

## Appendix 1 - Evaluation of Rezoning Submissions – Corrections (S158), Matakā Station (S230), The Landing (S183), Motukiekie Island (S32)

Submission No/Point No.	Site Address	Decision Requested	Submitter Reasons	Nature of pre-hearing correspondence or submitter pre-circulated evidence (if any)	Rezoning Criteria	Officer's Comment	Costs and Benefits of accepting rezoning request
Department of Corrections (S158.011)	Northland Regional Corrections Facility (NRCF), Kaikohe	Apply a Corrections Special Purpose Zone (SPZ) to the NRCF (Lot 1 DP 365989).	The application of the Rural Production Zone (RPROZ) for the site is inconsistent with modern planning practice for management of custodial corrections sites and that a Corrections SPZ, in tandem with the designation over the site, is necessary to ensure the NRCF is appropriately provided for in the PDP.	<p><b>Pre-hearing meetings</b> Informal pre-hearing meetings and correspondence to discuss issues and refine provisions as detailed in section 42A report.</p> <p><b>Pre-circulated evidence</b> <a href="#">S Grace, Planning Evidence</a> which includes Proposed Corrections SPZ provisions as Appendix 1 of Mr Grace's evidence and an evaluation of the rezoning proposal in accordance with section 32AA and Minute 14 Criteria.</p>	<p><b>Strategic direction</b></p> <p><b>Alignment with zone outcomes</b></p> <p><b>Higher order direction</b></p> <p><b>Reasons for the request</b></p> <p><b>Assessment of site suitability and potential effects of rezoning</b></p> <p><b>Infrastructure (three waters) servicing</b></p> <p><b>Transport infrastructure</b></p> <p><b>Consultation and further submissions</b></p> <p><b>Other relevant matters</b></p> <p><b>National planning standards criteria:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Significance to the district, region or country; and</li> <li>• Is it impractical to be managed through another zone; and</li> <li>• Is it impractical to be managed through a combination of spatial layers</li> </ul> <p><b>Relationship with Part 2 – District wide Matters</b></p> <p><b>Consultation on the Special Purpose Zone proposal</b></p> <p><b>Special Purpose Zone provisions</b></p> <p><b>Section 32AA evaluation</b></p>	<p>Refer Table 5, Section 6 of Appendix 2 of Mr Grace's Planning Evidence.</p> <p>Refer Table 5, Section 6 of Appendix 2 of Mr Grace's Planning Evidence.</p> <p>Refer Section 4 and Table 5, Section 6 of Appendix 2 of Mr Grace's Planning Evidence.</p> <p>Refer Table 5, Section 6 of Appendix 2 of Mr Grace's Planning Evidence.</p> <p>Refer Table 5, Section 6 of Appendix 2 of Mr Grace's Planning Evidence.</p> <p>Refer Table 5, Section 6 of Appendix 2 of Mr Grace's Planning Evidence.</p> <p>Refer Table 5, Section 6 of Appendix 2 of Mr Grace's Planning Evidence.</p> <p>N/A.</p> <p>Refer Section 4.1 and Table 6, Section 6 of Appendix 2 of Mr Grace's Planning Evidence.</p> <p>Refer Section 2 and Table 6, Section 6 of Appendix 2 to Mr Grace's Planning Evidence.</p> <p>Refer Table 6, Section 6 of Appendix 2 to Mr Grace's Planning Evidence.</p> <p>Refer Table 6, Section 6 of Appendix 2 to Mr Grace's Planning Evidence.</p> <p>Refer Sections 5.1 and 5.2 of Appendix 2 of Mr Grace's Planning Evidence.</p>	<p><b>Costs –</b> I consider that some further amendments to the Corrections SPZ provisions proposed by Corrections are necessary to make the provisions more targeted to the NRCF, including removing provisions for activities that are not anticipated or appropriate within the SPZ and to limit the provision for residential development. With these recommended amendments, I do not anticipate any costs from rezoning the NRCF to a Corrections Special Purpose Zone.</p> <p><b>Benefits –</b> The National Planning Standards 2019 specifically anticipate a Corrections SPZ as a “standard SPZ”. The NRCF is aligned with the description of a “standard SPZ” and it is appropriate to rezone the NRCF as a Corrections SPZ.</p> <p>The intent of the proposed provisions requested by the Department of Corrections will provide more targeted objectives and policies for the NRCF, to enable specific custodial and non-custodial activities within the SPZ, and the adoption of some RPROZ rules and standards will ensure activities of the Corrections SPZ are compatible with the character and amenity of the surrounding RPROZ.</p> <p><b>Risks of acting or not acting</b> N/A – I consider that there is sufficient and certain information to act through the provisions as a Corrections SPZ is anticipated by the National Planning Standards and adopted in other district plans.</p>

## Appendix 1 - Evaluation of Rezoning Submissions – Corrections (S158), Matakā Station (S230), The Landing (S183), Motukiekie Island (S32)

					Refer also section 3.2.1 of section 42A report where I broadly concur with the section 32AA evaluation provided by Mr Grace in Appendix 2 of his evidence. I also consider that my recommended amendments are an appropriate, effective, and efficient way to achieve the relevant PDP objectives in accordance with Section 32AA of the RMA.	
<b>Recommendation</b>  Rezone NRCF site from RPROZ to a Corrections Special Purpose Zone. Accept in part original submission and further submissions.						

## Appendix 1 - Evaluation of Rezoning Submissions – Corrections (S158), Matakā Station (S230), The Landing (S183), Motukiekie Island (S32)

Submission No/Point No.	Site Address	Decision Requested	Submitter Reasons	Nature of pre-hearing correspondence or submitter pre-circulated evidence (if any)	Rezoning Criteria <i>[Delete criteria in red text (which is only relevant for SPZs) if not relevant]</i>	Officer's Comment	Costs and Benefits of accepting rezoning request
Matakā Residents Association (S230.001) and thirty other submitters	Matakā Station, Purerua Peninsula, Bay of Islands	Inclusion of a new Special Purpose Zone (SPZ) for a Matakā Station Precinct that recognises and enables the construction of residential dwellings within buildable areas, as recognised by the consented Matakā Scheme subdivision.  Following discussions with the submitter, it was subsequently agreed that an SPZ would not be appropriate and instead a Matakā Station Precinct is sought.	Objectives, policies, and rules that are specific to the Matakā Precinct are sought to enable residential activity and buildings as a permitted activity where they are in accordance with the consented Matakā Scheme and located on the consented house sites. Specific provisions are also sought to enable farming, conservation, recreation and common facilities where they are in accordance with the consented Matakā Scheme	Informal pre-hearing meetings and correspondence to discuss issues and refine provisions as detailed in section 42A report. Site visit with Mr Williams and Ms Absolum on 12 June 2025.  <b>Pre-circulated evidence</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><a href="#">Peter Hall, Planning Evidence</a></li><li><a href="#">John Goodwin, Landscape Evidence</a></li><li><a href="#">Evan Williams, Corporate Evidence</a></li></ul>	<b>Strategic direction</b>	Refer paragraphs 224 to 227 of Mr Hall's Planning Evidence.	Analysis of the costs and benefits of each option (being Section 42A provisions and recommendations alone, a Precinct, or a Development Area) is provided in a Table in Section 3.2.2 of the Section 42A Report. This table, in conjunction with Mr Hall's assessment of the most appropriate spatial layer at paragraphs 62 to 90 of his evidence, outlines the key costs and benefits of each option. These are further summarised below.  <b>Costs:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Another bespoke spatial layer in the PDP adds complexity</li><li>The National Planning Standards description for precinct is focused on modifying the underlying zone (rather than overlay).</li></ul> <b>Benefits:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Provides greater certainty of outcomes</li><li>Enables the vision for Matakā Station to be articulated and delivered through bespoke provisions</li><li>Most of the underlying RPROZ and overlay provisions still apply (including all objectives and policies) with the exception of specified rules</li><li>Greater certainty that residential development can occur in accordance with that anticipated under the existing resource consents.</li></ul> <b>Risks of acting or not acting</b> N/A – I consider that there is sufficient and certain information to act through the provisions as these are based on a consented development that has been subject to previous landscape and other assessments. Further, the provisions work in tandem with the provisions for underlying zoning and overlays except in specific circumstances to provide for residential development anticipated through the existing consents.
					<b>Alignment with zone outcomes</b>	Refer paragraphs 228 to 230 of Mr Hall's Planning Evidence.	
					<b>Higher order direction</b>	Refer paragraphs 231 to 296 of Mr Hall's Planning Evidence.	
					<b>Reasons for the request</b>	Refer paragraphs 297 and 298 of Mr Hall's Planning Evidence.	
					<b>Assessment of site suitability and potential effects of rezoning</b>	Refer paragraphs 299 to 306 of Mr Hall's Planning Evidence.	
					<b>Infrastructure (three waters) servicing</b>	N/A – water supply and wastewater treatment addressed on-site.	
					<b>Transport infrastructure</b>	N/A – internal transport infrastructure already developed.	
					<b>Consultation and further submissions</b>	Refer paragraphs 307 to 311 of Mr Hall's Planning Evidence.	
					<b>Other relevant matters</b>	N/A	
					<b>National planning standards criteria:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Significance to the district, region or country; and</li><li>Is it impractical to be managed through another zone; and</li><li>Is it impractical to be managed through a combination of spatial layers</li></ul>	N/A – submitters no longer seek an SPZ and instead seek a precinct.	
				<b>Relationship with Part 2 – District wide Matters</b>	N/A – submitters no longer seek an SPZ and instead seek a precinct.		
				<b>Consultation on the Special Purpose Zone proposal</b>	N/A – submitters no longer seek an SPZ and instead seek a precinct.		
				<b>Special Purpose Zone provisions</b>	N/A – submitters no longer seek an SPZ and instead seek a precinct.		
				<b>Section 32AA evaluation</b>	Refer Paragraphs 312 and 313 and Attachment Two of Mr Hall's Planning Evidence. Refer also section 3.2.2 of section 42A report where I broadly concur with the section 32AA evaluation		

## Appendix 1 - Evaluation of Rezoning Submissions – Corrections (S158), Matakā Station (S230), The Landing (S183), Motukiekie Island (S32)

						provided by Mr Hall. I also consider that my recommended amendments are an appropriate, effective, and efficient way to achieve the relevant PDP objectives in accordance with section 32AA of the RMA.	
<b>Recommendation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Retain notified zoning (RPROZ) and relevant overlays (CE, NFL) and amend PDP mapping of the Matakā Station land identified in Appendix 4 to the section 42A report to be subject to a “Matakā Station Precinct” overlay.</li> <li>Amend the PDP to include the “Matakā Station Precinct” provisions in Appendix 3.1 under the “Rural Production Zone” heading in Part 3 of the PDP. Accept in part original submissions and further submissions.</li> </ul>							

## Appendix 1 - Evaluation of Rezoning Submissions – Corrections (S158), Matakā Station (S230), The Landing (S183), Motukiekie Island (S32)

Submission No/Point No.	Site Address	Decision Requested	Submitter Reasons	Nature of pre-hearing correspondence or submitter pre-circulated evidence (if any)	Rezoning Criteria	Officer's Comment	Costs and Benefits of accepting rezoning request
MLP LLC (S183.001)	The Landing, Purerua Peninsula, Bay of Islands	<p>Insert a new Special Purpose Zone (SPZ) for "The Landing Precinct", including objectives, policies, and rules specific to The Landing Precinct.</p> <p>Following discussions with the submitter, it was subsequently agreed that an SPZ would not be appropriate and instead "The Landing Precinct" is being requested as an alternative spatial layer.</p>	<p>A specific SPZ/Precinct is sought to recognise and enable the construction of residential dwellings within the residential lots authorised by The Landing Scheme subdivision. MLP LLC seek to enable residential activity and buildings as a permitted activity where they are within a residential lot, and to enable farming, conservation, recreation and common facilities where they are in accordance with the Landing Scheme.</p>	<p><b>Pre-hearing meetings</b> Informal pre-hearing meetings and correspondence to discuss issues and refine provisions as detailed in section 42A report. Site visit with Mr Jones and Ms Absolum on 12 June 2025.</p> <p><b>Pre-circulated evidence</b> MLP LLP provided planning, architecture, and landscape/visual evidence as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="#">Vijay Lala, Planning Evidence</a> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="#">V Lala, Planning Evidence Attachment 1</a></li> <li><a href="#">V Lala, Planning Evidence Attachment 2</a></li> </ul> </li> <li><a href="#">Pip Cheshire, Architecture Evidence</a> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="#">P Cheshire, Architecture evidence Attachment 1</a></li> </ul> </li> <li><a href="#">Gavin Lister, Landscape/Visual Evidence</a> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="#">G Lister, Landscape Evidence Attachment 1</a></li> <li><a href="#">G Lister, Landscape Evidence Attachment 2</a></li> <li><a href="#">G Lister, Landscape Evidence Attachment 3</a></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<b>Strategic direction</b>	Refer Paragraphs 7.1 to 7.4 of Mr Lala's Planning Evidence	<p>Analysis of the costs and benefits of each option for The Landing (being Section 42A provisions and recommendations alone, a Precinct, or a Development Area) is the same as that for Matakā Station as outlined in the Section 3.2.2 of the Section 42A Report. Mr Lala has also provided an evaluation of the costs and benefits of the different rezoning and spatial layer options in Appendix 2 of his evidence.</p> <p>As a result of this analysis, the preferred option to apply a precinct spatial layer to The Landing. The specific costs and benefits of this option are summarised below.</p> <p><b>Costs –</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Another bespoke spatial layer in the PDP adds complexity</li> <li>The National Planning Standards description for precinct is focused on modifying the underlying zone (rather than overlay).</li> </ul> <p><b>Benefits –</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides greater certainty of outcomes</li> <li>Enables the vision for The Landing to be articulated and delivered through bespoke provisions</li> <li>Most of the underlying RPROZ and overlay provisions still apply (including all objectives and policies) with the exception of specified rules Greater certainty that residential development can occur in accordance with that anticipated under the existing resource consents.</li> </ul> <p><b>Risks of acting or not acting</b> As articulated in the section 42A report, there are a number of outstanding issues and potential uncertainties associated with The Landing Precinct which primarily relate to Precinct Plan 1 and the Architectural and Landscape Design Guidelines. Acting through the provisions without addressing these outstanding matters creates the risks of development that is not aligned that that anticipated through the approved resource consents and/or implementation issues for FNDC.</p>
					<b>Alignment with zone outcomes</b>	Refer Paragraphs 7.5 to 7.7 of Mr Lala's Planning Evidence	
					<b>Higher order direction</b>	Refer Paragraph 7.8 of Mr Lala's Planning Evidence	
					<b>Reasons for the request</b>	Refer Paragraphs 7.9 to 7.11 of Mr Lala's Planning Evidence	
					<b>Assessment of site suitability and potential effects of rezoning</b>	Refer Paragraphs 7.12 to 7.14 of Mr Lala's Planning Evidence	
					<b>Infrastructure (three waters) servicing</b>	Refer Paragraph 7.15 of Mr Lala's Planning Evidence	
					<b>Transport infrastructure</b>	Refer Paragraph 7.16 of Mr Lala's Planning Evidence	
					<b>Consultation and further submissions</b>	Refer Paragraph 7.17 and Section 12 of Mr Lala's Planning Evidence	
					<b>Other relevant matters</b>	N/A	
					<b>National planning standards criteria:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significance to the district, region or country; and</li> <li>Is it impractical to be managed through another zone; and</li> <li>Is it impractical to be managed through a combination of spatial layers</li> </ul>	N/A – submitter no longer requests an SPZ and requests a precinct instead.	
					<b>Relationship with Part 2 – District wide Matters</b>	N/A – submitter no longer requests an SPZ and requests a precinct instead.	
					<b>Consultation on the Special Purpose Zone proposal</b>	N/A – submitter no longer requests an SPZ and requests a precinct instead.	
					<b>Special Purpose Zone provisions</b>	N/A – submitter no longer requests an SPZ and requests a precinct instead.	
					<b>Section 32AA evaluation</b>	Refer 7.18 and Section 12 of Mr Lala's Planning Evidence. Refer also section 3.2.2 of section 42A report where I broadly concur with the section 32AA evaluation provided by Mr Lala. I also consider that my recommended amendments are an appropriate,	

## Appendix 1 - Evaluation of Rezoning Submissions – Corrections (S158), Matakā Station (S230), The Landing (S183), Motukiekie Island (S32)

						effective, and efficient way to achieve the relevant PDP objectives in accordance with section 32AA of the RMA.	
<b>Recommendation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Accept <u>in principle</u> the request the request for a new “The Landing Precinct” to be included in the PDP, subject to a number of issues being adequately addressed as detailed in the section 42A report. My position on this submission will be confirmed in response to rebuttal evidence from MLP LLC.</li> <li>Amend the provisions for “The Landing Precinct” as set out in Appendix 3.3 and also address the outstanding matters identified in the section 42A report, including the updates to the Precinct Plan 1 and the Architectural and Landscape Design Guidelines.</li> </ul>							

## Appendix 1 - Evaluation of Rezoning Submissions – Corrections (S158), Matakā Station (S230), The Landing (S183), Motukiekie Island (S32)

Submission No/Point No.	Site Address	Decision Requested	Submitter Reasons	Nature of pre-hearing correspondence or submitter pre-circulated evidence (if any)	Rezoning Criteria	Officer's Comment	Costs and Benefits of accepting rezoning request
Mr Lewis Thomas Grant, Mr Jake Ryan Lockwood, Mr Luke Stephen Lockwood and Mr Stephen Graham Lockwood - S32.001 and S32.002	Motukiekie Island, Parcel ID - 4946022	Amend the Moturoa Island Zone to include appropriate references to Motukiekie Island, or alternatively, create a new Motukiekie Island Zone that is consistent with the approach taken for the Moturoa Island Zone. In either case, amend in accordance with submission S32.001 and identify an appropriate number of building platforms on Motukiekie Island to enable additional development.	The Motukiekie Owners consider the Natural Open Space Zone inappropriate for Motukiekie Island, as it does not reflect the island's private ownership, existing residential use, or the nature of its vegetation and built development. They note that the zone is overly restrictive, particularly in not enabling residential activity, and may have been applied in error due to a misunderstanding about the island's ownership history. The owners consider that either applying the Moturoa Island Zone or creating a similar Motukiekie Island Zone would better enable sustainable management, support their conservation efforts, and more appropriately achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan.	<b>Pre-hearing meetings</b> Refer to Appendix 6.  Pre-circulated evidence  The initial approach outlined in the primary evidence was modified by the submitter because of Council feedback. The amended approach is outlined in the supplementary evidence and the submitters recommended precinct provisions are outlined in " <i>Rural Production Zone – PRECX – Motukiekie Island Precinct</i> ".  <a href="#">James Hook, Planning evidence</a>  <a href="#">J Hook, Planning evidence Attachments 2-4</a>  <a href="#">J Hook, Planning evidence Attachment 5</a>  <a href="#">J Hook, Supplementary statement of evidence</a>  <a href="#">Michael Farrow, Landscape evidence</a>  <a href="#">M Farrow, Landscape evidence Attachments</a>  <a href="#">M Farrow, Landscape evidence Landscape and Character assessment</a>  <a href="#">M Farrow, Second supplementary statement of evidence</a>  <a href="#">J Carpenter, Archaeology and Historic Heritage assessment</a>  <a href="#">Rural Production Zone – PRECX – Motukiekie Island Precinct</a>	Strategic direction	See " <i>J Hook, Supplementary statement of evidence</i> "	Costs – Addressed in the S.42A Report
					Alignment with zone outcomes	See " <i>J Hook, Supplementary statement of evidence</i> "	
					Higher order direction	See " <i>J Hook, Supplementary statement of evidence</i> "	
					Reasons for the request	See " <i>J Hook, Supplementary statement of evidence</i> "	Benefits – Addressed in the S.42A Report
					Assessment of site suitability and potential effects of rezoning	See " <i>J Hook, Supplementary statement of evidence</i> "	
					Infrastructure (three waters) servicing	See " <i>J Hook, Supplementary statement of evidence</i> "	
					Transport infrastructure	See " <i>J Hook, Supplementary statement of evidence</i> "	Risks of acting or not acting - Addressed in the S.42A Report
					Consultation and further submissions	See " <i>J Hook, Supplementary statement of evidence</i> "	
					Other relevant matters	None.	
					National planning standards criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significance to the district, region or country; and</li> <li>Is it impractical to be managed through another zone; and</li> <li>Is it impractical to be managed through a combination of spatial layers</li> </ul>	The submitters alternative approach no longer involves a SPZ, however they have also addressed these criteria. See " <i>J Hook, Supplementary statement of evidence</i> "	
					Relationship with Part 2 – District wide Matters	The submitters alternative approach no longer involves a SPZ, however they have also addressed these criteria. See " <i>J Hook, Supplementary statement of evidence</i> "	
					Consultation on the Special Purpose Zone proposal	The submitters alternative approach no longer involves a SPZ, however they have also addressed these criteria. See " <i>J Hook,</i>	

## Appendix 1 - Evaluation of Rezoning Submissions – Corrections (S158), Matakā Station (S230), The Landing (S183), Motukiekie Island (S32)

						Supplementary statement of evidence"	
					Special Purpose Zone provisions	The submitters alternative approach no longer involves a SPZ, however they have also addressed these criteria. See "J Hook, Supplementary statement of evidence"	
					Section 32AA evaluation	I concur with the evidence provided on behalf of the submitter see "J Hook, Supplementary statement of evidence"	
<b>Recommendation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rezone Motukiekie Island to Rural Production zone with a Motukiekie Island Precinct. Accept in part the original submission and further submissions in support.</li> </ul>							