to that land?	Challenge the expert knowledge that the Council may perceive to hold in respect to my whakapapa to the land in question.	Not Stated
PC94B-13	f	Landowners Coalition Inc	Frank Newman	Oppose	PKA.1.6 Discretionary Activities	PKA.1.6b should be deleted.	Such land is unidentifiable to existing and potential landowners that are likely to be affected by a papakāinga development.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-15	a	Ross	Lynne	Oppose	PKA.1.6 Discretionary Activities	Delete PKA.1.6 discretionary activity status for papakāinga developments on land that is general land owned by Māori.	Guidelines and standards need to be specified, to prevent lowering to an unacceptable level.	No
PC94B-17	e	Reed	Ivan and Karen	Oppose	PKA.1.6 Discretionary Activities	The change of designation of general Māori land to ancestral land should be carefully considered.	There are no identifiable owners, only an identified link to ancestral land.	Would consider a joint case
PC94B-20	a	Roberts	Laurence	Oppose	PKA.1.6 Discretionary Activities	In PKA.1.6 delete: or where the land is General Land owned by Māori where an ancestral link has been identified.	The provision is discriminatory towards other general landowners.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-23	a	Tauaki	Gail Diane	Not Stated	PKA.1.6 Discretionary Activities	In respect to identifying an ancestral link for General land owned by Māori, who in Council would confirm the connection to that land?	I would challenge the expert knowledge that the Council may perceive to hold in respect to my whakapapa to the land in question.	Not Stated
PC94B-30	a	Cherrington	Betty	Not Stated	PKA.1.6 Discretionary Activities	In respect to identifying an ancestral link for General land owned by Māori, who in Council would confirm the connection to that land?	Challenge the expert knowledge that the Council may perceive to hold in respect to my whakapapa to the land in question.	Not Stated
PC94B-56	f	Marshall	Ivan	Oppose	PKA.1.6 Discretionary Activities	PKA.1.6b should be deleted.	Such land is unidentifiable to existing and potential landowners that are likely to be affected by a papakāinga development.	Would consider a joint case
PC94B-90	k	Far North District Council		Seek amendment	PKA.1.6 Discretionary Activities	Include reference to those activities considered discretionary under PKA.1.5.2 in PKA.1.6. Also include, if necessary, references to other parts of plan where assessment criteria can be found.	It is assumed that activities that do not comply with PKA.1.5.1 and are considered a discretionary activity as per PKA.1.5.2 have no relevant assessment criteria that must be addressed as they seem to relate only to PKA.1.6.1a and PKA.1.6.1b.	No
PC94B-90	l	Far North District Council		Seek amendment	PKA.1.6 Discretionary Activities	Including in PKA.1.6.2.d a sub-clause which requires demonstration of consultation with owners of adjoining multiply owned Māori land without management structures, which is not onerous for applicant's e.g.: hui on marae or public notice in newspaper.	This plan change is silent on the provision of written approvals from adjoining property owners. In a discretionary resource consent application for a 15 dwelling papakāinga housing proposal currently being considered in the Far North District, the process of consulting with large numbers of owners of adjoining Māori land is proving to be onerous despite best attempts from the applicant. This is exacerbated when these adjoining land blocks have no operating governance structure that represents shareholders.	No
PC94B-97	g	c/- Juliane Chetham	Patuharakeke Te Iwi Trust Board	Support, seek amendment	PKA.1.6 Discretionary Activities	Provide further definition of General Land owned by Māori. This discretionary status be retained primarily for other lands.	In general PKA.6.1 is supported. However, this section requires further definition of General Land owned by Māori, i.e.; Māori Land changed to general title by statute. Ideally this type of land would be considered under permitted activities. This discretionary status should be retained primarily for other lands, e.g. land returned through Treaty settlement into tribal ownership or land purchased where there is record that it was alienated from Māori.	Yes, would also consider joint

Sub No	Sub Point	Surname/ Company	First Name/ On Behalf Of	Support/ Oppose	Submission Topic	Relief Sought	Reasons	Wish to be Heard?
PC94B-112	g	Jared Pitman	Te Huinga	Support, seek amendment	PKA.1.6 Discretionary Activities	Provide further definition of General Land owned by Māori. This discretionary status be retained primarily for other lands.	In general PKA 6.1 is supported. However, this section requires further definition of General Land owned by Māori, i.e.; Māori Land changed to general title by statute. Ideally this type of land would be considered under permitted activities. This discretionary status should be retained primarily for other lands, e.g. land returned through Treaty settlement into tribal ownership or land purchased where there is record that it was alienated from Māori.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-113	d	Pita	Rihi Ngaroimata Kathleen	Support	PKA.1.6 Discretionary Activities	Retain PKA.1.6 as is.	Support and welcome this proposed change of allowing Māori who own ancestral land that is in general title, to have the right to provide papakainga development for their whanau.	No, would reconsider if requested by Iwi Authority
PC94B-15	b	Ross	Lynne	Oppose	PKA.1.7 Non-Complying Activities	Delete PKA.1.7 Non-Complying Activity status for papakainga developments on all other land.	Guidelines and standards need to be specified, to prevent lowering to an unacceptable level.	No
PC94B-43	e	Evans	Gwyn	Seek amendment	PKA.1.7 Non-Complying Activities	Add PKA.1.7.2 as follows: <u>Any Papakainga developments which directly and significantly effects land which is designated as environmentally sensitive or has significant biodiversity and ecosystems shall be a non-complying activity.</u>	Potential adverse effects on the environment cannot be prevented, there are no environmental controls.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-97	h	c/ Juliane Chetham	Petuharakeke Te Iwi Trust Board	Support	PKA.1.7 Non-Complying Activities	Retain PKA.1.7.1.	PTB do not object to this provision.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-112	h	Jared Pitman	Te Huinga	Support	PKA.1.7 Non-Complying Activities	Retain PKA.1.7.1.	We do not object to this provision.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-113	e	Pita	Rihi Ngaroimata Kathleen	Support	PKA.1.7 Non-Complying Activities	Retain PKA.1.7 as is.	Support.	No, would reconsider if requested by Iwi Authority
PC94B-13	g	Landowners Coalition Inc	Frank Newman	Oppose	PKA.1.8 Transfer of Powers	PKA.1.8.1 should be deleted.	The effects of a papakainga development extend beyond the Iwi authority and therefore should not exclude the public from participating in the management of the powers.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-38	e	Cregeen	Philip	Oppose	PKA.1.8 Transfer of Powers	Delete PKA.1.8 and delete except for areas subject to a transfer of powers in PKA.1.9.1. Typo PKA.5 - PKA.7 should read PKA.1.5 - PKA.1.7	Council has no right to transfer the decision making process for matters that may impact the wider community.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-41	c	Cooke	Kristy and Paul	Oppose	PKA.1.8 Transfer of Powers	Not stated.	We also feel that the transfer of powers leans towards making the applicant and the decision maker a related party which does not appear fair or transparent.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-42	a	Dickson	Janet	Oppose	PKA.1.8 Transfer of Powers	Council does not have the right to delegate its own powers to an individual or body of their choosing.	The transfer of powers granted to one body cannot be passed on to another. This is unlawful. The transfer of the power to grant Resource Consents to the very persons applying for those Resource Consents is corrupt: it is by definition conflict of interest, period. Nothing can justify corruption, neither expediency nor racial preference. Nothing.	Yes, would also consider joint

Sub No	Sub Point	Surname/ Company	First Name/ On Behalf Of	Support/ Oppose	Submission Topic	Relief Sought	Reasons	Wish to be Heard?
PC94B-56	g	Marshall	Ivan	Oppose	PKA.1.8 Transfer of Powers	PKA.1.8.1 should be deleted.	The effects of a papakāinga development extend beyond the iwi authority and therefore should not exclude the public from participating in the management of the powers.	Would consider a joint case
PC94B-80	d	Spencer	Nicola	Oppose	PKA.1.8 Transfer of Powers	This section should be deleted.	Decisions should be made by an independent panel with suitable expert Māori matters on it. There are other ways of ensuring fair hearings without making Māori subject to their own decision making structure, different to the rest of the community.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-92	b	Mackenzie	Fiona	Oppose	PKA.1.8 Transfer of Powers	Commit to total transparency and legal equality.	Inform your ratepayers how you will ensure there is no opportunity for corruption.	No
PC94B-97	i	c/ Juliane Chetham	Patuharakeke Te Iwi Trust Board	Support	PKA.1.8 Transfer of Powers	Retain PKA.1.8.1.	PTB Support this provision. We note however, that the Māori Land Court first defined all Māori land as being in hapū ownership. We therefore consider the intention should be to transfer powers to hapū associated with the lands, as opposed to Iwi Boards.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-112	i	Jared Pitman	Te Huinga	Support	PKA.1.8 Transfer of Powers	Retain PKA.1.8.1.	We support this provision. We note however, that the Māori Land Court first defined all Māori land as being in hapū ownership. We therefore consider the intention should be to transfer powers to hapū associated with the lands, as opposed to Iwi Boards.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-113	f	Pita	Rihi Ngaroimata Kathleen	Support	PKA.1.8 Transfer of Powers	Retain PKA.1.8 as is.	Support.	No, would reconsider if requested by Iwi Authority
PC94B-109	b	Muriel Newman	New Zealand Centre for Political Research	Oppose	PKA.1.8 Transfer of Powers & PKA.1.9 Decision Making	That PC94B be withdrawn.	By recommending that the owners of Māori ancestral land may request their application for 'development plans' or resource consents be heard by a Commissioner with expertise and qualifications in tikanga and Matauranga Māori - or in the long term by an Iwi Authority or Hapu Group through powers delegated under Section 33 or 36B of the RMA - the Council would be in breach of the common law requirement for public decision-making to be procedurally fair and without bias. By encouraging committees of relatives - or Commissioners who may be part of a wider ancestral network - to act as approval authorities, PC94B would breach the common law requirement that public decision-making is procedurally fair and without bias - and that 'no-one should be a judge in his own cause'.	Not Stated
PC94B-04	b	Darby	Chris	Support	PKA.1.9 Decision Making	That the appointment of Independent Commissioners with Tikanga Māori expertise be complementary to other expertise That where a hearing takes place the Tikanga Māori Commissioner be preferably not more than one of three of the panel members. That where a duty commissioner judges an application the tikanga Māori requirement does not apply.	Owens 170ha of land at 732 Rockell Road, Whananaki that abuts General land owned by Māori.	No

PC94B - Papakāinga
Summary Of Submissions by Topic

Sub No	Sub Point	Surname/ Company	First Name/ On Behalf Of	Support/ Oppose	Submission Topic	Relief Sought	Reasons	Wish to be Heard?
PC94B-41	d	Cooke	Kristy and Paul	Support	PKA.1.9 Decision Making	Not stated.	We support the process of the applicant being hearing by an independent commissioner with knowledge in tikanga Māori. That this would ensure the needs of applicants for papakāinga are fairly considered against the concerns and effects on the community and environment.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-42	b	Dickson	Janet	Oppose	PKA.1.9 Decision Making	Duly elected Councils cannot co-opt random unelected persons to vote or take decisions on their behalf.	This constitutes a transfer of powers and is unlawful. Even the ambivalent response to Council from Thomson Wilson indicates this.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-44	b	Messham	Raewyn	Not Stated	PKA.1.9 Decision Making	The Council should be the one dealing with every Resource Content application that is applied for, not passing some on to iwi for iwi.	The Council will allow Māori their own nominee (iwi) appointee to hear the matter. This is a conflict in interest. These decisions made by iwi can directly affect other ratepayers without them the ratepayers being able to put in any objects for or against.	Not Stated
PC94B-80	e	Spencer	Nicola	Oppose	PKA.1.9 Decision Making	Retain this section as it is.	Having suitably qualified expert that understands issues facing Māori developments should be enough to ensure that decisions are not biased against Papakāinga developments.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-84	c	Gilbert	Helen	Oppose	PKA.1.9 Decision Making	Reconsider this provision.	It is not fair that RC applicants of Māori land can request to be heard by an Independent Commissioner(s) when the rest of the community cannot.	No
PC94B-97	j	c/- Juliane Chetham	Patuharakeke Te Iwi Trust Board	Support, seek amendment	PKA.1.9 Decision Making	Reconsider the inclusion of: <u>and resource management</u> in PKA.1.9.1.	All commissioners are required (under s39 of the RMA) to acquire accreditation. This requires them to have passed the Ministry for the Environment's "Making Good Decisions" course and necessitates a robust knowledge of Planning. – so we are unsure what the purpose of the reference to planning is. We do support however, that Independent Commissioners involved in PKA decision making have requisite expertise in Matauranga Māori.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-112	j	Jared Pitman	Te Huinga	Support, seek amendment	PKA.1.9 Decision Making	Reconsider the inclusion of <u>and resource management</u> in PKA.1.9.1.	All commissioners are required (under s39 of the RMA) to acquire accreditation. This requires them to have passed the Ministry for the Environment's "Making Good Decisions" course and necessitates a robust knowledge of Planning. – so we are unsure what the purpose of the reference to planning is. We do support however, that Independent Commissioners involved in PKA decision making have requisite expertise in Matauranga Māori.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-113	g	Pita	Rihi Ngaroimata Kathleen	Support	PKA.1.9 Decision Making	Retain PKA.1.9 as is.	Support and welcome the implementation of this proposed change to the resource consent process so that all matters relevant to Māori can be considered by those who understand 'Te Ao Māori'.	No, would reconsider if requested by iwi Authority
PC94B-01	a	Koller	Simon	Not Stated	Procedural Issues	Clarity sought as to what the change could mean for the submitter's properties at Harris Road or Oakura.	The information provided in mailed documents doesn't provide enough information.	Not Stated
PC94B-03	a	Kepa	Dr Mere	Oppose	Procedural Issues	That crystal clear information rather than vague slogans should have been provided.	Māori land of the plan change to papakāinga.	No
PC94B-21	a	Trehwella	Dennis and Pam	Not Stated	Procedural Issues	Greater clarity and specificity around what is or is not permitted should be provided.	Currently the provisions are not sufficiently specific.	Yes, would also consider joint

PC94B - Papakāinga
Summary Of Submissions by Topic

Sub No	Sub Point	Surname/ Company	First Name/ On Behalf Of	Support/ Oppose	Submission Topic	Relief Sought	Reasons	Wish to be Heard?
PC94B-29	d	Oberholster	Dirk and Nicci	Seek amendment	Procedural Issues	Why was notification restricted to so few?	Neighbours in a much larger geographical area needed to have input into PC94B and it seems remiss that a much larger group were not notified by Council.	No, would consider a joint hearing
PC94B-48	e	Simonsen	Patti	Oppose	Procedural Issues	More information needed.	Not enough details in proposed submission to make a clear and informed decision as to how this impacts the Waikaraka community. More transparency needed.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-49	e	Simonsen	Andrew	Oppose	Procedural Issues	More information needed.	Not enough details in proposed submission to make a clear and informed decision as to how this impacts the Waikaraka community. More transparency needed.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-83	d	Ross	Lawrence and Elaine	Oppose	Procedural Issues	The proposal should have been given more public exposure.	The WDC process of notification was under the radar and should have been given more public exposure. Not enough of the population was made aware of the plan change and 8 weeks wasn't long enough to prepare submissions.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-86	b	Doornewerdt Trust		Oppose	Procedural Issues	Not Stated.	The consultation process is very confusing and a barrier for time poor and less academic people. The documents inviting submissions are confusing, non specific and relate to very complicated issues.	No, would consider joint case
PC94B-87	b	Visser	Saskia	Oppose	Procedural Issues	Not Stated.	The consultation process is very confusing and a barrier for time poor and less academic people. The documents inviting submissions are confusing, non specific and relate to very complicated issues.	No, would consider joint case
PC94B-109	d	Muriel Newman	New Zealand Centre for Political Research	Oppose	Procedural Issues	That PC94B be withdrawn.	Has this policy been seen, understood, and approved by all councillors. With almost 1,000 parcels of Māori ancestral land scattered throughout the Whangarei District, are all landowners and the community fully aware of the implications of the policy?	Not Stated
PC94B-02	b	Tairua	Mark	Not Stated	Rates	Should it be identified that my land is identified with an ancestral link, are the rates accorded a lower rate according to the Rating Powers Act as Māori Freehold Land is today?	Not stated	Not Stated
PC94B-02	c	Tairua	Mark	Not Stated	Rates	Are rebates or charges reviewed on the basis of access - e.g. non-sealed road and non-sealed road.	Many lands throughout the district are restricted in terms of roading.	Not Stated
PC94B-23	b	Taueki	Gail Diane	Not Stated	Rates	Should it be identified that my land is identified with an ancestral link, are the rates accorded a lower rate according to the Rating Powers Act as Māori Freehold Land is today?	Not stated.	Not Stated
PC94B-23	c	Taueki	Gail Diane	Not Stated	Rates	Are rebates or charges reviewed on the basis of access - e.g. non-sealed road and non-sealed road.	Many lands throughout the district are restricted in terms of roading.	Not Stated
PC94B-30	b	Cherrington	Betty	Not Stated	Rates	Should it be identified that my land is identified with an ancestral link, are the rates accorded a lower rate according to the Rating Powers Act as Māori Freehold Land is today?	Not stated	Not Stated
PC94B-30	c	Cherrington	Betty	Not Stated	Rates	Are rebates or charges reviewed on the basis of access - e.g. non-sealed road and non-sealed road.	Many lands throughout the district are restricted in terms of roading.	Not Stated

Sub No	Sub Point	Surname/ Company	First Name/ On Behalf Of	Support/ Oppose	Submission Topic	Relief Sought	Reasons	Wish to be Heard?
PC94B-115	a	Raewyn Bransgrove, Melvyn Kingi, Stewart Kingi	Neeta Kingi,	Oppose	Rates	Not Stated.	Our Tupuna's land now belongs to us and we should be able to develop it. Council has no right to stop us. This is a land grab and we object, why pay rates when you stop us for utilising our land when ever we wish.	Would consider a joint case
PC94B-15	c	Ross	Lynne	Oppose	Resource Consent Costs	Resource consent costs should be based on a small percentage of the owner/s total income for the previous 3 years.	Not stated.	No
PC94B-84	b	Gilbert	Helen	Oppose	Resource Consent Costs	Waiver RC fees for owners / shareholders of Māori ancestral land where it is obvious they cannot fund RC applications either individually or collectively.	Acknowledge that it is difficult for Māori to settle their land. It is important that the RC process is followed. Perhaps Treaty settlement money can be used.	No
PC94B-05	a	Kilpatrick	James	Seek Amendment	Standard of Development	Ensure that the same building standards apply to Papakāinga as apply to non Papakāinga.	Owens property nearby Māori Freehold Land, including 28 Tongatui Road, where a dwelling has been erected which is an eye-sore and devalues all other properties in the locality.	No, but would consider presenting a joint case at a hearing
PC94B-09	a	McKay	Neil	Oppose	Standard of Development	Treat all ratepayers with the same respect and conditions.	The plan change will result in decline in standards as is demonstrated by existing caravan and shanty buildings and overgrown grass on Lot 58 DP 40840.	No
PC94B-10	b	McKay	Diane	Oppose	Standard of Development	Everyone should be treated equally as far as costings are concerned.	Concerned that we could have sites throughout the area that would become junk yards for cars, caravans etc.	No
PC94B-17	b	Reed	Ivan and Karen	Oppose	Standard of Development	Council should cap the number of dwellings on the land.	Oppose the conditions where Māori are not required to obtain consents that would be monitored by Council. Housing in all sorts of dilapidated forms will be built.	Would consider a joint case
PC94B-18	a	Wyeth	Mike and Cynthia	Not Stated	Standard of Development	Any papakāinga development should require resource consent.	To provide guidelines and standards to ensure care and upkeep of the surrounding land as caretakers of such land.	No, but would consider presenting a joint case
PC94B-24	a	Grafton	John and Sandra	Not Stated	Standard of Development	All buildings should meet council requirements.	Not stated	Would consider a joint case
PC94B-29	b	Oberholster	Dirk and Nicci	Seek amendment	Standard of Development	There needs to be some covenants/quality requirements on dwellings allowed. Include bush and water (wetland) covenants. Visual and Noise considerations when placing dwellings and a reasonable standard of construction and quality required.	fairness to neighbouring properties in particular visual and noise considerations. The effect could be huge, there are also noise factors and valuation issues that are of real concern.	No, would consider a joint hearing
PC94B-81	b	Thorburn	Brian	Oppose	Standard of Development	Not agree to the proposed plan change.	The change would mean that Māori landowners could build as many houses as they wanted on Māori land.	No
PC94B-86	a	Doornewerdt Trust		Oppose	Standard of Development	Do not want to have more concentrated or increased density housing than is normally allowed for non-Māori Land on any Māori Land , where it is deemed as coastal countryside.	There is very little infrastructure in these areas. This area is used by a good number of domestic and international tourist annually. The relaxing of any restrictions on current requirements for resource consent for any landowners, regardless of ancestry could encourage the disfigurement of a scenic and popular tourist destination.	No, would consider joint case

Sub No	Sub Point	Surname/ Company	First Name/ On Behalf Of	Support/ Oppose	Submission Topic	Relief Sought	Reasons	Wish to be Heard?
PC94B-87	a	Visser	Saskia	Oppose	Standard of Development	Do not want to have more concentrated or increased density housing than is normally allowed for non-Māori Land on any Māori Land, where it is deemed as coastal countryside.	There is very little infrastructure in these areas. This area is used by a good number of domestic and international tourist annually. The relaxing of any restrictions on current requirements for resource consent for any landowners, regardless of ancestry could encourage the disfigurement of a scenic and popular tourist destination.	No, would consider joint case
PC94B-98	a	c/- Ian McAlley	Northland District Health Board	Seek amendment	Standard of Development	That the application of the rules must ensure that the quality of the development undertaken does not result in sub standard housing or services being developed that could result in negative health outcomes for the inhabitants. Ensure that Rule PKA.1.2 Eligibility and PKA.1.5 Permitted Activities are clear in its interpretation and application.	Northland has one of the most deprived populations in the country. Māori experience low levels of health status across a whole range of health and socioeconomic statistics. Due to the location of the majority of Māori land in rural land, this proposal could in-part result in a further shift of Māori to rural areas, reducing ready access to health services, which when coupled with an existing 'low health status' for Māori could exacerbate existing negative health trends within this population. NDHB therefore is neutral in terms of their support overall for this proposal. The specific concern NDHB has is that promoting the location of an at risk group potentially further from health resources could exacerbate existing negative health trends within the group. However, if provision of housing on ancestral Māori land removes some of the financial barriers to Māori being able to access better quality living accommodation, then this could result in health benefits. NDHB does not wish to see that the desire to enable housing development could potentially result in poor quality houses being developed and/or poor quality services being provided to those houses. Concerns are raised as to whether too much focus has been placed on the desire to remove perceived consenting hurdles with the risk that longer term outcomes have been overlooked and/or not provided for.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-97	a	c/- Juliane Chetham	Patuharakeke Te Iwi Trust Board	Support	Title	Retain change in chapter title.	Papakāinga means more than just housing and may also include activities such as community facilities, education, recreation and enterprise.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-112	a	Jared Pitman	Te Huinga	Support	Title	Retain change in chapter title.	Papakāinga means more than just housing and may also include activities such as community facilities, education, recreation and enterprise.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-113	a	Pita	Rihi Ngaroimata Kathleen	Support	Title	Retain change in chapter title.	Not stated.	No, would reconsider if requested by Iwi Authority
PC94B-06	a	NZ Transport	Rikash Kumar	Support	Whole Plan Change	That the Plan Change be granted.	NZTA support the plan change under the expectation that developments adjacent to or in close proximity to the State Highway network will assess the effects on the safety and operation of the State Highway in accordance with the EES 2010, and that NZTA will be notified.	Not Stated

Sub No	Sub Point	Surname/ Company	First Name/ On Behalf Of	Support/ Oppose	Submission Topic	Relief Sought	Reasons	Wish to be Heard?
PC94B-25	a	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Bill Edwards	Support in Principle	Whole Plan Change	That a stand-alone papakāinga chapter, to provide opportunities for Māori land owners to develop and live on their ancestral land and to develop guidelines and standards for the papakāinga process be retained.	The proposed plan change is required to recognise and provide for matters of national importance.	Yes
PC94B-34	a	Nielsen	Tania	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	Council reject PC94B.	The plan change will affect relationships and communication within local areas. This is not the way forward, need to address the issues in a manner that the whole community moves forward together.	No
PC94B-90	a	Far North District Council		Support	Whole Plan Change	That the plan change be accepted.	The Far North District Council supports in principle the enabling framework of the proposed plan change.	No
PC94B-101	a	Rebecca Eng	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	Support	Whole Plan Change	Retain PC94B as is.	Transpower supports the proposed Whangarei District Plan Change 94B and seeks no amendments.	Yes, would not consider joint
PC94B-105	a	Hau	Christina	Support	Whole Plan Change	Approve the plan change.	Not stated.	Yes, would also consider joint
PC94B-110	a	Jade Kake	Ngati Hau Trust Board	Support	Whole Plan Change	Accept the plan change subject to specific amendments.	Overall, we tautoko the proposed plan change. We believe the provisions will better enable Māori landowners to develop sustainable papakāinga on ancestral land. We also feel that the proposed provisions in the district plan will inform the development of Council policies and processes to guide and supporting whānau through the process of developing Papakāinga Development Plans, whilst also removing unnecessary compliance costs and other barriers.	Yes, would also consider joint