

| Topic ID | Topic             | Issue ID | Issue             | Sub ID    | Sub Point | Name   | Inclination            | Summary  | Decision Req  |
|----------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|-----------|-----------|--|------------------------|--|---|
| MI1      | Section 32 Report | 1        | Section 32 Report | 3         | 1         | Te Umuhapuku 3b Trust  | Support with Amendment | Support Option 2, but seek stronger expression of the objective and the addition of further attributes which maintain and support the history, identity and culture of the hapu of Matakana Island and their natural and cultural landscape.   | <p>Include the following objective in Issue 1, Option 2 of the Section 32 Report:</p> <p>The following attributes which are essential to the social and cultural well-being of the hapu of Matakana Island as the tangata whenua are supported and enhanced:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-the history of Matakana Island and associated hapu;</li> <li>-the preservation and protection of archaeological sites and wahi tapu on Matakana Island;</li> <li>-the tikanga and kaitiakitanga of tangata whenua;</li> <li>-the cultural identity and unique way of life of the Maori community;</li> <li>-the rich cultural values of the hapu of Matakana Island and associated marae;</li> <li>-the sensitive natural environment and significant amenity values of Matakana Island;</li> <li>-the relationship between the hapu of Matakana Island and indigenous flora and fauna particularly taonga species;</li> <li>-the significant cultural landscape of Matakana Island, Rangaiwaea, Otapu, Te Awanui and Te Moana a Toi.</li> </ul> <p>Options 1 and 2 of Issue 6 of the Section 32 Report is opposed as no further dwellings should be developed on the forested sand barrier.</p> |
|          |                   |          |                   | FS 27 [3] | 3 [1]     | Carrus Corporation Ltd [Te Umuhapuku 3b Trust]               | Oppose                 | The submission expresses support for some aspects of Option 1 (no more dwellings on the forested sand barrier) and this option is opposed. It also seeks prohibited activity status for further dwellings and this is opposed.   | Decline submission  |
|          |                   |          |                   | FS 29 [3] | 6 [1]     | TKC Holdings Ltd [Te Umuhapuku 3b Trust]                     | Oppose                 | <p>The submitter is seeking to strengthen the provisions of the plan change by introducing further cultural matters into the objectives and other provisions. They also seek no further dwellings on the forested sand barrier.</p> <p>This is inconsistent with the TKCH submission and is not a balanced approach.</p> | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.  |
|          |                   |          |                   | FS 31 [3] | 18 [1]    | Te Runanga O Ngai Te Rangi Iwi Trust [Te Umuhapuku 3b Trust] | Support with Amendment | Support the position of the plan change and its general intent. Support the amendments sought by the submitter to include their amended objective in issue 1, option 2 of the Section 32 report.   | Support with their amendment.   |
|          |                   |          |                   | FS 32 [3] | 17 [1]    | Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai [Te Umuhapuku 3b Trust]              | Support with Amendment | Support their position.  | Support with their amendments.  |
|          |                   |          |                   | 4         | 1         | Taingahue Family Trust                                       | Support with Amendment | Support Option 2, but seek stronger expression of the objective and the  | Include the following objective in Issue 1, Option 2:   |

|  |  |  |              |          |  |                        |  |  |
|--|--|--|--------------|----------|--|------------------------|--|--|
|  |  |  |              |          |  |                        | addition of further attributes which maintain and support the history, identity and culture of the hapu of Matakana Island and their natural and cultural landscape.   | <p>The following attributes which are essential to the social and cultural well-being of the hapu of Matakana Island as the tangata whenua are supported and enhanced:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-the history of Matakana Island and associated hapu;</li> <li>-the preservation and protection of archaeological sites and wahi tapu on Matakana Island;</li> <li>-the tikanga and kaitiakitanga of tangata whenua;</li> <li>-the cultural identity and unique way of life of the Maori community;</li> <li>-the rich cultural values of the hapu of Matakana Island and associated marae;</li> <li>-the sensitive natural environment and significant amenity values of Matakana Island;</li> <li>-the relationship between the hapu of Matakana Island and indigenous flora and fauna particularly taonga species;</li> <li>-the significant cultural landscape of Matakana Island, Rangaiwaea, Otapu, Te Awanui and Te Moana a Toi.</li> </ul> <p>Options 1 and 2 of Issue 6 of the Section 32 Report are opposed as no further dwellings should be developed on the forested sand barrier.</p> |
|  |  |  | FS 27<br>[4] | 5<br>[1] | Carrus Corporation Ltd<br>[Taingahue Family Trust] | Oppose                 | The submission expresses support for some aspects of Option 1 (no more dwellings on the forested sand barrier) and this option is opposed. It also seeks prohibited activity status for further dwellings and this is opposed.   | Decline submission   |
|  |  |  | FS 29<br>[4] | 8<br>[1] | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Taingahue Family Trust]       | Oppose                 | <p>The submitter is seeking to strengthen the provisions of the plan change by introducing further cultural matters into the objectives and other provisions. They also seek no further dwellings on the forested sand barrier.</p> <p>This is inconsistent with the TKCH submission and is not a balanced approach.</p> | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.   |
|  |  |  | 5            | 1        | Rangiwarea Marae Trust                             | Support with Amendment | Support Option 2, but seek stronger expression of the objective and the addition of further attributes which maintain and support the history, identity and culture of the hapu of Matakana Island and their natural and cultural landscape.   | <p>Include the following objective in Issue 1, Option 2:</p> <p>The following attributes which are essential to the social and cultural well-being of the hapu of Matakana Island as the tangata whenua are supported and enhanced:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-the history of Matakana Island and associated hapu;</li> <li>-the preservation and protection of archaeological sites and wahi tapu on Matakana Island;</li> <li>-the tikanga and kaitiakitanga of tangata</li> </ul>  |

|  |  |  |              |           |   |                        |  |  |
|--|--|--|--------------|-----------|---|------------------------|--|--|
|  |  |  |              |           |   |                        |  | <p>whenua;<br/>-the cultural identity and unique way of life of the Maori community;<br/>-the rich cultural values of the hapu of Matakana Island and associated marae;<br/>-the sensitive natural environment and significant amenity values of Matakana Island;<br/>-the relationship between the hapu of Matakana Island and indigenous flora and fauna particularly taonga species;<br/>-the significant cultural landscape of Matakana Island, Rangaiwaea, Otapu, Te Awanui and Te Moana a Toi.</p> <p>Options 1 and 2 of Issue 6 of the Section 32 Report are opposed as no further dwellings should be developed on the forested sand barrier.</p>  |
|  |  |  | FS 27<br>[5] | 7<br>[1]  | Carrus Corporation Ltd<br>[Rangiwaea Marae Trust] | Oppose                 | The submission expresses support for some aspects of Option 1 (no more dwellings on the forested sand barrier) and this option is opposed. It also seeks prohibited activity status for further dwellings and this is opposed  | Decline submission   |
|  |  |  | FS 29<br>[5] | 10<br>[1] | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Rangiwaea Marae Trust]       | Oppose                 | <p>The submitter is seeking to strengthen the provisions of the plan change by introducing further cultural matters into the objectives and other provisions. They also seek no further dwellings on the forested sand barrier.</p> <p>This is inconsistent with the TKCH submission and is not a balanced approach.</p> | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.   |
|  |  |  | 6            | 1         | Tauwhao Te Ngare Trust                            | Support with Amendment | Support Option 2, but seek stronger expression of the objective and the addition of further attributes which maintain and support the history, identity and culture of the hapu of Matakana Island and their natural and cultural landscape.   | <p>Include the following objective in Issue 1, Option 2:</p> <p>The following attributes which are essential to the social and cultural well-being of the hapu of Matakana Island as the tangata whenua are supported and enhanced:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-the history of Matakana Island and associated hapu;</li> <li>-the preservation and protection of archaeological sites and wahi tapu on Matakana Island;</li> <li>-the tikanga and kaitiakitanga of tangata whenua;</li> <li>-the cultural identity and unique way of life of the Maori community;</li> <li>-the rich cultural values of the hapu of Matakana Island and associated marae;</li> <li>-the sensitive natural environment and significant amenity values of Matakana Island;</li> <li>-the relationship between the hapu of Matakana Island and indigenous flora and fauna particularly taonga species;</li> <li>-the significant cultural landscape of</li> </ul> |

|  |  |  |  |              |           |  |         |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--------------|-----------|--|---------|--|--|
|  |  |  |  |              |           |  |         | Matakana Island, Rangaiwaea, Otapu, Te Awanui and Te Moana a Toi.  |  |
|  |  |  |  |              |           |  |         | Options 1 and 2 of Issue 6 of the Section 32 Report are opposed as no further dwellings should be developed on the forested sand barrier.  |  |
|  |  |  |  | FS 27<br>[6] | 9<br>[1]  | Carrus Corporation Ltd<br>[Tauwhao Te Ngare Trust]               | Oppose  | The submission expresses support for some aspects of Option 1 (no more dwellings on the forested sand barrier) and this option is opposed. It also seeks prohibited activity status for further dwellings and this is opposed.   | Decline submission   |
|  |  |  |  | FS 29<br>[6] | 12<br>[1] | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Tauwhao Te Ngare Trust]                     | Oppose  | The submitter is seeking to strengthen the provisions of the plan change by introducing further cultural matters into the objectives and other provisions. They also seek no further dwellings on the forested sand barrier.<br><br>This is inconsistent with the TKCH submission and is not a balanced approach.  | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH. |
|  |  |  |  | FS 31<br>[6] | 3<br>[1]  | Te Runanga O Ngai Te Rangi Iwi Trust<br>[Tauwhao Te Ngare Trust] | Support | The objective broadened by the TTN Trust is appropriate and clearly adds to the social, cultural and spiritual wellbeing of the Tangata Whenua of the islands.   | Include the broadened objective in issue 1, objective 2. Amend as required.    |
|  |  |  |  | FS 32<br>[6] | 3<br>[1]  | Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai<br>[Tauwhao Te Ngare Trust]              | Support | Objective is appropriate for tangata whenua.   | Include the broadband objective in issue 1, objective 2: amend as required.    |
|  |  |  |  | 7            | 1         | TKC Holdings Limited   | Oppose  | The submitter believes the Western Bay of Plenty District Council have not interpreted the obligation in the Regional Policy Statement in a balanced or appropriate way. In particular method 17A.4(iv).<br><br>There is also an outstanding issue as to whether this is a plan change, a variation, or some other process. To suggest it is a plan change assumes it is a plan change to an Operative Plan. The submitter is unsure as to how (or if) the District Plan became operative because it has live' appeals on the District Plan. This matter may need to be addressed.<br><br>It appears that the Council have instead taken the Island Study as an opportunity to prepare a plan change that is based on a political desire to introduce a number of aspirations that are perhaps community outcomes best placed in Council's Long Term Council Community Plan (under the LGA 2002) rather than a RMA document. The submitter is of the opinion that the provisions of Plan Change 46 do not provide a framework for sustainable management of the natural and physical resources of the forested sand barrier. |  |

|  |  |  |  |              |           |  |         |   |   |
|--|--|--|--|--------------|-----------|--|---------|---|---|
|  |  |  |  | 7            | 25        | TKC Holdings Limited   | Oppose  | Whilst the submitters support that general intent to enable some development, the document fails to deliver that outcome for Matakana Island. The provisions need to be amended to enable the sustainable management of resources in a more balanced way that simply using avoidance and prohibitive terms. The current provisions do not link well and seem to work against one another. In terms of section 32 Plan Change 46 is not efficient or effective; and The Section 32 Report is deficient in the analysis of the costs and benefits of the new provisions, and the analysis is deficient in that the new objective is not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act. | a) Consistency with the enabling purpose of the RMA and the strategic planning policy of the NZCPS (2010). In doing so Council needs to balance its approach to the various values on the Island with opportunities to secure environmental enhancement. We seek the matters in 1.7 - 1.15 and part 2 of this submission are address and provided for; and<br>b) Any similar or consequential relief which may include the relief sought (or amended relief sought) in ENV - 2010-AKL-000072; or in the alternative<br>c) Refusal of the Plan Change in its entirety. |
|  |  |  |  | FS 26<br>[7] | 2<br>[1]  | Faulkner, Cathryn<br>[TKC Holdings Limited]                    | Support | Identifies the unfairness in the enabling provisions for the Farmland part and the Forested Sand Barrier. One set of generous rules for maori owned land, another set of draconian rules for non maori private forest land. May be in breach of NZ Human Rights Act 1993.   | The enabling provisions should be applied equally to both Farmland and the Forested Sand Barrier to ensure equitable treatment for all property owners.   |
|  |  |  |  | FS 31<br>[7] | 1<br>[1]  | Te Runanga O Ngai Te Rangi Iwi Trust<br>[TKC Holdings Limited] | Oppose  | Do not support the position of TCKH, Carrus Corporation and Blakely Pacific Ltd. I believe the plan change is balanced and appropriate for the landscape and uniqueness of Matakana.<br><br>It does provide a framework for sustainable management of natural and physical resources of Matakana and especially the sand barrier arm.   | Retain as notified.   |
|  |  |  |  | FS 32<br>[7] | 1<br>[1]  | Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai<br>[TKC Holdings Limited]              | Oppose  | Support the plan change.  | Retain as notified.   |
|  |  |  |  | 8            | 3         | Carrus Corporation Ltd   | Oppose  | The report states that the sand barrier has poor soil conditions and then go on to state it is productive soil. It is contradictory to state that the forested sand barrier has to be protected, yet the farmland area, which has better soils, has limited development controls. There is no acknowledgement of the landowners nor the fact that the land is privately owned. The report contains a throw away comment that other rural activities would be able to be accommodated. The area concerned is some 4300 hectares - a totally misleading statement and that forestry is challenging. The comment that was made was marginally profitable.  | The whole Section 32 report and analysis is biased and unbalanced towards a desired outcome and therefore needs to be re-written.   |
|  |  |  |  | FS 26<br>[8] | 10<br>[3] | Faulkner, Cathryn<br>[Carrus Corporation Ltd]                  | Support | Throwaway comment in Plan Change 46 that other rural activities would be able to be accommodated. In part throwaway comment refers to beekeeping as an alternative use of land. This is flippant  | Reference to manuka, honey and beekeeping should be deleted.  |



|     |                       |   |         |              |           |   |         |  |  |
|-----|-----------------------|---|---------|--------------|-----------|---|---------|--|--|
|     |                       |   |         |              |           |   |         | with no supporting evidence to suggest it is viable.   |  |
|     |                       |   |         | FS 26<br>[8] | 11<br>[3] | Faulkner, Cathryn<br>[Carrus Corporation Ltd] | Support | The use of the words "currently challenging" are not the words used by the forester. The words used were "marginally profitable". Currently challenging suggests a short term, temporary blip, which was no said.  | Delete "currently challenging" and use the words "marginally profitable".  |
|     |                       |   |         | FS 26<br>[8] | 9<br>[3]  | Faulkner, Cathryn<br>[Carrus Corporation Ltd] | Support | Report states Sand Barrier has poor soil then says it is still productive and must be protected from dwellings. Farmland has much more productive soils which potentially are allowed to be heavily populated with dwellings. This is inconsistent and unfair. One rule for one part, another rule for another part - unacceptable.  | Similar regulations for the whole of Matakana Island.  |
|     |                       |   |         | FS 29<br>[8] | 16<br>[3] | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Carrus Corporation Ltd]  | Support | The submitter has identified many issues in the listed submission points consistent with the submission of TKCH.   | Accept parts of the submission where it is consistent with the relief sought by TKCH.  |
| MI2 | Plan Change - General | 2 | General | 1            | 1         | Duval, Bill                                   | Unknown | District Council has failed to include the legal occupiers of Te Tarawa Matakana in negotiations or consultations with the development of the proposed Plan Change.  | Add to the District Plan Maps and District Council records and documents the following;<br>1. Bill Matthew Cowley Duval nee Tarawa, occupier of Te Tarawa Matakana and Chairperson of Te Tarawa Matakana Trust.<br>2. Hapu representative for occupiers of Matakana and Kaitiaki of Te Tarawa o Matakana.<br>3. Mr Bill Duval or his legal representative must be contacted regarding any building, construction, or developments or proposals of the same, on or about Matakana Island. |
|     |                       |   |         | FS 27<br>[1] | 1<br>[1]  | Carrus Corporation Ltd<br>[Duval, Bill]       | Oppose  | The submission seeks the district plan be amended so that he has to be contacted prior to building or development on Matakana Island. This is not appropriate in relation to privately owned land.   | Decline submission   |
|     |                       |   |         | FS 29<br>[1] | 1<br>[1]  | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Duval, Bill]             | Oppose  | It is difficult to ascertain what the submitter is seeking from the requested consultation.<br><br>Part 3 of the submission (decision sought) requests that the submitter is contacted about " any building, construction, or developments or proposals of the same, on or about Matakana Island". This is contrary to the relief sought by TKCH and will not lead to efficient or effective provisions in terms of section 32 of the Act. | Reject the submission in its entirety.   |
|     |                       |   |         | FS 30<br>[1] | 1<br>[1]  | Blakely Pacific Ltd<br>[Duval, Bill]          | Oppose  | The submitter seeks changes requiring him to be contacted regarding any building, construction or development proposals on Matakana Island.<br><br>The change is opposed because the   | That the submission point is rejected.   |

|  |  |  |            |        |   |   |   |   |
|--|--|--|------------|--------|---|---|---|---|
|  |  |  |            |        |   | requirements for consultation and notification are prescribed by the RMA. |   |   |
|  |  |  | 11         | 1      | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council                          | Support with Amendment  | General support for the intent of the Plan Change as it provides for future development on Matakana Island in a way which takes into account the islands cultural, ecological and landscape values while considering the risk posed by natural hazards. Retain Variation 2 / Plan Change 46 provisions subject to amendments sought within the specific submission points.  | Retain Variation 2 / Plan Change 46 provisions subject to amendments sought below to address specific submission points.  |
|  |  |  | 11         | 4      | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council                          | Support with Amendment  | Regional Council commissioned research that indicates that for several scenarios maximum tsunami elevation along the coastline south-east of Matakana Island ranges from 8 to 13m. It is therefore important that consideration be given to the up to date natural hazard reports as part of resource consent applications for subdivision and development.   | Require consideration of up to date natural hazard reports as part of resource consent applications for subdivision and development.  |
|  |  |  | FS 27 [11] | 61 [1] | Carrus Corporation Ltd [Bay Of Plenty Regional Council] | Oppose  | The submitter seeks the retention of the plan change and/or amendments where identified in the submission and this is opposed for the reasons set out in the submission from Carrus Corporation Limited and this further submission.  | Make amendments to plan change as sought by Carrus Corporation Limited.   |
|  |  |  | FS 29 [11] | 55 [1] | TKC Holdings Ltd [Bay Of Plenty Regional Council]       | Oppose  | The submitter supports many of the provisions that are opposed by TKCH. The submitter also requests many amendments that have the effect of being even more restrictive than Plan Change 46 as it relates to the Forested Sand area of the Island. Many of the requested amendments are inconsistent with the agreed position over Variation 1 to the Regional Policy Statement.<br><br>Submission point 11/21 completely disregards the facilities for access to and from the Island that TKCH has an interest in. | Reject those parts of the submission and amend the plan change consistent with the TKCH submission. Amendments to 18.3.3 should also make provision for the same opportunities for owners on the forested area. |
|  |  |  | FS 29 [11] | 58 [4] | TKC Holdings Ltd [Bay Of Plenty Regional Council]       | Oppose  | The submitter supports many of the provisions that are opposed by TKCH. The submitter also requests many amendments that have the effect of being even more restrictive than Plan Change 46 as it relates to the Forested Sand area of the Island. Many of the requested amendments are inconsistent with the agreed position over Variation 1 to the Regional Policy Statement.<br><br>Submission point 11/21 completely disregards the facilities for access to and from the Island that TKCH has an interest in. | Reject those parts of the submission and amend the plan change consistent with the TKCH submission. Amendments to 18.3.3 should also make provision for the same opportunities for owners on the forested area. |
|  |  |  | FS 30 [11] | 9 [4]  | Blakely Pacific Ltd [Bay Of Plenty Regional Council]    | Oppose  | The submitter seeks that consideration be given to up-to-date natural hazard reports  | That the submission point is rejected.  |

|     |                       |   |  |               |           |  |         |   |   |
|-----|-----------------------|---|--|---------------|-----------|--|---------|---|---|
|     |                       |   |  |               |           | Council]   |         | as part of resource consent applications for subdivision and development.<br><br>The change is opposed because it is unclear exactly what changes are being proposed to the variation/plan change.  |   |
|     |                       |   |  | FS 31<br>[11] | 6<br>[1]  | Te Runanga O Ngai Te Rangi Iwi Trust<br>[Bay Of Plenty Regional Council] | Support | Allows for sustainable development on Matakana while taking into account the rich cultural, ecological and landscape environment and has regard to NZCPS, RPS and RCEP.   | Retain as notified.   |
|     |                       |   |  | FS 32<br>[11] | 6<br>[1]  | Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai<br>[Bay Of Plenty Regional Council]              | Support | Has full regard to NZCPS, RPS and RCEP.   | Retain as notified.   |
|     |                       |   |  | 12            | 1         | Smith, Malcolm John  | Unknown | The boundaries of the wetlands are not clear due to the small scale of the Planning Maps.<br>What are the activities allowed for landowners/houses on land blocks directly adjacent to proposed wetland areas?<br>Are current wetland areas to be designated as Wetland Reserves?<br>Where will the proposed legal access roads to the ocean beach, Panepane and cultural sites of significance be constructed? |   |
|     |                       |   |  | FS 29<br>[12] | 82<br>[1] | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Smith, Malcolm John]                                | Oppose  | It is difficult to ascertain what the submitter is seeking.   | Reject the submission in its entirety.  |
|     |                       |   |  | 7             | 26        | TKC Holdings Limited   | Oppose  | Consistency with the enabling purpose of the RMA and the strategic planning policy of the NZCPS (2010). In doing so Council needs to balance its approach to the various values on the Island with opportunities to secure environmental enhancement  |   |
|     |                       |   |  | 8             | 19        | Carrus Corporation Ltd   | Oppose  | Whilst there needs to be development on Matakana Island and it should be consistent with other areas in the district, this proposed plan is very restrictive and in some cases prohibitive even for existing land uses which imposes a significant financial liability. Also, some of the proposed provisions are in conflict with each other.  | Withdraw the proposed Plan Change in its entirety and deal with the planning provisions for Matakana Island under the existing appeals. |
|     |                       |   |  | 9             | 1         | New Zealand Historic Places Trust  | Support | The NZHPT supports Proposed Variation 2 /Plan Change 46 to Western Bay of Plenty District Council, District Plan. The NZHPT wish to be heard in support of their submission.  | Retain as notified.   |
|     |                       |   |  | FS 27<br>[9]  | 33<br>[1] | Carrus Corporation Ltd<br>[New Zealand Historic Places Trust]            | Support | The submitter supports clustering and that is supported.  | Ensure the plan change contains clustering provisions.  |
| MI2 | Plan Change - General | 1 | Differences between proposed Plan Change adopted by Council and Notified Plan Change | 10            | 7         | Blakely Pacific Limited  | Oppose  | The proposed plan provisions fail to provide adequate certainty as to opportunities for appropriate development on the Matakana Island forested sand barrier.   | Revise objectives, policies, matters of discretion and assessment criteria to address the concerns set out in the submission.           |



|  |  |  |  |               |           |  |                        |   |   |
|--|--|--|--|---------------|-----------|--|------------------------|---|---|
|  |  |  |  | FS 27<br>[10] | 40<br>[7] | Carrus Corporation Ltd<br>[Blakely Pacific Limited]      | Support                | Carrus Corporation Limited agrees that the proposed plan provisions fail to provide adequate certainty as to opportunities for appropriate development on the Matakana Island forested sand barrier.  | Amendments to provide adequate certainty as to opportunities for appropriate development on the Matakana Island forested sand barrier.  |
|  |  |  |  | FS 29<br>[10] | 37<br>[7] | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Blakely Pacific Limited]            | Support                | The submitter has identified many issues in the listed submission points consistent with the submission of TKCH.  | Accept parts of the submission where it is consistent with the relief sought by TKCH.   |
|  |  |  |  | 7             | 3         | TKC Holdings Limited                                     | Support with Amendment | The general intent of Plan Change 46 to have sensitive development on the Forested Sand Barrier is supportable in principle. However, there is an administrative disconnect between the enabling intent to have some limited development, and the provisions that seek to give effect to that intent.   | Review, reduce and amend the Significant Ecological Features Maps and Schedules for the Matakana Island Forested Sand Barrier to reflect the need to address the landowners forestry operations and reasonable land use change. |
|  |  |  |  | FS 27<br>[7]  | 11<br>[3] | Carrus Corporation Ltd<br>[TKC Holdings Limited]         | Support                | The submission seeks to review, reduce and amend the Significant Ecological Features Maps and Schedules for the Matakana Island Forested Sand Barrier to reflect the need to address the landowners' forestry operations and reasonable land use change and that is supported   | Amendments to the Significant Ecological Features Maps and Schedules for the Matakana Island Forested Sand Barrier to reflect the need to address the landowners' forestry operations and reasonable land use change            |
|  |  |  |  | FS 28<br>[7]  | 1<br>[3]  | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council<br>[TKC Holdings Limited] | Oppose                 | Oppose the relief sought by the submitter. The SEFs identified on Matakana, for the most part, exclude the main areas of production forestry, with the possible exception of the seaward side of the barrier arm. All SEFs have been identified for their significant biodiversity values, including those areas with old plantation trees still within them, and therefore are worthy of protection. Sites are identified as either meeting or not meeting the threshold for identification as significant under Section 6 (c) of the RMA. |   |
|  |  |  |  | FS 30<br>[7]  | 4<br>[3]  | Blakely Pacific Ltd<br>[TKC Holdings Limited]            | Support                | The submitter seeks to review, reduce and amend the Identified Significant Ecological Features maps and schedules for the Matakana Island forested sand barrier to reflect forestry operations and reasonable land use change.<br><br>The change is supported because it will ensure that all identified areas have values that warrant protection as a Identified Significant Ecological Feature.  | That the submission point is accepted.  |
|  |  |  |  | 8             | 2         | Carrus Corporation Ltd                                   | Oppose                 | The Proposed Plan Change 46 that has been notified is different in a number of areas to the Proposed Plan Change that was approved on the 19th of September 2013.   | The notified version has to be approved by Council and renotified.  |
|  |  |  |  | FS 29<br>[8]  | 15<br>[2] | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Carrus Corporation Ltd]             | Support                | The submitter has identified many issues in the listed submission points consistent with the submission of TKCH.  | Accept parts of the submission where it is consistent with the relief sought by TKCH.   |

|      |                            |   |                            |            |         |   |         |   |   |
|------|----------------------------|---|----------------------------|------------|---------|---|---------|---|---|
| MI12 | Section 18 - Rural General | 1 | Section 18 Rural - General | 16         | 1       | Department of Conservation                                  | Support | The proposed clustered development style of development for Matakana Island is supported as it is less likely to adversely affect significant ecological values, natural character of the coastal environment and outstanding features and landscape areas than dispersed development.  | Retain this approach to subdivision on Matakana Island.   |
|      |                            |   |                            | FS 27 [16] | 92 [1]  | Carrus Corporation Ltd [Department of Conservation]         | Support | The submission supports clustering and this is supported.   | Retain clustering provisions for Matakana Island.   |
|      |                            |   |                            | FS 28 [16] | 44 [1]  | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council [Department of Conservation] | Support | Support the use of cluster housing (minimum 10) to better enable the management of the impacts of housing and households on the landscape, ecological, cultural and natural character values of the island.   |   |
|      |                            |   |                            | FS 29 [16] | 144 [1] | TKC Holdings Ltd [Department of Conservation]               | Oppose  | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. Although TKCH opposes the submissions made by the Department, many of the issues can be worked through as a design matter. TKCH agrees with the Department that public access needs to be considered.   | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.  |
|      |                            |   |                            | 2          | 3       | Taikato, Easton   | Oppose  | Oppose the proposed change.   |   |
|      |                            |   |                            | FS 29 [2]  | 4 [3]   | TKC Holdings Ltd [Taikato, Easton]                          | Support | It is difficult to ascertain what the submitter is seeking.<br><br>The submitter opposes section 18 provisions (Rural) of the plan change. TKCH also oppose the majority of section 18.   | Accept parts of the submission where it is consistent with the relief sought by TKCH. Reject all others.  |
|      |                            |   |                            | 7          | 20      | TKC Holdings Limited  | Oppose  | The Plan Change includes amendments to the rural zone rules which has the effect of restricting use (see 18.3.1) of existing certificates of titles (or lots). For example rule 18.3.1(d) does not permit the construction of a dwelling on any lots owned by TKC Holdings. In addition 6 of the titles owned by the submitter are less than 40ha. Proposed rule 18.3.6(a) prohibits a dwelling being placed on those titles. This causes issues for the submitter in terms of creating a planning framework that prevents reasonable use. The same principle issue arises with the controlled activity rules (18.3.2), restricted discretionary activity rules (18.3.3), discretionary activity rules (18.3.4), the new non-complying activity (18.3.5), and the prohibited activities (18.3.6). The submitter oppose all of the exclusions in those rules as they relate to the Matakana Island Forested Sand Barrier and the new rules that have a more restrictive effect than on other rural areas of the Western Bay of Plenty District. The opposition also relates to the standards associated with | Delete all exclusions to the rules and standards in section 18 of the Plan that restricts the use of the submitter's certificates of titles (over and above the provisions relating to other rural land in the district). |

|      |                               |   |                               |               |            |   |                        |   |  |
|------|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---------------|------------|---|------------------------|---|--|
|      |                               |   |                               |               |            |   |                        | those rules.  |  |
|      |                               |   |                               | FS 26<br>[7]  | 8<br>[20]  | Faulkner, Cathryn<br>[TKC Holdings Limited]                 | Support                | A dwelling is prohibited on a title of less than 40ha and this is retrospectively removing property rights and devaluing land.  | This amendment should be deleted.  |
|      |                               |   |                               | FS 27<br>[7]  | 28<br>[20] | Carrus Corporation Ltd<br>[TKC Holdings Limited]            | Support                | The submitter seeks amendments to enable the reasonable subdivision, use and development of lots which are less than 40 ha and that is supported as Scorpions Limited owns one lot which is less than 40 ha. In particular, use of prohibited activity status is opposed.   | Amend Section 18 to enable the reasonable subdivision, use and development of lots which are less than 40 ha. Without constraining the scope of this, in particular delete proposed rule 18.3.6 (prohibited activities).                                   |
|      |                               |   |                               | FS 33<br>[7]  | 4<br>[20]  | New Zealand Historic Places Trust<br>[TKC Holdings Limited] | Oppose                 | The NZHPT opposes the amendments sought by the submitter. The NZHPT considers that some type of restrictions must be in place to provide protection for the historic heritage resource of the Island.<br><br>The NZHPT seeks that the provisions as notified remain.  | That the subdivision provisions are retained as notified.  |
| MI13 | Rural - Explanatory Statement | 1 | Rural - Explanatory Statement | 10            | 1          | Blakely Pacific Limited                                     | Oppose                 | The proposed plan provisions fail to acknowledge that the landowners are part of "the community" in the explanatory statement to Section 18.  | Revise explanatory statement to address the concerns included in the submission.   |
|      |                               |   |                               | 10            | 6          | Blakely Pacific Limited                                     | Oppose                 | The explanatory statement to Section 18 fails to recognise that most of the sand barrier has been a working forest for a number of years and therefore is not a pristine natural environment.   | Revise the explanatory statement to address the concerns set out by the submission.  |
|      |                               |   |                               | FS 27<br>[10] | 34<br>[1]  | Carrus Corporation Ltd<br>[Blakely Pacific Limited]         | Support                | The submission seeks a more balanced approach to the Rural introduction (explanatory statement and issue), and objectives and policies, and 18.5.8, to recognise that the landowners are part of the community, and that the sand barrier has been a working forest for a number of years, and this is supported. | Amend the Rural introduction (explanatory statement and issue), and objectives and policies, and 18.5.8, to recognise that the landowners are part of the community, and that the sand barrier has been a working forest for a number of years, as sought. |
|      |                               |   |                               | FS 27<br>[10] | 39<br>[6]  | Carrus Corporation Ltd<br>[Blakely Pacific Limited]         | Support                | The submission seeks a more balanced approach to the Rural introduction (explanatory statement and issue), and objectives and policies, and 18.5.8, to recognise that the landowners are part of the community, and that the sand barrier has been a working forest for a number of years, and this is supported. | Amend the Rural introduction (explanatory statement and issue), and objectives and policies, and 18.5.8, to recognise that the landowners are part of the community, and that the sand barrier has been a working forest for a number of years, as sought. |
|      |                               |   |                               | FS 29<br>[10] | 31<br>[1]  | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Blakely Pacific Limited]               | Support                | The submitter has identified many issues in the listed submission points consistent with the submission of TKCH.  | Accept parts of the submission where it is consistent with the relief sought by TKCH.  |
|      |                               |   |                               | FS 29<br>[10] | 36<br>[6]  | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Blakely Pacific Limited]               | Support                | The submitter has identified many issues in the listed submission points consistent with the submission of TKCH.  | Accept parts of the submission where it is consistent with the relief sought by TKCH.  |
|      |                               |   |                               | 11            | 17         | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council                              | Support with Amendment | Regional Council supports comments made in the explanatory statement but seeks amendments to :<br>Substitute the term development' with "subdivision, use and development."<br>Emphasise landscape values relating to   | Seek an amendment to amend (f) to the Explanatory Statement (or similar):<br>(f) The pine forest landscape, as viewed from the Harbour, open coast and mainland (including Mauao and Bowentown) is valued by residents of the                              |

|  |  |  |               |             |   |   |   |   |
|--|--|--|---------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|
|  |  |  |               |             |   | the unbuilt nature of the forested sand barrier in particular at the northern end and, at Panepane Point. | Island and the mainland, and visitors and it contributes to the character of Matakana Island.<br><br>Seek the following amendment to paragraph 2:<br>..... Council has adopted the Matakana Island Plan which addresses these significant issues in more detail to provide guidance for the future subdivision, use and development of the Island.....  |   |
|  |  |  | FS 27<br>[11] | 74<br>[17]  | Carrus Corporation Ltd<br>[Bay Of Plenty Regional Council]            | Oppose  | The submission is directly contrary to the submission of Carrus Corporation Limited in that rather than introducing more balance into the Rural introduction (explanatory statement and issue), and objectives and policies, it emphasises those matters which are highlighted to a concerning degree.  | Decline the submission and do not make the amendments sought. Amend the Rural introduction (explanatory statement and issue), and objectives and policies, as sought by Carrus Corporation Limited.             |
|  |  |  | FS 29<br>[11] | 71<br>[17]  | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Bay Of Plenty Regional Council]                  | Oppose  | The submitter supports many of the provisions that are opposed by TKCH. The submitter also requests many amendments that have the effect of being even more restrictive than Plan Change 46 as it relates to the Forested Sand area of the Island. Many of the requested amendments are inconsistent with the agreed position over Variation 1 to the Regional Policy Statement.<br><br>Submission point 11/21 completely disregards the facilities for access to and from the Island that TKCH has an interest in. | Reject those parts of the submission and amend the plan change consistent with the TKCH submission. Amendments to 18.3.3 should also make provision for the same opportunities for owners on the forested area. |
|  |  |  | FS 33<br>[11] | 12<br>[17]  | New Zealand Historic Places Trust<br>[Bay Of Plenty Regional Council] | Support   | The NZHPT supports the proposed amendments to the significance issues, as they better reflect the requirements of the Resource Management Act.  | That the amendments sought by the submitter are retained within the decision version of this Plan Change.   |
|  |  |  | 14            | 12          | Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai   | Support   | Proposed changes to the Explanatory Statement are supported.  | Retain as notified.   |
|  |  |  | FS 29<br>[14] | 97<br>[12]  | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai]                         | Oppose  | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. The intent of the submission appears to request making no provision for further living opportunities on the forested sand area of the Island.<br><br>Submission appears to be made after the 4pm closing period.  | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.  |
|  |  |  | 15            | 12          | Poka, Donna   | Support   | Proposed changes to the Explanatory Statement are supported.  | Retain as notified.   |
|  |  |  | FS 29<br>[15] | 126<br>[12] | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Poka, Donna]                                     | Oppose  | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. The intent of the submission appears to request making no provision for further living opportunities on the forested sand area of the Island, apart from the suggestion to have a density of  | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.  |



|      |                         |   |                         |            |          |   |         |  |  |
|------|-------------------------|---|-------------------------|------------|----------|---|---------|--|--|
|      |                         |   |                         |            |          |   |         | <p>dwellings at 1 per 100ha of land in a subdivision.</p> <p>Submission appears to be made after the 4pm closing period.</p>   |  |
|      |                         |   |                         | 16         | 13       | Department of Conservation                                  | Support | Matters (d) and (e) in the proposed new text are supported by the Department as important values of Matakana Island  | Retain as notified.  |
|      |                         |   |                         | FS 29 [16] | 156 [13] | TKC Holdings Ltd [Department of Conservation]               | Oppose  | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. Although TKCH opposes the submissions made by the Department, many of the issues can be worked through as a design matter. TKCH agrees with the Department that public access needs to be considered.  | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.   |
|      |                         |   |                         | 7          | 17       | TKC Holdings Limited  | Oppose  | Plan Change 46 introduces a new explanatory statement and issue 10 for Matakana Island. Whilst it lists some of the cultural, ecological, and visual values of the Island, it fails to recognise the full history of in particular the Forested Sand Barrier. The explanation does not balance the various aspects of sustainable management of the land and the potential benefits for ecological values, landscape values, cultural values, and economic well being by integrating development with all these matters. | Amend the explanatory statement and issue 10 to recognise a fuller history of the Island, including the ownership of the Forested Area, and the benefits of integrating development with the existing land use to achieve improvements for the various values on the Island. A balanced approach should allow adverse effects to be considered on an equal footing with potential benefits. A consistent approach to natural hazards needs to be taken with both Matakana and Rangiwaea Islands and for consistent administration. |
|      |                         |   |                         | FS 26 [7]  | 4 [17]   | Faulkner, Cathryn [TKC Holdings Limited]                    | Support | Some stakeholders on the Forested Sand Barrier have had freehold family owned land there for over 80 years but this, and other history, has been omitted. Much greater reference has been given to tangata whenua on the Farmland part. This is unbalanced.  | Detail the history of the Forested Sand Barrier.   |
|      |                         |   |                         | FS 27 [7]  | 25 [17]  | Carrus Corporation Ltd [TKC Holdings Limited]               | Support | The submission seeks a more balanced approach to the Rural introduction (explanatory statement and issue), objectives and policies for Matakana Island and this is supported.  | Amend the Rural introduction (explanatory statement and issue), objectives and policies for Matakana Island as sought.   |
|      |                         |   |                         | FS 31 [7]  | 9 [17]   | Te Runanga O Ngai Te Rangi Iwi Trust [TKC Holdings Limited] | Oppose  | Rural - explanatory statement.   | Retain as notified.  |
|      |                         |   |                         | 8          | 10       | Carrus Corporation Ltd                                      | Oppose  | In the explanatory statement there is no mention of the land tenure nor ownership and the whole statement contains no balance whatsoever.  | Remove the proposed Explanatory Statement as it is not balanced and does not reflect that the significant private ownership nor the fact that 4300 hectares is a production forest.  |
|      |                         |   |                         | FS 29 [8]  | 23 [10]  | TKC Holdings Ltd [Carrus Corporation Ltd]                   | Support | The submitter has identified many issues in the listed submission points consistent with the submission of TKCH.   | Accept parts of the submission where it is consistent with the relief sought by TKCH.  |
| MI14 | 18.1 Significant Issues | 1 | 18.1 Significant Issues | 10         | 2        | Blakely Pacific Limited                                     | Oppose  | The proposed plan provisions fail to recognise and provide for economic well-being of the landowners on the Matakana Island forested sand barrier in Significant Issues 18.1.10.   | Revise Significant Issues to address the concerns included in the submission.  |
|      |                         |   |                         | FS 26      | 14       | Faulkner, Cathryn   | Support | The economic well being of freehold  | Address this issue in detail, in the Plan.   |



|  |  |  |  |               |            |  |                        |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|---------------|------------|--|------------------------|--|--|
|  |  |  |  | [10]          | [2]        | [Blakely Pacific Limited]                                  |                        | landowners on the Forested Sand Bar and their need to gain a decent economic return on their investment is ignored in this Plan.   |  |
|  |  |  |  | FS 27<br>[10] | 35<br>[2]  | Carrus Corporation Ltd<br>[Blakely Pacific Limited]        | Support                | The submission seeks a more balanced approach to the Rural introduction (explanatory statement and issue), and objectives and policies, and 18.5.8, to recognise that the landowners are part of the community, and that the sand barrier has been a working forest for a number of years, and this is supported.  | Amend the Rural introduction (explanatory statement and issue), and objectives and policies, and 18.5.8, to recognise that the landowners are part of the community, and that the sand barrier has been a working forest for a number of years, as sought.   |
|  |  |  |  | FS 29<br>[10] | 32<br>[2]  | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Blakely Pacific Limited]              | Support                | The submitter has identified many issues in the listed submission points consistent with the submission of TKCH.   | Accept parts of the submission where it is consistent with the relief sought by TKCH.  |
|  |  |  |  | 11            | 18         | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council                             | Support with Amendment | the first amendment sought relates to the term development.' The third amendment seeks recognition of coastal erosion, a natural hazard that was identified in the section 32 report.<br>The amendments requested for the second bullet point will better reflect statements in the Matakana Island Plan relating to tangata whenua. This amendment will recognise and provide for matters of significance to Maori, particularly those relating to rangatiratanga, kaitiakitanga and cultural values. This amendment will give effect' to Proposed RPS Iwi Resource Management Policies IW 2B, IW 3B, IW 4B and IW 5B. These have been settled by consent order and are beyond legal challenge. | Amend the three bullet points in 18.1.10 as follows:<br>- The potential for more intensive or large scale subdivision, use and, development to adversely impact on.....<br>- The need and desire of tangata whenua to exercise rangatiratanga and kaitiakitanga, to actively protect cultural values, and live on and develop their ancestral land.<br>- The threat of a multiplicity of natural hazards including coastal erosion, tsunami .... |
|  |  |  |  | FS 27<br>[11] | 75<br>[18] | Carrus Corporation Ltd<br>[Bay Of Plenty Regional Council] | Oppose                 | The submission is directly contrary to the submission of Carrus Corporation Limited in that rather than introducing more balance into the Rural introduction (explanatory statement and issue), and objectives and policies, it emphasises those matters which are highlighted to a concerning degree.   | Decline the submission and do not make the amendments sought. Amend the Rural introduction (explanatory statement and issue), and objectives and policies, as sought by Carrus Corporation Limited.  |
|  |  |  |  | FS 29<br>[11] | 72<br>[18] | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Bay Of Plenty Regional Council]       | Oppose                 | The submitter supports many of the provisions that are opposed by TKCH. The submitter also requests many amendments that have the effect of being even more restrictive than Plan Change 46 as it relates to the Forested Sand area of the Island. Many of the requested amendments are inconsistent with the agreed position over Variation 1 to the Regional Policy Statement.<br><br>Submission point 11/21 completely disregards the facilities for access to and from the Island that TKCH has an interest in.  | Reject those parts of the submission and amend the plan change consistent with the TKCH submission. Amendments to 18.3.3 should also make provision for the same opportunities for owners on the forested area.  |
|  |  |  |  | FS 30<br>[11] | 11<br>[18] | Blakely Pacific Ltd<br>[Bay Of Plenty Regional Council]    | Oppose                 | The submitter seeks that 18.1.10 is amended to address "the need and desire  | That the submission point is rejected.   |



|      |                              |   |                   |               |            |  |                        |   |  |
|------|------------------------------|---|-------------------|---------------|------------|--|------------------------|---|--|
|      |                              |   |                   | FS 28<br>[8]  | 20<br>[12] | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council<br>[Carrus Corporation Ltd] | Oppose                 | Oppose the relief to remove reference in 18.1.10 to "the need and desire of Maori to live on and develop their ancestral lands". Consider it may be appropriate to acknowledge production forestry as being a significant issue for inclusion in the Matakana context.  |  |
|      |                              |   |                   | FS 29<br>[8]  | 25<br>[12] | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Carrus Corporation Ltd]               | Support                | The submitter has identified many issues in the listed submission points consistent with the submission of TKCH.  | Accept parts of the submission where it is consistent with the relief sought by TKCH.  |
| MI15 | 18.2 Objectives and Policies | 1 | 18.2.1 Objectives | 10            | 4          | Blakely Pacific Limited                                    | Oppose                 | The proposed plan provisions fail to recognise and provide for economic well-being of the landowners on the Matakana Island forested sand barrier in Objective 18.2.1.10.   | Revise objectives to address the concerns included in the submission.  |
|      |                              |   |                   | FS 27<br>[10] | 37<br>[4]  | Carrus Corporation Ltd<br>[Blakely Pacific Limited]        | Support                | The submission seeks a more balanced approach to the Rural introduction (explanatory statement and issue), and objectives and policies, and 18.5.8, to recognise that the landowners are part of the community, and that the sand barrier has been a working forest for a number of years, and this is supported.   | Amend the Rural introduction (explanatory statement and issue), and objectives and policies, and 18.5.8, to recognise that the landowners are part of the community, and that the sand barrier has been a working forest for a number of years, as sought.   |
|      |                              |   |                   | FS 29<br>[10] | 34<br>[4]  | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Blakely Pacific Limited]              | Support                | The submitter has identified many issues in the listed submission points consistent with the submission of TKCH.  | Accept parts of the submission where it is consistent with the relief sought by TKCH.  |
|      |                              |   |                   | 11            | 19         | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council                             | Support with Amendment | Regional Council supports Objective 10 which is specific to Matakana Island. Amendments are sought to include references to significant ecological features and outstanding landscape features (the latter term is consistent with terminology in the District Plan). Objective 10 would then (inclusive of amendments sought) give effect' to Proposed RPS Objectives 18. 20 and 21 and Policies IW 2B, IW 3B, MN 1B, MN 2B and MN 3B.   | Amend Objective 10 to read:<br>The following attributes which contribute to the social and cultural well-being of the Matakana Island community are maintained and supported:<br>- unique way of life,<br>- rich cultural values,<br>- sensitive natural environment, and<br>- significant ecological features and outstanding landscape features. |
|      |                              |   |                   | FS 27<br>[11] | 76<br>[19] | Carrus Corporation Ltd<br>[Bay Of Plenty Regional Council] | Oppose                 | The submission is directly contrary to the submission of Carrus Corporation Limited in that rather than introducing more balance into the Rural introduction (explanatory statement and issue), and objectives and policies, it emphasises those matters which are highlighted to a concerning degree.  | Decline the submission and do not make the amendments sought. Amend the Rural introduction (explanatory statement and issue), and objectives and policies, as sought by Carrus Corporation Limited.  |
|      |                              |   |                   | FS 29<br>[11] | 73<br>[19] | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Bay Of Plenty Regional Council]       | Oppose                 | The submitter supports many of the provisions that are opposed by TKCH. The submitter also requests many amendments that have the effect of being even more restrictive than Plan Change 46 as it relates to the Forested Sand area of the Island. Many of the requested amendments are inconsistent with the agreed position over Variation 1 to the Regional Policy Statement.<br><br>Submission point 11/21 completely disregards the facilities for access to and from the Island that TKCH has an interest | Reject those parts of the submission and amend the plan change consistent with the TKCH submission. Amendments to 18.3.3 should also make provision for the same opportunities for owners on the forested area.  |

|  |  |  |               |             |  |                        |  |   |
|--|--|--|---------------|-------------|--|------------------------|--|---|
|  |  |  |               |             | in.  |                        |  |   |
|  |  |  | FS 31<br>[11] | 14<br>[19]  | Te Runanga O Ngai Te Rangi Iwi Trust<br>[Bay Of Plenty Regional Council] | Support with Amendment | Amend Objective 10 to Bay of Plenty Regional Council's amendment.  | The following attributes which contribute to the social and cultural well-being of Matakana Island community are maintained and supported:<br>- Unique way of life;<br>- Rich cultural values;<br>- Sensitive natural environment;<br>- Significant ecological features and outstanding landscape features. |
|  |  |  | 14            | 14          | Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai  | Support                | Supports the proposed changes to the objectives and policies.  | Retain as notified.   |
|  |  |  | FS 29<br>[14] | 99<br>[14]  | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai]                            | Oppose                 | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. The intent of the submission appears to request making no provision for further living opportunities on the forested sand area of the Island.<br><br>Submission appears to be made after the 4pm closing period.   | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.  |
|  |  |  | 15            | 14          | Poka, Donna  | Support                | Supports the proposed changes to the objectives and policies.  | Retain as notified.   |
|  |  |  | FS 29<br>[15] | 128<br>[14] | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Poka, Donna]  | Oppose                 | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. The intent of the submission appears to request making no provision for further living opportunities on the forested sand area of the Island, apart from the suggestion to have a density of dwellings at 1 per 100ha of land in a subdivision.<br><br>Submission appears to be made after the 4pm closing period. | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.  |
|  |  |  | 16            | 14          | Department of Conservation   | Support                | The maintenance and support of the sensitive natural environment and significant landscape values of Matakana Island are supported as consistent with the requirements of the Act.   | Retain these provisions as notified.  |
|  |  |  | FS 29<br>[16] | 157<br>[14] | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Department of Conservation]                         | Oppose                 | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. Although TKCH opposes the submissions made by the Department, many of the issues can be worked through as a design matter. TKCH agrees with the Department that public access needs to be considered.  | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.  |
|  |  |  | 7             | 18          | TKC Holdings Limited   | Oppose                 | The plan change introduces a new Objective for Matakana Island (Objective 18.2.1.10). The proposed objective is opposed because it is not clear what Council would like to achieve, probably because it is more a political statement, rather than something to be achieved under an RMA framework. If the first three bullet points in the policy are to remain then those items will need clear definition           | Amend objective 18.2.1.10 to read (or other with similar effect):<br><br>To contribute to the social, cultural and economic well-being of Matakana Island including its community by maintaining and supporting:<br>- Cultural values,<br>- The natural environment attributes,<br>- Landscape values; and  |



|      |                              |   |                 |            |         |   |         |   |  |
|------|------------------------------|---|-----------------|------------|---------|---|---------|---|--|
|      |                              |   |                 |            |         |   |         | so decision makers and plan users know what is to be achieved. We suggest the objective is reworded.  | - Subdivision, use and development that promotes economic well being and which can be integrated within the existing Island environment on the Forested Sand Barrier.  |
|      |                              |   |                 | FS 26 [7]  | 5 [18]  | Faulkner, Cathryn [TKC Holdings Limited]                    | Support | Unique means being the only one of its kind. Waiheke Island has also been described as having a unique way of life, like many other places, so it is meaningless.   | Delete the words "unique way of life".   |
|      |                              |   |                 | FS 27 [7]  | 26 [18] | Carrus Corporation Ltd [TKC Holdings Limited]               | Support | The submission seeks a more balanced approach to the Rural introduction (explanatory statement and issue), objectives and policies for Matakana Island and this is supported.   | Amend the Rural introduction (explanatory statement and issue), objectives and policies for Matakana Island as sought.   |
|      |                              |   |                 | FS 31 [7]  | 10 [18] | Te Runanga O Ngai Te Rangi Iwi Trust [TKC Holdings Limited] | Oppose  | 18.2.1 Objectives   | Retain, but strengthen along amendments made by Bay of Plenty Regional Council.  |
|      |                              |   |                 | FS 32 [7]  | 9 [18]  | Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai [TKC Holdings Limited]              | Oppose  | 18.2.1 Objectives.  | Retain but strengthen along amendments made by Bay of Plenty Regional Council.   |
|      |                              |   |                 | FS 33 [7]  | 1 [18]  | New Zealand Historic Places Trust [TKC Holdings Limited]    | Oppose  | The NZHPT opposes the amendments sought to the Objective. The NZHPT considers that the proposed amendments dilute the protection for the archaeological resource of Matakana Island.  | That Objective 18.2.1.10 is retained as notified.  |
|      |                              |   |                 | 8          | 13      | Carrus Corporation Ltd                                      | Oppose  | How can a significant landscape add to Maoris social and cultural well being when they are not preserving any landscape on their land and the landscape is a production forest.   | Delete Objective 10 or reword it to give more clarity and to read as a RMA policy.   |
|      |                              |   |                 | FS 29 [8]  | 26 [13] | TKC Holdings Ltd [Carrus Corporation Ltd]                   | Support | The submitter has identified many issues in the listed submission points consistent with the submission of TKCH.  | Accept parts of the submission where it is consistent with the relief sought by TKCH.  |
| MI15 | 18.2 Objectives and Policies | 2 | 18.2.2 Policies | 10         | 5       | Blakely Pacific Limited                                     | Oppose  | The proposed plan provisions overstate and give too much weight to the interests of other Island residents (including tangata whenua) in relation to land that is privately owned in Policy 18.2.2.16 (a).  | Revise policies to address the concern in our submission.  |
|      |                              |   |                 | FS 26 [10] | 15 [5]  | Faulkner, Cathryn [Blakely Pacific Limited]                 | Support | The freehold Forest landowners are mentioned on very few occasions in this Plan in contrast to consultation with hapu, recognising significant matters to maori, adverse effects on maori, cultural values assessment of maori. Very one sided with bias apparent.  | Economic and other aspirations of Forest landowners need to be acknowledged in much greater detail.  |
|      |                              |   |                 | FS 27 [10] | 38 [5]  | Carrus Corporation Ltd [Blakely Pacific Limited]            | Support | The submission seeks a more balanced approach to the Rural introduction (explanatory statement and issue), and objectives and policies, and 18.5.8, to recognise that the landowners are part of the community, and that the sand barrier has been a working forest for a number of years, and this is supported. | Amend the Rural introduction (explanatory statement and issue), and objectives and policies, and 18.5.8, to recognise that the landowners are part of the community, and that the sand barrier has been a working forest for a number of years, as sought. |
|      |                              |   |                 | FS 29 [10] | 35 [5]  | TKC Holdings Ltd [Blakely Pacific Limited]                  | Support | The submitter has identified many issues in the listed submission points consistent   | Accept parts of the submission where it is consistent with the relief sought by  |



|  |  |  |            |          |   |                              |   |  |
|--|--|--|------------|----------|---|------------------------------|---|--|
|  |  |  |            |          |   | with the submission of TKCH. | TKCH.   |  |
|  |  |  | 11         | 20       | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council                          | Support with Amendment       | Policy 16 does not recognise the importance of maintaining public access to the island from the mainland. Structures are often required to provide for sea access to islands (wharves, jetties, boat ramps, slipways) and these are often located on land and in the coastal marine area.   | Amend Policy 16 as follows:<br>In addition to policies relating to the rural land resource, subdivision, use and development of land on Matakana Island shall recognise and provide for<br>(c) The need to ensure that large-scale or more intensive use, development and subdivision proposals do not<br>(h) Maintenance and enhancement of the existing transportation link(s) between Matakana Island and the mainland at Opureora Bay, and associated infrastructure and activities. |
|  |  |  | FS 27 [11] | 77 [20]  | Carrus Corporation Ltd [Bay Of Plenty Regional Council] | Support                      | The submission seeks amendments to recognise the maintenance and enhancement of existing transport links and this is supported.   | Add Policy 16(h) and 18.3.3(i) as sought.  |
|  |  |  | FS 29 [11] | 74 [20]  | TKC Holdings Ltd [Bay Of Plenty Regional Council]       | Oppose                       | The submitter supports many of the provisions that are opposed by TKCH. The submitter also requests many amendments that have the effect of being even more restrictive than Plan Change 46 as it relates to the Forested Sand area of the Island. Many of the requested amendments are inconsistent with the agreed position over Variation 1 to the Regional Policy Statement.<br><br>Submission point 11/21 completely disregards the facilities for access to and from the Island that TKCH has an interest in.   | Reject those parts of the submission and amend the plan change consistent with the TKCH submission. Amendments to 18.3.3 should also make provision for the same opportunities for owners on the forested area.  |
|  |  |  | 16         | 15       | Department of Conservation                              | Support with Amendment       | It is important that Policy 16(b) is retained, as it recognises these Matters of National Importance.<br><br>Policy 16(d) falls short of the requirements of Section 6(d) of the Act and the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement. These require that the public expectation and need for walking access to and along the coast is recognised and that this public access is maintained and enhanced. Although recognising the particular constraints occurring on Matakana Island, it is important that public access to and along the coastal marine area is required to be investigated when consents are applied for so that its appropriateness is required to be assessed and if suitable, implemented. | Retain Policy 16(b) as notified.<br><br>Amend 16(d) to require reference to the investigation and, if appropriate, implementation of public access to and along the coastline.   |
|  |  |  | FS 29 [16] | 158 [15] | TKC Holdings Ltd [Department of Conservation]           | Oppose                       | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. Although TKCH opposes the submissions made by the Department, many of the issues can be worked through as a design matter. TKCH agrees with the Department that public access needs to be considered.   | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.   |

|  |  |  |  |               |            |  |         |   |   |
|--|--|--|--|---------------|------------|--|---------|---|---|
|  |  |  |  | FS 30<br>[16] | 18<br>[15] | Blakely Pacific Ltd<br>[Department of Conservation]      | Oppose  | The submission seeks to amend Policy 16(b) in Chapter 18 to provide for implementation of public access along the coastline.<br><br>The change is opposed because it does not have sufficient regard to the interests of landowners to use and develop their land in accordance with the sustainable management purpose of the RMA.               | That the submission point is rejected.  |
|  |  |  |  | 7             | 19         | TKC Holdings Limited                                     | Oppose  | The Plan Change contains a policy specifically directed towards Matakana Island (policy 18.2.2.16). The submitter opposes the policy (included any related policies relevant for the Island) because we consider it does not provide objective guidance on how Council (or a decision maker) can assess development and activities on the Island. | Amend policy 18.2.2.16(a), (b), (d) and (g) to read (or other with similar effect):<br>16. In addition to policies relating to the rural land resource, development of land on Matakana Island shall recognise and provide for the following matters:<br>(a) Cultural values (including archaeology), including the need and desire of Maori to live on, develop and otherwise maintain a strong relationship with their ancestral land (on the Core area of the Island)<br>(b) Maintenance and enhancement of coastal character, ecological and landscapes values.<br>(d) Legal access to the ocean beach, Panepane and sites of cultural significance for at least the local community and land owners as a result of subdivision, use and development on the Forested Sand Barrier.<br>(g) Development that is of a scale and nature that will complement Matakana Island character areas. |
|  |  |  |  | FS 26<br>[7]  | 6<br>[19]  | Faulkner, Cathryn<br>[TKC Holdings Limited]              | Support | The words "on the Core area of the Island" should be added as the Maori need and desire to live on and develop their ancestral land does not extend to the freehold, private land on the Forested Sand Bar under the Torrens system. This must be clarified.  | Add the words "on the Core area of the Island".   |
|  |  |  |  | FS 26<br>[7]  | 7<br>[19]  | Faulkner, Cathryn<br>[TKC Holdings Limited]              | Support | The words "as a result of subdivision, use and development on the Forested Sand Barrier" should be added as access across private land is based on the goodwill of the owners and cannot be assumed as given.   | Add the words "as a result of subdivision, use and development on the Forested Sand Barrier".   |
|  |  |  |  | FS 27<br>[7]  | 27<br>[19] | Carrus Corporation Ltd<br>[TKC Holdings Limited]         | Support | The submission seeks a more balanced approach to the Rural introduction (explanatory statement and issue), objectives and policies for Matakana Island and this is supported.   | Amend the Rural introduction (explanatory statement and issue), objectives and policies for Matakana Island as sought.  |
|  |  |  |  | FS 28<br>[7]  | 11<br>[19] | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council<br>[TKC Holdings Limited] | Oppose  | Oppose the relief sought by the submitter as the amendments proposed by the submitter are inconsistent with the provisions of s6 RMA, the NZCPS 2010, the operative and proposed RPS and operative Regional Coastal Environment Plan.   |   |

|      |                     |   |         |              |            |   |         |  |   |
|------|---------------------|---|---------|--------------|------------|---|---------|--|---|
|      |                     |   |         | FS 33<br>[7] | 2<br>[19]  | New Zealand Historic Places Trust<br>[TKC Holdings Limited]   | Oppose  | The NZHPT opposes the amendments sought to the Policy.<br>The NZHPT considers that the proposed amendments dilute the protection for the archaeological resource of Matakana Island. Also the wording as notified better reflects the intention of Part 2, section 6(e) of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) that identified wahi tapu as a matter of national importance.  | That Policy 18.2.2.16(a) (b) (d) and (g) be retained as notified.   |
|      |                     |   |         | 8            | 14         | Carrus Corporation Ltd  | Oppose  | 16 (a) how can any development recognise spiritual value<br>16 (c) This so vague<br>16 (d) This policy is ultra vires<br>16 (e) This policy does not make sense<br>16 (g) This policy does not make sense  | Remove the word "spiritual" from Policy 16(a).<br>Delete Policy 16(c) as it is vague.<br>Delete Policy 16(d) as it is ultra vires.<br>Delete Policies 16(e) and (g) as it doesn't make sense.   |
|      |                     |   |         | FS 26<br>[8] | 12<br>[14] | Faulkner, Cathryn<br>[Carrus Corporation Ltd]                 | Support | "Spiritual value" lacks definition and is an intangible. How do you provide for an intangible, something that can never be realised, on Matakana Island? It's nonsense speak in this context.  | Remove the world "spiritual".   |
|      |                     |   |         | FS 29<br>[8] | 27<br>[14] | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Carrus Corporation Ltd]                  | Support | The submitter has identified many issues in the listed submission points consistent with the submission of TKCH.   | Accept parts of the submission where it is consistent with the relief sought by TKCH.   |
|      |                     |   |         | FS 33<br>[8] | 3<br>[14]  | New Zealand Historic Places Trust<br>[Carrus Corporation Ltd] | Oppose  | The NZHPT are concerned that the amendments sought by the submitter through deletion of some of the policies will result in the provisions not giving effect to the RMA, and not allowing integrated development to occur on the Island.<br><br>In addition the wording as notified better reflects the intention of Part 2, section 6(e) of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) that identified wahi tapu as a matter of national importance.<br><br>The NZHPT is also concerned that the suggested deletions reduce the protection afforded to archaeological sites.<br><br>Subject to relief sought elsewhere within this further submission the NZHPT seeks that the provisions are retained as notified. | Subject to relief sought elsewhere within this further submission the NZHPT seeks that the provisions are retained as notified.   |
| MI16 | 18.3 Activity Lists | 7 | General | 25           | 1          | Peter Axelrad   | Oppose  | The proposed plan change has been put forward for the benefit of the developers of large tracts of land. Due to the large size of their holdings, the average of 40ha minimum size and provision for clustered dwellings, makes perfect sense, and seems totally acceptable to me for large block holders.<br><br>However, as an existing small block holder, I will be significantly disadvantaged, as this plan change precludes me from any future subdivision of my land. Whilst I acknowledge, that   | That the proposed change is made, with the provision that existing small land holders be allowed to subdivide one further title (suggested minimum lot size 500sq. m ). There are of course a very limited number of land holders that fall into this category, therefore there would be minimal impact on the overall plan, and such additional dwellings will be consistent with the "clustered dwellings". |

|  |  |  |  |               |            |   |   |  |   |
|--|--|--|--|---------------|------------|---|---|--|---|
|  |  |  |  |               |            |   | currently I am unable to subdivide anyway, there has always been the possibility that future plans would enable me to do so. This proposed change would entirely remove that possibility. My house is a old rambling construction needing continual maintenance. It is totally suitable for large family gatherings, but at 60 years of age, I had hoped to be able to build a modern home for myself in my retirement, yet retain the existing building for family use. Under current legislation, and the proposed changes, I will be limited to an additional "minor dwelling of 60sq m. |  |   |
|  |  |  |  | FS 28<br>[25] | 48<br>[1]  | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council<br>[Peter Axelrad] | Oppose  | Oppose the relief sought on the basis that allowing sites to subdivide off a single additional 500m2 lot would need to be applied to all rural zoned properties. Cumulatively this could detract from the islands natural character and landscape values. The submitter may still seek consent for a second more modern dwelling via a land use application without the need to obtain a separate title. This land use would still need to demonstrate the ability to safely treat and dispose of wastewater while satisfying other plan standards.  |   |
|  |  |  |  | FS 29<br>[25] | 164<br>[1] | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Peter Axelrad]               | Support with Amendment  | The submitter supports development on the forested sand area. The submitter also supports the 'clustered' approach promoted by the Council and requests smaller titles can have an additional lot created under PC 46. TKCH have design issues with the Council's proposed clustering, and seeks a layout more conducive to a rural amenity. TKCH however supports Mr Axelrad's relief sought in relation to subdivision of smaller titles.  | Accept part of the submission where it is consistent with the relief sought by TKCH.  |
|  |  |  |  | 7             | 22         | TKC Holdings Limited                              | Oppose  | The main aspect of the subdivision rule is contained in 18.3.3 with links to other specific standards. Essentially it provides for 1 dwelling/lot per 40ha of land area included in the subdivision on the submitters land. Density of dwellings/lots exceeding the density of 1 per 40ha of land defaults to a prohibited activity. The intent appears to provide for a subdivision as a restricted discretionary activity, although this is impacted by the other provisions in section 5 and 6 of the Proposed Plan Change as previously discussed in this submission. The rules also have design controls on subdivision whereby the lots shall be clustered. Each cluster shall have a minimum of 20 dwellings/lots, each lot is to have a maximum size of 1ha, and each dwelling is to be an average distance of 80m | Amend the subdivision rules for the Matakana Island Forested Sand Barrier to be a controlled activity where there is an average density of no greater than 1 dwelling/lot per 40ha of land in the subdivision.<br>Or:<br>Amend the subdivision rules for the Matakana Island Forested Sand Barrier to be a restricted discretionary activity where there is an average density of no greater than 1 dwelling/lot per 40ha of land in the subdivision. This rule should be accompanied with non-notification clauses whereby applications under the amended rules need not be publicly notified and written approvals are not required from any party. |



|  |  |  |  |              |            |  |         |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--------------|------------|--|---------|--|--|
|  |  |  |  |              |            | <p>apart.</p> <p>The submitter considers that the Plan Change 46 approach to subdivision is overly rigid and will lead to an outcome more akin to an urban outcome rather than an integrated rural result. To concentrate dwellings/lots in the proposed manner would likely require mass deforestation in the clustered areas, communal wastewater facilities, and a peri urban feel'. This is likely to be inconsistent with Change Number 2 to the Regional Policy Statement, and inconsistent with the character of the Island.</p> <p>The Planning Maps attached to Plan Change 46 and other provisions in the District Plan relating to Matakana Island show an open coast natural hazard yard. The yard and planning map overlay is not consistent with the specific expert study by Economos (J Dahm) for the Island. It should be removed from the Planning Maps.</p> |         |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | FS 27<br>[7] | 30<br>[22] | Carrus Corporation Ltd<br>[TKC Holdings Limited]   | Support | <p>The submitter seeks amendments to ensure the workability of the clustering and subdivision, use and development rules. Carrus Corporation Limited supports clustering but agrees that the rules could be improved to ensure that the transferable development right provisions and clustering provisions are workable and that there is the ability to seek consent as a discretionary activity for subdivision which is lower than the 1:40ha density.</p> | Amend Section 18 to ensure that the transferable development right provisions and clustering provisions are workable and that there is the ability to seek consent as a discretionary activity for subdivision which is lower than the 1:40ha density. |
|  |  |  |  | FS 28<br>[7] | 12<br>[22] | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council<br>[TKC Holdings Limited]   | Oppose  | <p>Given the ecological, landscape, natural character and cultural values of the forested barrier it is not appropriate to allow for subdivision in these areas as a controlled activity. The Regional Council supports the assessment criteria listed in 18.5.8 of the proposed Plan Change, subject to the amendments requested in our original submission, including a small scale, minimum cluster size of 10 dwellings.</p>                               |  |
|  |  |  |  | FS 31<br>[7] | 12<br>[22] | Te Runanga O Ngai Te Rangi Iwi Trust<br>[TKC Holdings Limited]   | Oppose  | <p>Subdivision rule - although there is now a condition in place to prevent further subdivision fo the 40ha rural lots. I believe there should be no residential development on sand barrier arm. Although clustering is preferable to residential development, spread out through entire sand barrier arm, still think 20/cluster is too much. At one dwelling /100ha, no need for clusters at all.</p>   | Remove ability for 1/40ha dwelling allowance; 1/100ha. But no allowance for further subdivision on each title is still to be retained.   |
|  |  |  |  | FS 32<br>[7] | 12<br>[22] | Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai<br>[TKC Holdings Limited]  | Oppose  | <p>There should be no subdivision at all through the forestry even through clustering is an option.</p>  | Remove ability for 1/40ha dwelling allowances; 1/100ha. But no allowance for further subdivision on each title is still  |



|      |                     |   |                             |               |             |   |         |  |  |
|------|---------------------|---|-----------------------------|---------------|-------------|---|---------|--|--|
|      |                     |   |                             |               |             |   |         | to be retained.  |  |
|      |                     |   |                             | FS 33<br>[7]  | 5<br>[22]   | New Zealand Historic Places Trust<br>[TKC Holdings Limited] | Oppose  | The NZHPT opposes the amendments sought by the submitter. The NZHPT considers that some type of restrictions must be in place to provide protection for the historic heritage resource of the Island.<br><br>The NZHPT seeks that the provisions as notified remain.   | That the subdivision provisions are retained as notified.  |
| MI16 | 18.3 Activity Lists | 1 | 18.3.1 Permitted Activities | 14            | 15          | Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai                                     | Support | The proposed changes the the Permitted Activities are supported.   | Retain as notified.  |
|      |                     |   |                             | FS 29<br>[14] | 100<br>[15] | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai]               | Oppose  | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. The intent of the submission appears to request making no provision for further living opportunities on the forested sand area of the Island.<br><br>Submission appears to be made after the 4pm closing period.   | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.                       |
|      |                     |   |                             | 15            | 15          | Poka, Donna   | Support | The proposed changes the the Permitted Activities are supported.   | Retain as notified.  |
|      |                     |   |                             | FS 29<br>[15] | 129<br>[15] | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Poka, Donna]                           | Oppose  | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. The intent of the submission appears to request making no provision for further living opportunities on the forested sand area of the Island, apart from the suggestion to have a density of dwellings at 1 per 100ha of land in a subdivision.<br><br>Submission appears to be made after the 4pm closing period. | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.                       |
|      |                     |   |                             | 8             | 15          | Carrus Corporation Ltd                                      | Oppose  | Why is Matakana Island excluded from having rural contractor depots as they would possibly be needed in establishing other possible industries on the island.<br><br>Where titles are less than 40ha, dwellings are prohitod   | Allow Rural Contractors Depots as a Permitted Activity on the Matakana Island forested sand barrier. |
|      |                     |   |                             | 8             | 16          | Carrus Corporation Ltd                                      | Oppose  | Dwellings should be a Permitted Activity on all lots that are less than 40ha (consistant with other areas in the district) and not a Prohibited Activity.  | This is not consistent with other areas in the district, therefore it should be deleted.             |
|      |                     |   |                             | FS 28<br>[8]  | 21<br>[15]  | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council<br>[Carrus Corporation Ltd]  | Oppose  | Oppose the relief to include Rural Contractors depots as a permitted activity within the Matakana Island Forested Sand Barrier. A permitted activity status would not allow sufficient consideration with the landscape, ecological, natural character and cultural values identified on the island.   |  |
|      |                     |   |                             | FS 28<br>[8]  | 22<br>[16]  | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council<br>[Carrus Corporation Ltd]  | Oppose  | Oppose the deletion of prohibited activity status for residential development that exceeds a density of one dwelling per 40ha.   |  |

|      |                     |   |                              |            |          |  |         |  |  |
|------|---------------------|---|------------------------------|------------|----------|--|---------|--|--|
|      |                     |   |                              | FS 29 [8]  | 28 [15]  | TKC Holdings Ltd [Carrus Corporation Ltd]                  | Support | The submitter has identified many issues in the listed submission points consistent with the submission of TKCH.   | Accept parts of the submission where it is consistent with the relief sought by TKCH.  |
|      |                     |   |                              | FS 29 [8]  | 29 [16]  | TKC Holdings Ltd [Carrus Corporation Ltd]                  | Support | The submitter has identified many issues in the listed submission points consistent with the submission of TKCH.   | Accept parts of the submission where it is consistent with the relief sought by TKCH.  |
|      |                     |   |                              | FS 33 [8]  | 8 [16]   | New Zealand Historic Places Trust [Carrus Corporation Ltd] | Oppose  | The NZHPT considers that the special nature of Matakana Island warrants different controls from the remainder of the Western Bay District, to avoid adverse effects on the archaeological resource.  | That the controls are retained as notified.  |
| MI16 | 18.3 Activity Lists | 2 | 18.3.2 Controlled Activities | 14         | 16       | Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai                                    | Support | Supports the changes to the Controlled Activities.   | Retain as notified.  |
|      |                     |   |                              | FS 29 [14] | 101 [16] | TKC Holdings Ltd [Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai]                 | Oppose  | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. The intent of the submission appears to request making no provision for further living opportunities on the forested sand area of the Island.<br><br>Submission appears to be made after the 4pm closing period.   | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.   |
|      |                     |   |                              | 15         | 16       | Poka, Donna  | Support | Supports the changes to the Controlled Activities.   | Retain as notified.  |
|      |                     |   |                              | FS 29 [15] | 130 [16] | TKC Holdings Ltd [Poka, Donna]                             | Oppose  | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. The intent of the submission appears to request making no provision for further living opportunities on the forested sand area of the Island, apart from the suggestion to have a density of dwellings at 1 per 100ha of land in a subdivision.<br><br>Submission appears to be made after the 4pm closing period. | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.   |
|      |                     |   |                              | 7          | 2        | TKC Holdings Limited                                       | Oppose  | A significant number of dwellings can be developed on multiple owned Maori land on the farmland portion of the Island, which will impact on the rural feel of the Island. These provisions need to be addressed along with the provisions for the forested sand barrier.   | Consider rules 18.3.2(g) and 18.3.3(c) in the context of Plan Change 46. These matters need addressing along with the remainder of the Island. |
|      |                     |   |                              | 8          | 17       | Carrus Corporation Ltd                                     | Oppose  | Matakana Island should have the same rural provisions as the rest of the district, plus why should it only apply to the sand barrier.  | Remove the exclusions of Matakana Island and Matakana Island forested sand barrier from 18.3.2.  |
|      |                     |   |                              | FS 26 [8]  | 13 [17]  | Faulkner, Cathryn [Carrus Corporation Ltd]                 | Support | The Forested Sand Bar has been singled out for prohibited activities that do not apply to the rest of the area. This is discriminatory and unfair.   | Remove this exclusion.   |
|      |                     |   |                              | FS 28 [8]  | 23 [17]  | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council [Carrus Corporation Ltd]    | Oppose  | Oppose the relief sought by the submitter, Matakana Island has special landscape attributes and is unique within the wider Bay of Plenty Region and coastal environment. District Plan controls are required for all future development on Matakana Island.  |  |

|      |                     |   |  |               |            |   |                        |   |  |
|------|---------------------|---|--|---------------|------------|---|------------------------|---|--|
|      |                     |   |  | FS 29<br>[8]  | 30<br>[17] | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Carrus Corporation Ltd]                  | Support                | The submitter has identified many issues in the listed submission points consistent with the submission of TKCH.  | Accept parts of the submission where it is consistent with the relief sought by TKCH.  |
|      |                     |   |  | FS 33<br>[8]  | 9<br>[17]  | New Zealand Historic Places Trust<br>[Carrus Corporation Ltd] | Oppose                 | The NZHPT considers that the special nature of Matakana Island warrants different controls from the remainder of the Western Bay District, to avoid adverse effects on the archaeological resource.   | That the controls are retained as notified.  |
| MI16 | 18.3 Activity Lists | 3 | 18.3.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities | 10            | 21         | Blakely Pacific Limited                                       | Oppose                 | Restricted discretionary activity status does not provide adequate certainty to land owners. Controlled activity status is more appropriate and will give the consent authority an adequate level of control over adverse effects.  | Revise provisions to provide for subdivision and dwellings as a controlled activity in the Rural zone.   |
|      |                     |   |  | FS 27<br>[10] | 54<br>[21] | Carrus Corporation Ltd<br>[Blakely Pacific Limited]           | Support                | The submitter seeks amendments to ensure the workability of the clustering and subdivision, use and development rules. Carrus Corporation Limited supports clustering but agrees that the rules could be improved to ensure that the transferable development right provisions and clustering provisions are workable and that there is the ability to seek consent as a discretionary activity for subdivision which is lower than the 1:40ha density.           | Amend Section 18 to ensure that the transferable development right provisions and clustering provisions are workable and that there is the ability to seek consent as a discretionary activity for subdivision which is lower than the 1:40ha density. |
|      |                     |   |  | FS 28<br>[10] | 34<br>[21] | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council<br>[Blakely Pacific Limited]   | Oppose                 | Oppose the relief sought by the submitter, the Rural zone provisions already provide for subdivision and dwellings as a controlled activity. Rule 18.3.3(f) concerns dwellings and subdivision on the forested sand barrier as a restricted discretionary activity which is considered an appropriate classification in order to ensure any development complements the Island's significant values and the community's social, cultural and economic well-being. |  |
|      |                     |   |  | FS 29<br>[10] | 53<br>[21] | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Blakely Pacific Limited]                 | Support with Amendment | The submitter has requested subdivision and dwellings are considered by Council as a Controlled Activity.<br><br>TKCH agrees that subdivision should be a controlled activity, but dwellings within allotments on the Island should be a permitted activity.  | Accept parts of the submission where it is consistent with the relief sought by TKCH. Reject all other parts of the submission point.  |
|      |                     |   |  | 11            | 21         | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council                                | Support with Amendment | It is important that the District Plan recognise the importance of maintaining public access to the island from the mainland. Structures are often required to provide for sea access to islands (wharves, jetties, boat ramps, slipways) and these are often located on land and in the coastal marine area.   | Amend 18.3.3 by adding a new (i):<br>(i) the establishment and operation of wharves, jetties, slipways/boat ramps in an appropriate location at Opureora Point.  |
|      |                     |   |  | FS 27<br>[11] | 78<br>[21] | Carrus Corporation Ltd<br>[Bay Of Plenty Regional Council]    | Support                | The submission seeks amendments to recognise the maintenance and enhancement of existing transport links and this is supported.   | Add Policy 16(h) and 18.3.3(i) as sought   |

|      |                     |   |                                 |            |          |   |                        |   |   |
|------|---------------------|---|---------------------------------|------------|----------|---|------------------------|---|---|
|      |                     |   |                                 | FS 29 [11] | 75 [21]  | TKC Holdings Ltd [Bay Of Plenty Regional Council]       | Oppose                 | The submitter supports many of the provisions that are opposed by TKCH. The submitter also requests many amendments that have the effect of being even more restrictive than Plan Change 46 as it relates to the Forested Sand area of the Island. Many of the requested amendments are inconsistent with the agreed position over Variation 1 to the Regional Policy Statement.<br><br>Submission point 11/21 completely disregards the facilities for access to and from the Island that TKCH has an interest in. | Reject those parts of the submission and amend the plan change consistent with the TKCH submission. Amendments to 18.3.3 should also make provision for the same opportunities for owners on the forested area. |
|      |                     |   |                                 | 14         | 17       | Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai                                 | Support                | Supports the proposed changes to 18.3.3.  | Retain as notified.   |
|      |                     |   |                                 | FS 29 [14] | 102 [17] | TKC Holdings Ltd [Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai]              | Oppose                 | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. The intent of the submission appears to request making no provision for further living opportunities on the forested sand area of the Island.<br><br>Submission appears to be made after the 4pm closing period.  | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.  |
|      |                     |   |                                 | 15         | 17       | Poka, Donna   | Support                | Supports the proposed changes to 18.3.3.  | Retain as notified.   |
|      |                     |   |                                 | FS 29 [15] | 131 [17] | TKC Holdings Ltd [Poka, Donna]                          | Oppose                 | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. The intent of the submission appears to request making no provision for further living opportunities on the forested sand area of the Island, apart from the suggestion to have a density of dwellings at 1 per 100ha of land in a subdivision.<br><br>Submission appears to be made after the 4pm closing period.  | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.  |
|      |                     |   |                                 | 16         | 16       | Department of Conservation                              | Support                | 18.3.3(d), (e) and (f) are supported as providing an appropriate activity class for buildings and subdivision that complies with the relevant activity statuses.  | Retain as notified.   |
|      |                     |   |                                 | FS 29 [16] | 159 [16] | TKC Holdings Ltd [Department of Conservation]           | Oppose                 | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. Although TKCH opposes the submissions made by the Department, many of the issues can be worked through as a design matter. TKCH agrees with the Department that public access needs to be considered.   | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.  |
| MI16 | 18.3 Activity Lists | 4 | 18.3.4 Discretionary Activities | 11         | 22       | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council                          | Support with Amendment | Amendments are sought to ensure that (if applicable) the maximum density provision of 1 dwelling per 40ha also applies to subdivision consents.   | Amend 18.3.4 (s) to read: Development and subdivision on the Matakana Island forested sand barrier that fails to comply ...   |
|      |                     |   |                                 | FS 27 [11] | 79 [22]  | Carrus Corporation Ltd [Bay Of Plenty Regional Council] | Oppose                 | The submitter seeks to embed the 1:40ha density requirement and this is opposed.  | Decline the submission and do not make the amendments sought.   |
|      |                     |   |                                 | FS 29      | 76       | TKC Holdings Ltd  | Oppose                 | The submitter supports many of the  | Reject those parts of the submission and  |



|      |                     |   |                                 |            |          |   |         |  |  |
|------|---------------------|---|---------------------------------|------------|----------|---|---------|--|--|
|      |                     |   |                                 | [11]       | [22]     | [Bay Of Plenty Regional Council]              |         | provisions that are opposed by TKCH. The submitter also requests many amendments that have the effect of being even more restrictive than Plan Change 46 as it relates to the Forested Sand area of the Island. Many of the requested amendments are inconsistent with the agreed position over Variation 1 to the Regional Policy Statement.<br><br>Submission point 11/21 completely disregards the facilities for access to and from the Island that TKCH has an interest in. | amend the plan change consistent with the TKCH submission. Amendments to 18.3.3 should also make provision for the same opportunities for owners on the forested area. |
|      |                     |   |                                 | 14         | 18       | Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai                       | Support | Supports the changes to 18.3.4.  | Retain as notified.  |
|      |                     |   |                                 | FS 29 [14] | 103 [18] | TKC Holdings Ltd [Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai]    | Oppose  | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. The intent of the submission appears to request making no provision for further living opportunities on the forested sand area of the Island.<br><br>Submission appears to be made after the 4pm closing period.   | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.   |
|      |                     |   |                                 | 15         | 18       | Poka, Donna                                   | Support | Supports the changes to 18.3.4.  | Retain as notified.  |
|      |                     |   |                                 | FS 29 [15] | 132 [18] | TKC Holdings Ltd [Poka, Donna]                | Oppose  | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. The intent of the submission appears to request making no provision for further living opportunities on the forested sand area of the Island, apart from the suggestion to have a density of dwellings at 1 per 100ha of land in a subdivision.<br><br>Submission appears to be made after the 4pm closing period.   | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.   |
|      |                     |   |                                 | 16         | 17       | Department of Conservation                    | Support | The proposed amendments to this section, excluding Matakana Island from selected provisions and inserting (r) and (s) which provide appropriate development controls are supported.  | Retain as notified.  |
|      |                     |   |                                 | FS 29 [16] | 160 [17] | TKC Holdings Ltd [Department of Conservation] | Oppose  | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. Although TKCH opposes the submissions made by the Department, many of the issues can be worked through as a design matter. TKCH agrees with the Department that public access needs to be considered.  | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.   |
| MI16 | 18.3 Activity Lists | 5 | 18.3.5 Non Complying Activities | 14         | 19       | Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai                       | Support | Supports the changes to 18.3.5(f).   | Retain as notified.  |
|      |                     |   |                                 | FS 29 [14] | 104 [19] | TKC Holdings Ltd [Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai]    | Oppose  | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. The intent of the submission appears to request making no provision for further living opportunities on the forested sand area of the Island.  | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.   |

|      |                     |   |                              |               |             |   |                        |   |  |
|------|---------------------|---|------------------------------|---------------|-------------|---|------------------------|---|--|
|      |                     |   |                              |               |             |   |                        | Submission appears to be made after the 4pm closing period.   |  |
|      |                     |   |                              | 15            | 19          | Poka, Donna   | Support                | Supports the changes to 18.3.5(f).  | Retain as notified.  |
|      |                     |   |                              | FS 29<br>[15] | 133<br>[19] | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Poka, Donna]                           | Oppose                 | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. The intent of the submission appears to request making no provision for further living opportunities on the forested sand area of the Island, apart from the suggestion to have a density of dwellings at 1 per 100ha of land in a subdivision.<br><br>Submission appears to be made after the 4pm closing period.  | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.   |
| MI16 | 18.3 Activity Lists | 6 | 18.3.6 Prohibited Activities | 10            | 23          | Blakely Pacific Limited                                     | Oppose                 | Oppose the prohibited activity status for residential development that exceeds a density of one dwelling per 40 ha and minor dwellings on the Matakana Island forested sand barrier. There is a high legal threshold for prohibited activity status i.e. it must be demonstrated that the statutory tests support a rule that the prohibited activities must not take place under any circumstances. Prohibited activity status would not meet the statutory tests and it is more appropriate for activities that do not comply with the relevant performance standards to be assessed on their merits. | Delete prohibited activity status for residential development that exceeds a density of one dwelling per 40 ha and minor dwellings on the Matakana Island forested sand barrier.   |
|      |                     |   |                              | FS 27<br>[10] | 56<br>[23]  | Carrus Corporation Ltd<br>[Blakely Pacific Limited]         | Support                | The submitter seeks amendments to ensure the workability of the clustering and subdivision, use and development rules. Carrus Corporation Limited supports clustering but agrees that the rules could be improved to ensure that the transferable development right provisions and clustering provisions are workable and that there is the ability to seek consent as a discretionary activity for subdivision which is lower than the 1:40ha density.   | Amend Section 18 to ensure that the transferable development right provisions and clustering provisions are workable and that there is the ability to seek consent as a discretionary activity for subdivision which is lower than the 1:40ha density. |
|      |                     |   |                              | FS 28<br>[10] | 36<br>[23]  | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council<br>[Blakely Pacific Limited] | Oppose                 | Oppose the relief to delete prohibited activity status. The activity status is considered appropriate to ensure the management of the special natural and cultural values of Matakana Island for present and future generations.  |  |
|      |                     |   |                              | FS 29<br>[10] | 49<br>[23]  | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Blakely Pacific Limited]               | Support                | The submitter has identified many issues in the listed submission points consistent with the submission of TKCH.  | Accept parts of the submission where it is consistent with the relief sought by TKCH.  |
|      |                     |   |                              | 11            | 23          | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council                              | Support with Amendment | Amendments are sought to ensure that (if applicable) the maximum density provision of 1 dwelling per 40ha also applies to subdivision consents.   | Amend 18.3.6(a) to read:<br>Residential development or subdivision that exceeds a density of one dwelling per 40ha on the Matakana Island forested sand barrier .....  |
|      |                     |   |                              | FS 27<br>[11] | 80<br>[23]  | Carrus Corporation Ltd<br>[Bay Of Plenty Regional]          | Oppose                 | The submitter seeks to embed the 1:40ha density requirement and this is opposed.  | Decline the submission and do not make the amendments sought.  |

|  |            |          |   | Council]               |   |   |
|--|------------|----------|---|------------------------|---|---|
|  | FS 29 [11] | 77 [23]  | TKC Holdings Ltd [Bay Of Plenty Regional Council] | Oppose                 | The submitter supports many of the provisions that are opposed by TKCH. The submitter also requests many amendments that have the effect of being even more restrictive than Plan Change 46 as it relates to the Forested Sand area of the Island. Many of the requested amendments are inconsistent with the agreed position over Variation 1 to the Regional Policy Statement.<br><br>Submission point 11/21 completely disregards the facilities for access to and from the Island that TKCH has an interest in. | Reject those parts of the submission and amend the plan change consistent with the TKCH submission. Amendments to 18.3.3 should also make provision for the same opportunities for owners on the forested area. |
|  | 14         | 20       | Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai                           | Support                | Supports 16.3.6.  | Retain as notified.   |
|  | FS 29 [14] | 105 [20] | TKC Holdings Ltd [Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai]        | Oppose                 | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. The intent of the submission appears to request making no provision for further living opportunities on the forested sand area of the Island.<br><br>Submission appears to be made after the 4pm closing period.  | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.  |
|  | 15         | 20       | Poka, Donna                                       | Support                | Supports 16.3.6.  | Retain as notified.   |
|  | FS 29 [15] | 134 [20] | TKC Holdings Ltd [Poka, Donna]                    | Oppose                 | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. The intent of the submission appears to request making no provision for further living opportunities on the forested sand area of the Island, apart from the suggestion to have a density of dwellings at 1 per 100ha of land in a subdivision.<br><br>Submission appears to be made after the 4pm closing period.  | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.  |
|  | 3          | 2        | Te Umuhapuku 3b Trust                             | Support with Amendment | The activity list should give effect the the Hapu Management Plan.  | Activity list should be amended to ensure that the development of a dwelling on the forested sand barrier is a Prohibited Activity.   |
|  | FS 27 [3]  | 4 [2]    | Carrus Corporation Ltd [Te Umuhapuku 3b Trust]    | Oppose                 | The submission expresses support for some aspects of Option 1 (no more dwellings on the forested sand barrier) and this option is opposed. It also seeks prohibited activity status for further dwellings and this is opposed.  | Decline submission  |
|  | FS 29 [3]  | 7 [2]    | TKC Holdings Ltd [Te Umuhapuku 3b Trust]          | Oppose                 | The submitter is seeking to prohibit dwellings on the forested sand barrier of Matakana Island.<br><br>This is inconsistent with the TKCH submission and is not a balanced approach.  | Reject the submission in its entirety.  |
|  | 4          | 2        | Taingahue Family Trust                            | Oppose                 | The activity list does not give effect to the Hapu Management Plan.   | Activity list should be amended to ensure that the development of a dwelling on the   |

|  |  |  |              |           |  |        |  |  |
|--|--|--|--------------|-----------|--|--------|--|--|
|  |  |  |              |           |  |        | forested sand barrier is a Prohibited Activity.  |  |
|  |  |  | FS 27<br>[4] | 6<br>[2]  | Carrus Corporation Ltd<br>[Taingahue Family Trust] | Oppose | The submission expresses support for some aspects of Option 1 (no more dwellings on the forested sand barrier) and this option is opposed. It also seeks prohibited activity status for further dwellings and this is opposed. | Decline submission   |
|  |  |  | FS 29<br>[4] | 9<br>[2]  | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Taingahue Family Trust]       | Oppose | The submitter is seeking to prohibit dwellings on the forested sand barrier of Matakana Island.<br><br>This is inconsistent with the TKCH submission and is not a balanced approach.   | Reject the submission in its entirety.   |
|  |  |  | 5            | 2         | Rangiwhaea Marae Trust                             | Oppose | The activity list should give effect the the Hapu Management Plan.   | Activity list should be amended to ensure that the development of a dwelling on the forested sand barrier is a Prohibited Activity.  |
|  |  |  | FS 27<br>[5] | 8<br>[2]  | Carrus Corporation Ltd<br>[Rangiwhaea Marae Trust] | Oppose | The submission expresses support for some aspects of Option 1 (no more dwellings on the forested sand barrier) and this option is opposed. It also seeks prohibited activity status for further dwellings and this is opposed. | Decline submission   |
|  |  |  | FS 29<br>[5] | 11<br>[2] | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Rangiwhaea Marae Trust]       | Oppose | The submitter is seeking to prohibit dwellings on the forested sand barrier of Matakana Island.<br><br>This is inconsistent with the TKCH submission and is not a balanced approach.   | Reject the submission in its entirety.   |
|  |  |  | 6            | 2         | Tauwhao Te Ngare Trust                             | Oppose | Amend the activity list to give effect to the Hapu Management Plan.  | Activity list should be amended to ensure that the development of a dwelling on the forested sand barrier is a Prohibited Activity.  |
|  |  |  | FS 27<br>[6] | 10<br>[2] | Carrus Corporation Ltd<br>[Tauwhao Te Ngare Trust] | Oppose | The submission expresses support for some aspects of Option 1 (no more dwellings on the forested sand barrier) and this option is opposed. It also seeks prohibited activity status for further dwellings and this is opposed. | Decline submission   |
|  |  |  | FS 29<br>[6] | 13<br>[2] | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Tauwhao Te Ngare Trust]       | Oppose | The submitter is seeking to prohibit dwellings on the forested sand barrier of Matakana Island.<br><br>This is inconsistent with the TKCH submission and is not a balanced approach  | Reject the submission in its entirety.   |
|  |  |  | 7            | 24        | TKC Holdings Limited                               | Oppose | The proposed Prohibited status of subdivision and development of dwellings at a density exceeding 1 dwelling per 40ha is opposed.  | Amend the subdivision rules for the Matakana Island Forested Sand Barrier to be a discretionary activity where there is an average density of more than 1 dwelling/lot per 40ha of land in the subdivision. Applications under this rule will consider the criteria proposed in the previous submission point and, in addition, the matters referred to in |



|      |                                     |   |                 |               |             |  |                        |   |   |
|------|-------------------------------------|---|-----------------|---------------|-------------|--|------------------------|---|---|
|      |                                     |   |                 |               |             |  |                        | objective 10 and policy 16.   |   |
|      |                                     |   |                 | FS 27<br>[7]  | 32<br>[24]  | Carrus Corporation Ltd<br>[TKC Holdings Limited]                           | Support                | The submitter seeks amendments to ensure the workability of the clustering and subdivision, use and development rules. Carrus Corporation Limited supports clustering but agrees that the rules could be improved to ensure that the transferable development right provisions and clustering provisions are workable and that there is the ability to seek consent as a discretionary activity for subdivision which is lower than the 1:40ha density. | Amend Section 18 to ensure that the transferable development right provisions and clustering provisions are workable and that there is the ability to seek consent as a discretionary activity for subdivision which is lower than the 1:40ha density   |
|      |                                     |   |                 | FS 33<br>[7]  | 7<br>[24]   | New Zealand Historic Places Trust<br>[TKC Holdings Limited]                | Oppose                 | The NZHPT opposes the amendment sought by the submitter as the assessment criteria would be those outlined as outlined under their submission point 7.23 which are not suitable, for example a minimum lot size of 1 ha and the section 32 report, at pg. 31 of 52 outlines the prohibited activity as cap on development to provide certainty as to the level of development to the landowners, community and developers                               | That the prohibited activity status is retained   |
|      |                                     |   |                 | 8             | 18          | Carrus Corporation Ltd   | Oppose                 | With the other restrictions this is totally inequitable and not consistent with other areas in the district.  | Delete 18.3.6 to be consistent with the rest of the District.   |
|      |                                     |   |                 | FS 33<br>[8]  | 10<br>[18]  | New Zealand Historic Places Trust<br>[Carrus Corporation Ltd]              | Oppose                 | The NZHPT considers that the special nature of Matakana Island warrants different controls from the remainder of the Western Bay District, to avoid adverse effects on the archaeological resource.   | That the controls are retained as notified.   |
| MI17 | 18.4 Activity Performance Standards | 1 | 18.4.1(c) Yards | 13            | 3           | Western Bay of Plenty District Council                                     | Support with Amendment | 18.4.1(c) - Yards - refers to all landscape features with the exception of Matakana Island Open Coast (S25). Therefore insert Matakana Island Open Coast (S25) in 18.4.1(c)(v).   | Amend 18.4.1(c)(v) to read as follow: Landward Edge Protection Yard - for controls on activities up to 40m landward of MHWS around the Maketu Estuary and Waihi Estuary, and 100m landward of MHWS adjoining the Open Coast and within the Matakana Island Open Coast (S25), see Section 6.4. |
|      |                                     |   |                 | FS 27<br>[13] | 87<br>[3]   | Carrus Corporation Ltd<br>[Western Bay of Plenty District Council]         | Oppose                 | The submission seeks to increase yard restrictions on the Matakana Island Open Coast S25 and this is opposed.   | Decline the submission and do not make the amendments sought.   |
|      |                                     |   |                 | FS 28<br>[13] | 42<br>[3]   | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council<br>[Western Bay of Plenty District Council] | Support                | Support the amendments sought by the submitter to ensure consistency throughout the District and with the Regional Coastal Environment Plan.  |   |
|      |                                     |   |                 | FS 29<br>[13] | 85<br>[3]   | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Western Bay of Plenty District Council]               | Oppose                 | The submitter is seeking to correct provisions that are already in need of re-working. The use of the submission process to introduce new and further prohibited activities is inappropriate.   | Reject the submission in its entirety and leave final drafting of the plan change to the decision maker.  |
|      |                                     |   |                 | 14            | 21          | Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai  | Support                | Support the provisions in 18.4.1(c).  | Retain as notified.   |
|      |                                     |   |                 | FS 29<br>[14] | 106<br>[21] | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai]                              | Oppose                 | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. The intent of the   | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.  |

|      |                                     |   |  |               |             |   |  |  |  |
|------|-------------------------------------|---|--|---------------|-------------|---|--|--|--|
|      |                                     |   |  |               |             |   | submission appears to request making no provision for further living opportunities on the forested sand area of the Island.<br><br>Submission appears to be made after the 4pm closing period. |  |  |
|      |                                     |   |  | 15            | 21          | Poka, Donna   | Support  | Support the provisions in 18.4.1(c).<br>Retain as notified.  |  |
|      |                                     |   |  | FS 29<br>[15] | 135<br>[21] | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Poka, Donna]                   | Oppose   | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. The intent of the submission appears to request making no provision for further living opportunities on the forested sand area of the Island, apart from the suggestion to have a density of dwellings at 1 per 100ha of land in a subdivision.<br><br>Submission appears to be made after the 4pm closing period.   | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.   |
| MI17 | 18.4 Activity Performance Standards | 2 | 18.4.1(d) Clustering of dwellings on the Matakana Island forested sand barrier | 10            | 20          | Blakely Pacific Limited                             | Oppose   | The proposed provisions do not create a robust and comprehensive framework for transferable development rights. There is a general failure to give certainty as to how transferable development rights may be utilised by a "receiving" land owner. In the absence of certainty, the value of transferable development rights, and therefore the viability of the scheme, is doubtful. A clear example is rule 18.3.6 residential development that exceeds a density of one dwelling per 40 ha a prohibited activity. This would eliminate any possible advantage in purchasing transferable development rights. | Revise provisions to provide certainty that a "receiving" land owner will be able to utilise transferable development rights to complete more intensive development than would otherwise be possible.  |
|      |                                     |   |  | 10            | 22          | Blakely Pacific Limited                             | Support  | Residential "cluster development" in the Rural zone will enable adverse effects on the environment to be adequately avoided, remedied or mitigated.  | Maintain provisions providing for residential "cluster development" in the Rural zone.   |
|      |                                     |   |  | FS 27<br>[10] | 53<br>[20]  | Carrus Corporation Ltd<br>[Blakely Pacific Limited] | Support  | The submitter seeks amendments to ensure the workability of the clustering and subdivision, use and development rules. Carrus Corporation Limited supports clustering but agrees that the rules could be improved to ensure that the transferable development right provisions and clustering provisions are workable and that there is the ability to seek consent as a discretionary activity for subdivision which is lower than the 1:40ha density.  | Amend Section 18 to ensure that the transferable development right provisions and clustering provisions are workable and that there is the ability to seek consent as a discretionary activity for subdivision which is lower than the 1:40ha density. |
|      |                                     |   |  | FS 27<br>[10] | 55<br>[22]  | Carrus Corporation Ltd<br>[Blakely Pacific Limited] | Support  | The submitter seeks amendments to ensure the workability of the clustering and subdivision, use and development rules. Carrus Corporation Limited supports clustering but agrees that the rules could be improved to ensure that the transferable development right provisions and clustering provisions are workable and that there is the ability to   | Amend Section 18 to ensure that the transferable development right provisions and clustering provisions are workable and that there is the ability to seek consent as a discretionary activity for subdivision which is lower than the 1:40ha density. |

|  |  |  |               |            |  |                        |  |  |
|--|--|--|---------------|------------|--|------------------------|--|--|
|  |  |  |               |            | seek consent as a discretionary activity for subdivision which is lower than the 1:40ha density. |                        |  |  |
|  |  |  | FS 28<br>[10] | 35<br>[22] | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council<br>[Blakely Pacific Limited]                                      | Oppose                 | Support clustering residential development to better enable the management of potential adverse effects on the significant landscape, ecological, cultural and natural character values identified on Matakana Island.   |  |
|  |  |  | FS 28<br>[10] | 33<br>[20] | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council<br>[Blakely Pacific Limited]                                      | Oppose                 | Oppose the relief sought by the submitter, provisions as notified already set out with adequate clarity how transferring of development rights will occur.   |  |
|  |  |  | FS 29<br>[10] | 48<br>[20] | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Blakely Pacific Limited]  | Support                | The submitter has identified many issues in the listed submission points consistent with the submission of TKCH.   | Accept parts of the submission where it is consistent with the relief sought by TKCH.  |
|  |  |  | FS 29<br>[10] | 54<br>[22] | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Blakely Pacific Limited]  | Oppose                 | The submitter supports the "residential cluster development" provisions promoted through Plan Change 46. However, TKCH believe the amenity created by development should maintain a rural 'feel' and the proposed clustering provision are contrary to that end result.  | Reject that part of the submission and amend the plan change consistent with the TKCH submission.  |
|  |  |  | 11            | 24         | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council   | Support with Amendment | Regional Council supports this rule as it is well constructed and will minimise development and subdivision impacts. The primary methods outlined in this standard enable clustering' with density and other controls (distance, transferable development rights). Regional Council has concerns about the minimum number of dwellings being set at 20. A cluster of this size would need to be carefully situated to avoid having considerable impacts on indigenous biodiversity. In addition, it could result in the cluster becoming a suburban island, which is out of character with the island environment. | Amend 18.4.1 (d) to set the minimum dwellings per cluster to 10 and provide for a maximum number of dwellings per cluster to ensure the values identified on Matakana Island are maintained. |
|  |  |  | FS 27<br>[11] | 81<br>[24] | Carrus Corporation Ltd<br>[Bay Of Plenty Regional Council]                                       | Support                | The submitter seeks to provide controls on clustering including a minimum cluster of 10 and a maximum cluster of 20. This is broadly supported.  | Reduce minimum cluster size to 10.   |
|  |  |  | FS 29<br>[11] | 81<br>[24] | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Bay Of Plenty Regional Council]   | Support with Amendment | TKCH agree with the submitter that the proposed clustering provisions may lead to amenity values more akin to an suburban environment. The provisions are in need of amendment to provide for fewer dwellings in each cluster and a range of allotment sizes for maintenance of rural/coastal/island character.  | Accept part of the submission where it is consistent with the relief sought by TKCH.   |
|  |  |  | FS 30<br>[11] | 12<br>[24] | Blakely Pacific Ltd<br>[Bay Of Plenty Regional Council]  | Oppose                 | The submitter seeks to reduce the minimum number of dwellings per cluster to 10 and provide for a maximum number of dwellings per cluster.<br><br>The changes are opposed because they would unnecessarily constrain opportunities for appropriate development   | That the submission point is rejected.   |

|  |  |  |               |             |   |                        |   |  |
|--|--|--|---------------|-------------|---|------------------------|---|--|
|  |  |  |               |             | on Matakana Island.   |                        |   |  |
|  |  |  | FS 33<br>[11] | 14<br>[24]  | New Zealand Historic Places Trust<br>[Bay Of Plenty Regional Council] | Support                | <p>The NZHPT can see merit in reducing the size of the dwelling clusters, as a method to reduce the potential adverse effects on the archaeological resource of Matakana Island.</p> <p>The NZHPT anticipates that the location of the clusters of dwellings would always be informed by an archaeological assessment but do appreciate that other submitters also have other interests such as landscape and ecological matters that may be affected by the size of the dwelling clusters.</p> <p>The NZHPT would like to participate in discussions on this important matter.</p> | That the parties discuss the proposed size of dwelling clusters on the Forest Sand Barrier of Matakana Island. |
|  |  |  | 14            | 22          | Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai   | Support with Amendment | In general, don't support residential development on the forested sand barrier.   | Amend the maximum density to 1 dwelling per 100ha.   |
|  |  |  | FS 27<br>[14] | 88<br>[22]  | Carrus Corporation Ltd<br>[Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai]                   | Oppose                 | The submission seeks to amend the maximum density to 1 dwelling per 100ha and this is opposed.  | Decline the submission and do not make the amendments sought.  |
|  |  |  | FS 29<br>[14] | 107<br>[22] | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai]                         | Oppose                 | <p>The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. The intent of the submission appears to request making no provision for further living opportunities on the forested sand area of the Island.</p> <p>Submission appears to be made after the 4pm closing period.</p>   | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.                                 |
|  |  |  | FS 30<br>[14] | 16<br>[22]  | Blakely Pacific Ltd<br>[Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai]                      | Oppose                 | <p>The submitter seeks to reduce the maximum density for clustering of dwellings to 1 dwelling per 100 ha.</p> <p>The change is opposed because it would unnecessarily constrain opportunities for appropriate development on Matakana Island.</p>  | That the submission point is rejected.   |
|  |  |  | 15            | 22          | Poka, Donna   | Support with Amendment | In general, don't support residential development on the forested sand barrier.   | Amend the maximum density to 1 dwelling per 100ha.   |
|  |  |  | FS 27<br>[15] | 90<br>[22]  | Carrus Corporation Ltd<br>[Poka, Donna]                               | Oppose                 | The submission seeks to amend the maximum density to 1 dwelling per 100ha and this is opposed.  | Decline the submission and do not make the amendments sought.  |
|  |  |  | FS 29<br>[15] | 136<br>[22] | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Poka, Donna]                                     | Oppose                 | <p>The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. The intent of the submission appears to request making no provision for further living opportunities on the forested sand area of the Island, apart from the suggestion to have a density of dwellings at 1 per 100ha of land in a subdivision.</p> <p>Submission appears to be made after the 4pm closing period.</p>   | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.                                 |
|  |  |  | FS 30         | 17          | Blakely Pacific Ltd   | Oppose                 | The submitter seeks to reduce the   | That the submission point is rejected.   |



|      |                                     |   |  |            |          |   |                        |   |  |
|------|-------------------------------------|---|--|------------|----------|---|------------------------|---|--|
|      |                                     |   |  | [15]       | [22]     | [Poka, Donna]                                 |                        | maximum density for clustering of dwellings to 1 dwelling per 100 ha.<br><br>The change is opposed because it would unnecessarily constrain opportunities for appropriate development on Matakana Island.   |  |
|      |                                     |   |  | 7          | 21       | TKC Holdings Limited                          | Support with Amendment | Plan Change 46 has a framework for future subdivision on the Forested Sand Barrier. The intention to enable some form of subdivision and development is supportable in principle. The transferable development rights (18.4.1(d)) standards are also supportable in principle, but the words need reworking to ensure the administration of these achieves the intent.  |  |
|      |                                     |   |  | FS 27 [7]  | 29 [21]  | Carrus Corporation Ltd [TKC Holdings Limited] | Support                | The submitter seeks amendments to ensure the workability of the clustering and subdivision, use and development rules. Carrus Corporation Limited supports clustering but agrees that the rules could be improved to ensure that the transferable development right provisions and clustering provisions are workable and that there is the ability to seek consent as a discretionary activity for subdivision which is lower than the 1:40ha density. | Amend Section 18 to ensure that the transferable development right provisions and clustering provisions are workable and that there is the ability to seek consent as a discretionary activity for subdivision which is lower than the 1:40ha density. |
| MI17 | 18.4 Activity Performance Standards | 3 | 18.4.1(f) Standards for accommodation facilities and for education facilities on Matakana Island | 14         | 23       | Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai                       | Support                | Support the provisions in 18.4.1(f).  | Retain as notified.  |
|      |                                     |   |  | FS 29 [14] | 108 [23] | TKC Holdings Ltd [Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai]    | Oppose                 | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. The intent of the submission appears to request making no provision for further living opportunities on the forested sand area of the Island.<br><br>Submission appears to be made after the 4pm closing period.  | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.   |
|      |                                     |   |  | 15         | 23       | Poka, Donna                                   | Support                | Support the provisions in 18.4.1(f).  | Retain as notified.  |
|      |                                     |   |  | FS 29 [15] | 137 [23] | TKC Holdings Ltd [Poka, Donna]                | Oppose                 | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. The intent of the submission appears to request making no provision for further living opportunities on the forested sand area of the Island, apart from the suggestion to have a density of dwellings at 1 per 100ha of land in a subdivision.<br><br>Submission appears to be made after the 4pm closing period.                                  | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.   |
| MI17 | 18.4 Activity Performance Standards | 4 | 18.4.1(g) Standards for Place of Assembly on Matakana Island                                     | 14         | 24       | Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai                       | Support                | Supports 18.4.1(g).   | Retain as notified.  |
|      |                                     |   |  | FS 29 [14] | 109 [24] | TKC Holdings Ltd [Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai]    | Oppose                 | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. The intent of the submission appears to request making no provision for further living opportunities on   | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.   |

|      |   |   |  |               |             |   |         |   |  |
|------|---|---|--|---------------|-------------|---|---------|---|--|
|      |   |   |  |               |             |   |         | the forested sand area of the Island.<br>Submission appears to be made after the 4pm closing period.  |  |
|      |   |   |  | 15            | 24          | Poka, Donna   | Support | Supports 18.4.1(g).   | Retain as notified.  |
|      |   |   |  | FS 29<br>[15] | 138<br>[24] | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Poka, Donna]                   | Oppose  | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. The intent of the submission appears to request making no provision for further living opportunities on the forested sand area of the Island, apart from the suggestion to have a density of dwellings at 1 per 100ha of land in a subdivision.<br><br>Submission appears to be made after the 4pm closing period.                                  | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.   |
| MI18 | 18.4.2 Subdivision Activity Performance Standards | 2 | 18.4.2(i) Subdivision relating to clustered residential development on the Matakana Island forested sand barrier | 10            | 24          | Blakely Pacific Limited                             | Oppose  | Oppose the requirements for subdivision to "be in accordance with the related land use consent". There is no reason why subdivision and land use can't be considered separately. This would provide greater flexibility to land owners.   | Delete all provisions that imply subdivision consent will or should be preceded or accompanied by land use consent.  |
|      |   |   |  | 10            | 25          | Blakely Pacific Limited                             | Oppose  | Provisions intended to prevent further subdivision or development e.g. rule 18.4.2(i)(iii) which requires a memorandum of encumbrance to be registered on all titles to prevent further subdivision and the construction of additional dwellings or minor dwellings, matter of discretion 18.5.9 (a)(ii), and assessment criteria 18.5.10. Future applications for subdivision or land use consent should be assessed on their merits.                  | Delete all provisions that are directed at preventing further subdivision or development.  |
|      |   |   |  | FS 27<br>[10] | 57<br>[24]  | Carrus Corporation Ltd<br>[Blakely Pacific Limited] | Support | The submitter seeks amendments to ensure the workability of the clustering and subdivision, use and development rules. Carrus Corporation Limited supports clustering but agrees that the rules could be improved to ensure that the transferable development right provisions and clustering provisions are workable and that there is the ability to seek consent as a discretionary activity for subdivision which is lower than the 1:40ha density. | Amend Section 18 to ensure that the transferable development right provisions and clustering provisions are workable and that there is the ability to seek consent as a discretionary activity for subdivision which is lower than the 1:40ha density. |
|      |   |   |  | FS 27<br>[10] | 58<br>[25]  | Carrus Corporation Ltd<br>[Blakely Pacific Limited] | Support | The submitter seeks amendments to ensure the workability of the clustering and subdivision, use and development rules. Carrus Corporation Limited supports clustering but agrees that the rules could be improved to ensure that the transferable development right provisions and clustering provisions are workable and that there is the ability to seek consent as a discretionary activity for subdivision which is lower than the 1:40ha density. | Amend Section 18 to ensure that the transferable development right provisions and clustering provisions are workable and that there is the ability to seek consent as a discretionary activity for subdivision which is lower than the 1:40ha density. |

|  |  |  |  |               |            |  |         |   |   |
|--|--|--|--|---------------|------------|--|---------|---|---|
|  |  |  |  | FS 28<br>[10] | 37<br>[24] | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council<br>[Blakely Pacific Limited]    | Oppose  | Oppose the relief sought by the submitter as the subdivision rule is clearly related to proposals for clustered residential development on the forested sand barrier. It is appropriate that land use consent will be required and that subdivision related to that be consistent to better promote the integrated management of the island's natural and physical resources.   |   |
|  |  |  |  | FS 28<br>[10] | 38<br>[25] | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council<br>[Blakely Pacific Limited]    | Oppose  | Oppose the relief sought on the basis that the rule requiring the registration of a memorandum of encumbrance is an appropriate mechanism for ensuring the sustainable management of the special natural and cultural values of Matakana Island for present and future generations.   |   |
|  |  |  |  | FS 29<br>[10] | 50<br>[24] | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Blakely Pacific Limited]                  | Support | The submitter has identified many issues in the listed submission points consistent with the submission of TKCH.  | Accept parts of the submission where it is consistent with the relief sought by TKCH.   |
|  |  |  |  | FS 29<br>[10] | 51<br>[25] | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Blakely Pacific Limited]                  | Support | The submitter has identified many issues in the listed submission points consistent with the submission of TKCH.  | Accept parts of the submission where it is consistent with the relief sought by TKCH.   |
|  |  |  |  | FS 33<br>[10] | 11<br>[24] | New Zealand Historic Places Trust<br>[Blakely Pacific Limited] | Oppose  | The NZHPT opposes that the submitter seeks the removal of the requirement for subdivision that it is based on a land use consent, for several reasons. Currently the land use consent determines the density of development and it is appropriate that a subdivision consent in Matakana Island is based on this, as the resource consent will determine the most appropriate layout for development that will avoid adverse effects on the archaeological resource.<br><br>The NZHPT seeks that the provisions as notified remain. | That the requirement for a subdivision to be based on a landuse consent be retained in the Plan.  |
|  |  |  |  | 11            | 25         | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council                                 | Support | Rule 18.4.2 (i) ensures consistency between the land use and subdivision provisions.  | Retain 18.4.2 (i) as notified.  |
|  |  |  |  | FS 27<br>[11] | 82<br>[25] | Carrus Corporation Ltd<br>[Bay Of Plenty Regional Council]     | Oppose  | The submitter seeks to retain 18.4.2(i) as notified and this is opposed as it could make better provision for clustering.   | Amend clustering provisions as sought by Carrus Corporation Limited.  |
|  |  |  |  | FS 29<br>[11] | 78<br>[25] | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Bay Of Plenty Regional Council]           | Oppose  | The submitter supports many of the provisions that are opposed by TKCH. The submitter also requests many amendments that have the effect of being even more restrictive than Plan Change 46 as it relates to the Forested Sand area of the Island. Many of the requested amendments are inconsistent with the agreed position over Variation 1 to the Regional Policy Statement.<br><br>Submission point 11/21 completely disregards the facilities for access to and from the Island that TKCH has an interest in.                 | Reject those parts of the submission and amend the plan change consistent with the TKCH submission. Amendments to 18.3.3 should also make provision for the same opportunities for owners on the forested area. |

|  |  |  |            |          |  |        |  |   |
|--|--|--|------------|----------|--|--------|--|---|
|  |  |  | 14         | 26       | Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai                          | Oppose | Do not support residential development on the forested sand barrier.   | delete 18.4.2(i)  |
|  |  |  | FS 27 [14] | 89 [26]  | Carrus Corporation Ltd [Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai] | Oppose | The submission does not support residential development on the forested sand barrier and this is opposed.  | Decline the submission and do not make the amendments sought.   |
|  |  |  | FS 29 [14] | 111 [26] | TKC Holdings Ltd [Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai]       | Oppose | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. The intent of the submission appears to request making no provision for further living opportunities on the forested sand area of the Island.<br><br>Submission appears to be made after the 4pm closing period.   | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.  |
|  |  |  | 15         | 26       | Poka, Donna                                      | Oppose | Do not support residential development on the forested sand barrier.   | delete 18.4.2(i)  |
|  |  |  | FS 27 [15] | 91 [26]  | Carrus Corporation Ltd [Poka, Donna]             | Oppose | The submission does not support residential development on the forested sand barrier and this is opposed.  | Decline the submission and do not make the amendments sought.   |
|  |  |  | FS 29 [15] | 140 [26] | TKC Holdings Ltd [Poka, Donna]                   | Oppose | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. The intent of the submission appears to request making no provision for further living opportunities on the forested sand area of the Island, apart from the suggestion to have a density of dwellings at 1 per 100ha of land in a subdivision.<br><br>Submission appears to be made after the 4pm closing period. | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.  |
|  |  |  | 7          | 23       | TKC Holdings Limited                             | Oppose | The proposed activity performance standards are to restrictive, not practical and will not achieve the proposed objectives and policies.   | Only the following matters should be considered in a subdivision application:<br>- The appropriate location for the clusters of development having regard to the scale of areas included in the application. A balance title/lot shall be shown on the plan of subdivision including the location of the dwelling and accessory building areas within the balance lot;<br>- The location of proposed dwelling sites in the subdivision and the success of the design of the subdivision to integrate the dwelling sites with the forested areas. The location of dwelling sites shall also include curtilage management and controls/methods that integrate with coastal character considerations;<br>- The methods included in a management plan for the subdivision to maintain and enhance ecological, landscape, archaeological and cultural values. The management plan shall detail forestry management and tenure for all lots. The management plan shall detail appropriate tenure controls and education methods to be conveyed to new lot owners to recognise and provide |



|  |  |  |  |              |            |  |         |  |   |
|--|--|--|--|--------------|------------|--|---------|--|---|
|  |  |  |  |              |            |  |         | <p>for these matters. The management plan shall also identify the location, provision and appropriateness of any other built form for ancillary land use within the subdivision (such as proposed accommodation facilities, commercial facilities; education facilities);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Appropriate ranges of allotment sizes to integrate the dwelling locations with the forested areas. The minimum lot size shall be 1ha;</li> <li>- Minimisation of the risk to life and damage of property from natural hazards, including appropriate setbacks from the coast taking into account predicted climate change and potential earthworks requirements for minimum habitable building heights;</li> <li>- The sustainability of water, wastewater, electricity, telecommunication provisions;</li> <li>- The provision of safe and efficient legal access for the subdivision;</li> <li>- How the introduction of pest plants and animals will be minimised and managed;</li> <li>- Methods for preventing further subdivision.</li> </ul> |   |
|  |  |  |  | FS 27<br>[7] | 31<br>[23] | Carrus Corporation Ltd<br>[TKC Holdings Limited]               | Support | <p>The submitter seeks amendments to ensure the workability of the clustering and subdivision, use and development rules. Carrus Corporation Limited supports clustering but agrees that the rules could be improved to ensure that the transferable development right provisions and clustering provisions are workable and that there is the ability to seek consent as a discretionary activity for subdivision which is lower than the 1:40ha density.</p>   | <p>Amend Section 18 to ensure that the transferable development right provisions and clustering provisions are workable and that there is the ability to seek consent as a discretionary activity for subdivision which is lower than the 1:40ha density.</p>                                       |
|  |  |  |  | FS 31<br>[7] | 13<br>[23] | Te Runanga O Ngai Te Rangi Iwi Trust<br>[TKC Holdings Limited] | Oppose  | <p>Subdivision activity performance standards are appropriate for island.</p>  | <p>Retain as notified. Oppose TKCH's amendments.</p>  |
|  |  |  |  | FS 32<br>[7] | 13<br>[23] | Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai<br>[TKC Holdings Limited]              | Oppose  | <p>Appropriate subdivision activity performance standards for Matakana.</p>  | <p>Support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- unique way of life;</li> <li>- rich cultural values;</li> <li>- sensitive natural environs;</li> <li>- significant ecological features and outstanding landscape features;</li> </ul> <p>as the ultimate tenants for life on Matakana.</p> |
|  |  |  |  | FS 33<br>[7] | 6<br>[23]  | New Zealand Historic Places Trust<br>[TKC Holdings Limited]    | Oppose  | <p>The NZHPT opposes the provisions sought by the submitter as these include some provisions that are typically covered within the subdivision section of the plan. It is important that matters relating to Matakana Island are highlighted within the land use section of the Plan.</p> <p>The NZHPT seeks that the provisions as notified remain.</p>   | <p>That the subdivision Activity Performance Standards provisions are retained as notified.</p>   |

|      |   |   |   |            |          |  |         |   |  |
|------|---|---|---|------------|----------|--|---------|---|--|
| MI18 | 18.4.2 Subdivision Activity Performance Standards | 1 | 18.4.2(b) General farming lots excluding the Matakana Island forested sand barrier          | 14         | 25       | Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai                          | Support | Supports the provisions.  | Retain as notified.  |
|      |   |   |   | FS 29 [14] | 110 [25] | TKC Holdings Ltd [Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai]       | Oppose  | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. The intent of the submission appears to request making no provision for further living opportunities on the forested sand area of the Island.<br><br>Submission appears to be made after the 4pm closing period.  | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.   |
|      |   |   |   | 15         | 25       | Poka, Donna                                      | Support | Supports the provisions.  | Retain as notified.  |
|      |   |   |   | FS 29 [15] | 139 [25] | TKC Holdings Ltd [Poka, Donna]                   | Oppose  | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. The intent of the submission appears to request making no provision for further living opportunities on the forested sand area of the Island, apart from the suggestion to have a density of dwellings at 1 per 100ha of land in a subdivision.<br><br>Submission appears to be made after the 4pm closing period.                                  | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.   |
| MI19 | 18.5 Matters of Discretion                        | 1 | 18.5.8 Restricted Discretionary Activities on Matakana Island - General Assessment Criteria | 10         | 26       | Blakely Pacific Limited                          | Oppose  | Oppose the matters of discretion and any other provisions to the extent they give the consent authority discretion or control in relation to the maintenance, enhancement, or active management of the "balance area". The "balance area" will not be directly affected by subdivision and development and therefore there should not be scope to require maintenance, enhancement, or active management.   | Revise provisions to confirm there is no scope to require maintenance, enhancement, or active management of the "balance area".  |
|      |   |   |   | 10         | 3        | Blakely Pacific Limited                          | Oppose  | The proposed plan provisions fail to acknowledge that the landowners are part of "the community" in the matters of discretion 18.5.8 (f).   | Revise the assessment criteria to address the concerns of the submitter.   |
|      |   |   |   | FS 27 [10] | 59 [26]  | Carrus Corporation Ltd [Blakely Pacific Limited] | Support | The submitter seeks amendments to ensure the workability of the clustering and subdivision, use and development rules. Carrus Corporation Limited supports clustering but agrees that the rules could be improved to ensure that the transferable development right provisions and clustering provisions are workable and that there is the ability to seek consent as a discretionary activity for subdivision which is lower than the 1:40ha density. | Amend Section 18 to ensure that the transferable development right provisions and clustering provisions are workable and that there is the ability to seek consent as a discretionary activity for subdivision which is lower than the 1:40ha density.     |
|      |   |   |   | FS 27 [10] | 36 [3]   | Carrus Corporation Ltd [Blakely Pacific Limited] | Support | The submission seeks a more balanced approach to the Rural introduction (explanatory statement and issue), and objectives and policies, and 18.5.8, to recognise that the landowners are part of the community, and that the sand barrier has been a working forest for a number of years, and this is supported.   | Amend the Rural introduction (explanatory statement and issue), and objectives and policies, and 18.5.8, to recognise that the landowners are part of the community, and that the sand barrier has been a working forest for a number of years, as sought. |

|  |  |  |  |               |            |   |                        |   |  |
|--|--|--|--|---------------|------------|---|------------------------|---|--|
|  |  |  |  | FS 28<br>[10] | 39<br>[26] | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council<br>[Blakely Pacific Limited] | Oppose                 | Oppose the relief sought by the submitters establishing residential allotments adjacent to or near significant ecological features still have actual and potential effects on ecological features. These can include the effects of predation and disturbance by domestic pets, introduction of invasive plant species and garden escapes, foot and/or vehicle tracking by residents accessing the beach or other areas. The rules should be retained to require subdivision consent regardless of whether the Identified Significant Ecological Feature is within the residential allotment or the balance area. |  |
|  |  |  |  | FS 29<br>[10] | 33<br>[3]  | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Blakely Pacific Limited]               | Support                | The submitter has identified many issues in the listed submission points consistent with the submission of TKCH.  | Accept parts of the submission where it is consistent with the relief sought by TKCH.  |
|  |  |  |  | FS 29<br>[10] | 52<br>[26] | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Blakely Pacific Limited]               | Support                | The submitter has identified many issues in the listed submission points consistent with the submission of TKCH.  | Accept parts of the submission where it is consistent with the relief sought by TKCH.  |
|  |  |  |  | 11            | 26         | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council                              | Support with Amendment | The amendment to 18.5.8 (b) is requested as it is unclear if this relates to the provision of water or, the long term impact of providing services. An amendment to 18.5.8 (d) is requested to provide better consistency with the RMA, NZCPS (policies 11, 13 and 15), the Proposed RPS and the RCEP. The additions of (j), (k) and (l) reflect an earlier request in the above submission point for 5.6.1 to relocate assessment criteria which could apply to other activities (not just in SEFs).   | Amend 18.5.8 (b) to read (or similar):<br>The sustainability of providing water, wastewater, electricity, telecommunication and solid waste removal provisions and the long term financial and environmental impact of infrastructure provision.<br><br>Amend 18.5.8 (d) to read:<br>(d) The impact of development (including earthworks) on natural character, natural features and landscapes, indigenous biological diversity, cultural and archaeological values.<br><br>Add new clauses (j), (k) and (l) to the assessment criteria in 18.5.8 to read:<br>(j) Potential for conflict with existing and foreseeable activities in the area.<br>In justifying any location where potential for conflict and other adverse effects arise, consideration should be made of possible alternative locations and the need to be in the specific area chosen.<br>(k) Traffic Generation<br>- Impact on roading including traffic safety;<br>- Access;<br>- Effect on amenity.<br>(l) Scale of the activity including number of people and how this affects the existing character and amenity values. |
|  |  |  |  | FS 27<br>[11] | 83<br>[26] | Carrus Corporation Ltd<br>[Bay Of Plenty Regional Council]  | Oppose                 | The submission seeks amendments which broaden the assessment criteria in 18.5.8 and 18.5.9 including the need to assess alternatives and this is opposed.   | Decline the submission and do not make the amendments sought.  |
|  |  |  |  | FS 29         | 79         | TKC Holdings Ltd  | Oppose                 | The submitter supports many of the  | Reject those parts of the submission and   |

|  |  |  |  |            |          |  |         |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|------------|----------|--|---------|--|--|
|  |  |  |  | [11]       | [26]     | [Bay Of Plenty Regional Council]                     |         | provisions that are opposed by TKCH. The submitter also requests many amendments that have the effect of being even more restrictive than Plan Change 46 as it relates to the Forested Sand area of the Island. Many of the requested amendments are inconsistent with the agreed position over Variation 1 to the Regional Policy Statement.<br><br>Submission point 11/21 completely disregards the facilities for access to and from the Island that TKCH has an interest in. | amend the plan change consistent with the TKCH submission. Amendments to 18.3.3 should also make provision for the same opportunities for owners on the forested area. |
|  |  |  |  | FS 30 [11] | 13 [26]  | Blakely Pacific Ltd [Bay Of Plenty Regional Council] | Oppose  | The submitter seeks changes to the matters of discretion in 18.5.8.<br><br>The changes are opposed because they are unclear and uncertain as to purpose. In particular it is not clear what is meant by "the long term financial and environmental impact of infrastructure provision", "foreseeable activities" and "the need to be in the specific area chosen".   | That the submission point is rejected.   |
|  |  |  |  | 14         | 27       | Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai                              | Support | Supports the proposed changes.   | Retain as notified.  |
|  |  |  |  | FS 29 [14] | 112 [27] | TKC Holdings Ltd [Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai]           | Oppose  | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. The intent of the submission appears to request making no provision for further living opportunities on the forested sand area of the Island.<br><br>Submission appears to be made after the 4pm closing period.   | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.   |
|  |  |  |  | 15         | 27       | Poka, Donna  | Support | Supports the proposed changes.   | Retain as notified.  |
|  |  |  |  | FS 29 [15] | 141 [27] | TKC Holdings Ltd [Poka, Donna]                       | Oppose  | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. The intent of the submission appears to request making no provision for further living opportunities on the forested sand area of the Island, apart from the suggestion to have a density of dwellings at 1 per 100ha of land in a subdivision.<br><br>Submission appears to be made after the 4pm closing period.   | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.   |
|  |  |  |  | 16         | 18       | Department of Conservation                           | Support | Provisions (d), (e), (g), (h) and (i) are supported as appropriate matters of discretion.  | retain as notified   |
|  |  |  |  | FS 29 [16] | 161 [18] | TKC Holdings Ltd [Department of Conservation]        | Oppose  | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. Although TKCH opposes the submissions made by the Department, many of the issues can be worked through as a design matter. TKCH agrees with the Department that public access needs to be considered.  | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.   |



|      |                            |   |  |            |         |  |                        |   |   |
|------|----------------------------|---|--|------------|---------|--|------------------------|---|---|
| MI19 | 18.5 Matters of Discretion | 2 | 18.5.9 Restricted Discretionary Assessment Criteria applying to clustered residential development on the Matakana Island forested sand barrier | 10         | 27      | Blakely Pacific Limited                                  | Support                | Support the matter of discretion relating to how development will co-exist with production forestry operations. Such a provision will support the continuation of forestry operations which is consistent with the sustainable management purpose of the RMA.   | Maintain matter of discretion 18.5.9 (a)(iii).  |
|      |                            |   |  | FS 27 [10] | 60 [27] | Carrus Corporation Ltd [Blakely Pacific Limited]         | Support                | The submitter seeks amendments to ensure the workability of the clustering and subdivision, use and development rules. Carrus Corporation Limited supports clustering but agrees that the rules could be improved to ensure that the transferable development right provisions and clustering provisions are workable and that there is the ability to seek consent as a discretionary activity for subdivision which is lower than the 1:40ha density.   | Amend Section 18 to ensure that the transferable development right provisions and clustering provisions are workable and that there is the ability to seek consent as a discretionary activity for subdivision which is lower than the 1:40ha density.                          |
|      |                            |   |  | FS 28 [10] | 43 [27] | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council [Blakely Pacific Limited] | Support                | Regional Council supports the need to ensure rural production activities (which includes forestry operations) are able to continue to operate in rural zoned areas subject to measures for managing and protecting effects on areas with significant landscape, ecological, natural character or cultural values.   |   |
|      |                            |   |  | 11         | 27      | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council                           | Support with Amendment | Regional Council supports the reference to ensuring how development will co-exist with the production forestry operations. It is however requested that consideration also be given to providing public access to the open coast where it is not in conflict with production forestry.  | Amend 18.5.9 (a) (iv) as follows (or similar):<br>(iv) The provision of public access to the open coast where it is not in conflict with production forestry operations and convenient access for the existing Island community to Panepane and sites of cultural significance; |
|      |                            |   |  | FS 27 [11] | 84 [27] | Carrus Corporation Ltd [Bay Of Plenty Regional Council]  | Oppose                 | The submission seeks amendments which broaden the assessment criteria in 18.5.8 and 18.5.9 including the need to assess alternatives and this is opposed.   | Decline the submission and do not make the amendments sought.   |
|      |                            |   |  | FS 29 [11] | 80 [27] | TKC Holdings Ltd [Bay Of Plenty Regional Council]        | Oppose                 | The submitter supports many of the provisions that are opposed by TKCH. The submitter also requests many amendments that have the effect of being even more restrictive than Plan Change 46 as it relates to the Forested Sand area of the Island. Many of the requested amendments are inconsistent with the agreed position over Variation 1 to the Regional Policy Statement.<br><br>Submission point 11/21 completely disregards the facilities for access to and from the Island that TKCH has an interest in. | Reject those parts of the submission and amend the plan change consistent with the TKCH submission. Amendments to 18.3.3 should also make provision for the same opportunities for owners on the forested area.   |
|      |                            |   |  | FS 30 [11] | 14 [27] | Blakely Pacific Ltd [Bay Of Plenty Regional Council]     | Oppose                 | The submitter seeks that the assessment criteria be amended to provide for public access to the open coast (where it is not in conflict with production forestry) and convenient access for the existing Island   | That the submission point is rejected.  |

|      |                            |   |  |            |          |  |  |  |  |
|------|----------------------------|---|--|------------|----------|--|--|--|--|
|      |                            |   |  |            |          |  | community to Panepane and sites of cultural significance.<br><br>The changes are opposed because they do not have sufficient regard to the interests of landowners to use and develop their land in accordance with the sustainable management purpose of the RMA. It is also unclear what is meant by "sites of cultural significance". |  |  |
|      |                            |   |  | 14         | 28       | Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai                    | Support  | Supports the proposed changes  | Retain as notified.  |
|      |                            |   |  | FS 29 [14] | 113 [28] | TKC Holdings Ltd [Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai] | Oppose   | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. The intent of the submission appears to request making no provision for further living opportunities on the forested sand area of the Island.<br><br>Submission appears to be made after the 4pm closing period.   | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH. |
|      |                            |   |  | 15         | 28       | Poka, Donna                                | Support  | Supports the proposed changes  | Retain as notified.  |
|      |                            |   |  | FS 29 [15] | 142 [28] | TKC Holdings Ltd [Poka, Donna]             | Oppose   | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. The intent of the submission appears to request making no provision for further living opportunities on the forested sand area of the Island, apart from the suggestion to have a density of dwellings at 1 per 100ha of land in a subdivision.<br><br>Submission appears to be made after the 4pm closing period. | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH. |
| MI19 | 18.5 Matters of Discretion | 3 | 18.5.10 Discetionary and Non Complying Activity Criteria - General | 14         | 29       | Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai                    | Support  | Supports the proposed changes  | Retain as notified.  |
|      |                            |   |  | FS 29 [14] | 114 [29] | TKC Holdings Ltd [Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai] | Oppose   | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. The intent of the submission appears to request making no provision for further living opportunities on the forested sand area of the Island.<br><br>Submission appears to be made after the 4pm closing period.   | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH. |
|      |                            |   |  | 15         | 29       | Poka, Donna                                | Support  | Supports the proposed changes  | Retain as notified.  |
|      |                            |   |  | FS 29 [15] | 143 [29] | TKC Holdings Ltd [Poka, Donna]             | Oppose   | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. The intent of the submission appears to request making no provision for further living opportunities on the forested sand area of the Island, apart from the suggestion to have a density of dwellings at 1 per 100ha of land in a subdivision.<br><br>Submission appears to be made after the 4pm closing period. | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH. |
| MI3  | Section 5 - General        | 1 | General  | 11         | 2        | Bay Of Plenty Regional                     | Support with   | The Regional Council supports the  | Retain Variation 2 / Plan Change 46  |

|     |                     |   |   |               |            | Council   | Amendment | amendments to Schedule 1, Planning Maps, and additional assessment criteria for Discretionary and Non-Complying Activities. Retain Variation 2 / Plan Change 46 provisions subject to amendments sought by specific submission points.  | provisions subject to amendments sought below to address specific submission points.  |
|-----|---------------------|---|---|---------------|------------|---|-----------|---|---|
|     |                     |   |   | FS 27<br>[11] | 62<br>[2]  | Carrus Corporation Ltd<br>[Bay Of Plenty Regional Council]  | Oppose    | The submitter seeks the retention of the plan change and/or amendments where identified in the submission and this is opposed for the reasons set out in the submission from Carrus Corporation Limited and this further submission.  | Make amendments to plan change as sought by Carrus Corporation Limited.   |
|     |                     |   |   | FS 29<br>[11] | 56<br>[2]  | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Bay Of Plenty Regional Council]        | Oppose    | The submitter supports many of the provisions that are opposed by TKCH. The submitter also requests many amendments that have the effect of being even more restrictive than Plan Change 46 as it relates to the Forested Sand area of the Island. Many of the requested amendments are inconsistent with the agreed position over Variation 1 to the Regional Policy Statement.<br><br>Submission point 11/21 completely disregards the facilities for access to and from the Island that TKCH has an interest in. | Reject those parts of the submission and amend the plan change consistent with the TKCH submission. Amendments to 18.3.3 should also make provision for the same opportunities for owners on the forested area. |
|     |                     |   |   | 2             | 1          | Taikato, Easton   | Support   | Support in principle.   |   |
|     |                     |   |   | FS 29<br>[2]  | 2<br>[1]   | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Taikato, Easton]                       | Oppose    | It is difficult to ascertain what the submitter is seeking.<br><br>The submitter supports the Natural Environment Provisions (section 5). These have been opposed by TKCH because they do not allow reasonable use.   | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.  |
| MI4 | 5.4 - Activity List | 1 | 5.4.2 - Restricted Discretionary Activities | 10            | 10         | Blakely Pacific Limited                                     | Oppose    | All proposed provisions that provide specific exclusions or more restrictive activity status in relation to Identified Significant Ecological Features on Matakana Island.  | Revise provisions to remove specific exclusions or more restrictive activity status in relation to Identified Significant Ecological Features on Matakana Island.   |
|     |                     |   |   | FS 27<br>[10] | 43<br>[10] | Carrus Corporation Ltd<br>[Blakely Pacific Limited]         | Support   | The submission is consistent with the submission made by Carrus Corporation Limited regarding the removal of S9, S9a and S25 from the Schedule of Identified Outstanding Landscape Features and this is supported.<br><br>The submission also seeks to enable production forestry as a permitted activity, and a less onerous suite of rules, and this is supported.  | Remove S9, S9a and S25 from the Schedule of Identified Outstanding Landscape Features, and make amendments to enable production forestry as a permitted activity, and a less onerous suite of rules.            |
|     |                     |   |   | FS 28<br>[10] | 24<br>[10] | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council<br>[Blakely Pacific Limited] | Oppose    | Oppose the relief sought by the submitter as consider that the actual and potential effects of forestry and subdivision activities on Identified Significant Ecological Feature can have significant adverse effects to an Identified Significant   |   |

|  |  |  |               |            |  |         |  |  |
|--|--|--|---------------|------------|--|---------|--|--|
|  |  |  |               |            |  |         | Ecological Feature. More restrictive provisions allow for proper consideration of actual and potential effects and potential solutions to avoid/remedy/mitigate the effects.   |  |
|  |  |  | FS 29<br>[10] | 40<br>[10] | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Blakely Pacific Limited]            | Support | The submitter has identified many issues in the listed submission points consistent with the submission of TKCH.   | Accept parts of the submission where it is consistent with the relief sought by TKCH.  |
|  |  |  | 16            | 2          | Department of Conservation                               | Support | The exclusion of Matakana Island from 5.4.2, and insertion of discretionary and non-complying activities as 5.4.3 and 5.4.4 are supported as providing appropriate protection for the sensitive significant natural areas of the Island.   | Retain these sections as notified.   |
|  |  |  | FS 27<br>[16] | 93<br>[2]  | Carrus Corporation Ltd<br>[Department of Conservation]   | Oppose  | The submitter seeks to retain the provisions in Section 5.4 and this is opposed as Carrus Corporation Limited seeks provisions which enable production forestry as a permitted activity, and a less onerous suite of rules including a controlled activity rule for dwellings and subdivision.   | Amend Section 5.4 as sought by Carrus Corporation Limited.   |
|  |  |  | FS 29<br>[16] | 145<br>[2] | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Department of Conservation]         | Oppose  | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. Although TKCH opposes the submissions made by the Department, many of the issues can be worked through as a design matter. TKCH agrees with the Department that public access needs to be considered.  | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.   |
|  |  |  | 7             | 6          | TKC Holdings Limited                                     | Oppose  | The exclusions of Matakana Island in rule 5.4.2 unfairly limit the current use of the submitters existing certificates of title. Remove the exclusions from 5.4.2 for the Matakana Island Forested Sand Barrier.   | Ensure that production forestry is a permitted activity on the Matakana Island Forested Sand Barrier.  |
|  |  |  | FS 27<br>[7]  | 14<br>[6]  | Carrus Corporation Ltd<br>[TKC Holdings Limited]         | Support | The submission seeks changes to the provisions in 5.4 setting out activity lists/status so as to enable production forestry as a permitted activity, and a less onerous suite of rules including a controlled activity rule for dwellings and subdivision. This is supported as the rules should be less onerous whilst still enabling Council to exercise appropriate control over dwellings and subdivision.   | Amendments to the provisions in 5.4 setting out activity lists/status so as to enable production forestry as a permitted activity, and a less onerous suite of rules including a controlled activity rule for dwellings and subdivision. |
|  |  |  | FS 28<br>[7]  | 4<br>[6]   | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council<br>[TKC Holdings Limited] | Oppose  | A blanket rule making production forestry a permitted activity does not allow for the consideration of the actual and potential effects of forestry activities on biodiversity (and other) values on the island and consideration of potential solutions to avoid/remedy/mitigate the effects.<br><br>Given the high ecological value of the Identified Significant Ecological Feature, and the direction in Policy 11 of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010 regarding protection of indigenous biological diversity in the coastal |  |



|     |                     |   |                                  |            |         |  |                        |   |   |
|-----|---------------------|---|----------------------------------|------------|---------|--|------------------------|---|---|
|     |                     |   |                                  |            |         |  |                        | environment, it is not appropriate to allow for subdivision and development in these areas as a permitted activity.   |   |
| MI4 | 5.4 - Activity List | 2 | 5.4.3 - Discretionary Activities | 10         | 11      | Blakely Pacific Limited                                  | Oppose                 | All proposed provisions that provide specific exclusions or more restrictive activity status in relation to Identified Significant Ecological Features on Matakana Island.  | Revise provisions to remove specific exclusions or more restrictive activity status in relation to Significant Ecological Features on Matakana Island.  |
|     |                     |   |                                  | FS 27 [10] | 44 [11] | Carrus Corporation Ltd [Blakely Pacific Limited]         | Support                | The submission is consistent with the submission made by Carrus Corporation Limited regarding the removal of S9, S9a and S25 from the Schedule of Identified Outstanding Landscape Features and this is supported.<br><br>The submission also seeks to enable production forestry as a permitted activity, and a less onerous suite of rules, and this is supported.  | Remove S9, S9a and S25 from the Schedule of Identified Outstanding Landscape Features, and make amendments to enable production forestry as a permitted activity, and a less onerous suite of rules.  |
|     |                     |   |                                  | FS 28 [10] | 25 [11] | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council [Blakely Pacific Limited] | Oppose                 | Oppose the relief sought by the submitter as consider that the actual and potential effects of forestry and subdivision activities on Identified Significant Ecological Feature can have significant adverse effects to an Identified Significant Ecological Feature. More restrictive provisions allow for proper consideration of actual and potential effects and potential solutions to avoid/remedy/mitigate the effects.  |   |
|     |                     |   |                                  | FS 29 [10] | 41 [11] | TKC Holdings Ltd [Blakely Pacific Limited]               | Support                | The submitter has identified many issues in the listed submission points consistent with the submission of TKCH.  | Accept parts of the submission where it is consistent with the relief sought by TKCH.   |
|     |                     |   |                                  | 11         | 5       | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council                           | Support with Amendment | New discretionary and non-complying activities in identified Significant Ecological Features (SEFs) have been proposed for Matakana Island. They do not include all of the Restricted Discretionary Activities listed under Rule 5.4.2. (as it excludes Matakana Island). Proposed Rules 5.4.3 (discretionary) and 5.4.4 (non-complying) refer to:<br>Visitor and outdoor recreational facilities and activities.<br>Accommodation facilities and educational facilities<br>Subdivision and development | Amend 5.4.3 and/or 5.4.4 to identify activities not currently listed for Significant Ecological Features on Matakana Island (see Rule 5.4.2) or, if the intention is that these activities be discretionary, amend 5.4.3 to read (or similar):<br>(c) Any activity not listed as a Permitted, Discretionary or Non-Complying Activity within an Identified Significant Ecological Feature on Matakana Island, is a Discretionary Activity.. |
|     |                     |   |                                  | FS 29 [11] | 59 [5]  | TKC Holdings Ltd [Bay Of Plenty Regional Council]        | Oppose                 | The submitter supports many of the provisions that are opposed by TKCH. The submitter also requests many amendments that have the effect of being even more restrictive than Plan Change 46 as it relates to the Forested Sand area of the Island. Many of the requested amendments are inconsistent with the agreed position over Variation 1 to the Regional Policy Statement.<br><br>Submission point 11/21 completely   | Reject those parts of the submission and amend the plan change consistent with the TKCH submission. Amendments to 18.3.3 should also make provision for the same opportunities for owners on the forested area.   |

|  |            |         |   |                        |  |   |  |
|--|------------|---------|---|------------------------|--|---|--|
|  |            |         |   |                        |  | disregards the facilities for access to and from the Island that TKCH has an interest in.   |  |
|  | 13         | 1       | Western Bay of Plenty District Council                                  | Support with Amendment |  | <p>Rule 5.4.3(a) refers to activity performance standards in 18.4.1(f) for accommodation facilities and education facilities on Matakana Island. This cross reference is incorrect, as it doesn't relate to visitor and outdoor recreation facilities and activities.</p> <p>5.4.3(b): The reference number to Section 18 is incorrect. It should be (f) and not (e).</p>   | <p>5.4.3(a): Delete the reference to 18.4.1(f) to read as follows:<br/>Visitor and outdoor recreational facilities and activities on Matakana Island.</p> <p>5.4.3(b): Replace (e) with (f) to read as follows:<br/>Accommodation facilities and educational facilities associated with (a) above on Matakana Island that meet the performance standards in 18.4.1(f).</p> |
|  | FS 27 [13] | 85 [1]  | Carrus Corporation Ltd [Western Bay of Plenty District Council]         | Oppose                 |  | The submitter seeks the prohibition of places of assembly and accommodation facilities on Matakana Island and this is opposed as it appears to be without proper justification.   | Decline the submission and do not make the amendments sought.  |
|  | FS 28 [13] | 40 [1]  | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council [Western Bay of Plenty District Council] | Support                |  | Support the relief sought by the submitter.   |  |
|  | FS 29 [13] | 83 [1]  | TKC Holdings Ltd [Western Bay of Plenty District Council]               | Oppose                 |  | The submitter is seeking to correct provisions that are already in need of re-working. The use of the submission process to introduce new and further prohibited activities is inappropriate.   | Reject the submission in its entirety and leave final drafting of the plan change to the decision maker.   |
|  | 14         | 1       | Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai   | Support                |  | We support the provisions.  | Retain as notified.  |
|  | FS 29 [14] | 87 [1]  | TKC Holdings Ltd [Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai]                              | Oppose                 |  | <p>The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. The intent of the submission appears to request making no provision for further living opportunities on the forested sand area of the Island.</p> <p>Submission appears to be made after the 4pm closing period.</p>   | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.   |
|  | 15         | 1       | Poka, Donna   | Support                |  | We support the provisions.  | Retain as notified.  |
|  | FS 29 [15] | 115 [1] | TKC Holdings Ltd [Poka, Donna]  | Oppose                 |  | <p>The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. The intent of the submission appears to request making no provision for further living opportunities on the forested sand area of the Island, apart from the suggestion to have a density of dwellings at 1 per 100ha of land in a subdivision.</p> <p>Submission appears to be made after the 4pm closing period.</p> | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.   |
|  | 16         | 3       | Department of Conservation  | Support                |  | The insertion of discretionary and non-complying activities as 5.4.3 and 5.4.4 are supported as providing appropriate protection for the sensitive significant natural areas of the Island.   | Retain these sections as notified.   |

|  |  |  |  |               |            |  |         |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|---------------|------------|--|---------|--|--|
|  |  |  |  | FS 27<br>[16] | 94<br>[3]  | Carrus Corporation Ltd<br>[Department of Conservation]   | Oppose  | The submitter seeks to retain the provisions in Section 5.4 and this is opposed as Carrus Corporation Limited seeks provisions which enable production forestry as a permitted activity, and a less onerous suite of rules including a controlled activity rule for dwellings and subdivision.   | Amend Section 5.4 as sought by Carrus Corporation Limited.   |
|  |  |  |  | FS 29<br>[16] | 146<br>[3] | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Department of Conservation]         | Oppose  | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. Although TKCH opposes the submissions made by the Department, many of the issues can be worked through as a design matter. TKCH agrees with the Department that public access needs to be considered.  | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.   |
|  |  |  |  | 7             | 7          | TKC Holdings Limited                                     | Oppose  | The exclusions of Matakana Island in rule 5.4.2 unfairly limit the current use of the submitter's existing certificates of title. If Council believes the activities currently available for all other rural areas (pursuant to 5.4.2), once a development is on the table, are not appropriate for Matakana Island, then these should be matters added to the assessment criteria in 5.6 so they can be considered as part of a land use and/or subdivision consent. In particular the management plan developed through a subdivision consent for the land can assess the appropriateness of these other activities and with regard to an amended assessment criteria in both sections 5 and 18 of the District Plan. The exclusions in Plan Change 46 should have no application to the existing certificates of title. | Remove the exclusions from 5.4.2 for the Matakana Island Forested Sand Barrier, delete rule 5.4.3 and make any consequential amendments to assessment criteria in the District Plan.   |
|  |  |  |  | FS 26<br>[7]  | 1<br>[7]   | Faulkner, Cathryn<br>[TKC Holdings Limited]              | Support | The exclusions unfairly limit the current use of existing certificates of title. This is retrospective removing property rights and devaluing the land.  | Rule should be deleted.  |
|  |  |  |  | FS 27<br>[7]  | 15<br>[7]  | Carrus Corporation Ltd<br>[TKC Holdings Limited]         | Support | The submission seeks changes to the provisions in 5.4 setting out activity lists/status so as to enable production forestry as a permitted activity, and a less onerous suite of rules including a controlled activity rule for dwellings and subdivision. This is supported as the rules should be less onerous whilst still enabling Council to exercise appropriate control over dwellings and subdivision.   | Amendments to the provisions in 5.4 setting out activity lists/status so as to enable production forestry as a permitted activity, and a less onerous suite of rules including a controlled activity rule for dwellings and subdivision. |
|  |  |  |  | FS 28<br>[7]  | 5<br>[7]   | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council<br>[TKC Holdings Limited] | Oppose  | Oppose the relief sought by the submitter as consider the activities listed in 5.4.2 would be inappropriate as limited discretionary activities on Matakana Island given the significant ecological, landscape, natural character and cultural values already identified.  |  |

|     |                     |   |                                  |            |         |  |         |  |   |
|-----|---------------------|---|----------------------------------|------------|---------|--|---------|--|---|
|     |                     |   |                                  | 8          | 5       | Carrus Corporation Ltd                                   | Oppose  | Matakana Island should be given these rights.  | Remove 5.4.3  |
|     |                     |   |                                  | FS 28 [8]  | 15 [5]  | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council [Carrus Corporation Ltd]  | Oppose  | Oppose the deletion of those Discretionary activities listed in 5.4.3 due to the sensitive nature of the natural environment on Matakana Island and the potential effects associated with these activities.  |   |
|     |                     |   |                                  | FS 29 [8]  | 18 [5]  | TKC Holdings Ltd [Carrus Corporation Ltd]                | Support | The submitter has identified many issues in the listed submission points consistent with the submission of TKCH.   | Accept parts of the submission where it is consistent with the relief sought by TKCH.   |
| MI4 | 5.4 - Activity List | 3 | 5.4.4 - Non Complying Activities | 10         | 12      | Blakely Pacific Limited                                  | Oppose  | All proposed provisions that provide specific exclusions or more restrictive activity status in relation to Identified Significant Ecological Features on Matakana Island.   | Revise provisions to remove specific exclusions or more restrictive activity status in relation to Significant Ecological Features on Matakana Island.  |
|     |                     |   |                                  | 10         | 14      | Blakely Pacific Limited                                  | Oppose  | It needs to be clear that the requirement for subdivision consent is not triggered if all Identified Significant Ecological Features are contained entirely within the "balance area". Otherwise virtually all subdivision on the barrier arm of the Island would require subdivision consent under Section 5 (given the abundance of Identified Significant Ecological Features).   | Revise rules to make it clear that subdivision consent is required under Section 5 only where an Identified Significant Ecological Features is located within a new residential allotment and not where all Identified Significant Ecological Features are located within the "balance area". |
|     |                     |   |                                  | FS 27 [10] | 45 [12] | Carrus Corporation Ltd [Blakely Pacific Limited]         | Support | The submission is consistent with the submission made by Carrus Corporation Limited regarding the removal of S9, S9a and S25 from the Schedule of Identified Outstanding Landscape Features and this is supported.<br><br>The submission also seeks to enable production forestry as a permitted activity, and a less onerous suite of rules, and this is supported.   | Remove S9, S9a and S25 from the Schedule of Identified Outstanding Landscape Features, and make amendments to enable production forestry as a permitted activity, and a less onerous suite of rules.  |
|     |                     |   |                                  | FS 27 [10] | 47 [14] | Carrus Corporation Ltd [Blakely Pacific Limited]         | Support | The submission is consistent with the submission made by Carrus Corporation Limited regarding the removal of S9, S9a and S25 from the Schedule of Identified Outstanding Landscape Features and this is supported.<br><br>The submission also seeks to enable production forestry as a permitted activity, and a less onerous suite of rules, and this is supported.   | Remove S9, S9a and S25 from the Schedule of Identified Outstanding Landscape Features, and make amendments to enable production forestry as a permitted activity, and a less onerous suite of rules.  |
|     |                     |   |                                  | FS 28 [10] | 26 [12] | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council [Blakely Pacific Limited] | Oppose  | Oppose the relief sought by the submitter as consider that the actual and potential effects of forestry and subdivision activities on Identified Significant Ecological Feature can have significant adverse effects to an Identified Significant Ecological Feature. More restrictive provisions allow for proper consideration of actual and potential effects and potential solutions to avoid/remedy/mitigate the effects. |   |



|  |  |  |  |               |            |   |         |  |   |
|--|--|--|--|---------------|------------|---|---------|--|---|
|  |  |  |  | FS 28<br>[10] | 28<br>[14] | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council<br>[Blakely Pacific Limited] | Oppose  | Oppose relief sought by the submitter establishing residential allotments adjacent to or near significant ecological features still have actual and potential effects on ecological features. These can include the effects of predation and disturbance by domestic pets, introduction of invasive plant species and garden escapes, foot and/or vehicle tracking by residents accessing the beach or other areas. The rules should be retained to require subdivision consent regardless of whether the SEF is within the residential allotment or the balance area. |   |
|  |  |  |  | FS 29<br>[10] | 42<br>[12] | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Blakely Pacific Limited]               | Support | The submitter has identified many issues in the listed submission points consistent with the submission of TKCH.   | Accept parts of the submission where it is consistent with the relief sought by TKCH. |
|  |  |  |  | 14            | 2          | Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai                                     | Support | Support the provisions to control development and subdivision on Matakana Island.  | Retain as notified.   |
|  |  |  |  | FS 29<br>[14] | 88<br>[2]  | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai]               | Oppose  | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. The intent of the submission appears to request making no provision for further living opportunities on the forested sand area of the Island.<br><br>Submission appears to be made after the 4pm closing period.   | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.        |
|  |  |  |  | 15            | 2          | Poka, Donna   | Support | Support the provisions to control development and subdivision on Matakana Island.  | Retain as notified.   |
|  |  |  |  | FS 29<br>[15] | 116<br>[2] | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Poka, Donna]                           | Oppose  | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. The intent of the submission appears to request making no provision for further living opportunities on the forested sand area of the Island, apart from the suggestion to have a density of dwellings at 1 per 100ha of land in a subdivision.<br><br>Submission appears to be made after the 4pm closing period.   | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.        |
|  |  |  |  | 16            | 4          | Department of Conservation                                  | Support | The insertion of non-complying activities as 5.4.4 are supported as providing appropriate protection for the sensitive significant natural areas of the Island.  | Retain these sections as notified.  |
|  |  |  |  | FS 27<br>[16] | 95<br>[4]  | Carrus Corporation Ltd<br>[Department of Conservation]      | Oppose  | The submitter seeks to retain the provisions in Section 5.4 and this is opposed as Carrus Corporation Limited seeks provisions which enable production forestry as a permitted activity, and a less onerous suite of rules including a controlled activity rule for dwellings and subdivision.   | Amend Section 5.4 as sought by Carrus Corporation Limited.                            |
|  |  |  |  | FS 29<br>[16] | 147<br>[4] | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Department of Conservation]            | Oppose  | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the   | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by              |

|  |  |  |              |           |  |         |   |   |
|--|--|--|--------------|-----------|--|---------|---|---|
|  |  |  |              |           | Conservation]  |         | submissions of TKCH. Although TKCH opposes the submissions made by the Department, many of the issues can be worked through as a design matter. TKCH agrees with the Department that public access needs to be considered.  | TKCH.   |
|  |  |  | 7            | 8         | TKC Holdings Limited                                     | Oppose  | Both subdivision and development is a non-complying activity. Coupled with Rule 5.4.4 and the District Plan's definition of Development, a very restrictive planning regime is created for the submitters land. The result of this could be to prevent consideration of dwellings in those areas. Dwellings and occupation (established under appropriate conditions and including information on enhancement opportunities) may actually be the trigger for improvement of ecology. The rule should be deleted and replaced with a new controlled activity rule for dwellings and subdivision.   | Delete rule 5.4.4. Insert a new controlled activity rule (5.4.1A) and a new list of matters Council can reserve control over for the purposes of imposing conditions for ecological values in part 5.6.1. The new rule should cover dwellings, accessory buildings, associated development, and subdivision. Or; insert new rules that allow activities subject to and appropriate assessment of ecological values. |
|  |  |  | FS 27<br>[7] | 16<br>[8] | Carrus Corporation Ltd<br>[TKC Holdings Limited]         | Support | The submission seeks changes to the provisions in 5.4 setting out activity lists/status so as to enable production forestry as a permitted activity, and a less onerous suite of rules including a controlled activity rule for dwellings and subdivision. This is supported as the rules should be less onerous whilst still enabling Council to exercise appropriate control over dwellings and subdivision.  | Amendments to the provisions in 5.4 setting out activity lists/status so as to enable production forestry as a permitted activity, and a less onerous suite of rules including a controlled activity rule for dwellings and subdivision.  |
|  |  |  | FS 28<br>[7] | 6<br>[8]  | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council<br>[TKC Holdings Limited] | Oppose  | Oppose the relief sought by the submitter to amend the activity status of subdivision and development on Matakana Island from non-complying to controlled. The Island has significant ecological, landscape, natural character and cultural values identified, and it is inappropriate to allow for subdivision in these areas as a controlled activity.<br><br>Given the high ecological value of the SEF, and the direction in Policy 11 of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010 regarding protection of indigenous biological diversity in the coastal environment, it is not appropriate to allow for subdivision and development in these areas as a controlled activity. |   |
|  |  |  | 8            | 6         | Carrus Corporation Ltd                                   | Oppose  | Why should any development on Matakana Island be non complying besides adding additional costs and uncertainty it is in conflict with the rest of the rural provisions. This imposes very restrictive development opportunities.  | Subdivision and development on Matakana Island should be a Discretionary Activity to allow development opportunities to occur subject to some assessment criteria to ecological values.   |
|  |  |  | 8            | 4         | Carrus Corporation Ltd                                   | Oppose  | Production forestry is not listed in the activity list, therefore it will default to a Non-Complying Activity.  | The activity list needs to be amended to include production forestry as a Permitted Activity.   |

|     |                     |   |                               |               |            |   |         |   |  |
|-----|---------------------|---|-------------------------------|---------------|------------|---|---------|---|--|
|     |                     |   |                               | FS 28<br>[8]  | 16<br>[6]  | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council<br>[Carrus Corporation Ltd]  | Oppose  | Subdivision and development needs to be sited sensitively so that the ecology and natural character values of Matakana are sustained.   |  |
|     |                     |   |                               | FS 28<br>[8]  | 14<br>[4]  | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council<br>[Carrus Corporation Ltd]  | Oppose  | Oppose the amendment to include production forestry as a permitted activity. The permitted activity status is inappropriate within an identified Natural Feature and Landscape.   |  |
|     |                     |   |                               | FS 29<br>[8]  | 19<br>[6]  | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Carrus Corporation Ltd]                | Support | The submitter has identified many issues in the listed submission points consistent with the submission of TKCH.  | Accept parts of the submission where it is consistent with the relief sought by TKCH.  |
|     |                     |   |                               | FS 29<br>[8]  | 17<br>[4]  | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Carrus Corporation Ltd]                | Support | The submitter has identified many issues in the listed submission points consistent with the submission of TKCH.  | Accept parts of the submission where it is consistent with the relief sought by TKCH.  |
| MI4 | 5.4 - Activity List | 4 | 5.4.5 - Prohibited Activities | 10            | 13         | Blakely Pacific Limited                                     | Oppose  | Over time, plantation trees within Identified Significant Ecological Features may be cleared for commercial purposes, or they may die from natural causes. Unless they are replanted, or regenerate naturally, forest owners will face a potentially significant carbon liability under the Climate Change Response Act 2002 (the Emissions Trading Scheme). The sustainable management purpose of the RMA will be better met by providing for production forestry as a permitted activity. This will avoid forcing liability upon forest owners under the Emissions Trading Scheme. The Prohibited status for production forestry within Identified Significant Ecological Features located on Matakana Island is therefore opposed. | Revise rules to make production forestry a permitted activity within Identified Significant Ecological Features on Matakana Island.  |
|     |                     |   |                               | FS 27<br>[10] | 46<br>[13] | Carrus Corporation Ltd<br>[Blakely Pacific Limited]         | Support | The submission is consistent with the submission made by Carrus Corporation Limited regarding the removal of S9, S9a and S25 from the Schedule of Identified Outstanding Landscape Features and this is supported.<br><br>The submission also seeks to enable production forestry as a permitted activity, and a less onerous suite of rules, and this is supported.  | Remove S9, S9a and S25 from the Schedule of Identified Outstanding Landscape Features, and make amendments to enable production forestry as a permitted activity, and a less onerous suite of rules. |
|     |                     |   |                               | FS 28<br>[10] | 27<br>[13] | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council<br>[Blakely Pacific Limited] | Oppose  | Oppose the relief sought to make production forestry a permitted activity within an Identified Significant Ecological Feature. It is inappropriate to allow production forestry as a permitted activity within an Identified Significant Ecological Feature beyond harvest of existing trees at the appropriate time. The SEF identified on Matakana, for the most part, exclude the main areas of production forestry, with the possible exception of the seaward side of the barrier arm. All SEF have been identified for their significant biodiversity values, including those areas with old plantation trees still within them,  |  |

|  |  |  |               |            |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|---------------|------------|--|--|--|--|
|  |  |  |               |            |  | and therefore are worthy of protection. It is considered inappropriate to re-plant within any of the SEF and set-backs should be considered to provide for some buffering of those sites from the potential for damage during future harvesting processes. |  |  |
|  |  |  | FS 29<br>[10] | 43<br>[13] | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Blakely Pacific Limited]                                    | Support  | The submitter has identified many issues in the listed submission points consistent with the submission of TKCH.   | Accept parts of the submission where it is consistent with the relief sought by TKCH.  |
|  |  |  | 13            | 2          | Western Bay of Plenty<br>District Council  | Support with<br>Amendment  | Due to the sensitivity of the natural environment on Matakana Island, places of assembly, accommodation facilities and educational facilities not covered in 5.4.3 (Discretionary Activities) should be a Prohibited Activity rather than defaulting to Non-Complying.   | Include the following as Prohibited Activities:<br>(a) Places of assembly not covered in 5.4.2 and 5.4.3.<br>(b) Accommodation facilities and education facilities not covered in 5.4.2 and 5.4.3. |
|  |  |  | FS 27<br>[13] | 86<br>[2]  | Carrus Corporation Ltd<br>[Western Bay of Plenty<br>District Council]            | Oppose   | The submitter seeks the prohibition of places of assembly and accommodation facilities on Matakana Island and this is opposed as it appears to be without proper justification.  | Decline the submission and do not make the amendments sought.  |
|  |  |  | FS 28<br>[13] | 41<br>[2]  | Bay Of Plenty Regional<br>Council<br>[Western Bay of Plenty<br>District Council] | Support  | Support the relief sought by the submitter.  |  |
|  |  |  | FS 29<br>[13] | 84<br>[2]  | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Western Bay of Plenty<br>District Council]                  | Oppose   | The submitter is seeking to correct provisions that are already in need of re-working. The use of the submission process to introduce new and further prohibited activities is inappropriate.  | Reject the submission in its entirety and leave final drafting of the plan change to the decision maker.   |
|  |  |  | FS 30<br>[13] | 15<br>[2]  | Blakely Pacific Ltd<br>[Western Bay of Plenty<br>District Council]               | Oppose   | The submitter seeks to include as prohibited activities places of assembly, accommodation facilities and education facilities, that are not covered by other rules.<br><br>The changes are opposed because they unnecessarily constrain opportunities for appropriate development on Matakana Island.  | That the submission point is rejected.   |
|  |  |  | 24            | 1          | Federated Farmers  | Oppose   | The Plan Change had proposed that production forestry be Prohibited on Matakana Island in 5.4.5(c) as production forestry is excluded from the Restricted Discretionary activity provisions in 5.4.2.  | Amend production forestry to be a permitted activity on Matakana Island including the forested sand barrier.   |
|  |  |  | FS 28<br>[24] | 46<br>[1]  | Bay Of Plenty Regional<br>Council<br>[Federated Farmers]                         | Oppose   | Oppose the relief sought on the basis that a blanket rule making production forestry a permitted activity. Production forestry is a permitted activity in the Rural zone (18.3.1(b)). While it is accepted that plantation forestry on the island has existing use rights, once the current rotation is felled replanting is now proposed as prohibited within identified SEF areas. Regional Council supports |  |



|     |                           |   |  |               |            |  |  |  |  |
|-----|---------------------------|---|--|---------------|------------|--|--|--|--|
|     |                           |   |  |               |            |  | the expanded SEF areas surrounding the island's coastal margins and considers it appropriate that future pinus radiata plantations should be restricted away from these SEF areas. |  |  |
|     |                           |   |  | FS 29<br>[24] | 162<br>[1] | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Federated Farmers]                        | Support  | The submitter requests that production forestry on Matakana Island is a permitted activity.  | Accept the submission point.   |
|     |                           |   |  | 7             | 9          | TKC Holdings Limited   | Oppose   | Rule 5.4.5 lists activities which are prohibited within areas Council considers to be Significant Ecological Areas. Included in the list are Places of Assembly, Accommodation Facilities and Production Forestry (not covered in RDA and DA rules 5.4.2 and 5.4.3). By their nature some accommodation facilities could be mutually beneficial in areas with ecological value (such as in eco - tourism or other such use). It would be more efficient and effects based if these types of activities had the ability to be tested on a merits basis through the resource consent process, particularly where these might be the trigger for enhancements to occur. | Remove 5.4.5 (a) (b) from the list of Prohibited Activities and list these in 5.4.2 Restricted Discretionary Activities for Matakana Island Forested Sand Barrier.   |
|     |                           |   |  | FS 27<br>[7]  | 17<br>[9]  | Carrus Corporation Ltd<br>[TKC Holdings Limited]               | Support  | The submission seeks changes to the provisions in 5.4 setting out activity lists/status so as to enable production forestry as a permitted activity, and a less onerous suite of rules including a controlled activity rule for dwellings and subdivision. This is supported as the rules should be less onerous whilst still enabling Council to exercise appropriate control over dwellings and subdivision.   | Amendments to the provisions in 5.4 setting out activity lists/status so as to enable production forestry as a permitted activity, and a less onerous suite of rules including a controlled activity rule for dwellings and subdivision. |
|     |                           |   |  | FS 28<br>[7]  | 7<br>[9]   | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council<br>[TKC Holdings Limited]       | Oppose   | Oppose the relief sought by the submitter to amend the activity status from Prohibited. Consider the existing activity status is appropriate given the Island has significant ecological, landscape, natural character and cultural values identified.   |  |
|     |                           |   |  | FS 30<br>[7]  | 7<br>[9]   | Blakely Pacific Ltd<br>[TKC Holdings Limited]                  | Support  | The submitter seeks to include places of assembly and accommodation facilities as restricted discretionary activities within Identified Significant Ecological Features rather than prohibited.<br><br>The change is supported because prohibited status would not meet the high legal threshold and it is more appropriate for the activities to be assessed on their merits.   | That the submission point is accepted.   |
|     |                           |   |  | FS 31<br>[7]  | 4<br>[9]   | Te Runanga O Ngai Te Rangi Iwi Trust<br>[TKC Holdings Limited] | Oppose   | Retain prohibited activities in the SEF areas and on the maps.   | Retain as notified.  |
|     |                           |   |  | FS 32<br>[7]  | 4<br>[9]   | Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai<br>[TKC Holdings Limited]              | Oppose   | Retain prohibited activities in SEF areas and on the maps.   | Retain as notified.  |
| MI5 | 5.6 Matters of Discretion | 1 | Discretionary and Non Complying Activities - Matters | 10            | 8          | Blakely Pacific Limited  | Oppose   | Under clause 30 of Schedule 1 to the RMA, references to the Matakana Island  | Remove any references to the Matakana Island Plan from the matters of discretion   |

|  |  |  |                                       |               |           |  |  |   |   |
|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|---------------|-----------|--|--|---|---|
|  |  |  | of Discretion and Assessment Criteria |               |           |  | Plan give it legal effect as part of the Plan or Proposed Plan, which is not appropriate. The Matakana Island Plan is a background document that was not prepared for the purpose of forming part of the statutory planning framework. | included in 5.6.1(b).   |   |
|  |  |  |                                       | FS 27<br>[10] | 41<br>[8] | Carrus Corporation Ltd<br>[Blakely Pacific Limited]  | Support  | Carrus Corporation Limited agrees that references to the Matakana Island Plan should be removed from 5.6.1(b) and 6.6.2.1.  | Remove references to the Matakana Island Plan from 5.6.1(b) and 6.6.2.1.  |
|  |  |  |                                       | FS 29<br>[10] | 38<br>[8] | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Blakely Pacific Limited]        | Support  | The submitter has identified many issues in the listed submission points consistent with the submission of TKCH.  | Accept parts of the submission where it is consistent with the relief sought by TKCH.   |
|  |  |  |                                       | 11            | 6         | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council                       | Support with Amendment   | Rule 5.6.1 provides assessment criteria for new Rules 5.4.3 and 5.4.4 as they apply to activities in Matakana Island Significant Ecological Features. This new section implies that discretion is limited to matters listed (although the activities are fully discretionary). It also introduces assessment criteria that do not appear to be specific to natural environment values. In particular (d), (e) and (f), relate to conflict with existing uses, traffic and amenity values. These matters identify criteria which are relevant to restricted discretionary criteria for Matakana Island as listed in Section 18.5.8. Also note that Rule 5.6.1 should be numbered 5.6.2 (there is an existing 5.6.1). | 5.6.1 (as notified) should be 5.6.2 as 5.6.1 already exists. Amend 5.6.2 (the notified 5.6.1) to read:<br>The matters listed in 5.6.1, 18.5.8 and the following matters shall be used as a guide for assessing Discretionary and Non Complying Activities:<br>(a) Relevant objectives and policies.....<br><br>Delete (d), (e) and (f). |
|  |  |  |                                       | FS 29<br>[11] | 60<br>[6] | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Bay Of Plenty Regional Council] | Oppose   | The submitter supports many of the provisions that are opposed by TKCH. The submitter also requests many amendments that have the effect of being even more restrictive than Plan Change 46 as it relates to the Forested Sand area of the Island. Many of the requested amendments are inconsistent with the agreed position over Variation 1 to the Regional Policy Statement.<br><br>Submission point 11/21 completely disregards the facilities for access to and from the Island that TKCH has an interest in.   | Reject those parts of the submission and amend the plan change consistent with the TKCH submission. Amendments to 18.3.3 should also make provision for the same opportunities for owners on the forested area.   |
|  |  |  |                                       | 14            | 3         | Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai                              | Support  | Support the provisions in 5.6.1(a) to (f).  | Retain as notified.   |
|  |  |  |                                       | FS 29<br>[14] | 89<br>[3] | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai]        | Oppose   | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. The intent of the submission appears to request making no provision for further living opportunities on the forested sand area of the Island.<br><br>Submission appears to be made after the 4pm closing period.  | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.  |
|  |  |  |                                       | 15            | 3         | Poka, Donna  | Support  | Support the provisions in 5.6.1(a) to (f).  | Retain as notified.   |

|  |  |  |  |               |            |  |                        |  |   |
|--|--|--|--|---------------|------------|--|------------------------|--|---|
|  |  |  |  | FS 29<br>[15] | 117<br>[3] | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Poka, Donna]                | Oppose                 | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. The intent of the submission appears to request making no provision for further living opportunities on the forested sand area of the Island, apart from the suggestion to have a density of dwellings at 1 per 100ha of land in a subdivision.<br><br>Submission appears to be made after the 4pm closing period.   | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.  |
|  |  |  |  | 16            | 5          | Department of Conservation                       | Support                | The numbering of this section is inappropriate. The existing 5.6.1 is used for Assessment Criteria for Restricted Discretionary Activities. This new section should be renumbered as 5.6.2.  | Renumber this new section as 5.6.2.   |
|  |  |  |  | 16            | 6          | Department of Conservation                       | Support with Amendment | These activities are discretionary or non-complying as they have the potential to have greater adverse effects than the default restricted discretionary activity status across the rest of the District.<br><br>The Assessment Criteria for Restricted Discretionary Activities (5.6.1) is much more detailed in determining the appropriateness of the activity on significant natural areas.<br><br>These existing assessment criteria must still be used to inform decisions made concerning activities that affect significant natural areas. | Include Assessment Criteria for Restricted Discretionary Activities (5.6.1) as a Matter of Discretion for Discretionary and Non-Complying Activities - Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria to ensure that significant natural areas are accorded adequate protection. |
|  |  |  |  | FS 29<br>[16] | 148<br>[5] | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Department of Conservation] | Oppose                 | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. Although TKCH opposes the submissions made by the Department, many of the issues can be worked through as a design matter. TKCH agrees with the Department that public access needs to be considered.  | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.  |
|  |  |  |  | FS 29<br>[16] | 149<br>[6] | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Department of Conservation] | Oppose                 | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. Although TKCH opposes the submissions made by the Department, many of the issues can be worked through as a design matter. TKCH agrees with the Department that public access needs to be considered.  | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.  |
|  |  |  |  | 7             | 10         | TKC Holdings Limited                             | Oppose                 | Section 5 of the District Plan is largely related to the management of areas Council considers to be significant ecological areas, the proposed assessment criteria in 5.6.1 contains a number of provisions for assessing other matters.  | Amend 5.6.1 to matters only relating to ecology. Delete references to unrelated or subjective matters (such as the Matakana Island Plan).   |
|  |  |  |  | FS 27<br>[7]  | 18<br>[10] | Carrus Corporation Ltd<br>[TKC Holdings Limited] | Support                | The submission seeks to refine the proposed assessment criteria in 5.6.1 and this is supported.  | Refine the proposed assessment criteria in 5.6.1 as sought.   |

|     |   |   |   |            |        |   |         |   |   |
|-----|---|---|---|------------|--------|---|---------|---|---|
|     |   |   |   | 8          | 7      | Carrus Corporation Ltd  | Oppose  | The matters of discretion are vague and provide no certainty for any applicant. Some of the matters included have nothing to do with ecology.   | Remove the following words:<br>- "implementation strategies" in rule 5.6.1 (b);<br>- "foreseeable" in rule 5.6.1 (d); and<br>- "effect on amenity" in 5.6.1 (e).  |
|     |   |   |   | FS 29 [8]  | 20 [7] | TKC Holdings Ltd [Carrus Corporation Ltd]                             | Support | The submitter has identified many issues in the listed submission points consistent with the submission of TKCH.  | Accept parts of the submission where it is consistent with the relief sought by TKCH.   |
| MI6 | Appendix 1 - Identified Significant Ecological Features | 1 | Appendix 1 - Identified Significant Ecological Features | 11         | 7      | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council  | Support | Matakana Island is within the coastal environment. Policy 11 of the NZCPS identifies characteristics of indigenous biodiversity that should be protected in the coastal environment. Ecological values on Matakana Island have significance under the RPS criteria. They also meet the criteria for National Priorities for the protection of indigenous biodiversity on private land (MfE and DOC 2007). In accordance with method 53A of the Proposed Regional Policy Statement (RPS), Regional Council has undertaken an assessment of the indigenous biodiversity areas in the coastal environment and classified those that meet the criteria in Policy 11 of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010. This technical work (Significant Natural Areas in the Coastal Environment, 2012, Wildland Consultants Limited) included an assessment of biodiversity sites using criteria contained in Appendix F, Set 3: Indigenous Vegetation and Habitats of Indigenous Fauna in the Operative RPS. | Retain Appendix 1: Identified Significant Ecological Features as notified.  |
|     |   |   |   | FS 27 [11] | 64 [7] | Carrus Corporation Ltd [Bay Of Plenty Regional Council]               | Support | The submitter seeks the retention of the identified Significant Ecological Areas and this is opposed.   | Amend identified Significant Ecological Areas as sought by Carrus Corporation Limited.  |
|     |   |   |   | FS 29 [11] | 61 [7] | TKC Holdings Ltd [Bay Of Plenty Regional Council]                     | Oppose  | The submitter supports many of the provisions that are opposed by TKCH. The submitter also requests many amendments that have the effect of being even more restrictive than Plan Change 46 as it relates to the Forested Sand area of the Island. Many of the requested amendments are inconsistent with the agreed position over Variation 1 to the Regional Policy Statement.<br><br>Submission point 11/21 completely disregards the facilities for access to and from the Island that TKCH has an interest in.   | Reject those parts of the submission and amend the plan change consistent with the TKCH submission. Amendments to 18.3.3 should also make provision for the same opportunities for owners on the forested area. |
|     |   |   |   | FS 31 [11] | 16 [7] | Te Runanga O Ngai Te Rangi Iwi Trust [Bay Of Plenty Regional Council] | Support | Support comments.   | Retain Appendix 1 as notified.  |
|     |   |   |   | FS 32 [11] | 15 [7] | Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai [Bay Of Plenty Regional Council]              | Support | Support the comments.   | Retain Appendix 1 - Identified SEF's as notified.   |



|  |  |  |            |         |   |                        |  |  |
|--|--|--|------------|---------|---|------------------------|--|--|
|  |  |  | 14         | 4       | Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai                                     | Support                | The proposed changes to Appendix 1 are supported.  | Retain Appendix 1 as notified.   |
|  |  |  | FS 29 [14] | 90 [4]  | TKC Holdings Ltd [Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai]                  | Oppose                 | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. The intent of the submission appears to request making no provision for further living opportunities on the forested sand area of the Island.<br><br>Submission appears to be made after the 4pm closing period.   | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.   |
|  |  |  | 15         | 4       | Poka, Donna   | Support                | The proposed changes to Appendix 1 are supported.  | Retain Appendix 1 as notified.   |
|  |  |  | FS 29 [15] | 118 [4] | TKC Holdings Ltd [Poka, Donna]                              | Oppose                 | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. The intent of the submission appears to request making no provision for further living opportunities on the forested sand area of the Island, apart from the suggestion to have a density of dwellings at 1 per 100ha of land in a subdivision.<br><br>Submission appears to be made after the 4pm closing period.   | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.   |
|  |  |  | 16         | 7       | Department of Conservation                                  | Support with Amendment | Except where discussed below, this list of updated Significant Ecological Features is supported as consistent with Wildland's assessments and is required to protect these areas, as required by Section 6(c) of the RMA.<br><br>Analysis of the Wildlands supporting documents has raised several issues with the identification of specific areas. This involves the identification of some areas identified as of moderate significance as significant and others as not significant.<br><br>This has resulted in the Matakana Island Wetlands 3 site (PNA Site Number 137) not being identified, as well as two of the Proposed Covenant Areas (A and B). These areas were proposed for protection during the previous consent application and no definite information showing that they are not significant under Section 6(c) has been produced. | Retain all proposed Significant Ecological Features unless expert assessment proves that they are not significant or that the boundaries require amendment.<br><br>Unless expert assessment of the three "moderately significant" areas described can be provided that demonstrates that they are no longer of significance for the purposes of Section 6(c), then their identification as Significant Ecological Areas is required. |
|  |  |  | FS 28 [16] | 45 [7]  | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council [Department of Conservation] | Support                | Support the retention of all Significant Ecological Features. Biodiversity sites on Matakana Island all meet at least one of the criteria for National Priorities for the protection of indigenous biodiversity on private land (MfE and DOC 2007) - they fall on acutely threatened and chronically under protected Land Environments (priority 1), many are wetland and dune ecosystems (priority 2) and many also include flora and/or fauna that are considered threatened and at risk under   |  |

|  |  |  |               |            |  |   |   |   |
|--|--|--|---------------|------------|--|---|---|---|
|  |  |  |               |            |  | the threatened species classification system (priority 4). All warrant a level of protection to be provided within the District Plan. |   |   |
|  |  |  | FS 29<br>[16] | 150<br>[7] | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Department of Conservation]         | Oppose  | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. Although TKCH opposes the submissions made by the Department, many of the issues can be worked through as a design matter. TKCH agrees with the Department that public access needs to be considered.   | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.  |
|  |  |  | 2             | 2          | Taikato, Easton  | Oppose  | Oppose Section 6.   | It should redress the Long Term Plan 2009 - 19 for Papakainga development.  |
|  |  |  | FS 29<br>[2]  | 3<br>[2]   | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Taikato, Easton]                    | Unknown   | It is difficult to ascertain what the submitter is seeking.<br><br>The submitter opposes the Landscape Provisions (section 6). Most of these have also been opposed by TKCH because they do not provide certainty. TKCH also support section 6 of the plan as it relates to permitting production forestry.   | Accept parts of the submission where it is consistent with the relief sought by TKCH. Reject all others.  |
|  |  |  | FS 30<br>[2]  | 2<br>[2]   | Blakely Pacific Ltd<br>[Taikato, Easton]                 | Oppose  | The submitter seeks to "Redress Long Term Plan 2009 - 19 Papakainga Development".<br><br>The change is opposed because it is unclear what is being sought.  | That the submission point is rejected.  |
|  |  |  | 7             | 4          | TKC Holdings Limited                                     | Support with Amendment  | The general intent of Plan Change 46 to have sensitive development on the Forested Sand Barrier is supportable in principle. However, there is an administrative disconnect between the enabling intent to have some limited development, and the provisions that seek to give effect to that intent.   | Review, reduce and amend the Significant Ecological Features Schedule in Appendix 1 for the Matakana Island Forested Sand Barrier to reflect the need to address the landowners forestry operations and reasonable land use change. |
|  |  |  | FS 27<br>[7]  | 12<br>[4]  | Carrus Corporation Ltd<br>[TKC Holdings Limited]         | Support   | The submission seeks to review, reduce and amend the Significant Ecological Features Maps and Schedules for the Matakana Island Forested Sand Barrier to reflect the need to address the landowners' forestry operations and reasonable land use change and that is supported.  | Amendments to the Significant Ecological Features Maps and Schedules for the Matakana Island Forested Sand Barrier to reflect the need to address the landowners' forestry operations and reasonable land use change.               |
|  |  |  | FS 28<br>[7]  | 2<br>[4]   | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council<br>[TKC Holdings Limited] | Oppose  | Oppose the relief sought by the submitter. The SEFs identified on Matakana, for the most part, exclude the main areas of production forestry, with the possible exception of the seaward side of the barrier arm. All SEFs have been identified for their significant biodiversity values, including those areas with old plantation trees still within them, and therefore are worthy of protection. Sites are identified as either meeting or not meeting the threshold for identification as significant under Section 6 (c) of the RMA. |   |

|     |                     |   |         |               |            |  |                        |  |   |
|-----|---------------------|---|---------|---------------|------------|--|------------------------|--|---|
|     |                     |   |         | FS 30<br>[7]  | 5<br>[4]   | Blakely Pacific Ltd<br>[TKC Holdings Limited]                  | Support                | The submitter seeks to review, reduce and amend the Identified Significant Ecological Features maps and schedules for the Matakana Island forested sand barrier to reflect forestry operations and reasonable land use change.<br><br>The change is supported because it will ensure that all identified areas have values that warrant protection as a Identified Significant Ecological Feature.   | That the submission point is accepted.  |
|     |                     |   |         | FS 31<br>[7]  | 2<br>[4]   | Te Runanga O Ngai Te Rangi Iwi Trust<br>[TKC Holdings Limited] | Oppose                 | The restriction on development within the significant ecological features schedule and strengthening of the areas included is appropriate.   | Retain Appendix 1 as notified.  |
|     |                     |   |         | FS 32<br>[7]  | 2<br>[4]   | Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai<br>[TKC Holdings Limited]              | Oppose                 | Restrictions on development are appropriate.   | Retain Appendix 1 as notified.  |
| MI7 | Section 6 - General | 1 | General | 10            | 18         | Blakely Pacific Limited  | Oppose                 | Oppose all proposed provisions that provide specific restrictions, exclusions or more restrictive activity status in relation to Identified Natural Features and Landscapes on Matakana Island. A more restrictive approach to Identified Natural Features and Landscapes on Matakana Island is not warranted.   | Revise provisions to delete specific restrictions, exclusions or more restrictive activity status in relation to Identified Natural Features and Landscapes on Matakana Island.   |
|     |                     |   |         | FS 27<br>[10] | 51<br>[18] | Carrus Corporation Ltd<br>[Blakely Pacific Limited]            | Support                | The submission seeks revisions to the rules relating to Identified Natural Features and Landscapes on Matakana Island and this is supported.   | Revise the rules relating to Identified Natural Features and Landscapes on Matakana Island as sought.   |
|     |                     |   |         | FS 28<br>[10] | 32<br>[18] | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council<br>[Blakely Pacific Limited]    | Oppose                 | Oppose relief sought by the submitters as establishing residential allotments adjacent to or near significant ecological features can still have actual and potential effects on ecological features. These can include the effects of predation and disturbance by domestic pets, introduction of invasive plant species and garden escapes, foot and/or vehicle tracking by residents accessing the beach or other areas. The rules should be retained to require subdivision consent regardless of whether the Identified Significant Ecological Feature is within the residential allotment or the balance area. |   |
|     |                     |   |         | FS 29<br>[10] | 47<br>[18] | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Blakely Pacific Limited]                  | Support                | The submitter has identified many issues in the listed submission points consistent with the submission of TKCH.   | Accept parts of the submission where it is consistent with the relief sought by TKCH.   |
|     |                     |   |         | 11            | 3          | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council                                 | Support with Amendment | Regional Council supports the protection of natural features and landscapes within the coastal environment as this aligns with Policies in the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010 (NZCPS) and Variation 1. It is however considered that there are additional areas which may be appropriate for recognition and landscape protection in particular, the forested sand barrier, depending on further technical landscape assessment.  | Amend Section 6: Landscape, Appendix 2 and Planning Maps to give effect to the criteria in Appendix F of the Operative Regional Policy Statement and, to ensure consistency with the Operative Regional Coastal Environment Plan which identifies all of Matakana Island as being a regional significant landscape. |

|  |  |  |  |               |            |  |                        |   |  |
|--|--|--|--|---------------|------------|--|------------------------|---|--|
|  |  |  |  | FS 27<br>[11] | 63<br>[3]  | Carrus Corporation Ltd<br>[Bay Of Plenty Regional Council]               | Oppose                 | The submitter seeks further landscape amendments which go further than the plan change as notified and are more restrictive than the amendments sought by Carrus Corporation Limited. Further there is no evidence supporting such an outcome.  | Do not include additional areas for recognition and landscape protection.  |
|  |  |  |  | FS 29<br>[11] | 57<br>[3]  | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Bay Of Plenty Regional Council]                     | Oppose                 | The submitter supports many of the provisions that are opposed by TKCH. The submitter also requests many amendments that have the effect of being even more restrictive than Plan Change 46 as it relates to the Forested Sand area of the Island. Many of the requested amendments are inconsistent with the agreed position over Variation 1 to the Regional Policy Statement.<br><br>Submission point 11/21 completely disregards the facilities for access to and from the Island that TKCH has an interest in. | Reject those parts of the submission and amend the plan change consistent with the TKCH submission. Amendments to 18.3.3 should also make provision for the same opportunities for owners on the forested area.                      |
|  |  |  |  | FS 30<br>[11] | 8<br>[3]   | Blakely Pacific Ltd<br>[Bay Of Plenty Regional Council]                  | Oppose                 | The submitter seeks to amend the proposed plan change to identify additional areas for recognition and landscape protection.<br><br>The change is opposed because there is no evidential basis for the identification of any additional areas.  | That the submission point is rejected.   |
|  |  |  |  | FS 31<br>[11] | 15<br>[3]  | Te Runanga O Ngai Te Rangi Iwi Trust<br>[Bay Of Plenty Regional Council] | Support with Amendment | Support comments and alignment with NZCPS 2010 and Variation 1.   | Amend section 6 Landscape, Appendix 2 and Planning Maps to give effect to criteria in Appendix F of operative RPS and to ensure consistency with operative RCEP; which identified all of Matakana as regional significant landscape. |
|  |  |  |  | FS 32<br>[11] | 14<br>[3]  | Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai<br>[Bay Of Plenty Regional Council]              | Support with Amendment | Support comments and alignment with NZCP 2010 and Variation 1.  | Amend 5.6 Landscape, Appendix 2 and Planning Maps to give effect to criteria in Appendix F of operative RPS.   |
|  |  |  |  | 7             | 13         | TKC Holdings Limited   | Oppose                 | Matakana Island is not an outstanding landscape or natural feature itself.  | Remove S9, S9a, and S25 from Section 6 as Matakana Island is not an outstanding landscape or natural feature itself, however parts of it are highly valued in particular for its Tangata Whenua, historical and ecological values.   |
|  |  |  |  | FS 27<br>[7]  | 21<br>[13] | Carrus Corporation Ltd<br>[TKC Holdings Limited]                         | Support                | The submission is consistent with the submission made by Carrus Corporation Limited regarding the removal of S9, S9a and S25 from the Schedule of Identified Outstanding Landscape Features and this is supported.  | Remove S9, S9a and S25 from the Schedule of Identified Outstanding Landscape Features.   |
|  |  |  |  | FS 28<br>[7]  | 8<br>[13]  | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council<br>[TKC Holdings Limited]                 | Oppose                 | Oppose the deletion of the schedule of identified features. The operative Regional Coastal Environment Plan identifies the entire forested sand barrier as a "Regionally Significant Feature and Landscape" and confirmed as meeting the RPS criteria for Outstanding Natural   |  |



|     |                   |   |         |              |            |  |         |   |   |
|-----|-------------------|---|---------|--------------|------------|--|---------|---|---|
|     |                   |   |         |              |            |  |         | Landscapes and Features (Boffa Miskell, 2006). The District Plan therefore needs to be consistent with this.<br>The Landscape management areas assist in protecting the unbuilt natural character of Matakana Island from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.   |   |
| MI8 | 6.4 Activity List | 5 | General | 7            | 15         | TKC Holdings Limited   | Oppose  | The submitter opposes the restrictions imposed on its land holdings through rules 6.4.1.2, 6.4.1.3, the exclusions to the restricted discretionary activities in rule 6.4.3.1 - 6.4.3.3, and the new non-complying activity rule 6.4.5.1(a) - (c). The submitter believes the landscape values in areas S9, S9a and S25 can be effectively maintained and enhanced through a new controlled activity rule for subdivision, built form (including dwellings) and standards on earthworks. The submitters approach is consistent with the way that Council have dealt with landscape values and built form on Rangiwaea Island. | Delete rule 6.4.5.1 (a) (c) and remove all restrictions and exclusions of the Matakana Island Forested Sand Barrier from section 6 of the District Plan. Insert new controlled activity rules (6.4.2A) and a new list of matters Council can reserve control over for the purposes of imposing conditions for landscape values in part 6.6.2. The new rule should cover dwellings, accessory buildings, associated development, and subdivision. Standards should include appropriate matters such as height, reflectivity, types of glass, vegetation clearance, earthworks and servicing.<br>Or<br>Insert new restricted discretionary activity rules. The new rules should provide for dwellings, accessory buildings, associated development, and subdivision. Matters such as height, reflectivity, types of glass, vegetation clearance, earthworks and servicing can be included in assessment criteria. The new restricted discretionary activity rules should be accompanied with non-notification clauses whereby applications under those rules need not be publicly notified and written approvals are not required from any party. |
|     |                   |   |         | FS 27<br>[7] | 23<br>[15] | Carrus Corporation Ltd<br>[TKC Holdings Limited]               | Support | The submission seeks the retention of production forestry as a permitted activity and a less onerous suite of rules including a controlled activity rule or a restricted discretionary activity rule with associated non-notification provisions. This is supported as the rules should be less onerous whilst still enabling Council to exercise appropriate control.  | Amendments to the provisions in 6.4 so as to provide a less onerous suite of rules including a controlled activity rule or a restricted discretionary activity rule with associated non-notification provisions.  |
|     |                   |   |         | FS 28<br>[7] | 9<br>[15]  | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council<br>[TKC Holdings Limited]       | Oppose  | Oppose the relief sought by the submitter. Matakana Island is recognised in the Regional Coastal Environment Plan and Variation 1 as having landscape and natural character values unique within the wider Bay of Plenty Region and coastal environment.  |   |
|     |                   |   |         | FS 31<br>[7] | 8<br>[15]  | Te Runanga O Ngai Te Rangi Iwi Trust<br>[TKC Holdings Limited] | Oppose  | TKCH seeks to marginalise the landscape characteristics by changing/deleting activities allowed in these areas and the impact on these areas.   | Retain as notified.   |
|     |                   |   |         | FS 32<br>[7] | 8<br>[15]  | Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai<br>[TKC Holdings Limited]              | Oppose  | Impacts not fully considered by there comments.   | Retain a notified.  |

|     |                   |   |                              |            |         |  |         |  |  |
|-----|-------------------|---|------------------------------|------------|---------|--|---------|--|--|
|     |                   |   |                              | 8          | 8       | Carrus Corporation Ltd                                   | Oppose  | Opposed the restrictions imposed on Matakana Island within the rules 6.4.1.2, 6.4.1.3, 6.4.3.1 & 6.4.3.3.  | Remove these restrictions  |
|     |                   |   |                              | FS 28 [8]  | 17 [8]  | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council [Carrus Corporation Ltd]  | Oppose  | Oppose the relief sought by the submitter as consider the permitted activity and restricted discretionary status is appropriate within an identified Natural Feature and Landscape.  |  |
|     |                   |   |                              | FS 29 [8]  | 21 [8]  | TKC Holdings Ltd [Carrus Corporation Ltd]                | Support | The submitter has identified many issues in the listed submission points consistent with the submission of TKCH.   | Accept parts of the submission where it is consistent with the relief sought by TKCH.  |
| MI8 | 6.4 Activity List | 1 | 6.4.1 - Permitted Activities | 10         | 17      | Blakely Pacific Limited                                  | Support | Permitted activity status for production forestry is consistent with the predominant existing land use on the Matakana Island sand barrier. It is appropriate in terms of the sustainable management purpose of the RMA.   | Maintain permitted activity status for production forestry in the Matakana Island Landscape Management Area (S9), the Matakana Island Open Coast (S25), and the Rural zone.                          |
|     |                   |   |                              | FS 27 [10] | 50 [17] | Carrus Corporation Ltd [Blakely Pacific Limited]         | Support | The submission is consistent with the submission made by Carrus Corporation Limited regarding the removal of S9, S9a and S25 from the Schedule of Identified Outstanding Landscape Features and this is supported.<br><br>The submission also seeks to enable production forestry as a permitted activity, and a less onerous suite of rules, and this is supported.   | Remove S9, S9a and S25 from the Schedule of Identified Outstanding Landscape Features, and make amendments to enable production forestry as a permitted activity, and a less onerous suite of rules. |
|     |                   |   |                              | FS 28 [10] | 31 [17] | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council [Blakely Pacific Limited] | Support | Regional Council supports the retention of Production forestry as a permitted activity in S9 and S25. Production forestry forms part of the landscape and rural character of Matakana Island. Regional Council also recognises that production forestry can be a useful screen for built development if designed accordingly. Conversely, if production forestry is removed, for example for pastoral farming, this can expose built development to public view.   |  |
|     |                   |   |                              | FS 29 [10] | 46 [17] | TKC Holdings Ltd [Blakely Pacific Limited]               | Support | The submitter has identified many issues in the listed submission points consistent with the submission of TKCH.   | Accept parts of the submission where it is consistent with the relief sought by TKCH.  |
|     |                   |   |                              | 11         | 11      | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council                           | Support | The amendment to 6.4.1.2 provides for earthwork restrictions within a 50 m Landscape Management Area (LMA) inland from MHWS in S9 - Matakana Island. This is consistent with the Wairoa River LMA and Tauranga Harbour LMAs (S7 and S8).<br>S9 - Matakana Island has also been added to 6.4.1.3 and this will result in additional restrictions between 50m and 300m inland from MHWS. This will provide a higher level of control over: earthworks, building heights, reflectivity, mirror glass and indigenous vegetation clearance. | Retain 6.4.1.2 and 6.4.1.3 as notified.  |

|  |  |  |  |            |         |   |         |   |   |
|--|--|--|--|------------|---------|---|---------|---|---|
|  |  |  |  | 11         | 9       | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council                          | Support | This section acknowledges the importance of Identified Outstanding Landscape Features' also referred to as Identified Natural Features and Landscapes. These are listed in Appendix 2 and illustrated on Planning Maps. The Plan Change provides specific restrictions on development within updated Matakana Island Natural Features and Landscapes. These areas have been updated in Planning Maps and Appendix 2 (S25 - Matakana Island is new).<br>Rule 6.4.1.1 (a) provides a permitted activity status for Production forestry in Natural Features and Landscapes S9 and S25 - Matakana Island.<br>The permitted activity status provided for production forestry in Rule 6.4.1.1 as this activity forms part of the landscape and rural character of Matakana Island. Regional Council also recognises that production forestry can be a useful screen for built development if designed accordingly. Conversely, if production forestry is removed, for example for pastoral farming, this can expose built development to public view. | Retain 6.4.1.1 (a) as notified.   |
|  |  |  |  | FS 27 [11] | 66 [9]  | Carrus Corporation Ltd [Bay Of Plenty Regional Council] | Support | The submitter seeks retention or clarification of rules to ensure that production forestry is a permitted activity and this is supported.   | Retain and/or clarify rules to ensure that production forestry is a permitted activity.   |
|  |  |  |  | FS 27 [11] | 68 [11] | Carrus Corporation Ltd [Bay Of Plenty Regional Council] | Oppose  | The submitter seeks to retain 6.4.1.2 and 6.4.1.3 as notified and this is opposed as they are considered too restrictive.   | Amend 6.4.1.2 and 6.4.1.3 as sought by Carrus Corporation Limited.  |
|  |  |  |  | FS 29 [11] | 63 [9]  | TKC Holdings Ltd [Bay Of Plenty Regional Council]       | Oppose  | The submitter supports many of the provisions that are opposed by TKCH. The submitter also requests many amendments that have the effect of being even more restrictive than Plan Change 46 as it relates to the Forested Sand area of the Island. Many of the requested amendments are inconsistent with the agreed position over Variation 1 to the Regional Policy Statement.<br><br>Submission point 11/21 completely disregards the facilities for access to and from the Island that TKCH has an interest in.   | Reject those parts of the submission and amend the plan change consistent with the TKCH submission. Amendments to 18.3.3 should also make provision for the same opportunities for owners on the forested area. |
|  |  |  |  | FS 29 [11] | 65 [11] | TKC Holdings Ltd [Bay Of Plenty Regional Council]       | Oppose  | The submitter supports many of the provisions that are opposed by TKCH. The submitter also requests many amendments that have the effect of being even more restrictive than Plan Change 46 as it relates to the Forested Sand area of the Island. Many of the requested amendments are inconsistent with the agreed position over Variation 1 to the Regional Policy Statement.  | Reject those parts of the submission and amend the plan change consistent with the TKCH submission. Amendments to 18.3.3 should also make provision for the same opportunities for owners on the forested area. |

|     |                   |   |   |            |         |   |                        |   |  |
|-----|-------------------|---|---|------------|---------|---|------------------------|---|--|
|     |                   |   |   |            |         |   |                        | Submission point 11/21 completely disregards the facilities for access to and from the Island that TKCH has an interest in.   |  |
|     |                   |   |   | 14         | 5       | Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai                                 | Support                | Support the provisions as notified.   | Retain 6.4.1 as notified.  |
|     |                   |   |   | FS 29 [14] | 86 [5]  | TKC Holdings Ltd [Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai]              | Support with Amendment | The submitter supports 6.4.1.1(a) as it relates to production forestry. This is consistent with the intent of TKCH's submission to better provide for production forestry in the context of PC 46.  | Accept the part of the submission where it is consistent with the relief sought by TKCH as it relates to permitting production forestry on Matakana Island.  |
|     |                   |   |   | 15         | 5       | Poka, Donna   | Support                | Support the provisions as notified.   | Retain 6.4.1 as notified.  |
|     |                   |   |   | FS 29 [15] | 119 [5] | TKC Holdings Ltd [Poka, Donna]                          | Oppose                 | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. The intent of the submission appears to request making no provision for further living opportunities on the forested sand area of the Island, apart from the suggestion to have a density of dwellings at 1 per 100ha of land in a subdivision.<br><br>Submission appears to be made after the 4pm closing period.  | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.   |
|     |                   |   |   | 7          | 14      | TKC Holdings Limited                                    | Support                | The submitter supports rule 6.4.1.1(a) that permits production forestry in areas shown as S9 and S25. This rule should also apply to area S9a. This rule should prevail over the natural environment rules.   | Retain rule 6.4.1.1(a).  |
|     |                   |   |   | FS 27 [7]  | 22 [14] | Carrus Corporation Ltd [TKC Holdings Limited]           | Support                | The submission seeks the retention of production forestry as a permitted activity and a less onerous suite of rules including a controlled activity rule or a restricted discretionary activity rule with associated non-notification provisions. This is supported as the rules should be less onerous whilst still enabling Council to exercise appropriate control.  | Amendments to the provisions in 6.4 so as to provide a less onerous suite of rules including a controlled activity rule or a restricted discretionary activity rule with associated non-notification provisions.   |
| MI8 | 6.4 Activity List | 2 | 6.4.3 - Restricted Discretionary Activities | 11         | 10      | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council                          | Support with Amendment | An amendment is requested to avoid any ambiguity that might arise given the explanation in 6.4.1 Permitted Activities which states:<br>In addition to those activities listed as Permitted in the respective zone but excluding those listed as Restricted Discretionary in 6.4.3, the following are permitted activities:<br>In 6.4.3 of the Operative District Plan Production Forestry is listed as a Restricted Discretionary Activity in two sub-sections being 6.4.3.1 (e) and 6.4.3.2 (e). | Include the words (excluding Matakana Island) in 6.4.3.1 (e) and 6.4.3.2 (e) to clarify that production forestry on Matakana Island is a Permitted Activity and not a Restricted Discretionary Activity, as for the rest of the District. (e) Production Forestry (excluding Matakana Island). |
|     |                   |   |   | FS 27 [11] | 67 [10] | Carrus Corporation Ltd [Bay Of Plenty Regional Council] | Support                | The submitter seeks retention or clarification of rules to ensure that production forestry is a permitted activity and this is supported.   | Retain and/or clarify rules to ensure that production forestry is a permitted activity.  |



|     |                   |   |                                  |            |         |   |                        |   |   |
|-----|-------------------|---|----------------------------------|------------|---------|---|------------------------|---|---|
|     |                   |   |                                  | FS 29 [11] | 64 [10] | TKC Holdings Ltd [Bay Of Plenty Regional Council] | Oppose                 | The submitter supports many of the provisions that are opposed by TKCH. The submitter also requests many amendments that have the effect of being even more restrictive than Plan Change 46 as it relates to the Forested Sand area of the Island. Many of the requested amendments are inconsistent with the agreed position over Variation 1 to the Regional Policy Statement.<br><br>Submission point 11/21 completely disregards the facilities for access to and from the Island that TKCH has an interest in. | Reject those parts of the submission and amend the plan change consistent with the TKCH submission. Amendments to 18.3.3 should also make provision for the same opportunities for owners on the forested area. |
|     |                   |   |                                  | 14         | 6       | Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai                           | Support                | Support the proposed changes to 6.4.3.  | Retain as notified.   |
|     |                   |   |                                  | FS 29 [14] | 91 [6]  | TKC Holdings Ltd [Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai]        | Oppose                 | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. The intent of the submission appears to request making no provision for further living opportunities on the forested sand area of the Island.<br><br>Submission appears to be made after the 4pm closing period.  | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.  |
|     |                   |   |                                  | 15         | 6       | Poka, Donna                                       | Support                | Support the proposed changes to 6.4.3.  | Retain as notified.   |
|     |                   |   |                                  | FS 29 [15] | 120 [6] | TKC Holdings Ltd [Poka, Donna]                    | Oppose                 | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. The intent of the submission appears to request making no provision for further living opportunities on the forested sand area of the Island, apart from the suggestion to have a density of dwellings at 1 per 100ha of land in a subdivision.<br><br>Submission appears to be made after the 4pm closing period.  | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.  |
|     |                   |   |                                  | 16         | 8       | Department of Conservation                        | Support                | The proposed amendments to these lists to exclude the Matakana Island Open Coast (S25) Natural Feature and Landscape from 6.4.3.1 and the Matakana Island Landscape Management Area (S9) from 6.4.3.2 and 6.4.3.3 is supported as recognising the importance of the natural character and landscape values of this coastal area and providing for its protection.   | Retain as notified.   |
|     |                   |   |                                  | FS 29 [16] | 151 [8] | TKC Holdings Ltd [Department of Conservation]     | Oppose                 | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. Although TKCH opposes the submissions made by the Department, many of the issues can be worked through as a design matter. TKCH agrees with the Department that public access needs to be considered.   | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.  |
| MI8 | 6.4 Activity List | 3 | 6.4.4 - Discretionary Activities | 11         | 12      | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council                    | Support with Amendment | 6.4.4.1 and 6.4.4.2 state that solid fences exceeding 1.2m in height within 300m of MHWS in S9- Matakana Island LMA will  | Retain 6.4.4.1, 6.4.4.2 and 6.4.4.3 as notified, but add an additional provision to recognise the ability of existing small   |

|     |                   |   |                                  |               |            |  |   |   |   |
|-----|-------------------|---|----------------------------------|---------------|------------|--|---|---|---|
|     |                   |   |                                  |               |            |  | be discretionary activities.<br>6.4.4.3 clarifies that activities which are not listed as non-complying (new activity status) shall default to discretionary. Regional Council requests consideration be given to an exemption, or other provision, for existing residential or small allotments to continue to live and use their land without being unduly affected by the proposed LMA provisions (for example if a property only extends back from the coast a certain distance). | landowners to utilise their land (within certain parameters).   |   |
|     |                   |   |                                  | FS 27<br>[11] | 69<br>[12] | Carrus Corporation Ltd<br>[Bay Of Plenty Regional Council] | Support   | The submitter seeks provisions to enable exemptions to 6.4.4.1, 6.4.4.2 and 6.4.4.3 to recognise the ability of existing small landowners to utilise their land and this is supported.  | If restrictive provisions 6.4.4.1, 6.4.4.2 and 6.4.4.3 are retained, amend them to recognise the ability of existing small landowners to utilise their land (within certain parameters).                        |
|     |                   |   |                                  | FS 29<br>[11] | 66<br>[12] | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Bay Of Plenty Regional Council]       | Oppose  | The submitter supports many of the provisions that are opposed by TKCH. The submitter also requests many amendments that have the effect of being even more restrictive than Plan Change 46 as it relates to the Forested Sand area of the Island. Many of the requested amendments are inconsistent with the agreed position over Variation 1 to the Regional Policy Statement.<br><br>Submission point 11/21 completely disregards the facilities for access to and from the Island that TKCH has an interest in. | Reject those parts of the submission and amend the plan change consistent with the TKCH submission. Amendments to 18.3.3 should also make provision for the same opportunities for owners on the forested area. |
|     |                   |   |                                  | 14            | 7          | Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai                                    | Support   | Support the provisions.   | Retain as notified.   |
|     |                   |   |                                  | FS 29<br>[14] | 92<br>[7]  | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai]              | Oppose  | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. The intent of the submission appears to request making no provision for further living opportunities on the forested sand area of the Island.<br><br>Submission appears to be made after the 4pm closing period.  | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.  |
|     |                   |   |                                  | 15            | 7          | Poka, Donna  | Support   | Support the provisions.   | Retain as notified.   |
|     |                   |   |                                  | FS 29<br>[15] | 121<br>[7] | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Poka, Donna]                          | Oppose  | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. The intent of the submission appears to request making no provision for further living opportunities on the forested sand area of the Island, apart from the suggestion to have a density of dwellings at 1 per 100ha of land in a subdivision.<br><br>Submission appears to be made after the 4pm closing period.  | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.  |
| MI8 | 6.4 Activity List | 4 | 6.4.5 - Non Complying Activities | 10            | 19         | Blakely Pacific Limited                                    | Oppose  | Provisions that fail to make it clear whether a subdivision that contains all Identified Natural Features and Landscapes entirely within the "balance   | Revise rules to make it clear that subdivision consent is required under Section 6 only where an Identified Natural Features and Landscapes is  |

|     |                           |   |   |               |            |   |  |  |   |
|-----|---------------------------|---|---|---------------|------------|---|--|--|---|
|     |                           |   |   |               |            |   | area" (i.e. the new residential allotments avoid all INFLs) would require subdivision consent under Section 6. | located within a new residential allotment and not where all Identified Natural Features and Landscapes are located within the "balance area".   |   |
|     |                           |   |   | FS 27<br>[10] | 52<br>[19] | Carrus Corporation Ltd<br>[Blakely Pacific Limited] | Support  | The submission seeks revisions to the rules relating to Identified Natural Features and Landscapes on Matakana Island and this is supported.   | Revise the rules relating to Identified Natural Features and Landscapes on Matakana Island as sought.   |
|     |                           |   |   | 14            | 8          | Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai                             | Support  | Support the provisions in 6.4.5.   | Retain as notified.   |
|     |                           |   |   | FS 29<br>[14] | 93<br>[8]  | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai]       | Oppose   | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. The intent of the submission appears to request making no provision for further living opportunities on the forested sand area of the Island.<br><br>Submission appears to be made after the 4pm closing period.   | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.  |
|     |                           |   |   | 15            | 8          | Poka, Donna   | Support  | Support the provisions in 6.4.5.   | Retain as notified.   |
|     |                           |   |   | FS 29<br>[15] | 122<br>[8] | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Poka, Donna]                   | Oppose   | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. The intent of the submission appears to request making no provision for further living opportunities on the forested sand area of the Island, apart from the suggestion to have a density of dwellings at 1 per 100ha of land in a subdivision.<br><br>Submission appears to be made after the 4pm closing period. | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.  |
|     |                           |   |   | 16            | 9          | Department of Conservation                          | Support  | The classification of buildings, dwellings and additional lots from subdivision as non-complying activities is supported as recognising the constraints to development within 50m of MHWS.   | Retain as notified.   |
|     |                           |   |   | FS 29<br>[16] | 152<br>[9] | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Department of Conservation]    | Oppose   | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. Although TKCH opposes the submissions made by the Department, many of the issues can be worked through as a design matter. TKCH agrees with the Department that public access needs to be considered.  | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.  |
| MI9 | 6.6 Matters of Discretion | 1 | 6.6.1 - Assessment criteria for Restricted Discretionary Activities | 11            | 13         | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council                      | Support with Amendment   | Consideration should be given to enhancing the recognition of views to Matakana Island forested areas from Bowentown and Mauao.  | Amend 6.6.1.1(c) to read (or similar):<br><br>Activities within the Matakana Island Open Coast (S25) where such activities will be visible from the adjoining beach, waterbody and mainland (from Bowentown and Mauao).<br>The pine forest landscape, as viewed from the Harbour, open coast and mainland (including Mauao and Bowentown) is valued by residents of the Island and the mainland, and visitors and it contributes to the character of Matakana Island. |

|  |  |  |  |               |            |  |                        |   |   |
|--|--|--|--|---------------|------------|--|------------------------|---|---|
|  |  |  |  | FS 26<br>[11] | 16<br>[13] | Faulkner, Cathryn<br>[Bay Of Plenty Regional Council]                    | Oppose                 | The pine forest was not planted for its landscape value to residents of Bowentown, the Mount or anywhere else. It was planted as a production forest which means trees are eventually felled. Council fails to acknowledge that reality here.   | Disregard reference to the pine forest landscape and its contributions to the character of Matakana Island.   |
|  |  |  |  | FS 27<br>[11] | 70<br>[13] | Carrus Corporation Ltd<br>[Bay Of Plenty Regional Council]               | Oppose                 | The submitter seeks to broaden the assessment criteria under 6.6.1 and 6.6.2 and this is opposed, particularly as regards views from Mauao and the Matakana Island Plan.  | Decline the submission and do not make the amendments sought.   |
|  |  |  |  | FS 29<br>[11] | 67<br>[13] | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Bay Of Plenty Regional Council]                     | Oppose                 | The submitter supports many of the provisions that are opposed by TKCH. The submitter also requests many amendments that have the effect of being even more restrictive than Plan Change 46 as it relates to the Forested Sand area of the Island. Many of the requested amendments are inconsistent with the agreed position over Variation 1 to the Regional Policy Statement.<br><br>Submission point 11/21 completely disregards the facilities for access to and from the Island that TKCH has an interest in. | Reject those parts of the submission and amend the plan change consistent with the TKCH submission. Amendments to 18.3.3 should also make provision for the same opportunities for owners on the forested area. |
|  |  |  |  | FS 30<br>[11] | 10<br>[13] | Blakely Pacific Ltd<br>[Bay Of Plenty Regional Council]                  | Oppose                 | The submitter seeks to make activities within the Matakana Island Open Coast (S25) subject to assessment criteria if they are visible from the adjoining beach, water body and mainland.<br><br>The change is opposed because it is directed at maintaining landscape character which is incidental to the current land use on the barrier arm of the Island i.e. production forestry. This approach could be interpreted as precluding other reasonable uses of the land.  | That the submission point is rejected.  |
|  |  |  |  | FS 31<br>[11] | 17<br>[13] | Te Runanga O Ngai Te Rangi Iwi Trust<br>[Bay Of Plenty Regional Council] | Support with Amendment | 6.6.1 Assessment criteria for RDA's Enhance and Maintain the views of Matakana from Mauao and Bowentown.  | Support amendment.  |
|  |  |  |  | FS 32<br>[11] | 16<br>[13] | Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai<br>[Bay Of Plenty Regional Council]              | Support with Amendment | 6.6.1 Support assessment criteria.  | Support amendment   |
|  |  |  |  | 14            | 9          | Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai  | Support                | The proposed changes to 6.6.1 is supported.   | Retain as notified.   |
|  |  |  |  | FS 29<br>[14] | 94<br>[9]  | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai]                            | Oppose                 | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. The intent of the submission appears to request making no provision for further living opportunities on the forested sand area of the Island.<br><br>Submission appears to be made after the 4pm closing period.  | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.  |



|     |                           |   |  |            |          |  |                        |   |  |
|-----|---------------------------|---|--|------------|----------|--|------------------------|---|--|
|     |                           |   |  | 15         | 9        | Poka, Donna                                      | Support                | The proposed changes to 6.6.1 is supported.   | Retain as notified.  |
|     |                           |   |  | FS 29 [15] | 123 [9]  | TKC Holdings Ltd [Poka, Donna]                   | Oppose                 | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. The intent of the submission appears to request making no provision for further living opportunities on the forested sand area of the Island, apart from the suggestion to have a density of dwellings at 1 per 100ha of land in a subdivision.<br><br>Submission appears to be made after the 4pm closing period.  | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.   |
|     |                           |   |  | 16         | 10       | Department of Conservation                       | Support                | The proposed new provisions relating to Matakana Island are supported as recognising and providing for the values of the Matakana Island Landscape Management Areas (S9) and the Matakana Island Plan.  | Retain as notified.  |
|     |                           |   |  | FS 29 [16] | 153 [10] | TKC Holdings Ltd [Department of Conservation]    | Oppose                 | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. Although TKCH opposes the submissions made by the Department, many of the issues can be worked through as a design matter. TKCH agrees with the Department that public access needs to be considered.   | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.   |
| MI9 | 6.6 Matters of Discretion | 2 | 6.6.2 - Discretionary and Non Complying Activities - Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria for Matakana Island | 10         | 9        | Blakely Pacific Limited                          | Oppose                 | Under clause 30 of Schedule 1 to the RMA, references to the Matakana Island Plan give it legal effect as part of the Plan or Proposed Plan, which is not appropriate. The Matakana Island Plan is a background document that was not prepared for the purpose of forming part of the statutory planning framework   | Remove any references to the Matakana Island Plan from the assessment criteria in Rule 6.6.2.1.  |
|     |                           |   |  | FS 27 [10] | 42 [9]   | Carrus Corporation Ltd [Blakely Pacific Limited] | Support                | Carrus Corporation Limited agrees that references to the Matakana Island Plan should be removed from 5.6.1(b) and 6.6.2.1.  | Remove references to the Matakana Island Plan from 5.6.1(b) and 6.6.2.1.   |
|     |                           |   |  | FS 29 [10] | 39 [9]   | TKC Holdings Ltd [Blakely Pacific Limited]       | Support                | The submitter has identified many issues in the listed submission points consistent with the submission of TKCH.  | Accept parts of the submission where it is consistent with the relief sought by TKCH.  |
|     |                           |   |  | 11         | 14       | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council                   | Support with Amendment | 6.6.2.1 sets out assessment criteria for discretionary and non-complying activities on Matakana Island (this then applies to S9 and S25). It requires Council to consider the vision, principles and implementation strategies included in the adopted Matakana Island Plan. Regional Council acknowledges the general guidance provided by the Matakana Island Plan but also requests that this be supported by relevant assessment criteria within the District Plan. Regional Council considers that a robust assessment should be required given Matakana Islands landscape and natural | Amend 6.6.2 as follows (or similar):<br>The matters listed in 6.6.1.3 and, 18.5.8 and the following matters shall be used as a guide for assessing Discretionary and Non Complying Activities:<br>(a) relevant objectives and policies of the District Plan.<br>(b) the vision, principles and implementation strategies included in the adopted Matakana Island Plan. |

|  |  |  |               |             |   |         |   |   |
|--|--|--|---------------|-------------|---|---------|---|---|
|  |  |  |               |             | character values as provided for in Variation 1 and the RCEP. |         |   |   |
|  |  |  | FS 27<br>[11] | 71<br>[14]  | Carrus Corporation Ltd<br>[Bay Of Plenty Regional Council]    | Oppose  | The submitter seeks to broaden the assessment criteria under 6.6.1 and 6.6.2 and this is opposed, particularly as regards views from Mauao and the Matakana Island Plan.  | Decline the submission and do not make the amendments sought.   |
|  |  |  | FS 29<br>[11] | 68<br>[14]  | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Bay Of Plenty Regional Council]          | Oppose  | The submitter supports many of the provisions that are opposed by TKCH. The submitter also requests many amendments that have the effect of being even more restrictive than Plan Change 46 as it relates to the Forested Sand area of the Island. Many of the requested amendments are inconsistent with the agreed position over Variation 1 to the Regional Policy Statement.<br><br>Submission point 11/21 completely disregards the facilities for access to and from the Island that TKCH has an interest in. | Reject those parts of the submission and amend the plan change consistent with the TKCH submission. Amendments to 18.3.3 should also make provision for the same opportunities for owners on the forested area. |
|  |  |  | 14            | 10          | Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai                                       | Support | The proposed changes align with the Hapu Management Plan and the Matakana Island Plan.  | Retain as notified.   |
|  |  |  | FS 29<br>[14] | 95<br>[10]  | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai]                 | Oppose  | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. The intent of the submission appears to request making no provision for further living opportunities on the forested sand area of the Island.<br><br>Submission appears to be made after the 4pm closing period.  | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.  |
|  |  |  | 15            | 10          | Poka, Donna   | Support | The proposed changes align with the Hapu Management Plan and the Matakana Island Plan.  | Retain as notified.   |
|  |  |  | FS 29<br>[15] | 124<br>[10] | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Poka, Donna]                             | Oppose  | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. The intent of the submission appears to request making no provision for further living opportunities on the forested sand area of the Island, apart from the suggestion to have a density of dwellings at 1 per 100ha of land in a subdivision.<br><br>Submission appears to be made after the 4pm closing period.  | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.  |
|  |  |  | 16            | 11          | Department of Conservation                                    | Support | The proposed new provisions relating to Matakana Island are supported as recognising and providing for the values of the Matakana Island Landscape Management Areas (S9) and the Matakana Island Plan.  | Retain as notified.   |
|  |  |  | FS 29<br>[16] | 154<br>[11] | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Department of Conservation]              | Oppose  | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. Although TKCH opposes the submissions made by the   | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.  |

|      |  |   |  |            |         |  |   |   |  |
|------|--|---|--|------------|---------|--|---|---|--|
|      |  |   |  |            |         |  | Department, many of the issues can be worked through as a design matter. TKCH agrees with the Department that public access needs to be considered. |   |  |
|      |  |   |  | 7          | 16      | TKC Holdings Limited                                     | Oppose  | Part 6.6.2 of the Plan Change contains assessment criteria for activities considered to be a discretionary or non-complying activity. Although this section of the District Plan is largely related to the management of areas Council considers to be outstanding landscape features, the proposed assessment criteria contains a number of provisions for assessing other matters. For example it asks for an assessment on aspects such strategies in the Matakana Island Plan. These items have little or nothing to do with landscape value and therefore should be deleted. | Amend 6.6.2 to matters only relating to ecology. Delete references to unrelated or subjective matters (such as the Matakana Island Plan).  |
|      |  |   |  | FS 27 [7]  | 24 [16] | Carrus Corporation Ltd [TKC Holdings Limited]            | Support   | The submission seeks to refine the proposed assessment criteria in 6.6.2 and this is supported.   | Refine the proposed assessment criteria in 6.6.2 as sought.  |
|      |  |   |  | FS 28 [7]  | 10 [16] | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council [TKC Holdings Limited]    | Oppose  | Oppose the relief sought as Matakana Island has special landscape attributes and is unique within the wider Bay of Plenty Region and coastal environment. It is therefore considered the matters of discretion and assessment criteria extend beyond those of ecology sought by the submitter.  |  |
| MI10 | Appendix 2 - Schedule of Natural Features and Landscapes | 1 | Appendix 2 - Schedule of Natural Features and Landscapes | 10         | 16      | Blakely Pacific Limited                                  | Oppose  | Oppose the identification of Matakana Island Landscape Management Area (S9) and Matakana Island Open Coast (S25). There is no evidential basis for the extent of these areas.   | Delete S9 and S25 from the Schedule of Identified Natural Features and Landscapes in Appendix 2.   |
|      |  |   |  | FS 27 [10] | 49 [16] | Carrus Corporation Ltd [Blakely Pacific Limited]         | Support   | The submission is consistent with the submission made by Carrus Corporation Limited regarding the removal of S9, S9a and S25 from the Schedule of Identified Outstanding Landscape Features and this is supported.<br><br>The submission also seeks to enable production forestry as a permitted activity, and a less onerous suite of rules, and this is supported.  | Remove S9, S9a and S25 from the Schedule of Identified Outstanding Landscape Features, and make amendments to enable production forestry as a permitted activity, and a less onerous suite of rules. |
|      |  |   |  | FS 28 [10] | 30 [16] | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council [Blakely Pacific Limited] | Oppose  | Oppose the deletion of the schedule of identified features. The operative Regional Coastal Environment Plan identifies the entire forested sand barrier as a "Regionally Significant Feature and Landscape" and confirmed as meeting the RPS criteria for Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Features (Boffa Miskell, 2006). The District Plan therefore needs to be consistent with this.<br><br>The Landscape management areas assist in protecting the unbuild natural character of Matakana Island from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.                       |  |

|  |  |  |  |               |             |  |                        |   |   |
|--|--|--|--|---------------|-------------|--|------------------------|---|---|
|  |  |  |  | FS 29<br>[10] | 45<br>[16]  | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Blakely Pacific Limited]              | Support                | The submitter has identified many issues in the listed submission points consistent with the submission of TKCH.  | Accept parts of the submission where it is consistent with the relief sought by TKCH.   |
|  |  |  |  | 11            | 15          | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council                             | Support with Amendment | Regional Council supports the increase (40m to 50m) from MHWS for the more restrictive S9 LMA area. The addition of S25 Matakana Island Open Coast is also supported as this illustrates that the Plan Change has had regard to and is consistent with Variation 1 to the RPS. An amendment has been made to remove S24 from the Planning Maps if it has been replaced by S25.  | Retain S25 in Schedule 2 and in Planning Maps as notified. Remove S24 Open Coastal Landscape Landward Edge Protection Yard in Appendix 2 if this has been superseded by S25 -.Matakana Island Open Coast.       |
|  |  |  |  | FS 27<br>[11] | 72<br>[15]  | Carrus Corporation Ltd<br>[Bay Of Plenty Regional Council] | Oppose                 | The submitter seeks the retention of the identified Natural Features and Landscapes/Outstanding Landscape Features and this is opposed.   | Amend identified Natural Features and Landscapes/Outstanding Landscape Features as sought by Carrus Corporation Limited.  |
|  |  |  |  | FS 29<br>[11] | 69<br>[15]  | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Bay Of Plenty Regional Council]       | Oppose                 | The submitter supports many of the provisions that are opposed by TKCH. The submitter also requests many amendments that have the effect of being even more restrictive than Plan Change 46 as it relates to the Forested Sand area of the Island. Many of the requested amendments are inconsistent with the agreed position over Variation 1 to the Regional Policy Statement.<br><br>Submission point 11/21 completely disregards the facilities for access to and from the Island that TKCH has an interest in. | Reject those parts of the submission and amend the plan change consistent with the TKCH submission. Amendments to 18.3.3 should also make provision for the same opportunities for owners on the forested area. |
|  |  |  |  | 14            | 11          | Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai                                    | Support                | Supports the proposed changes as it recognise the fragile environment, especially S25.  | Retain as notified.   |
|  |  |  |  | FS 29<br>[14] | 96<br>[11]  | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai]              | Oppose                 | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. The intent of the submission appears to request making no provision for further living opportunities on the forested sand area of the Island.<br><br>Submission appears to be made after the 4pm closing period.  | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.  |
|  |  |  |  | 15            | 11          | Poka, Donna  | Support                | Supports the proposed changes as it recognise the fragile environment, especially S25.  | Retain as notified.   |
|  |  |  |  | FS 29<br>[15] | 125<br>[11] | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Poka, Donna]                          | Oppose                 | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. The intent of the submission appears to request making no provision for further living opportunities on the forested sand area of the Island, apart from the suggestion to have a density of dwellings at 1 per 100ha of land in a subdivision.<br><br>Submission appears to be made after the  | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.  |



|  |  |  |            |          |   |                     |  |  |
|--|--|--|------------|----------|---|---------------------|--|--|
|  |  |  |            |          |   | 4pm closing period. |  |  |
|  |  |  | 16         | 12       | Department of Conservation                                  | Support             | The amendment to S9 (Matakana Island Management Area) and the addition of S25 (Matakana Island Open Coast) are supported as recognising and providing protection to these Outstanding Landscape Features.  | Retain as notified.  |
|  |  |  | FS 29 [16] | 155 [12] | TKC Holdings Ltd [Department of Conservation]               | Oppose              | The submitter supports a number of provisions that are not consistent with the submissions of TKCH. Although TKCH opposes the submissions made by the Department, many of the issues can be worked through as a design matter. TKCH agrees with the Department that public access needs to be considered.                          | Reject the submission where it is inconsistent with the relief sought by TKCH.   |
|  |  |  | 7          | 11       | TKC Holdings Limited  | Oppose              | Most recent landscape assessment completed for the Island by Isthmus Group Limited (dated August 2011) stated that Matakana Island is not an outstanding landscape or natural feature itself, however parts of it are highly valued in particular for its Tangata Whenua, historical and ecological values.                        | Remove S9, S9a, and S25 from the Schedule of Identified Outstanding Landscape Features as Matakana Island is not an outstanding landscape or natural feature itself. |
|  |  |  | FS 26 [7]  | 3 [11]   | Faulkner, Cathryn [TKC Holdings Limited]                    | Support             | Council has identified certain Outstanding Landscape features but this is in contradiction to the report Council commissioned from Isthmus Group (Aug.2011) where it stated "Matakana Island is not an outstanding landscape or natural feature itself... etc". Isthmus are presumably the experts and their words should prevail. | Remove those areas identified as Outstanding Landscape Features from plans and maps.   |
|  |  |  | FS 27 [7]  | 19 [11]  | Carrus Corporation Ltd [TKC Holdings Limited]               | Support             | The submission is consistent with the submission made by Carrus Corporation Limited regarding the removal of S9, S9a and S25 from the Schedule of Identified Outstanding Landscape Features and this is supported.   | Remove S9, S9a and S25 from the Schedule of Identified Outstanding Landscape Features.   |
|  |  |  | FS 31 [7]  | 5 [11]   | Te Runanga O Ngai Te Rangi Iwi Trust [TKC Holdings Limited] | Oppose              | Appendix 2: Schedule of Natural Features and Landscapes. Reconfirms Matakana as outstanding landscape. Aligns with RCEP and RPS. Matakana identified in RCEP as regional significant landscape.  | Retain as notified.  |
|  |  |  | FS 32 [7]  | 5 [11]   | Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai [TKC Holdings Limited]              | Oppose              | Appendix 2 - Reconfirming Matakana as outstanding landscape. Aligns with RCEP and RPS. Matakana identified in RCEP as a regional significant landscape.  | Retain as notified.  |
|  |  |  | 8          | 9        | Carrus Corporation Ltd                                      | Oppose              | As there is no evidence to support this arbitrary overlay, remove areas S9, S9a and S25 from the planning maps and Appendix 2 - Schedule of Natural Features and Landscapes.   | Remove areas S9, S9a and S25 from the planning maps and Appendix 2 - Schedule of Natural Features and Landscapes.  |
|  |  |  | FS 28 [8]  | 18 [9]   | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council [Carrus Corporation Ltd]     | Oppose              | Oppose the deletion of the schedule of identified features. The operative Regional Coastal Environment Plan identifies the entire forested sand barrier as a "Regionally Significant Feature and   |  |

|      |           |   |                                 |            |        |   |         |   |   |
|------|-----------|---|---------------------------------|------------|--------|---|---------|---|---|
|      |           |   |                                 |            |        |   |         | Landscape" and confirmed as meeting the RPS criteria for Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Features (Boffa Miskell, 2006). The District Plan therefore needs to be consistent with this.<br>The Landscape management areas assist in protecting the unbuilt natural character of Matakana Island from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.  |   |
|      |           |   |                                 | FS 29 [8]  | 22 [9] | TKC Holdings Ltd [Carrus Corporation Ltd]               | Support | The submitter has identified many issues in the listed submission points consistent with the submission of TKCH.  | Accept parts of the submission where it is consistent with the relief sought by TKCH.   |
| MI11 | Plan Maps | 1 | Significant Ecological Features | 11         | 8      | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council                          | Support | Matakana Island is within the coastal environment. Policy 11 of the NZCPS identifies characteristics of indigenous biodiversity that should be protected in the coastal environment.<br>Ecological values on Matakana Island have significance under the RPS criteria. They also meet the criteria for National Priorities for the protection of indigenous biodiversity on private land (MfE and DOC 2007).<br>In accordance with method 53A of the Proposed Regional Policy Statement (RPS), Regional Council has undertaken an assessment of the indigenous biodiversity areas in the coastal environment and classified those that meet the criteria in Policy 11 of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010. This technical work (Significant Natural Areas in the Coastal Environment, 2012, Wildland Consultants Limited) included an assessment of biodiversity sites using criteria contained in Appendix F, Set 3: Indigenous Vegetation and Habitats of Indigenous Fauna in the Operative RPS. | Retain the identified Significant Ecological Features on the Planning Maps as notified.   |
|      |           |   |                                 | FS 27 [11] | 65 [8] | Carrus Corporation Ltd [Bay Of Plenty Regional Council] | Support | The submitter seeks the retention of the identified Significant Ecological Areas and this is opposed.   | Amend identified Significant Ecological Areas as sought by Carrus Corporation Limited.  |
|      |           |   |                                 | FS 29 [11] | 62 [8] | TKC Holdings Ltd [Bay Of Plenty Regional Council]       | Oppose  | The submitter supports many of the provisions that are opposed by TKCH. The submitter also requests many amendments that have the effect of being even more restrictive than Plan Change 46 as it relates to the Forested Sand area of the Island. Many of the requested amendments are inconsistent with the agreed position over Variation 1 to the Regional Policy Statement.<br><br>Submission point 11/21 completely disregards the facilities for access to and from the Island that TKCH has an interest in.   | Reject those parts of the submission and amend the plan change consistent with the TKCH submission. Amendments to 18.3.3 should also make provision for the same opportunities for owners on the forested area. |
|      |           |   |                                 | 24         | 2      | Federated Farmers                                       | Oppose  | The proposed Significant Ecological Features maps do not accurately reflect the extent of land that is currently in production forestry. This in turn presents  | Amend the Significant Ecological Features Maps - MI 2,5,12,14,15,18,19,27 to include all current plantation forestry consistent with  |

|  |  |  |  |               |            |   |                      |  |   |
|--|--|--|--|---------------|------------|---|----------------------|--|---|
|  |  |  |  |               |            | an ETS liability for land that is currently in production forestry. Existing use rights should prevail here and to force a land owner into a situation of ETS liability is not consistent with central government policy. | existing use rights. |  |   |
|  |  |  |  | FS 28<br>[24] | 47<br>[2]  | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council<br>[Federated Farmers]   | Oppose               | Oppose the relief sought by the submitter, it is inappropriate to map the existing plantation forestry as a significant ecological feature. To be identified as a Significant Ecological Feature must meet a threshold. The bulk of Identified Significant Ecological Features do not include active forestry, and where forestry is occurring within SEF then there needs to be consideration of ways to manage a progressive process to remove production forestry from Identified Significant Ecological Features. Some areas may not be subject to Emissions Trading Scheme liability. |   |
|  |  |  |  | FS 29<br>[24] | 163<br>[2] | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Federated Farmers]   | Support              | The submitter requests that the Significant Ecological Features maps are amended to avoid ETS liability for the forested area of the Island. TKCH supports the intent of the submission to permit forestry to avoid these potential liabilities.   | Accept the part of the submission where it is consistent with the relief sought by TKCH as it relates to permitting production forestry on Matakana Island.   |
|  |  |  |  | 7             | 5          | TKC Holdings Limited  | Oppose               | The maps do not accurately reflect the extent of the land used for production forestry including the drip line extent necessary for the landowners ETS obligations. The request for ecological areas needs to be balanced with the ETS regulations imposed by central government (they need consistent application)  | Review, reduce and amend the Significant Ecological Features Schedule in Appendix 1 for the Matakana Island Forested Sand Barrier to reflect the need to address the landowners forestry operations and reasonable land use change. |
|  |  |  |  | FS 27<br>[7]  | 13<br>[5]  | Carrus Corporation Ltd<br>[TKC Holdings Limited]  | Support              | The submission seeks to review, reduce and amend the Significant Ecological Features Maps and Schedules for the Matakana Island Forested Sand Barrier to reflect the need to address the landowners' forestry operations and reasonable land use change and that is supported.   | Amendments to the Significant Ecological Features Maps and Schedules for the Matakana Island Forested Sand Barrier to reflect the need to address the landowners' forestry operations and reasonable land use change.               |
|  |  |  |  | FS 28<br>[7]  | 3<br>[5]   | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council<br>[TKC Holdings Limited]  | Oppose               | Oppose the relief sought by the submitter. The SEFs identified on Matakana, for the most part, exclude the main areas of production forestry, with the possible exception of the seaward side of the barrier arm. All SEFs have been identified for their significant biodiversity values, including those areas with old plantation trees still within them, and therefore are worthy of protection. Sites are identified as either meeting or not meeting the threshold for identification as significant under Section 6 (c) of the RMA.  |   |

|      |           |   |                                |               |            |   |                        |   |  |
|------|-----------|---|--------------------------------|---------------|------------|---|------------------------|---|--|
|      |           |   |                                | FS 30<br>[7]  | 6<br>[5]   | Blakely Pacific Ltd<br>[TKC Holdings Limited]               | Support                | The submitter seeks to review, reduce and amend the Identified Significant Ecological Features maps and schedules for the Matakana Island forested sand barrier to reflect forestry operations and reasonable land use change.<br><br>The change is supported because it will ensure that all identified areas have values that warrant protection as a Identified Significant Ecological Feature.  | That the submission point is accepted.   |
| MI11 | Plan Maps | 2 | Outstanding Landscape Features | 10            | 15         | Blakely Pacific Limited                                     | Oppose                 | Oppose the identification of Matakana Island Landscape Management Area (S9) and Matakana Island Open Coast (S25). There is no evidential basis for the extent of these areas.   | Delete S9 and S25 from the planning maps.  |
|      |           |   |                                | FS 27<br>[10] | 48<br>[15] | Carrus Corporation Ltd<br>[Blakely Pacific Limited]         | Support                | The submission is consistent with the submission made by Carrus Corporation Limited regarding the removal of S9, S9a and S25 from the Schedule of Identified Outstanding Landscape Features and this is supported.<br><br>The submission also seeks to enable production forestry as a permitted activity, and a less onerous suite of rules, and this is supported.  | Remove S9, S9a and S25 from the Schedule of Identified Outstanding Landscape Features, and make amendments to enable production forestry as a permitted activity, and a less onerous suite of rules. |
|      |           |   |                                | FS 28<br>[10] | 29<br>[15] | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council<br>[Blakely Pacific Limited] | Oppose                 | Oppose the deletion of the schedule of identified features. The operative Regional Coastal Environment Plan identifies the entire forested sand barrier as a "Regionally Significant Feature and Landscape" and confirmed as meeting the RPS criteria for Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Features (Boffa Miskell, 2006). The District Plan therefore needs to be consistent with this.<br>The Landscape management areas assist in protecting the unbuild natural character of Matakana Island from inappropriate subdivision, use and development. |  |
|      |           |   |                                | FS 29<br>[10] | 44<br>[15] | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Blakely Pacific Limited]               | Support                | The submitter has identified many issues in the listed submission points consistent with the submission of TKCH.  | Accept parts of the submission where it is consistent with the relief sought by TKCH.  |
|      |           |   |                                | 11            | 16         | Bay Of Plenty Regional Council                              | Support with Amendment | A new NFL: S25 Matakana Island Open Coast has been proposed. The identification of S25 supports recognition that Matakana Island is the largest sand barrier island in New Zealand with unique dune characteristics which have high natural character values.   | Retain S25 in the Planning Maps as notified.<br>Remove S24 Open Coastal Landscape Landward Edge Protection Yard from the Maps as it has been superseded by S25 -Matakana Island Open Coast.          |
|      |           |   |                                | FS 27<br>[11] | 73<br>[16] | Carrus Corporation Ltd<br>[Bay Of Plenty Regional Council]  | Oppose                 | The submitter seeks the retention of the identified Natural Features and Landscapes/Outstanding Landscape Features and this is opposed.   | Amend identified Natural Features and Landscapes/Outstanding Landscape Features as sought by Carrus Corporation Limited.   |
|      |           |   |                                | FS 29<br>[11] | 70<br>[16] | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Bay Of Plenty Regional Council]        | Oppose                 | The submitter supports many of the provisions that are opposed by TKCH. The submitter also requests many amendments that have the effect of being   | Reject those parts of the submission and amend the plan change consistent with the TKCH submission. Amendments to 18.3.3 should also make provision for the  |



|  |  |  |           |         |   |  |   |  |
|--|--|--|-----------|---------|---|--|---|--|
|  |  |  |           |         |   | <p>even more restrictive than Plan Change 46 as it relates to the Forested Sand area of the Island. Many of the requested amendments are inconsistent with the agreed position over Variation 1 to the Regional Policy Statement.</p> <p>Submission point 11/21 completely disregards the facilities for access to and from the Island that TKCH has an interest in.</p> | <p>same opportunities for owners on the forested area.</p>  |  |
|  |  |  | 2         | 4       | Taikato, Easton   | Support with Amendment   | <p>Update the maps with the additional and updated cultural and other significant areas of tangata whenua importance.</p>   |  |
|  |  |  | FS 27 [2] | 2 [4]   | Carrus Corporation Ltd [Taikato, Easton]                    | Oppose   | <p>The submission seeks updated maps with additional/updated cultural and other significant areas of tangata whenua importance and it is not known whether this affects the land owned by Scorpions Limited or not.</p>   | <p>Do not add cultural and other significant areas of tangata whenua importance to the land owned by Scorpions Limited.</p>  |
|  |  |  | FS 29 [2] | 5 [4]   | TKC Holdings Ltd [Taikato, Easton]                          | Oppose   | <p>It is difficult to ascertain what the submitter is seeking.</p> <p>The submitter is looking to introduce additional (by undefined) cultural areas onto the planning maps. TKCH is not aware what sites the submitter is referring to as none are attached to the submission.</p>   | <p>Reject this part of the submission.</p>   |
|  |  |  | FS 30 [2] | 3 [4]   | Blakely Pacific Ltd [Taikato, Easton]                       | Oppose   | <p>The submitter seeks to update the maps with additional cultural and other significant areas of tangata whenua importance.</p> <p>The change is opposed because there is no evidential basis for the identification of any additional areas.</p>  | <p>That the submission point is rejected.</p>  |
|  |  |  | 7         | 12      | TKC Holdings Limited  | Oppose   | <p>Plan Change 46/Variation 2 contains planning maps showing areas of what Council considers to be Outstanding Landscape Features through notations S9, S9a and S25. However the most recent landscape assessment completed by Isthmus Group Limited (dated August 2011) states that Matakana Island is not an outstanding landscape or natural feature itself, however parts of it are highly valued in particular for its Tangata Whenua, historical and ecological values.</p> | <p>Remove S9, S9a, and S25 from the District Plan maps as Matakana Island is not an outstanding landscape or natural feature itself, however parts of it are highly valued in particular for its Tangata Whenua, historical and ecological values.</p> |
|  |  |  | FS 27 [7] | 20 [12] | Carrus Corporation Ltd [TKC Holdings Limited]               | Support  | <p>The submission is consistent with the submission made by Carrus Corporation Limited regarding the removal of S9, S9a and S25 from the Schedule of Identified Outstanding Landscape Features and this is supported.</p>   | <p>Remove S9, S9a and S25 from the Schedule of Identified Outstanding Landscape Features.</p>  |
|  |  |  | FS 31 [7] | 7 [12]  | Te Runanga O Ngai Te Rangi Iwi Trust [TKC Holdings Limited] | Oppose   | <p>Oppose TCKH's position with Isthmus report. No longer current. It is outdated, August 2011. RCEP and RPS have current updates.</p>   | <p>Retain as notified.</p>   |

|  |  |  |  |              |            |   |                           |   |  |
|--|--|--|--|--------------|------------|---|---------------------------|---|--|
|  |  |  |  | FS 32<br>[7] | 7<br>[12]  | Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai<br>[TKC Holdings Limited]             | Oppose                    | Report is flawed, old and one-sided.<br>RCEP more appropriate, up to date<br>document.  | Retain as notified.  |
|  |  |  |  | FS 32<br>[7] | 10<br>[12] | Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai<br>[TKC Holdings Limited]             | Oppose                    | Rural - explanatory statement.  | Retain as notified.  |
|  |  |  |  | 8            | 1          | Carrus Corporation Ltd  | Oppose                    | The map showing the proposed<br>outstanding landscape features is not<br>what has been agreed, following<br>mediations with regard to the Regional<br>Policy Statement.   | Update the District Plan maps so that it is<br>consistent with the map produced<br>through the RPS mediations. |
|  |  |  |  | 8            | 11         | Carrus Corporation Ltd  | Oppose                    | There are already provisions that apply<br>with these areas. The planning maps<br>show overlay areas S9, S9a & S25, which<br>are considered to be outstanding<br>landscape features. These areas had<br>previously been identified as the opposite.   | Remove S9, S9a and S25 from the<br>District Plan Maps.   |
|  |  |  |  | FS 28<br>[8] | 19<br>[11] | Bay Of Plenty Regional<br>Council<br>[Carrus Corporation Ltd] | Oppose                    | Oppose the deletion of the schedule of<br>identified features. The operative<br>Regional Coastal Environment Plan<br>identifies the entire forested sand barrier<br>as a "Regionally Significant Feature and<br>Landscape" and confirmed as meeting<br>the RPS criteria for Outstanding Natural<br>Landscapes and Features (Boffa Miskell,<br>2006). The District Plan therefore needs<br>to be consistent with this.<br>The Landscape management areas assist<br>in protecting the unbuilt natural character<br>of Matakana Island from inappropriate<br>subdivision, use and development. |  |
|  |  |  |  | FS 28<br>[8] | 13<br>[1]  | Bay Of Plenty Regional<br>Council<br>[Carrus Corporation Ltd] | Support with<br>Amendment | Support in part noting that the RPS<br>matters concern natural character and<br>those within the District Plan relate to<br>Identified Significant Ecological Areas.  |  |
|  |  |  |  | FS 29<br>[8] | 24<br>[11] | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Carrus Corporation Ltd]                  | Support                   | The submitter has identified many issues<br>in the listed submission points consistent<br>with the submission of TKCH.  | Accept parts of the submission where it<br>is consistent with the relief sought by<br>TKCH.                    |
|  |  |  |  | FS 29<br>[8] | 14<br>[1]  | TKC Holdings Ltd<br>[Carrus Corporation Ltd]                  | Support                   | The submitter has identified many issues<br>in the listed submission points consistent<br>with the submission of TKCH.  | Accept parts of the submission where it<br>is consistent with the relief sought by<br>TKCH.                    |