Appendix 2.1 – Officer's Recommended Decisions on Submissions (General Residential Zone)

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S554.003	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited	General / Process	Oppose	This is a fundamental flaw within the options assessment to provide for future urban growth over the 10-year life cycle of the pFNDP. The s32 report has inadequately considered all viable options and therefore the assessment is skewed in relation to determination of the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act. Residential Growth within the pFNDP is provided solely through infill development and increasing the intensity of the development within the existing Residential zone and Rural Residential zone while allowing for residential activities within the Mixed-Use zone. This is a less efficient and more uncertain way to provide for growth. Infill development can be less feasible and occurs in a more ad hoc way and at lesser scale meaning that comprehensive outcomes in relation to infrastructure upgrades, new road, parks etc are more difficult to fund and deliver. Relying on rural residential areas to provide for future growth beyond the current foreseeable plan period is inefficient and likely to generate greater adverse environmental effects with respect to reverse sensitivity, the provision of infrastructure and urban amenities such as parks and cycleways. Because of the value of	Amend FNDC Urban Section 32 Report to include a fourth option to zone rural land to urban where it can be shown that servicing can be provided in the future.	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				rural lifestyle land, it is likely to more costly to develop this land. Costly land development does not contribute to achieving an improvement in housing affordability.				
FS29.39	Trent Simpkin		Support	I agree with zoning rural land to urban where it can be shown that servicing can be provided in the future. This allows for the district to grow and developments to happen which improves our district further, rather than choking growth.	Allow		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS172.340	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons stated in this primary submission.	Allow		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS36.093	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency		Oppose	Opposes the proposed rezoning/ intensification of the approximately 197ha "Brownlie Land Precinct" until there is a clearer understanding on how the proposal affects the safety, efficiency, and effectiveness of the land transport system. There needs to be clear documentation of what transport infrastructure/ upgrades/mitigation measures are needed to avoid, remedy or mitigate effects on the transport system, triggers for necessary infrastructure development and how the infrastructure will be funded. The proposed rezoning needs to ensure that it includes details as to how the proposed transport network will provide active modes and support the longer term development of public transport.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission until appropriate analysis and information has been provided for the proposed rezonings (inferred).	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS32.006	Jeff Kemp		Support in part	The submitter supports the overall intent and purpose of the original submission as it is the only viable and practical option to enable planned and coordinated development in and around Kerikeri and the Waipapa area. The submitter notes that the	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to consideration of traffic movements, flood mitigation measures and amending the zoning as	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				documentation on proposed traffic movements is unclear. The original submission has not provided details on potential traffic movements and intersections for Waitotara Dive and Waipapa Road and how these might link to State Highway 10. For example, it is unclear if the new link from State Highway 10 through to the Kerikeri Town Centre is going to be a primary route and the link through to Waipapa Road a secondary route. The submitter notes it is unclear if the proposed flood mitigation measures will increase or reduce flooding along Waitotara Drive. The submitter also supports the proposed zoning as depicted within the original submission is an efficient use of land.		depicted in the original submission.		
FS389.008	Smartlife Trust		Oppose	All of submission S544 in relation to the proposed Structure Plan for the landholding. In particular, the documents / plans which refer to a future access point through the Further Submitters land.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS389.009	Smartlife Trust		Oppose	All of submission S554 in relation to the proposed Structure Plan for the landholding. In particular, the documents / plans which refer to a future access point through the Further Submitters land	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
S559.038	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rēhia	General / Process	Support	In Kerikeri we have 'the working poor' and many of these workers have been squeezed out to surrounding towns because they cannot afford to rent or buy at home in Kerikeri. This is exemplified for hapū members and those wanting to move home or are already here that cannot afford to buy or rent in their own rohe regardless of	Insert a new Inclusionary Housing chapter or insert provisions in the Subdivision, General Residential Zone chapters that allow for a percentage share of the estimated value of the sale of the subdivided lots to a nominated Community Housing Provider within the relevant urban area.		Reject	Key Issue: Inclusionary Housing

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				wage and income ability. Some of us do not have access to papakainga whenua; and for some our papakainga whenua is far from the services of the Kerikeri township and they need to be closer to those services. The proposed amendment would provide developer contributions to assist with the establishment of affordable housing, something that is drastically needed in Kerikeri.				
FS151.346	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject	Key Issue: Inclusionary Housing
FS243.023	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose	Kāinga Ora endorses the need to address affordability within the Far North District. However, Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought. The Queenstown Lakes District Council Inclusionary Housing Plan Change remains incomplete and submissions on the plan change are yet to be heard. There have been no hearings on the plan change, and therefore the approach proposed by the Council is not confirmed. Majority of the submissions made on the QLDC Plan Change opposes the approach taken by the Council and several of those submissions are questioning the legality of the provisions within the RMA framework	Disallow	Disallow	Accept	Key Issue: Inclusionary Housing
FS277.5	Jenny Collison		Support	A Community Housing Provider would be better placed to provide housing and support than the blanket Kaianga Ora approach, to provide much-needed housing	Allow		Reject	Key Issue: Inclusionary Housing
FS570.2228	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is	Reject	Key Issue: Inclusionary Housing

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
						consistent with our original submission		
FS348.065	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept	Key Issue: Inclusionary Housing
FS566.2242	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Inclusionary Housing
FS569.2264	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Inclusionary Housing
S559.039	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rēhia	General / Process	Support in part	In Kerikeri we have 'the working poor' and many of these workers have been squeezed out to surrounding towns because they cannot afford to rent or buy at home in Kerikeri. This is exemplified for hapū members, those wanting to move home or are already here that cannot afford to buy or rent in their own rohe regardless of wage and income ability. Some of us do not have access to papakainga whenua; and for some our papakainga whenua is far from the services of the Kerikeri township and they need to be closer to those services.	Amend to a similar approach to Queenstown Lakes District Council regarding Subdivision and land use development rules associated with contributions for affordable housing.		Reject	Key Issue: Inclusionary Housing
FS151.347	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject	Key Issue: Inclusionary Housing
FS243.024	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose	Kāinga Ora endorses the need to address affordability within the Far North District. However, Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought. The Queenstown Lakes District Council Inclusionary Housing Plan Change remains incomplete and submissions	Disallow	Disallow	Accept	Key Issue: Inclusionary Housing

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				on the plan change are yet to be heard. There have been no hearings on the plan change, and therefore the approach proposed by the Council is not confirmed. Majority of the submissions made on the QLDC Plan Change opposes the approach taken by the Council and several of those submissions are questioning the legality of the provisions within the RMA framework				
FS570.2229	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Inclusionary Housing
FS348.066	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept	Key Issue: Inclusionary Housing
FS566.2243	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Inclusionary Housing
FS569.2265	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Inclusionary Housing
S560.004	Jane E Johnston	General / Process	Oppose	There is a need to provide for accommodation that is affordable and accessible to work, education and recreation opportunities. Accommodation as per the PDP fails to provide for young adults (new entrant workers or students), as well as for the home-alone elderly. The PDP does not cater to all options or 'potential' choices for people throughout their life-cycle, in being heavily biased towards providing for 'families' rather than for individuals or other groups who may choose to	Insert a new high density residential zone which provides choice at the opposite end of the continuum from 'rural-residential', 'rural lifestyle' and 'coastal-living' as per the operative plan and does not require a commerical ground floor level.		Accept in part	Key Issue: Zone Selection

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				want to cohabitate. The requirements of a minimum size of section, a cap on the number of units able to be accommodated per section, outdoor living space and yard to boundary rules prohibit high density residential accommodation, without a relationship with 'commercial' use as provided for in the mixed-use zone.				
FS25.015	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Support	Supports the proposal to include additional housing choice by providing for high density dwellings in appropriate locations.	Allow	Allow the original submission, subject to appropriate wording.	Accept in part	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS36.002	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency		Neutral	Supports the development of high density residential zones as this supports the provision of walking/cycling and public transport in centres. However, the submitter recognises that the location and timing of this development requires careful consideration of adverse effects and wider infrastructure provision. Therefore, the submitter requests that any consideration of higher density is undertaken as part of a wider planning initiative and the submitter seeks to be involved in this process.	Allow in part	Allow the original submission in part once adequate analysis of options, alternatives, effects and infrastructure provision is undertaken.	Accept in part	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS325.011	Turnstone Trust Limited		Support	TT supports the proposal to include additional housing choice by providing for high density dwellings in appropriate location.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS325.064	Turnstone Trust Limited		Support	TT supports intensification in appropriate locations to support vitality in the key commercial areas of the District.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate wording.	Accept in part	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS348.083	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Reject in part	Key Issue: Zone Selection

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S428.008	Kapiro Residents Association	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	We support the principle of PDP provisions controlling the area of impermeable surface per site, and consider it is probably also necessary to monitor and limit the total cumulative impermeable area in residential/urban zones.	Amend to provide for greater limits on impermeable areas (and/or requirements for minimum permeable areas) for subdivision, use and development. In urban/residential zones, it will also be necessary to adopt measures to limit the cumulative total impermeable surface and/or protect a specified cumulative total permeable area.	Reject	Key Issue: Impermeable Surface
S427.069	Kapiro Residents Association	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	We agree that multi-unit developments such as terraced housing and low rise apartment blocks can contribute to the greater vibrancy of Kerikeri, and allow for the construction of a greater variety of housing types and sizes. However, one of our concerns is that the rules around outdoor space are inadequate, and there is a danger that in the drive for higher density, the planning rules will not achieve the overall goal of protecting what is valued by the community. We believe that intensification in urban zones should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings (e.g. apartment blocks) with permeable areas including garden/landscaped ground. In too many multi-unit developments in other districts, the only outdoor space is the concrete used to move and park cars. Especially where these developments take place alongside each other the importance of outdoor space increases. Outdoor spaces provide the opportunity for people to connect, to create a sense of community. When designed well, working within well designed rules, multi-unit developments could enhance the sense of community with Kerikeri and become a real asset.	Amend the PDP provisions for multi-unit developments to: -include requirements for outdoor space beyond the area needed to move and park vehicles private, including private and shared outdoor space on the north, east or west side of a building -where multi-unit developments take place alongside each other, the rules for shared 'greenspace' reflects the greater density and the need for places for people to share and connect, pedestrian walkways and access to community facilities and amenities.	Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Intensity

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S138.021	Kairos Connection Trust and Habitat for Humanity Northern Region Ltd	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	To further improve housing choices for low-moderate income households in the Far North and in addition to the amendments sought in the submission, seek that the Council consider including a separate Inclusionary Housing chapter, or integrate throughout proposed subdivision and residential and mixed use zone chapters, provision for inclusionary housing that would require a 5% share of the estimated value of the sale of subdivided lots (or as appropriate to the Far North context) to a nominated CHP to ensure the establishment of affordable housing within its high growth urban environments. The appropriate % share of lots would need to be determined for the Far North District, as it would essentially be a financial contribution condition for which a district plan policy is required under Section 108 (10).	Insert a separate Inclusionary housing chapter, or integrate throughout proposed subdivision and residential and mixed use zone chapters, provision for inclusionary housing that would require a 5% share of the estimated value of the sale of subdivided lots (or as appropriate to the Far North context) to a nominated community housing provider to ensure the establishment of affordable housing within its high growth urban environments.		Reject	Key Issue: Inclusionary Housing
FS25.016	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Oppose	Supports the aspiration of having affordable housing for low-moderate income households, it does not support the proposed inclusionary housing mechanism. No assessment has been provided of the costs and benefits of such a scheme in the Far North District to support an understanding of whether the proposal is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA or the objectives of the FNDP.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept	Key Issue: Inclusionary Housing
FS325.012	Turnstone Trust Limited		Oppose	TT does not support the proposed inclusionary housing mechanism. No assessment has been provided of the costs and benefits of such a scheme in the Far North District to support an understanding of whether the proposal is the most appropriate way to achieve	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept	Key Issue: Inclusionary Housing

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				the purpose of the RMA or the objectives of the proposed district plan.				
S522.056	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	We agree that multi-unit developments such as terraced housing and low rise apartment blocks can contribute to the greater vibrancy of Kerikeri, and allow for the construction of a greater variety of housing types and sizes. However, one of our concerns is that the rules around outdoor space are inadequate, and there is a danger that in the drive for higher density, the planning rules will not achieve the overall goal of protecting what is valued by the community. We believe that intensification in urban zones should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings (e.g. apartment blocks) with permeable areas including garden/landscaped ground. In too many multi-unit developments in other districts, the only outdoor space is the concrete used to move and park cars. Especially where these developments take place alongside each other the importance of outdoor space increases. Outdoor spaces provide the opportunity for people to connect, to create a sense of community. When designed well, working within well designed rules, multi-unit developments could enhance the sense of community with Kerikeri and become a real asset.	Amend the PDP provisions for multi-unit developments to: • include requirements for outdoor space beyond the area needed to move and park vehicles private, including private and shared outdoor space on the north, east or west side of a building • where multi-unit developments take place alongside each other, the rules for shared 'greenspace' reflects the greater density and the need for places for people to share and connect, pedestrian walkways and access to community facilities and amenities.		Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
FS243.013	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose	Kāinga Ora seek any development standards to align with the National standards for multi-unit development set out in the RMA (Medium Density Residential Standards).	Disallow	Disallow	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Intensity

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS277.47	Jenny Collison		Support	I support Vision Kerikeri submission	Allow		Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
FS566.1795	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
S338.071	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	We agree that multi-unit developments such as terraced housing and low rise apartment blocks can contribute to the greater vibrancy of Kerikeri, and allow for the construction of a greater variety of housing types and sizes. However, one of our concerns is that the rules around outdoor space are inadequate, and there is a danger that in the drive for higher density, the planning rules will not achieve the overall goal of protecting what is valued by the community. We believe that intensification in urban zones should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings (e.g. apartment blocks) with permeable areas including garden/landscaped ground. In too many multi-unit developments in other districts, the only outdoor space is the concrete used to move and park cars. Especially where these developments take place alongside each other the importance of outdoor space increases. Outdoor spaces provide the opportunity for people to connect, to create a sense of community. When designed well, working within well designed rules, multi-unit developments could enhance the sense of community with Kerikeri and become a real asset.	Amend the PDP provisions for multi-unit developments to: • include requirements for outdoor space beyond the area needed to move and park vehicles private, including private and shared outdoor space on the north, east or west side of a building • where multi-unit developments take place alongside each other, the rules for shared 'greenspace' reflects the greater density and the need for places for people to share and connect, pedestrian walkways and access to community facilities and amenities.		Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Intensity

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS243.027	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose	Kāinga Ora seek any development standards to align with the National standards for multi-unit development set out in the RMA (Medium Density Residential Standards).	Disallow	Disallow	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
FS277.46	Jenny Collison		Support	Basic to building good communities	Allow		Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
FS570.1008	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
FS566.1022	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
FS569.1044	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
S521.008	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	We support the principle of PDP provisions controlling the area of impermeable surface per site, and consider it is probably also necessary to monitor and limit the total cumulative impermeable area in residential/urban zones.	Amend to provide for greater limits on impermeable areas (and/or requirements for minimum permeable areas) for subdivision, use and development. In urban/residential zones, it will also be necessary to adopt measures to limit the cumulative total impermeable surface and/or protect a specified cumulative total permeable area.		Reject	Key Issue: Impermeable Surface
FS277.18	Jenny Collison		Support in part	To support Vision Kerikeri submission	Allow in part		Reject	Key Issue: Impermeable Surface
FS566.1718	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Impermeable Surface
S529.198	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	We agree that multi-unit developments such as terraced housing and low rise apartment blocks can contribute to the greater vibrancy of Kerikeri, and allow for the construction of a greater variety of housing types and sizes. However,	Amend the PDP provisions for multi-unit developments: • include requirements for outdoor space beyond the area needed to move and park vehicles private,		Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Intensity

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				one of our concerns is that the rules around outdoor space are inadequate, and there is a danger that in the drive for higher density, the planning rules will not achieve the overall goal of protecting what is valued by the community. We believe that intensification in urban zones should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings (e.g. apartment blocks) with permeable areas including garden/landscaped ground. In too many multi-unit developments in other districts, the only outdoor space is the concrete used to move and park cars. Especially where these developments take place alongside each other the importance of outdoor space increases. Outdoor spaces provide the opportunity for people to connect, to create a sense of community. When designed well, working within well designed rules, multi-unit developments could enhance the sense of community with Kerikeri and become a real asset.	including private and shared outdoor space on the north, east or west side of a building • where multi-unit developments take place alongside each other, the rules for shared 'greenspace' reflects the greater density and the need for places for people to share and connect, pedestrian walkways and access to community facilities and amenities.			
FS277.48	Jenny Collison		Support	Future proofing is essentail	Allow		Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
FS570.2085	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
FS566.2099	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
FS569.2121	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Intensity

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S529.054	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	We support the principle of PDP provisions controlling the area of impermeable surface per site, and consider it is probably also necessary to monitor and limit the total cumulative impermeable area in residential/urban zones.	Amend to provide for greater limits on impermeable areas (and/or requirements for minimum permeable areas) for subdivision, use and development. In urban/residential zones, it will also be necessary to adopt measures to limit the cumulative total impermeable surface and/or protect a specified cumulative total permeable area.		Reject	Key Issue: Impermeable Surface
FS570.1943	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Impermeable Surface
FS566.1957	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Impermeable Surface
FS569.1979	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Impermeable Surface
S170.004	Alec Brian Cox	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	The Rules in the Subdivision section seek to impose minimum standards on developments. In recent times, there have been a number of developments in the form of gated communities where the number of allotments exceeds the number allowed for a private accessway, where roads remain as part of the allotments. In the alternative approach of a Land Use Change, used for Retirement Villages, the subdivision rules are not enforced as there are no new allotments. In these two situations, the unit size is increased by a share of the common ground, thus permitting a more intensive development before reaching the limits. To provide an equitable situation common ground should be excluded from the net allotment size.	Amend to apply the subdivision rules to Land Use Changes which create multiple units.		Deferred to Hearing 17 Subdivision	Key Issue: Subdivision framework

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS566.493	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Deferred to Hearing 17 Subdivision	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
S561.008	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	MULTI-UNIT DEVELOPMENT	Oppose	It is considered that multi-unit developments can be in the form of detached units and attached units and a separate definition is not required. In addition to this amendment, consequential changes are sought for the rules currently referencing multi-unit development (as set out in this submission) to include provisions for three or more units to be assessed based as a Restricted Discretionary activity based on design outcomes sought. This would enable a range of multi-unit typologies - multiple standalone units, terrace housing & apartments.	Delete the definition of Multi-Unit Development		Reject	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
FS25.044	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Support	The FNDP should give effect to and implement strategic documents addressing planned growth.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
FS32.062	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	The original submission seeks to amend the FNDP in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes. The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept	Key Issue: Residential Intensity

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts. The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.				
FS325.024	Turnstone Trust Limited		Support	TT agrees that multi-unit development can include attached and detached units.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
FS23.280	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
FS47.022	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Accept	Key Issue: Residential Intensity

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document				
FS348.095	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
S328.005	Traverse Ltd	MULTI-UNIT DEVELOPMENT	Not Stated	The proposed definition for 'Multi-Unit Development' is group of two or residential units contained within one contiguous building. It is unclear why the definition requires residential units to be contained within one contiguous building.	Amend the definition of multi-unit development as follows - Means a group of two or more residential units ~~contained within one contiguous building.~~ located on the same site		Reject	Key Issue Residential Intensity
FS243.039	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Support	Kāinga Ora supports provisions that sure housing choice by enabling a range of housing typologies at various densities. Multi-unit developments can be in the form of detached units and attached units	Allow	Allow	Reject	Key Issue Residential Intensity
S400.006	BR and R Davies	MULTI-UNIT DEVELOPMENT	Oppose	The proposed definition for 'Multi-Unit Development' is group of two or residential units contained within one contiguous building. It is unclear why the definition requires residential units to be contained within one contiguous building.	Amend the definition of multi-unit development as follows - Means a group of two or residential units ~~contained within one contiguous building.located on the same site~~		Reject	Key Issue Residential Intensity
FS243.040	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Support	Kāinga Ora supports provisions that sure housing choice by enabling a range of housing typologies at various densities. Multi-unit developments can be in the form of detached units and attached units.	Allow	Amend	Reject	Key Issue Residential Intensity
S413.001	Roman Catholic Bishop of the Diocese of Auckland	MULTI-UNIT DEVELOPMENT	Oppose	i)National Planning Standards do not define Multi-Unit Development. ii)The definition chosen by FNDC is too rigid and is contrary to the objective to enable different types of residential developments in the district.	Amend it to mean: a **development** ~~group~~ of ~~two~~ **three** or more residential units contained within one contiguous ~~building~~ **site**.		Accept in part	Key Issue Residential Intensity

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				.iii)Historically, muti-unit developments have been built in the district to provide economical housing for the elderly. The existing multi-unit development of Senior Citizens Housing at Tawanui Road, Kaikohe is a good example. It contains several buildings with 3-4 residential units in each. iv)The number of houses that can be built on a site must be in relation to the land area available for development as in the Operative District Plan. The style of development i.e. whether the units are contained within one building or detached are design choices that will enable different types of residential developments in the district.				
FS243.041	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Support	Kāinga Ora supports provisions that sure housing choice by enabling a range of housing typologies at various densities. Multi-unit developments can be in the form of detached units and attached units.	Allow	Amend	Accept in part	Key Issue Residential Intensity
S419.001	LMD Planning Consultancy	MULTI-UNIT DEVELOPMENT	Oppose	i) National Planning Standards do not define Multi-Unit Development. ii) The definition chosen is too rigid and is contrary to the objective to enable different types of residential developments in the district. iii) Historically, muti-unit developments have been built in the district to provide economical housing for the elderly. iv) The number of houses that can be built on a site must be in relation to the land area available for development as in the Operative District Plan. The style of development i.e. whether the units are contained within one building or detached are design choices that will enable different types of residential developments in the district.	Amend the definition of multi-unit development as follows:~~means a group of two or more residential units contained within one contiguous building~~ **A development of three or more residential units contained within one contiguous site.**		Reject	Key Issue Residential Intensity

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS243.042	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Support	Kāinga Ora supports provisions that sure housing choice by enabling a range of housing typologies at various densities. Multi-unit developments can be in the form of detached units and attached units.	Allow	Amend	Reject	Key Issue Residential Intensity
FS566.1240	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	Key Issue Residential Intensity
S502.007	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	OUTDOOR LIVING SPACE	Support in part	Needs clarification. If the outdoor space is a deck, does it matter if the deck is partially enclosed eg: roof, sides enclosed etc.	Amend the definition of Outdoor Living Space to clarify if the outdoor space is a deck, does it matter if the deck is partially enclosed eg: roof, sides enclosed		Reject	Key Issue: General Residential Zone – Standards
S158.005	Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	RESIDENTIAL ACTIVITY	Support	The definition is consistent with the wording provided for in the National Planning Standards.	Retain the definition of "residential activity".		Accept	Key Issue: Definitions
S486.032	Te Rūnanga o Whaingaroa	RESIDENTIAL ACTIVITY	Support	Te Rūnanga o Whaingaroa works with the housing sector and stakeholders to co-ordinate better housing resources to address whānau and hapū housing needs. Wider consideration of Social and Emergency Housing needs to be included within the definition of Residential Activity for accommodation that resides outside of Papakāinga.	Amend the definition of 'Residential Activity' to include Social Housing and Emergency Housing		Reject	Key Issue: Definitions
S390.022	Te Runanga o Ngai Takoto Trust	RESIDENTIAL ACTIVITY	Support	The submitter considers that the definition of Residential Activity needs to include Social and Emergency Housing in order to co-ordinate better housing resources to address whānau and hapū housing needs.	Amend the definition of Residential Activity to include Social Housing and Emergency Housing.		Reject	Key Issue: Definitions
S498.023	Te Rūnanga Ā Iwi O Ngapuhi	RESIDENTIAL ACTIVITY	Support	The submitter considers that the definition of Residential Activity needs to include Social and Emergency Housing in order to co-ordinate better	Amend the definition of Residential Activity to include Social Housing and Emergency Housing.		Reject	Key Issue: Definitions

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				housing resources to address whānau and hapū housing needs.				
FS151.64	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject	Key Issue: Definitions
FS23.191	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	It is important that provisions are consistent with Treaty principles and recognise and provide for Māori interests, including (but not limited to) appropriate economic development of their land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission.	Reject	Key Issue: Definitions
S503.003	Waitangi Limited	RESIDENTIAL UNIT	Not Stated	Confirmation is sought that activities such as motels do not fall under this definition, even if they do include sleeping, cooking, bathing and toilet facilities. In the event activities such as motels are captured, and the definition is unable to be changed as it is a National Template, we seek the relief that all Residential Activity and similar rules exclude motels and similar activities and further that the Visitor Accommodation rule be amended to provide clarity regarding hotels and motels.	Amend the definition of 'residential unit' to clarify that activities such as motels do not fall under the definition OR Amend all 'Residential Activity' and similar rules to exclude motels and similar activities, with the 'Visitor Accommodation' rule to be amended to provide clarity regarding hotels and motels.		Reject	Key Issue: Definitions
FS42.001	Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections		Oppose	Opposed to any amendment of the definition of "residential unit", noting that this is a definition specified under the National Planning Standards (which cannot be modified if implemented in the PDP).	Disallow	Retain the definition of "residential unit" as notified in the PDP.	Accept	Key Issue: Definitions
S158.002	Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	New Definition	Oppose	The National Planning Standards include definitions for "residential activity" and "residential unit" that must be used when a local authority includes a definition for such in its plan. The PDP includes both of these definitions, which is supported. However, the definition of "residential unit" refers to a "household" which is not defined in the	Insert a definition of "household" as follows:*HOUSEHOLD***means a person or group of people who live together as a unit whether or not:a. any or all of them are members of the same family; orb.**		Reject	Key Issue: Definitions

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				PDP. Ara Poutama seeks that a new definition be added, to clarify that a household is not necessarily limited to a family unit or a flatting arrangement (which are more commonly perceived household situations).	**one or more members of the group (whether or not they are paid) provides day-to-day care, support and supervision to any other member(s) of the group.**			
S554.001	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited	Overview	Oppose	The PDP should be amended to give effect to the NPS-UD, particularly to enable development that can provide for and contribute to a well-functioning urbanenvironment for Kerikeri / Waipapa. Far North District Council is a Tier 3 territorial authority because it has all of an urban environment in its district. Kerikeri and Waipapa area is considered to be an urban environment now because it is predominantly urban in character and is or is intended to be part of a housing and labour market of at least 10,000 people. Refer to the Economic Assessment, prepared by Urban Economics in the full submission.	Amend the assessment against the NPS-Urban Development and confirm that Kerikeri is an "urban environment" given the existing urban character, existing population and projected population in the medium term and classify Far North District Council as a Tier 3 local authority.		Accept in part	Key Issue: NOP-Urban Development and Hearings Panel Minute 7 Response
FS172.339	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons stated in this primary submission.	Allow		Accept in part	Key Issue: NOP-Urban Development and Hearings Panel Minute 7 Response
FS32.004	Jeff Kemp		Support in part	The submitter supports the overall intent and purpose of the original submission as it is the only viable and practical option to enable planned and coordinated development in and around Kerikeri and the Waipapa area. The submitter notes that the documentation on proposed traffic movements is unclear. The original submission has not provided details on	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to consideration of traffic movements, flood mitigation measures and amending the zoning as depicted in the original submission.	Accept in part	Key Issue: NOP-Urban Development and Hearings Panel Minute 7 Response

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				potential traffic movements and intersections for Waitotara Dive and Waipapa Road and how these might link to State Highway 10. For example, it is unclear if the new link from State Highway 10 through to the Kerikeri Town Centre is going to be a primary route and the link through to Waipapa Road a secondary route. The submitter notes it is unclear if the proposed flood mitigation measures will increase or reduce flooding along Waitotara Drive. The submitter also supports the proposed zoning as depicted within the original submission is an efficient use of land.				
FS389.007	Smartlife Trust		Oppose	All of submission S554 in relation to the proposed Structure Plan for the landholding. In particular, the documents / plans which refer to a future access point through the Further Submitters land	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: NOP-Urban Development and Hearings Panel Minute 7 Response
S348.014	Sapphire Surveyors Limited	Rules	Support in part	Rule GRZ-R9 does not take into consideration the capacity of existing infrastructure, namely water supply, stormwater and wastewater, as required under Policy GRZ-P3. This rule could result in extra loadings on already straining infrastructure, which could result in discharges of untreated sewage to waterways or the sea, reductions in quality or shortages of drinking water, or exacerbated damage during stormwater events.	Amend Rule GRZ-R9 to only allow multi-unit development in areas where all infrastructure has been upgraded and maintained to allow for the maximum development potential under this rule and subdivision rules.		Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
S40.017	Martin John Yuretich	Rules	Support in part	Rule GRZ-R9 does not take into consideration the capacity of existing infrastructure, namely water supply, stormwater and wastewater, as required under Policy GRZ-P3. This rule could result in extra loadings	Amend Rule GRZ-R9 to only allow multi-unit development in areas where all infrastructure has been upgraded and maintained to allow for the maximum development potential under this rule and subdivision rules.		Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Intensity

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				on already straining infrastructure, which could result in discharges of untreated sewage to waterways or the sea, reductions in quality or shortages of drinking water, or exacerbated damage during stormwater events.			
S41.017	Joel Vieviorka	Rules	Oppose	Rule GRZ-R9 does not take into consideration the capacity of existing infrastructure, namely water supply, stormwater and wastewater, as required under Policy GRZ-P3. This rule could result in extra loadings on already straining infrastructure, which could result in discharges of untreated sewage to waterways or the sea, reductions in quality or shortages of drinking water, or exacerbated damage during stormwater events.	Amend Rule GRZ-R9 to only allow multi-unit development in areas where all infrastructure has been upgraded and maintained to allow for the maximum development potential under this rule and subdivision rules.	Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
S472.021	Michael Foy	SUB-S1	Support in part	We support a higher density of subdivision as a restricted discretionary activity instead of a discretionary activity in the residential zone, as these areas should be encouraged for more housing and amenity value is of less of a concern to the provision of housing in these areas that do not have landscape or heritage overlays. We feel that it should be restricted discretionary to ensure that the assessment criteria that neighbours can have weighting over as an affected party is limited, to ensure that more housing can be provided with less likelihood of a hearing, as there should be a strong push to enable more housing in urban centres	Amend SUB-S1, to provide for subdivision down to 300m2 lot size in General Residential Zone as a restricted discretionary activity, with matters of discretion derived from the matters of control listed in rule SUB-R3. This rule should only be allowed in areas where all infrastrucutre has been upgraded and maintained to allow for the maximum development potenial under this rule and subdivision rules These areas could be shown on one of the FNDC GIS Maps	Reject	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
S413.006	Roman Catholic Bishop of the Diocese of Auckland	SUB-S1	Oppose	There are only a few vacant Residential Zoned serviced sites in Kaikohe and in the District. Reducing the current operative standard of 600m2 for controlled activity	Amend SBS1 - Minimum Allotment Sizes for the General Residential Zone to: • Controlled Activity - ~~600m2~~ **500m2**	Reject	Key Issue: Subdivision framework

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				subdivision to 500m2 in the Proposed Plan will provide certainty of affordable residential sites.	• Discretionary Activity - ~~300m2~~ **250m2**			
S26.001	Trent Simpkin	SUB-S1	Support	Supports the proposed minimum lot size for General Residential (having 600m2 and 300m2 as minimum lot sizes) because it allows for smaller developments in serviced areas, providing more affordable houses for Far Northlanders to purchase.	Retain proposed minimum lot sizes for General Residential at 600m2 and 300m2.		Reject	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
FS44.11	Northland Planning & Development 2020 Ltd		Support	Allows for smaller allotments which are within serviced areas.	Allow		Reject	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
FS44.12	Northland Planning & Development 2020 Ltd		Support	Allows for smaller allotments which are within serviced areas.	Allow		Reject	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
FS547.064	Heron Point Limited		Support	Allow Submission	Allow	Retain 600m2 minimum lot size for the General Residential Zone as a controlled activity.	Reject	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
S174.003	Tristan Simpkin	SUB-S1	Support in part	Supports Residential Zone having 600m2 and 300m2 as minimum lot sizes, however with townhouse developments likely to become more popular in our town centres, thought should be given to if the minimum as a Discretionary activity should be 200m2. It allows for smaller developments in serviced areas, which is a good improvement. Wastewaster and stormwater considerations, as always, would need to be covered as part of resource consent.	Amend the Discretionary minimum lot size for the Residential Zone from 300m2 to 200m2.		Reject	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
FS29.20	Trent Simpkin		Support	I support this suggestion as it allows more townhouse style developments to take place in town centres which is better use of land.	Allow		Reject	Key Issue: Subdivision framework

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S356.091	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	SUB-S1	Oppose	Waka Kotahi note that the objectives and policies of the plan support a range of housing outcomes including higher density development. However, the minimum lot size for the General Residential zone is 600m2 as a controlled activity. Waka Kotahi considers that this is a large site size that does not encourage housing choice or adequately support transport outcomes particularly in and around Far North's townships and more urbanised areas. Waka Kotahi considers that there may be a number of options to enable greater housing density in the right locations and we would welcome the opportunity to discuss these with Council. Options include a combination of: - Reducing the minimum lot size as a controlled activity, - Introducing a medium density residential zone in appropriate locations - Introducing an enabling consent pathway for higher density residential development rather than as a Discretionary Activity	Amend to enable higher density housing in the General Residential zone as Waka Kotahi considers that a minimum lot size of 600m2 for the general residential zone as a controlled activity will not achieve good transport outcomes.		Reject	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
FS25.112	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Support	Supports the amendments for the reasons given in the submission, to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in KFO's submission.	Allow in part	Allow the original submission in part.	Reject	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
FS400.002	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Oppose	The PDP standards reflect the existing provisions of the Operative District Plan which has been attaining the purposes of the RMA. The Submitter is seeking higher density development which has a direct corelation additional traffic movements will occur from a than would otherwise be generated from a single	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept	Key Issue: Subdivision framework

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				600m2 residential site. This size lot also enable a range of housing choice which is reflected within the existing housing stock.				
FS396.002	Ed and Inge Amsler		Oppose	The PDP standards reflect the existing provisions of the Operative District Plan which has been attaining the purposes of the RMA. The Submitter is seeking higher density development which has a direct corelation additional traffic movements will occur from a than would otherwise be generated from a single 600m2 residential site. This size lot also enable a range of housing choice which is reflected within the existing housing stock.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
FS392.002	Ken Lewis Limited		Oppose	The PDP standards reflect the existing provisions of the Operative District Plan which has been attaining the purposes of the RMA. The Submitter is seeking higher density development which has a direct corelation additional traffic movements will occur from a than would otherwise be generated from a single 600m2 residential site. This size lot also enable a range of housing choice which is reflected within the existing housing stock.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
FS389.003	Smartlife Trust		Oppose	The PDP standards reflect the existing provisions of the Operative District Plan which has been attaining the purposes of the RMA. The Submitter is seeking higher density development which has a direct correlation additional traffic movements will occur from a than would otherwise be generated from a single 600m2 residential site. This size lot also enable a range of	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept	Key Issue: Subdivision framework

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				housing choice which is reflected within the existing housing stock.				
FS243.078	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Support in part	Kāinga Ora does not support minimum lot sizes for residential subdivision. A minimum building platform size is a more efficient means to ensure residential outcomes are achieved. Kāinga Ora supports provisions that enable development within and around existing towns, particularly those that support compact and varied housing	Allow in part	Amend SUB-S1 to enable higher	Accept	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
S561.051	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	SUB-S1	Support in part	Kāinga Ora does not support minimum lot sizes for residential subdivision. A minimum building platform size is a more efficient means to ensure residential outcomes are achieved.	Delete minimum allotment sizes for residential subdivision from SUB S1		Reject	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
FS32.105	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	The original submission seeks to amend the FNDP in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes. The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept	Key Issue: Subdivision framework

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.				
FS348.004	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The current rules for minimum lot size are frequently ignored under discretionary decisions. They instead require strengthening by use of prohibitions below minimum lot size.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
FS23.323	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Reject	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
FS47.065	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Accept	Key Issue: Subdivision framework

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS348.138	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
S257.020	Te Hiku Community Board	SUB-S1	Support in part	Support a higher density of subdivision as a restricted discretionary activity instead of a discretionary activity in the residential zone, as these areas should be encouraged for more housing and amenity value is of less of a concern to the provision of housing in these areas that do not have landscape or heritage overlays. It should be restricted discretionary to ensure that the assessment criteria that neighbours can have weighting over as an affected party is limited, to ensure that more housing can be provided with less likelihood of a hearing, as there should be a strong push to enable more housing in urban centres.	Retain in SUB-S1 the 600m2 minimum lot size in the General Residential zone as a controlled activity. Amend SUB-S1, to provide for subdivision down to 300m2 lot size in General Residential Zone as a restricted discretionary activity, with matters of discretion derived from the matters of control listed in rule SUB-R3.		Reject	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
FS400.001	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Support	For the reasons given within the Original Submission No 257	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
FS396.001	Ed and Inge Amsler		Support	For the reasons given within the Original Submission No 257.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
FS392.001	Ken Lewis Limited		Support	For the reasons given within the Original Submission No 257	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
FS389.002	Smartlife Trust		Support	For the reasons given within the Original Submission No 257.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
FS547.065	Heron Point Limited		Support	Allow Submission	Allow	Retain 600m2 minimum lot size for the General Residential Zone as a controlled activity.	Reject	Key Issue: Subdivision framework

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS547.075	Heron Point Limited		Neutral	Allow submission.	Allow	Amend SUB-S1 to provide for subdivision with a 300m2 minimum lot size as a Restricted Discretionary Activity.	Reject	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
S419.006	LMD Planning Consultancy	SUB-S1	Oppose	There are only a few vacant residential zoned serviced sites in Kaikohe and in the District. Reducing the current operative standard of 600m² for controlled activity subdivision to 500m² in the Proposed Plan will provide certainty of affordable residential sites.	Amend Standard SUB-S1 as it applies to the General Residential zone as follows: • Controlled Activity - ~~600m²~~ **500m²** • Discretionary Activity - ~~300m²~~ **250m²**		Reject	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
FS400.003	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Support	For the reasons given within the Original Submission No 419.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
FS396.003	Ed and Inge Amsler		Support	For the reasons given within the Original Submission No 419.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
FS392.003	Ken Lewis Limited		Support	For the reasons given within the Original Submission No 419	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
FS389.004	Smartlife Trust		Support	For the reasons given within the Original Submission No 419.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
FS566.1245	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
S541.023	Elbury Holdings	SUB-S1	Support in part	Areas should be encouraged for more housing and amenity value is of less of a concern to the provision of housing in these areas that do not have landscape or heritage overlays. We feel that it should be restricted discretionary to ensure that the assessment criteria that neighbours can have weighting over as	Retain the 600m2 minimum lot size in the General Residential Zone as a controlled activity'Amend SUB-S1, to provide for subdivision down to 300m2 lot size in General Residential Zone as a restricted discretionary activity, with matters of discretion derived from the matters of control		Reject	Key Issue: Subdivision framework

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				an affected party is limited, to ensure that more housing can be provided with less likelihood of a hearing, as there should be a strong push to enable more housing in urban centres.	listed in Rule SUB-R3.			
FS400.004	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Support	For the reasons given within the Original Submission No 541	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
FS396.004	Ed and Inge Amsler		Support	For the reasons given within the Original Submission No 541.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
FS392.004	Ken Lewis Limited		Support	For the reasons given within the Original Submission No 541	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
FS389.005	Smartlife Trust		Support	For the reasons given within the Original Submission No 541.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
FS547.074	Heron Point Limited		Support	Allow Submission	Allow	Retain 600m2 minimum lot size for the General Residential Zone as a controlled activity.	Reject	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
FS547.082	Heron Point Limited		Neutral	Allow Submission	Allow	Amend SUB-S1 to provide for subdivision with a 300m2 minimum lot size as a Restricted Discretionary Activity	Reject	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
S9.002	Ken Lewis Limited	SUB-S1	Support	The subdivision standards reflect efficient use of land and maintain an intensity and scale found with urban areas of the District.	Retain min lot size for General Residential Zone.		Accept	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
FS389.001	Smartlife Trust		Support	For the reasons given within the Original Submission No 009.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
FS547.063	Heron Point Limited		Support	Allow submission.,	Allow	Retain 600m2 minimum lot size for the General Residential Zone as a controlled activity.	Accept	Key Issue: Subdivision framework

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S357.020	Sean Frieling	SUB-S1	Support in part	We support a higher density of housing in the new multi-unit development rules. We support a higher density of housing in the residential zones We support a higher density of subdivision as a restricted discretionary activity instead of a discretionary activity in the residential zone, as these areas should be encouraged for more housing and amenity value is of less of a concern to the provision of housing in these areas that do not have landscape or heritage overlays. We feel that it should be restricted discretionary to ensure that the assessment criteria that neighbours can have weighting over as an affected party is limited, to ensure that more housing can be provided with less likelihood of a hearing, as there should be a strong push to enable more housing in urban centres. The rules should only be allowed in areas where all infrastructure has been upgraded and maintained to allow for the maximum development potential under this rule and subdivision rules.	Retain in SUB-S1 the 600m2 minimum lot size in the General Residential zone as a controlled activity.		Accept	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
FS547.066	Heron Point Limited		Support	Allow Submission	Allow	Allow submission	Accept	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
S358.020	Leah Frieling	SUB-S1	Support in part	We support a higher density of subdivision as a restricted discretionary activity instead of a discretionary activity in the residential zone, as these areas should be encouraged for more housing and amenity value is of less of a concern to the provision of housing in these areas that do not have landscape or heritage overlays. We feel that it should be restricted discretionary to ensure that the assessment criteria that neighbours can have weighting over as	Retain in Standard SUB-S1 the 600m2 minimum lot size in the General Residential zone as a controlled activity		Accept	Key Issue: Subdivision framework

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				an affected party is limited, to ensure that more housing can be provided with less likelihood of a hearing, as there should be a strong push to enable more housing in urban centres.				
FS547.067	Heron Point Limited		Support	Allow Submission	Allow	Retain 600m2 minimum lot size for the General Residential Zone as a controlled activity.	Accept	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
S464.026	LJ King Ltd	SUB-S1	Support	Not stated.	Retain the 600m2 minimum lot size in the General Residential Zone as a controlled activity.		Accept	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
FS547.068	Heron Point Limited		Support	Allow Submission	Allow	Retain 600m2 minimum lot size for the General Residential Zone as a controlled activity.	Accept	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
FS566.1569	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
S543.024	LJ King Limited	SUB-S1	Support in part	Not stated	Retain the 600m2 minimum lot size in the General Residential Zone as a controlled activity		Accept	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
FS547.069	Heron Point Limited		Support	Allow Submission	Allow	Retain 600m2 minimum lot size for the General Residential Zone as a controlled activity.	Accept	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
FS566.2185	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
S547.024	LJ King Limited	SUB-S1	Support in part	not stated	Retain the 600m2 minimum lot size in the General Residential Zone as a controlled activity		Accept	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
FS547.070	Heron Point Limited		Support	Allow Submission	Allow	Accept	Accept	Key Issue: Subdivision framework

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S472.020	Michael Foy	SUB-S1	Support	We support a higher density of subdivision as a restricted discretionary activity instead of a discretionary activity in the residential zone, as these areas should be encouraged for more housing and amenity value is of less of a concern to the provision of housing in these areas that do not have landscape or heritage overlays. We feel that it should be restricted discretionary to ensure that the assessment criteria that neighbours can have weighting over as an affected party is limited, to ensure that more housing can be provided with less likelihood of a hearing, as there should be a strong push to enable more housing in urban centres	Retain in SUB-S1 the 600m2 minimum lot size in the General Residential zone as a controlled activity.		Accept	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
FS547.071	Heron Point Limited		Support	Allow Submission	Allow	Retain 600m2 minimum lot size for the General Residential Zone as a controlled activity.	Accept	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
S485.025	Elbury Holdings	SUB-S1	Support	N/A	Retain the 600m2 minimum lot size in the General Residential Zone as a controlled activity.		Accept	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
FS547.072	Heron Point Limited		Support	Allow Submission	Allow	Retain 600m2 minimum lot size for the General Residential Zone as a controlled activity.	Accept	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
S519.025	Elbury Holdings	SUB-S1	Support	N/A	Retain the 600m2 minimum lot size in the General Residential Zone as a controlled activity.		Accept	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
FS547.073	Heron Point Limited		Support	Allow Submission	Allow	Retain 600m2 minimum lot size for the General Residential Zone as a controlled activity.	Accept	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
S357.021	Sean Frieling	SUB-S1	Support	We support a higher density of housing in the new multi-unit development rules. We support a higher density of housing	Amend SUB-S1, to provide for subdivision down to 300m2 lot size in General Residential Zone as a restricted discretionary activity, with matters of discretion derived		Reject	Key Issue: Subdivision framework

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				in the residential zones We support a higher density of subdivision as a restricted discretionary activity instead of a discretionary activity in the residential zone, as these areas should be encouraged for more housing and amenity value is of less of a concern to the provision of housing in these areas that do not have landscape or heritage overlays. We feel that it should be restricted discretionary to ensure that the assessment criteria that neighbours can have weighting over as an affected party is limited, to ensure that more housing can be provided with less likelihood of a hearing, as there should be a strong push to enable more housing in urban centres. The rules should only be allowed in areas where all infrastructure has been upgraded and maintained to allow for the maximum development potential under this rule and subdivision rules.	from the matters of control listed in rule SUB-R3.			
FS547.076	Heron Point Limited		Neutral	Allow submission.	Allow	Amend SUB-S1 to provide for subdivision with a 300m2 minimum lot size as a Restricted Discretionary Activity.	Reject	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
S464.027	LJ King Ltd	SUB-S1	Support in part	Areas should be encouraged for more housing and amenity value is of less of a concern to the provision of housing in these areas that do not have landscape or heritage overlays. We feel that it should be restricted discretionary to ensure that the assessment criteria that neighbours can have weighting over as an affected party is limited, to ensure that more housing can be provided with less likelihood of a hearing, as there should be a strong push to enable more housing in urban centres.	Amend SUB-S1 to provide for subdivision down to 300m2 lot size in General Residential Zone as a restricted discretionary activity, with matters of discretion derived from the matters of control listed in rule SUB-R3.		Reject	Key Issue: Subdivision framework

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS547.077	Heron Point Limited		Neutral	Allow Submission	Allow	Amend SUB-S1 to provide for subdivision with a 300m2 minimum lot size as a Restricted Discretionary Activity	Reject	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
FS566.1570	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
S543.025	LJ King Limited	SUB-S1	Support in part	Areas should be encouraged for more housing and amenity value is of less of a concern to the provision of housing in these areas that do not have landscape or heritage overlays. We feel that it should be restricted discretionary to ensure that the assessment criteria that neighbours can have weighting over as an affected party is limited, to ensure that more housing can be provided with less likelihood of a hearing, as there should be a strong push to enable more housing in urban centres	Amend SUB-S1 to provide for subdivision down to 300m2 lot size in General Residential Zone as a restricted discretionary activity, with matters of discretion derived from the matters of control listed in rule SUB-R3		Reject	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
FS547.079	Heron Point Limited		Neutral	Allow Submission	Allow	Amend SUB-S1 to provide for subdivision with a 300m2 minimum lot size as a Restricted Discretionary Activity	Reject	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
FS566.2186	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Allow	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
S547.025	LJ King Limited	SUB-S1	Support in part	Areas should be encouraged for more housing and amenity value is of less of a concern to the provision of housing in these areas that do not have landscape or heritage overlays. We feel that it should be restricted discretionary to ensure that the assessment criteria that neighbours can have weighting over as an affected party is limited, to ensure	Amend SUB-S1 to provide for subdivision down to 300m2 lot size in General Residential Zone as a restricted discretionary activity, with matters of discretion derived from the matters of control listed in rule SUB-R3		Reject	Key Issue: Subdivision framework

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				that more housing can be provided with less likelihood of a hearing, as there should be a strong push to enable more housing in urban centres				
FS547.079	Heron Point Limited		Neutral	Allow Submission	Allow	Amend SUB-S1 to provide for subdivision with a 300m2 minimum lot size as a Restricted Discretionary Activity	Reject	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
S485.026	Elbury Holdings	SUB-S1	Support in part	Areas should be encouraged for more housing and amenity value is of less of a concern to the provision of housing in these areas that do not have landscape or heritage overlays. We feel that it should be restricted discretionary to ensure that the assessment criteria that neighbours can have weighting over as an affected party is limited, to ensure that more housing can be provided with less likelihood of a hearing, as there should be a strong push to enable more housing in urban centres.	Amend SUB-S1 to provide for subdivision down to 300m2 lot size in General Residential Zone as a restricted discretionary activity, with matters of discretion derived from the matters of control listed in rule SUB-R3.		Reject	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
FS547.080	Heron Point Limited		Neutral	Allow Submission	Allow	Amend SUB-S1 to provide for subdivision with a 300m2 minimum lot size as a Restricted Discretionary Activity	Reject	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
S519.026	Elbury Holdings	SUB-S1	Support in part	Areas should be encouraged for more housing and amenity value is of less of a concern to the provision of housing in these areas that do not have landscape or heritage overlays. We feel that it should be restricted discretionary to ensure that the assessment criteria that neighbours can have weighting over as an affected party is limited, to ensure that more housing can be provided with less likelihood of a hearing, as there should be a strong push to enable more housing in urban centres.	Amend SUB-S1 to provide for subdivision down to 300m2 lot size in General Residential Zone as a restricted discretionary activity, with matters of discretion derived from the matters of control listed in rule SUB-R3.		Reject	Key Issue: Subdivision framework

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS547.081	Heron Point Limited		Neutral	Allow Submission	Allow	Amend SUB-S1 to provide for subdivision with a 300m2 minimum lot size as a Restricted Discretionary Activity	Reject	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
S358.021	Leah Frieling	SUB-S1	Support in part	We support a higher density of subdivision as a restricted discretionary activity instead of a discretionary activity in the residential zone, as these areas should be encouraged for more housing and amenity value is of less of a concern to the provision of housing in these areas that do not have landscape or heritage overlays. We feel that it should be restricted discretionary to ensure that the assessment criteria that neighbours can have weighting over as an affected party is limited, to ensure that more housing can be provided with less likelihood of a hearing, as there should be a strong push to enable more housing in urban centres.	Amend standard SUB-S1, to provide for subdivision down to 300m2 lot size in General Residential Zone as a restricted discretionary activity, with matters of discretion derived from the matters of control listed in rule SUB-R3		Reject	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
S561.112	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Overview	Not Stated	Introduce a framework of Objectives; Policies; Standards and rules; Matters of discretion; and Assessment Criteria to support the proposed Medium density residential zone.	Insert new provisions as set out in Appendix 4 of the submission to support the introduction of the proposed Medium density residential zone.		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS32.166	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	The original submission seeks to amend the FNDP in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes. The amenity, values and character of	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts. The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.				
FS348.016	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	There is no requirement for the proposed medium density zone.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS23.384	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS47.126	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document				
FS348.199	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
S428.019	Kapiro Residents Association	Objectives	Support in part	It should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings, for example, with requirements for permeable open areas including garden/landscaped ground. Developments should use permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths. The PDP should require all new buildings to store/use roof water wherever possible, to avoid the need for expensive reticulation systems and reduce the need for water top-ups via water tankers. New buildings connected to a public water supply should be required to collect roof water in storage vessels to use for gardens and flushing toilets (at minimum) and contribute to other household water uses such as laundry connections. Water storage vessels do not need to be a traditional round tank - other useful shapes exist, such as rectangular upright vessels that are easy to install against the side of a house or garage, or short flat vessels designed to be completely buried underground or placed under the foundations of new builds. Greywater harvesting and re-use should also be required for new buildings. These types of water-saving measures would also	Amend PDP to include objectives, policies and rules/standards that require best practice environmentally sustainable techniques for new developments, including - • Permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths etc. • Best practice for lowest environmental impact and water sensitive designs, requiring greywater recycling techniques and other technologies to ensure efficient use of water, rain storage tanks for properties connected to a public water supply, additional water storage for buildings that rely solely on roof water (to cope with drought), and other measures • Renewable energy technologies and energy-efficient technologies, and similar requirements that foster improved environmental design/technologies and lower lifecycle climate impacts • Specified area (percentage) of tree canopy cover and green corridors should be required within new subdivisions. These will be increasingly important for shade/cooling for buildings and pedestrians in future.		Accept in part	Key Issue: Impermeable Surface

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				reduce future Council infrastructure costs for additional water supplies and wastewater. Passive heating and cooling designs, for example, reduce energy consumption and the on-going costs of heating/cooling. Solar panels with batteries, for example, can be purchased on lease-to-buy schemes so that the owner/occupier only pays the amount that they would have paid anyway for grid electricity. Additional electricity generation by households will be essential for powering EVs in future because current national generation capacity is not sufficient.				
FS196.176	Joe Carr		Support in part	delete 'best' practice and replace with 'good' practice where it appears in the plan, as good practice is proven effective and usually affordable.	Allow in part		Accept in part	Key Issue: Impermeable Surface
S561.113	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Objectives	Not Stated	Introduce a framework of Objectives; Policies; Standards and rules; Matters of discretion; and Assessment Criteria to support the proposed Medium density residential zone.	Insert new provisions as set out in Appendix 4 of the submission to support the introduction of the proposed Medium density residential zone.		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS32.167	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	The original submission seeks to amend the FNDP in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes. The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts. The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.				
FS348.017	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	There is no requirement for the proposed medium density zone.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS23.385	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS47.127	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document				
FS348.200	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
S356.128	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Objectives	Support	Add Objective and Policy to support residential zoning around employment and access to local amenities to achieve integrated land use and reduction in vehicle kilometres travelled.	Insert a new Objective to support residential zoning being located close to employment and amenities.		Accept in part	Key Issue: General Residential Zone - Objectives
FS243.128	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Support	Kāinga Ora supports provisions that enable housing with good access to jobs, amenities and services and the co-location of activities to contribute to economic, social, environmental, and cultural wellbeing.	Allow	Insert a new Objective to support residential zoning being located close to employment and amenities.	Accept in part	Key Issue: General Residential Zone - Objectives
S454.106	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	Objectives	Not Stated	Due to its linear nature and the requirement to connect new electricity generation to the National Grid, regardless of where the new generation facilities are located, transmission lines may need to traverse any zone within the Far North District. Critical infrastructure such as the National Grid sometimes has a functional or operational need to locate in the General Residential zone and needs to be provided for. A new objective is required to address this.	Insert new objective GRZ-O7 as follows:**The General Residential zone is used by compatible activities and infrastructure, that have a functional or operational need to locate in the zone.**		Reject	Key Issue: Plan wide or urban wide submissions
FS243.156	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, as it is inconsistent with its primary submission. The amendment is unnecessary	Disallow	Insert new objective GRZ-O7 as follows: The General Residential zone is used by compatible activities and infrastructure, that have a functional or	Accept	Key Issue: Plan wide or urban wide submissions

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
						operational need to locate in the zone.		
FS369.498	Top Energy		Support	Top Energy supports the new objective GRZ-O7 to provide for infrastructure that has a functional or operational need to locate in the zone.	Allow		Reject	Key Issue: Plan wide or urban wide submissions
S521.022	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	Objectives	Support in part	It should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings, for example, with requirements for permeable open areas including garden/landscaped ground. Developments should use permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths. The PDP should require all new buildings to store/use roof water wherever possible, to avoid the need for expensive reticulation systems and reduce the need for water top-ups via water tankers. New buildings connected to a public water supply should be required to collect roof water in storage vessels to use for gardens and flushing toilets (at minimum) and contribute to other household water uses such as laundry connections. Water storage vessels do not need to be a traditional round tank - other useful shapes exist, such as rectangular upright vessels that are easy to install against the side of a house or garage, or short flat vessels designed to be completely buried underground or placed under the foundations of new builds. Greywater harvesting and re-use should also be required for new buildings. These types of water-saving measures would also reduce future Council infrastructure costs for additional water supplies and	Amend PDP to include objectives, policies and rules/standards that require best practice environmentally sustainable techniques for new developments, including - • Permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths etc. • Best practice for lowest environmental impact and water sensitive designs, requiring greywater recycling techniques and other technologies to ensure efficient use of water, rain storage tanks for properties connected to a public water supply, additional water storage for buildings that rely solely on roof water (to cope with drought), and other measures • Renewable energy technologies and energy-efficient technologies, and similar requirements that foster improved environmental design/technologies and lower lifecycle climate impacts • Specified area (percentage) of tree canopy cover and green corridors should be required within new subdivisions. These will be increasingly important for shade/cooling for buildings and pedestrians in future.		Accept in part	Key Issue: Impermeable Surface

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				wastewater. Passive heating and cooling designs, for example, reduce energy consumption and the on-going costs of heating/cooling. Solar panels with batteries, for example, can be purchased on lease-to-buy schemes so that the owner/occupier only pays the amount that they would have paid anyway for grid electricity. Additional electricity generation by households will be essential for powering EVs in future because current national generation capacity is not sufficient.				
FS566.1732	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: Impermeable Surface
S218.002	Summerset Group Holdings Limited	GRZ-O1	Support	expresses support for the submission of the Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand (submission 520) in its entirety.	Retain GRZ-O1		Accept	Key Issue: General Residential Zone - Objectives
S520.002	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	GRZ-O1	Support	GRZ-O1 recognises the need for the General Residential Zone to provide a variety of densities, housing types and lot sizes that respond to housing needs and demand.	Retain GRZ-O1		Accept	Key Issue: General Residential Zone - Objectives
S138.011	Kairos Connection Trust and Habitat for Humanity Northern Region Ltd	GRZ-O1	Support in part	Provided the Council provides clarity about the servicing capacity for 'Plan Enabled' development (as addressed in submission), the ability to establish a variety of residential housing densities and typologies within functional and high amenity living environments is supported.	Retain Objective GRZ-O1		Accept	Key Issue: General Residential Zone - Objectives
FS196.90	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko	Allow		Accept	Key Issue: General Residential Zone - Objectives

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S561.066	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	GRZ-O1	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports these objectives and policies as they relate to General Residential zoned sites, in particular, as they provide a planning framework to achieve good housing outcomes. However, a Medium Density Residential zone is sought for the walkable catchment around Kerikeri and new objectives, policies and rules related to that zone are sought as discussed further in Appendix 4 and detailed in Appendix 5 of the submission.	Retain GRZ-O1 as notified in relation to General Residentially zoned sites. New provisions are sought to apply to Medium Density Residentially zoned sites round Kerikeri Town Centre. Refer to Appendix 4 and Appendix 5 in the submission.		Accept in part	Key Issue: General Residential Zone - Objectives
FS25.131	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Oppose	Seeks to ensure that quality-built and urban form outcomes are achieved for the Kerikeri town centre and adjoining residential zoned land. To secure these outcomes appropriate objectives, policies, rules - consent triggers, assessment criteria etc are required. Providing for residential intensification also needs to consider the most appropriate and efficient way to provide capacity with reference to the integration of infrastructure with development and creation of well-functioning urban environments.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission (inferred).	Accept in part	Key Issue: General Residential Zone - Objectives
FS32.120	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	The original submission seeks to amend the FNDP in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes. The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept in part	Key Issue: General Residential Zone - Objectives

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts. The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.				
FS348.006	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	There is no requirement for the proposed medium density zone.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept in part	Key Issue: General Residential Zone - Objectives
FS325.069	Turnstone Trust Limited		Oppose	TT seeks to ensure that quality-built and urban form outcomes are achieved for the Kerikeri town centre and adjoining residential zoned land. To secure these outcomes appropriate objectives, policies, rules - consent triggers, assessment criteria etc are required.	Disallow in part	Disallow the original submission subject to wording, mapping, and any other related changes.	Accept in part	Key Issue: General Residential Zone - Objectives
FS23.338	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: General Residential Zone - Objectives
FS47.080	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: General Residential Zone - Objectives

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document				
FS348.153	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept in part	Key Issue: General Residential Zone - Objectives
FS584.009	Peter Malcolm		Support	Support enabling building heights up to 3 storeys (11m) around the Kerikeri Town Centre and other centres including Kaikohe. There is currently a shortage of affordable and public housing within this area. Central Kerikeri is an appropriate location to enable residential intensification as it has sufficient servicing, low natural hazard risk and is accessible to public transport, services and amenities. Enabling intensification within the Kerikeri Town Centre will help reduce sprawl, improve economic viability and promote vibrant communities.	Allow in part	Amend the Proposed District Plan to enable building heights up to 3 storeys (11m) around the Kerikeri Town Centre and other town centres (inferred).	Accept in part	Key Issue: General Residential Zone - Objectives
S554.012	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited	GRZ-O1	Support	KFO supports the objective as it appropriately recognises the need for housing supply to meet demand.	Retain the objective as notified.		Accept	Key Issue: General Residential Zone - Objectives
FS32.015	Jeff Kemp		Support in part	The submitter supports the overall intent and purpose of the original submission as it is the only viable and practical option to enable planned and coordinated development in and	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to consideration of traffic movements, flood mitigation measures and	Accept	Key Issue: General Residential Zone - Objectives

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				around Kerikeri and the Waipapa area. The submitter notes that the documentation on proposed traffic movements is unclear. The original submission has not provided details on potential traffic movements and intersections for Waitotara Dive and Waipapa Road and how these might link to State Highway 10. For example, it is unclear if the new link from State Highway 10 through to the Kerikeri Town Centre is going to be a primary route and the link through to Waipapa Road a secondary route. The submitter notes it is unclear if the proposed flood mitigation measures will increase or reduce flooding along Waitotara Drive. The submitter also supports the proposed zoning as depicted within the original submission is an efficient use of land.		amending the zoning as depicted in the original submission.		
FS389.018	Smartlife Trust		Oppose	All of submission S554 in relation to the proposed Structure Plan for the landholding. In particular, the documents / plans which refer to a future access point through the Further Submitters land	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: General Residential Zone - Objectives
S138.012	Kairos Connection Trust and Habitat for Humanity Northern Region Ltd	GRZ-O2	Support in part	Provided the Council provides clarity about the servicing capacity for 'Plan Enabled' development (as addressed in submission), the ability to establish a variety of residential housing densities and typologies within functional and high amenity living environments is supported.	Retain Objective GRZ-O2		Reject	Key Issue: General Residential Zone - Objectives
S561.067	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	GRZ-O2	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports these objectives and policies as they relate to General Residential zoned sites, in particular, as they provide a planning framework	Retain GRZ-O2 asnotified in relation to General Residentially zoned sites. New provisions are sought to apply to Medium Density Residentially zoned sitesround		Reject	Key Issue: General Residential Zone - Objectives

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				to achieve good housing outcomes. However, a Medium Density Residential zone is sought for the walkable catchment around Kerikeri and new objectives, policies and rules related to that zone are sought as discussed further in Appendix 4 and detailed in Appendix 5 of the submission.	Kerikeri Town Centre. Refer to Appendix 4 and Appendix 5 inthe submission.			
FS25.132	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Oppose	Seeks to ensure that quality-built and urban form outcomes are achieved for the Kerikeri town centre and adjoining residential zoned land. To secure these outcomes appropriate objectives, policies, rules - consent triggers, assessment criteria etc are required. Providing for residential intensification also needs to consider the most appropriate and efficient way to provide capacity with reference to the integration of infrastructure with development and creation of well-functioning urban environments.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission (inferred).	Accept	Key Issue: General Residential Zone - Objectives
FS32.121	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	The original submission seeks to amend the FNDP in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes. The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept	Key Issue: General Residential Zone - Objectives

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts. The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.				
FS348.007	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	There is no requirement for the proposed medium density zone.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept	Key Issue: General Residential Zone - Objectives
FS325.070	Turnstone Trust Limited		Oppose	TT seeks to ensure that quality-built and urban form outcomes are achieved for the Kerikeri town centre and adjoining residential zoned land. To secure these outcomes appropriate objectives, policies, rules - consent triggers, assessment criteria etc are required.	Disallow in part	Disallow submission subject to wording, mapping, and any other related changes.	Accept in part	Key Issue: General Residential Zone - Objectives
FS23.339	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Reject	Key Issue: General Residential Zone - Objectives
FS47.081	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Accept	Key Issue: General Residential Zone - Objectives

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document				
FS348.154	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept	Key Issue: General Residential Zone - Objectives
FS584.0010	Peter Malcolm		Support	Support enabling building heights up to 3 storeys (11m) around the Kerikeri Town Centre and other centres including Kaikohe. There is currently a shortage of affordable and public housing within this area. Central Kerikeri is an appropriate location to enable residential intensification as it has sufficient servicing, low natural hazard risk and is accessible to public transport, services and amenities. Enabling intensification within the Kerikeri Town Centre will help reduce sprawl, improve economic viability and promote vibrant communities.	Allow in part	Amend the Proposed District Plan to enable building heights up to 3 storeys (11m) around the Kerikeri Town Centre and other town centres (inferred).	Reject in part	Key Issue: General Residential Zone - Objectives
S554.013	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited	GRZ-O2	Oppose	KFO disagree with the "while reducing urban sprawl" section of the Objective. This objective should be reworded to address the demand for housing, rather than reducing urban sprawl. It may also state that extensions to the Residential zone to provide for growth should be located with consideration to achieving a well-functioning and quality urban environment.	Amend Objective GRZ-O2 as follows: "The General Residential zone consolidates urban residential development around available or programmed development infrastructure **(including private infrastructure)** to improve the function and resilience of the receiving residential environment while ~~reducing urban sprawl.~~ **providing for urban growth in**		Accept in part	Key Issue: General Residential Zone - Objectives

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					locations where the outcomes will achieve a quality well functioning urban environment."			
FS32.016	Jeff Kemp		Support in part	The submitter supports the overall intent and purpose of the original submission as it is the only viable and practical option to enable planned and coordinated development in and around Kerikeri and the Waipapa area. The submitter notes that the documentation on proposed traffic movements is unclear. The original submission has not provided details on potential traffic movements and intersections for Waitotara Dive and Waipapa Road and how these might link to State Highway 10. For example, it is unclear if the new link from State Highway 10 through to the Kerikeri Town Centre is going to be a primary route and the link through to Waipapa Road a secondary route. The submitter notes it is unclear if the proposed flood mitigation measures will increase or reduce flooding along Waitotara Drive. The submitter also supports the proposed zoning as depicted within the original submission is an efficient use of land.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to consideration of traffic movements, flood mitigation measures and amending the zoning as depicted in the original submission.	Accept in part	Key Issue: General Residential Zone - Objectives
FS47.002	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose		Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: General Residential Zone - Objectives
FS547.083	Heron Point Limited		Support	The amendments sought to Objective 2 are supported.	Allow	Amend	Accept in part	Key Issue: General Residential Zone - Objectives

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS243.182	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose	Kāinga Ora supports provisions that align development with the provision of adequate climate-resilient services and infrastructure and that enable varied, higher density housing around existing towns. Kāinga Ora supports provisions that prioritise growth within, and around existing centres as opposed to greenfield development to support the vitality of these centres while also locating homes close to jobs, services, and amenities.	Disallow	Amend Objective GRZ-O2 as follows:	Accept in part	Key Issue: General Residential Zone - Objectives
FS569.026	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	We oppose the deletion of "reducing urban sprawl	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: General Residential Zone - Objectives
FS389.019	Smartlife Trust		Oppose	All of submission S554 in relation to the proposed Structure Plan for the landholding. In particular, the documents / plans which refer to a future access point through the Further Submitters land	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: General Residential Zone - Objectives
S356.115	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	GRZ-O2	Support in part	Add Objective and Policy to support residential zoning around employment and access to local amenities to achieve integrated land use and reduction in vehicle kilometres travelled.	Insert Objective and Policy to support residential zoning being located close to employment and amenities		Accept in part	Key Issue: General Residential Zone - Objectives
FS243.129	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Support	Kāinga Ora supports provisions that enable housing with good access to jobs, amenities and services and the co-location of activities to contribute to economic, social, environmental, and cultural wellbeing.	Allow	Insert Objective and Policy to support residential zoning being located close to employment and amenities	Accept in part	Key Issue: General Residential Zone - Objectives
S331.062	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	GRZ-O3	Support	The submitter supports objective GRZ-03 and consider educational facilities to contribute to the well-being of the community while complementing the	Retain objective GRZ-03, as proposed.		Accept	Key Issue: Plan wide or urban wide submissions

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				scale, character and amenity of the General Residential zone.				
S554.014	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited	GRZ-O3	Support	KFO support Objective GRZ-O3 as it appropriately recognises the need to co-locate compatible activities.	Retain the objective as notified.		Accept	Key Issue: General Residential Zone - Objectives
FS32.017	Jeff Kemp		Support in part	The submitter supports the overall intent and purpose of the original submission as it is the only viable and practical option to enable planned and coordinated development in and around Kerikeri and the Waipapa area. The submitter notes that the documentation on proposed traffic movements is unclear. The original submission has not provided details on potential traffic movements and intersections for Waitotara Dive and Waipapa Road and how these might link to State Highway 10. For example, it is unclear if the new link from State Highway 10 through to the Kerikeri Town Centre is going to be a primary route and the link through to Waipapa Road a secondary route. The submitter notes it is unclear if the proposed flood mitigation measures will increase or reduce flooding along Waitotara Drive. The submitter also supports the proposed zoning as depicted within the original submission is an efficient use of land.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to consideration of traffic movements, flood mitigation measures and amending the zoning as depicted in the original submission.	Accept	Key Issue: General Residential Zone - Objectives
FS389.020	Smartlife Trust		Oppose	All of submission S554 in relation to the proposed Structure Plan for the landholding. In particular, the documents / plans which refer to a future access point through the Further Submitters land	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: General Residential Zone - Objectives

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S138.013	Kairos Connection Trust and Habitat for Humanity Northern Region Ltd	GRZ-O4	Support in part	Provided the Council provides clarity about the servicing capacity for 'Plan Enabled' development (as addressed in submission), the ability to establish a variety of residential housing densities and typologies within functional and high amenity living environments is supported.	Retain Objective GRZ-04		Accept	Key Issue: General Residential Zone - Objectives
S554.015	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited	GRZ-O4	Support in part	Objective GRZ-O4 should recognise alternative means to addressing shortages in infrastructure capacity provided for by Council. There may be cases where private solutions can provide adequate capacity to support land use and subdivision in the General Residential Zone. There are also options for council to enter into Developer Agreements.	Amend Objective GRZ-O4 as follows: Land use and subdivision in the General Residential zone is supported where there is adequacy and capacity of available**, or programmed development infrastructure, or a private infrastructure solution**.		Reject	Key Issue: Infrastructure
FS32.018	Jeff Kemp		Support in part	The submitter supports the overall intent and purpose of the original submission as it is the only viable and practical option to enable planned and coordinated development in and around Kerikeri and the Waipapa area. The submitter notes that the documentation on proposed traffic movements is unclear. The original submission has not provided details on potential traffic movements and intersections for Waitotara Dive and Waipapa Road and how these might link to State Highway 10. For example, it is unclear if the new link from State Highway 10 through to the Kerikeri Town Centre is going to be a primary route and the link through to Waipapa Road a secondary route. The submitter notes it is unclear if the proposed flood mitigation measures will	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to consideration of traffic movements, flood mitigation measures and amending the zoning as depicted in the original submission.	Reject	Key Issue: Infrastructure

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				increase or reduce flooding along Waitotara Drive. The submitter also supports the proposed zoning as depicted within the original submission is an efficient use of land.				
FS547.084	Heron Point Limited		Support	The amendments sought to Objective 4 are supported.	Allow	Amend	Reject	Key Issue: Infrastructure
FS389.021	Smartlife Trust		Oppose	All of submission S554 in relation to the proposed Structure Plan for the landholding. In particular, the documents / plans which refer to a future access point through the Further Submitters land	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept	Key Issue: Infrastructure
S554.016	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited	GRZ-O5	Support	KFO supports Objective GRZ-O5 and its recognition of the importance of functional, high amenity environments.	Retain the objective as notified.		Accept	Key Issue: General Residential Zone - Objectives
FS32.019	Jeff Kemp		Support in part	The submitter supports the overall intent and purpose of the original submission as it is the only viable and practical option to enable planned and coordinated development in and around Kerikeri and the Waipapa area. The submitter notes that the documentation on proposed traffic movements is unclear. The original submission has not provided details on potential traffic movements and intersections for Waitotara Dive and Waipapa Road and how these might link to State Highway 10. For example, it is unclear if the new link from State Highway 10 through to the Kerikeri Town Centre is going to be a primary route and the link through to Waipapa Road a secondary route. The submitter notes it is unclear if the proposed flood mitigation measures will	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to consideration of traffic movements, flood mitigation measures and amending the zoning as depicted in the original submission.	Accept	Key Issue: General Residential Zone - Objectives

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				increase or reduce flooding along Waitotara Drive. The submitter also supports the proposed zoning as depicted within the original submission is an efficient use of land.				
FS547.085	Heron Point Limited		Support	This is supported.	Allow	Retain the objective as notified.	Reject	Key Issue: General Residential Zone - Objectives
FS389.022	Smartlife Trust		Oppose	All of submission S554 in relation to the proposed Structure Plan for the landholding. In particular, the documents / plans which refer to a future access point through the Further Submitters land	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: General Residential Zone - Objectives
S561.068	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	GRZ-O6	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports these objectives and policies as they relate to General Residential zoned sites, in particular, as they provide a planning framework to achieve good housing outcomes. However, a Medium Density Residential zone is sought for the walkable catchment around Kerikeri and new objectives, policies and rules related to that zone are sought as discussed further in Appendix 4 and detailed in Appendix 5 of the submission.	Retain GRZ-O6 asnotified in relation to General Residentially zoned sites. New provisions are sought to apply to Medium Density Residentially zoned sitesround Kerikeri Town Centre. Refer to Appendix 4 and Appendix 5 inthe submission.		Reject	Key Issue: General Residential Zone - Objectives
FS25.133	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Oppose	Seeks to ensure that quality-built and urban form outcomes are achieved for the Kerikeri town centre and adjoining residential zoned land. To secure these outcomes appropriate objectives, policies, rules - consent triggers, assessment criteria etc are required. Providing for residential intensification also needs to consider the most appropriate and efficient way to provide capacity with reference to the integration of infrastructure with	Disallow	Disallow the original submission (inferred).	Accept	Key Issue: General Residential Zone - Objectives

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				development and creation of well-functioning urban environments.				
FS32.122	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	The original submission seeks to amend the FNDP in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes. The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts. The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept	Key Issue: General Residential Zone - Objectives
FS348.008	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	There is no requirement for the proposed medium density zone.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept	Key Issue: General Residential Zone - Objectives
FS325.071	Turnstone Trust Limited		Oppose	TT seeks to ensure that quality-built and urban form outcomes are achieved for the Kerikeri town centre and adjoining residential zoned land. To secure these outcomes appropriate objectives, policies, rules - consent	Disallow in part	Disallow submission subject to wording, mapping, and any other related changes.	Accept in part	Key Issue: General Residential Zone - Objectives

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				triggers, assessment criteria etc are required.				
FS23.340	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Reject	Key Issue: General Residential Zone - Objectives
FS47.082	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Accept	Key Issue: General Residential Zone - Objectives
FS348.155	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept	Key Issue: General Residential Zone - Objectives
FS584.011	Peter Malcolm		Support	Support enabling building heights up to 3 storeys (11m) around the Kerikeri Town Centre and other centres including Kaikohe. There is currently a shortage of affordable and public housing within this area. Central	Allow in part	Amend the Proposed District Plan to enable building heights up to 3 storeys (11m) around the Kerikeri Town Centre	Reject in part	Key Issue: General Residential Zone - Objectives

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				Kerikeri is an appropriate location to enable residential intensification as it has sufficient servicing, low natural hazard risk and is accessible to public transport, services and amenities. Enabling intensification within the Kerikeri Town Centre will help reduce sprawl, improve economic viability and promote vibrant communities.		and other town centres (inferred).		
S554.017	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited	GRZ-O6	Support	KFO supports Objective GRZ-O6 as it recognises the importance of resilient communities.	Retain the objective as notified.		Accept	Key Issue: General Residential Zone - Objectives
FS32.020	Jeff Kemp		Support in part	The submitter supports the overall intent and purpose of the original submission as it is the only viable and practical option to enable planned and coordinated development in and around Kerikeri and the Waipapa area. The submitter notes that the documentation on proposed traffic movements is unclear. The original submission has not provided details on potential traffic movements and intersections for Waitotara Dive and Waipapa Road and how these might link to State Highway 10. For example, it is unclear if the new link from State Highway 10 through to the Kerikeri Town Centre is going to be a primary route and the link through to Waipapa Road a secondary route. The submitter notes it is unclear if the proposed flood mitigation measures will increase or reduce flooding along Waitotara Drive. The submitter also supports the proposed zoning as depicted within the original submission is an efficient use of land.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to consideration of traffic movements, flood mitigation measures and amending the zoning as depicted in the original submission.	Accept	Key Issue: General Residential Zone - Objectives

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS547.086	Heron Point Limited		Support	This is supported	Allow	Retain the objective as notified.	Accept	Key Issue: General Residential Zone - Objectives
FS389.023	Smartlife Trust		Oppose	All of submission S554 in relation to the proposed Structure Plan for the landholding. In particular, the documents / plans which refer to a future access point through the Further Submitters land	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: General Residential Zone - Objectives
S218.004	Summerset Group Holdings Limited	Policies	Not Stated	expresses support for the submission of the Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand (submission 520) in its entirety.	Insert new policies in the GRZ GRZ-PXX: Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within the General Residential Zone by providing for more efficient use of those sites. GRZ-PXX: Enable the standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments.		Reject	Key Issue: Retirement Villages
S520.004	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Policies	Not Stated	Not explicitly stated	Insert new policies in the GRZ**GRZ-PXX: Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within the General Residential Zone by providing for more efficient use of those sites.GRZ-PXX: Enable the standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments.**		Reject	Key Issue: Retirement Villages
S561.114	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Policies	Not Stated	Introduce a framework of Objectives; Policies; Standards and rules; Matters of discretion; and Assessment Criteria to support the proposed Medium density residential zone.	Insert new provisions as set out in Appendix 4 of the submission to supportthe introduction of the proposed Medium densityresidential zone.		Accept in part	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS32.168	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	The original submission seeks to amend the FNDP in a way which	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Reject in part	Key Issue: Zone Selection

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes. The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts. The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.				
FS348.018	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	There is no requirement for the proposed medium density zone.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Reject in part	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS23.386	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS47.128	Our Kerikeri Community		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Reject in part	Key Issue: Zone Selection

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
	Charitable Trust			approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document				
FS348.201	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Reject in part	Key Issue: Zone Selection
S356.129	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Policies	Support	Add Objective and Policy to support residential zoning around employment and access to local amenities to achieve integrated land use and reduction in vehicle kilometres travelled.	Insert a new policy to support residential zoning being located close to employment and amenities.		Reject	Key Issue: General Residential Zone – Polices
FS243.130	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Support	Kāinga Ora supports provisions that responds to the impacts of climate change by increasing resilience and enabling adaptation.	Allow	Insert a new policy to support residential zoning being located close to employment and amenities.	Reject	Key Issue: General Residential Zone – Polices
S454.107	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	Policies	Not Stated	A number of policies set out the activities that are to be enabled in the General Residential zone. Transpower supports the intent of this policy, however critical infrastructure, such as the National Grid, is not clearly provided for. Due to its linear nature and the requirement to connect new electricity generation to the National	Insert new policy GRZ-Px as follows:**Enable compatible activities and infrastructure, that have a functional or operational need to locate in the General Residential zone.**		Reject	Key Issue: Plan wide or urban wide submissions

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				Grid, regardless of where the new generation facilities are located, transmission lines may need to traverse any zone within the Far North District. A new policy is required to make it explicit that infrastructure such as the National Grid is enabled in the General Residential zone.				
FS243.166	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, as it is inconsistent with its primary submission. The amendment is unnecessary.	Disallow	Insert new policy GRZ-Px as follows: Enable compatible activities and infrastructure, that have a functional or operational need to locate in the General Residential zone.	Accept	Key Issue: Plan wide or urban wide submissions
FS369.499	Top Energy		Support	Top Energy supports the new policy GRZ-PX to provide for infrastructure that has a functional or operational need to locate in the zone	Allow		Reject	Key Issue: Plan wide or urban wide submissions
S521.023	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	Policies	Support in part	It should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings, for example, with requirements for permeable open areas including garden/landscaped ground. Developments should use permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths. The PDP should require all new buildings to store/use roof water wherever possible, to avoid the need for expensive reticulation systems and reduce the need for water top-ups via water tankers. New buildings connected to a public water supply should be required to collect roof water in storage vessels to use for gardens and flushing toilets (at minimum) and contribute to other household water	Amend PDP to include objectives, policies and rules/standards that require best practice environmentally sustainable techniques for new developments, including - • Permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths etc. • Best practice for lowest environmental impact and water sensitive designs, requiring greywater recycling techniques and other technologies to ensure efficient use of water, rain storage tanks for properties connected to a public water supply, additional water storage for buildings that rely solely on roof water (to cope with drought), and other measures		Accept in part	Key Issue: Impermeable Surface

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				uses such as laundry connections. Water storage vessels do not need to be a traditional round tank - other useful shapes exist, such as rectangular upright vessels that are easy to install against the side of a house or garage, or short flat vessels designed to be completely buried underground or placed under the foundations of new builds. Greywater harvesting and re-use should also be required for new buildings. These types of water-saving measures would also reduce future Council infrastructure costs for additional water supplies and wastewater. Passive heating and cooling designs, for example, reduce energy consumption and the on-going costs of heating/cooling. Solar panels with batteries, for example, can be purchased on lease-to-buy schemes so that the owner/occupier only pays the amount that they would have paid anyway for grid electricity. Additional electricity generation by households will be essential for powering EVs in future because current national generation capacity is not sufficient.	• Renewable energy technologies and energy-efficient technologies, and similar requirements that foster improved environmental design/technologies and lower lifecycle climate impacts • Specified area (percentage) of tree canopy cover and green corridors should be required within new subdivisions. These will be increasingly important for shade/cooling for buildings and pedestrians in future.			
FS243.177	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose	Kāinga Ora supports provisions that responds to the impacts of climate change by increasing resilience and enabling adaptation however prescriptive rules/standards such as those suggested would create additional burden and complexity to development proposals. The appropriate mechanism for these techniques would be through non-statutory design guidelines. It is also unclear on what the specific amendments or relief sought to the	Disallow in part	Amend PDP to include objectives, policies and rules/standards that require best practice environmentally sustainable techniques for new developments, including -	Reject in part	Key Issue: Impermeable Surface

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				provisions in the PDP. Further clarity required to the proposed amendments to the provisions.				
FS566.1733	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: Impermeable Surface
S529.227	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	Policies	Support in part	It should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings, for example, with requirements for permeable open areas including garden/landscaped ground. Developments should use permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths. The PDP should require all new buildings to store/use roof water wherever possible, to avoid the need for expensive reticulation systems and reduce the need for water top-ups via water tankers. New buildings connected to a public water supply should be required to collect roof water in storage vessels to use for gardens and flushing toilets (at minimum) and contribute to other household water uses such as laundry connections. Water storage vessels do not need to be a traditional round tank - other useful shapes exist, such as rectangular upright vessels that are easy to install against the side of a house or garage, or short flat vessels designed to be completely buried underground or placed under the foundations of new builds. Greywater harvesting and re-use should also be required for new buildings. These types of water-saving measures would also reduce future Council infrastructure costs for additional water supplies and wastewater. Passive heating and cooling designs,	Amend PDP to include objectives, policies and rules/standards that require best practice environmentally sustainable techniques for new developments, including - • Permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths etc. • Best practice for lowest environmental impact and water sensitive designs, requiring greywater recycling techniques and other technologies to ensure efficient use of water, rain storage tanks for properties connected to a public water supply, additional water storage for buildings that rely solely on roof water (to cope with drought), and other measures • Renewable energy technologies and energy-efficient technologies, and similar requirements that foster improved environmental design/technologies and lower lifecycle climate impacts • Specified area (percentage) of tree canopy cover and green corridors should be required within new subdivisions. These will be increasingly important for shade/cooling for buildings and pedestrians in future.		Accept in part	Key Issue: Impermeable Surface

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				for example, reduce energy consumption and the on-going costs of heating/cooling. Solar panels with batteries, for example, can be purchased on lease-to-buy schemes so that the owner/occupier only pays the amount that they would have paid anyway for grid electricity. Additional electricity generation by households will be essential for powering EVs in future because current national generation capacity is not sufficient.				
FS243.179	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose	Kāinga Ora supports provisions that responds to the impacts of climate change by increasing resilience and enabling adaptation however prescriptive rules/standards such as those suggested would create additional burden and complexity to development proposals. The appropriate mechanism for these techniques would be through non-statutory design guidelines. It is also unclear on what the specific amendments or relief sought to the provisions in the PDP. Further clarity required to the proposed amendments to the provisions.	Allow in part	Amend PDP to include objectives, policies and rules/standards that require best practice environmentally sustainable techniques for new developments, including -	Accept in part	Key Issue: Impermeable Surface
FS570.2114	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: Impermeable Surface
FS566.2128	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: Impermeable Surface
FS569.2150	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: Impermeable Surface
S428.020	Kapiro Residents Association	Policies	Support in part	It should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings, for example, with	Amend PDP to include objectives, policies and rules/standards that require best practice environmentally sustainable		Accept in part	Key Issue: Impermeable Surface

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				requirements for permeable open areas including garden/landscaped ground. Developments should use permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths. The PDP should require all new buildings to store/use roof water wherever possible, to avoid the need for expensive reticulation systems and reduce the need for water top-ups via water tankers. New buildings connected to a public water supply should be required to collect roof water in storage vessels to use for gardens and flushing toilets (at minimum) and contribute to other household water uses such as laundry connections. Water storage vessels do not need to be a traditional round tank - other useful shapes exist, such as rectangular upright vessels that are easy to install against the side of a house or garage, or short flat vessels designed to be completely buried underground or placed under the foundations of new builds. Greywater harvesting and re-use should also be required for new buildings. These types of water-saving measures would also reduce future Council infrastructure costs for additional water supplies and wastewater. Passive heating and cooling designs, for example, reduce energy consumption and the on-going costs of heating/cooling. Solar panels with batteries, for example, can be purchased on lease-to-buy schemes so that the owner/occupier only pays the amount that they would have paid anyway for grid electricity. Additional	techniques for new developments, including - • Permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths etc. • Best practice for lowest environmental impact and water sensitive designs, requiring greywater recycling techniques and other technologies to ensure efficient use of water, rain storage tanks for properties connected to a public water supply, additional water storage for buildings that rely solely on roof water (to cope with drought), and other measures • Renewable energy technologies and energy-efficient technologies, and similar requirements that foster improved environmental design/technologies and lower lifecycle climate impacts • Specified area (percentage) of tree canopy cover and green corridors should be required within new subdivisions. These will be increasingly important for shade/cooling for buildings and pedestrians in future.		

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				electricity generation by households will be essential for powering EVs in future because current national generation capacity is not sufficient.				
FS243.181	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose	Kāinga Ora supports provisions that responds to the impacts of climate change by increasing resilience and enabling adaptation however prescriptive rules/standards such as those suggested would create additional burden and complexity to development proposals. The appropriate mechanism for these techniques would be through non-statutory design guidelines. It is also unclear on what the specific amendments or relief sought to the provisions in the PDP. Further clarity required to the proposed amendments to the provisions.	Allow in part	Amend PDP to include objectives, policies and rules/standards that require best practice environmentally sustainable techniques for new developments, including -	Accept in part	Key Issue: Impermeable Surface
S554.018	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited	GRZ-P1	Support in part	Policy GRZ-P1, Policy GRZ-P2 and GRZ- P3 should also recognize alternative means to addressing shortages in infrastructure capacity provided for by Council. There may be cases where private solutions and Developer Agreements can facilitate or provide adequate capacity to support land use and subdivision in the General Residential Zone. In this case, connections to the reticulated network may be made to the boundary but are unable to be connected until such time as there is an upgrade of the Council wastewater or potable water system. During this time, an interim onsite solution may be able to adequately address the infrastructure shortfall.	Amend Policy GRZ-P1 as follows: Enable land use and subdivision in the General Residential zone where: a) there is adequacy and capacity of available or programmed development infrastructure to support it; and b) it is consistent with the scale, character and amenity anticipated in the residential environment**; orc) a private infrastructure solution exists**.		Reject	Key Issue: Infrastructure
FS32.021	Jeff Kemp		Support in part	The submitter supports the overall intent and purpose of the original	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to	Reject	Key Issue: Infrastructure

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				submission as it is the only viable and practical option to enable planned and coordinated development in and around Kerikeri and the Waipapa area. The submitter notes that the documentation on proposed traffic movements is unclear. The original submission has not provided details on potential traffic movements and intersections for Waitotara Dive and Waipapa Road and how these might link to State Highway 10. For example, it is unclear if the new link from State Highway 10 through to the Kerikeri Town Centre is going to be a primary route and the link through to Waipapa Road a secondary route. The submitter notes it is unclear if the proposed flood mitigation measures will increase or reduce flooding along Waitotara Drive. The submitter also supports the proposed zoning as depicted within the original submission is an efficient use of land.		consideration of traffic movements, flood mitigation measures and amending the zoning as depicted in the original submission.		
FS547.087	Heron Point Limited		Support	This is supported	Allow	Amend Policy GRZ-P1 as follows: Enable land use and subdivision in the General Residential zone where: a) there is adequacy and capacity of available or programmed development infrastructure to support it; and b) it is consistent with the scale, character and amenity anticipated in the residential environment; or c) a	Reject	Key Issue: Infrastructure

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
						private infrastructure solution exists		
FS389.024	Smartlife Trust		Oppose	All of submission S554 in relation to the proposed Structure Plan for the landholding. In particular, the documents / plans which refer to a future access point through the Further Submitters land	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Infrastructure
S138.014	Kairos Connection Trust and Habitat for Humanity Northern Region Ltd	GRZ-P1	Support in part	Provided the Council provides clarity about the servicing capacity for 'Plan Enabled' development (as addressed in submission), the ability to establish a variety of residential housing densities and typologies within functional and high amenity living environments is supported.	Retain Policy GRZ-P1 (inferred)		Accept	Key Issue: General Residential Zone – Polices
S368.021	Far North District Council	GRZ-P2	Support in part	Minor grammatical correction in reference to d.	Amend GRZ-P2 Require all subdivision in the General Residential zone to provide the following reticulated services to the boundary of each lot: a. telecommunications: i. fibre where it is available; or ii. copper where fibre is not available; b. local electricity distribution network; c. wastewater; and d. potable water and stormwater where **they are** ~~it is~~ available.		Accept	Key Issues: Minor amendments
S328.001	Traverse Ltd	GRZ-P2	Not Stated	Policy GRZ-P2 should be amended so that it does not require copper connections where fibre is not available. Copper is antiquated technology, and expensive to install. Wireless technology is a more viable alternative in the absence of fibre	Amend Policy GRZ-P2 to remove requirement for copper connections where fibre is not available.		Accept in part	Key Issue: Infrastructure

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S400.002	BR and R Davies	GRZ-P2	Oppose	Policy GRZ-P2 should be amended so that it does not require copper connections where fibre is not available. Copper is antiquated technology, and expensive to install. Wireless technology is a more viable alternative in the absence of fibre	Amend Policy GRZ-P2 so that it does not require copper connections where fibre is not available		Accept in part	Key Issue: Infrastructure
S268.002	Brad Hedger	GRZ-P2	Support	Services where available should be connected.	Retain GRZ-P2.		Accept in part	Key Issue: Infrastructure
S124.001	Lynley Newport	GRZ-P2	Oppose	The policy is dictating how an urban dweller MUST receive their phone/telecommunications connectivity and power connectivity, and its wastewater, water and stormwater reticulation. There should be scope for alternatives. Telecommunications no longer must be in ground fibre or copper wire; power no longer must be conventional nonrenewable means. Technology has moved on. If a site in this zone is large enough to sustainably cater for on-site wastewater then it should not be 'required' to connect up to a council service. If a property can sustainably provide for their own potable water supply, they should not be 'required' to connect and pay for a council service.	Amend GRZ-P2 to read:**Encourage** all subdivision .... leave a-d unchanged; add sentence at the end;**And where it is proposed to rely on alternatives to the reticulated services outlined above, the alternative shall be capable of providing the same level of service as conventional reticulated services.**		Reject	Key Issue: Infrastructure
FS172.211	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject	Key Issue: Infrastructure
FS547.088	Heron Point Limited		Support	Support to the extent that Policy 2 should enable alternative delivery of infrastructure and servicing where there are capacity issues. The submitter supports the decision sought and amendments to Policy 2 as set out in Submission Point 554.019 below.	Allow	Amend GRZ-P2 to read: Encourage all subdivision .... leave a-d unchanged; add sentence at the end; And where it is proposed to rely on alternatives to the reticulated services outlined above, the alternative shall be	Reject	Key Issue: Infrastructure

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
						capable of providing the same level of service as conventional reticulated services.		
S554.019	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited	GRZ-P2	Support in part	Policy GRZ-P1, Policy GRZ-P2 and GRZ- P3 should also recognize alternative means to addressing shortages in infrastructure capacity provided for by Council. There may be cases where private solutions and Developer Agreements can facilitate or provide adequate capacity to support land use and subdivision in the General Residential Zone. In this case, connections to the reticulated network may be made to the boundary but are unable to be connected until such time as there is an upgrade of the Council wastewater or potable water system. During this time, an interim onsite solution may be able to adequately address the infrastructure shortfall.	Amend Policy GRZ-P2 as follows: Require all subdivision in the General Residential zone to provide the following~~reticulated~~ services to the boundary of each lot: a) telecommunications: i. fibre where it is available; or ii. copper where fibre is not available; b) local electricity distribution network; c) wastewater; and d) potable water and stormwater where it is available.		Reject	Key Issue: Infrastructure
FS32.022	Jeff Kemp		Support in part	The submitter supports the overall intent and purpose of the original submission as it is the only viable and practical option to enable planned and coordinated development in and around Kerikeri and the Waipapa area. The submitter notes that the documentation on proposed traffic movements is unclear. The original submission has not provided details on potential traffic movements and intersections for Waitotara Dive and Waipapa Road and how these might link to State Highway 10. For example, it is unclear if the new link from State Highway 10 through to the Kerikeri Town Centre is going to be a primary route and the link through to Waipapa	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to consideration of traffic movements, flood mitigation measures and amending the zoning as depicted in the original submission.	Reject	Key Issue: Infrastructure

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				Road a secondary route. The submitter notes it is unclear if the proposed flood mitigation measures will increase or reduce flooding along Waitotara Drive. The submitter also supports the proposed zoning as depicted within the original submission is an efficient use of land.				
FS547.089	Heron Point Limited		Support	The amendment sought to Policy 2 are supported.	Allow	Amend	Reject	Key Issue: Infrastructure
FS389.025	Smartlife Trust		Oppose	All of submission S554 in relation to the proposed Structure Plan for the landholding. In particular, the documents / plans which refer to a future access point through the Further Submitters land	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept	Key Issue: Infrastructure
S138.015	Kairos Connection Trust and Habitat for Humanity Northern Region Ltd	GRZ-P3	Support in part	Provided the Council provides clarity about the servicing capacity for 'Plan Enabled' development (as addressed in submission), the ability to establish a variety of residential housing densities and typologies within functional and high amenity living environments is supported.	Retain Policy GRZ-P3		Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
S554.020	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited	GRZ-P3	Support in part	Policy GRZ-P1, Policy GRZ-P2 and GRZ- P3 should also recognize alternative means to addressing shortages in infrastructure capacity provided for by Council. There may be cases where private solutions and Developer Agreements can facilitate or provide adequate capacity to support land use and subdivision in the General Residential Zone. In this case, connections to the reticulated network may be made to the boundary but are unable to be connected until such time as there is an upgrade of the Council wastewater or potable water system. During this	Amend Policy GRZ-P3 as follows: Enable multi-unit developments within the General Residential zone, including terraced housing and apartments, where there is adequacy and capacity of available or programmed development infrastructure**, or a private infrastructure solution**.		Reject	Key Issue: Residential Intensity

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				time, an interim onsite solution may be able to adequately address the infrastructure shortfall.				
FS32.023	Jeff Kemp		Support in part	The submitter supports the overall intent and purpose of the original submission as it is the only viable and practical option to enable planned and coordinated development in and around Kerikeri and the Waipapa area. The submitter notes that the documentation on proposed traffic movements is unclear. The original submission has not provided details on potential traffic movements and intersections for Waitotara Dive and Waipapa Road and how these might link to State Highway 10. For example, it is unclear if the new link from State Highway 10 through to the Kerikeri Town Centre is going to be a primary route and the link through to Waipapa Road a secondary route. The submitter notes it is unclear if the proposed flood mitigation measures will increase or reduce flooding along Waitotara Drive. The submitter also supports the proposed zoning as depicted within the original submission is an efficient use of land.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to consideration of traffic movements, flood mitigation measures and amending the zoning as depicted in the original submission.	Reject in part	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
FS547.101	Heron Point Limited		Support	The decision sought is supported.	Allow	Amend Policy GRZ-P3	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
FS547.111	Heron Point Limited		Support	The decision sought is supported.	Allow	Amend Policy GRZ-P3	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
FS389.026	Smartlife Trust		Oppose	All of submission S554 in relation to the proposed Structure Plan for the landholding. In particular, the documents / plans which refer to a	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept	Key Issue: Residential Intensity

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				future access point through the Further Submitters land				
S561.069	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	GRZ-P3	Oppose	Kāinga Ora oppose the definition of multi-unit development (as noted in definitions above). The amendments to this policy are sought follow on from this amendment and ensure the policy remains consistent with Objective GRZ-O1.	Amend policy as follows: Enable ~~multi-unit~~ **a range of residential** developments within the General Residential zone, including terraced housing and apartments, where there is adequacy and capacity of available or programmed development infrastructure.		Accept	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
FS32.123	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	The original submission seeks to amend the FNDP in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes. The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts. The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Intensity

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.				
FS23.341	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Accept	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
FS47.083	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
FS348.156	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
S165.010	Arvida Group Limited	GRZ-P3	Support	Policy GRZ-P3 appropriately seeks to enable "multi-unit developments within the General Residential Zone, including terraced housing and apartments, where there is adequacy and capacity of available or programmed	Retain Policy GRZ-P3		Support in part	Key Issue General Residential Zone - Policies

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				development infrastructure." This enablement of a variety of different housing typologies is further reflected in Policy GRZ-P5 which specifically provides for retirement villages with four different criteria which are realistically capable of being achieved.				
FS547.090	Heron Point Limited		Support	The decision sought is supported to the extent that Policy 3 acknowledges the importance of providing a mix of housing densities and typologies through the delivery of housing supply	Allow	Retain Policy GRZ-P3.	Support in part	Key Issue General Residential Zone - Policies
S257.018	Te Hiku Community Board	GRZ-P3	Support in part	Support a higher density of housing in the new multi-unit development rules and a higher density of housing in the residential zones	Retain policy GRZ-P3, enabling multi-unit development		Accept	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
FS547.091	Heron Point Limited		Support	The decision sought is supported to the extent that Policy 3 acknowledges the importance of providing a mix of housing densities and typologies through the delivery of housing supply.	Allow	Retain policy GRZ-P3, enabling multi-unit development.	Accept	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
S357.018	Sean Frieling	GRZ-P3	Support in part	We support a higher density of housing in the new multi-unit development rules. We support a higher density of housing in the residential zones We support a higher density of subdivision as a restricted discretionary activity instead of a discretionary activity in the residential zone, as these areas should be encouraged for more housing and amenity value is of less of a concern to the provision of housing in these areas that do not have landscape or heritage overlays. We feel that it should be restricted discretionary to ensure that the assessment criteria that neighbours can have weighting over as an affected party is limited, to ensure that more housing can be provided with less likelihood of a hearing, as there	Retain policy GRZ-P3, enabling multi-unit development		Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Intensity

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				should be a strong push to enable more housing in urban centres. The rules should only be allowed in areas where all infrastructure has been upgraded and maintained to allow for the maximum development potential under this rule and subdivision rules.				
FS547.092	Heron Point Limited		Support	The decision sought is supported to the extent that Policy 3 acknowledges the importance of providing a mix of housing densities and typologies through the delivery of housing supply.	Allow	Retain policy GRZ-P3, enabling multi-unit development	Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
S358.018	Leah Frieling	GRZ-P3	Support in part	We support a higher density of housing in the new multi-unit development rules. We support a higher density of housing in the residential zones	Retain policy GRZ-P3		Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
FS547.093	Heron Point Limited		Support	The decision sought is supported to the extent that Policy 3 acknowledges the importance of providing a mix of housing densities and typologies through the delivery of housing supply	Allow	Accept in part	Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
S464.024	LJ King Ltd	GRZ-P3	Support in part	We support a higher density of housing in the new multi-unit development rules.	Retain GRZ-P3.		Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
FS547.094	Heron Point Limited		Support	The decision sought is supported to the extent that Policy 3 acknowledges the importance of providing a mix of housing densities and typologies through the delivery of housing supply	Allow	Accept in part	Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
FS566.1567	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
S543.022	LJ King Limited	GRZ-P3	Support in part	We support a higher density of housing in the new multi-unit development rules	Retain GRZ-P3		Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Intensity

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS547.095	Heron Point Limited		Support	The decision sought is supported to the extent that Policy 3 acknowledges the importance of providing a mix of housing densities and typologies through the delivery of housing supply	Allow	Retain policy GRZ-P3.	Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
FS566.2183	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
S547.022	LJ King Limited	GRZ-P3	Support in part	We support a higher density of housing in the new multi-unit development rules	Retain GRZ-P3		Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
FS547.096	Heron Point Limited		Support	The decision sought is supported to the extent that Policy 3 acknowledges the importance of providing a mix of housing densities and typologies through the delivery of housing supply	Allow	Retain policy GRZ-P3.	Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
S472.018	Michael Foy	GRZ-P3	Support	We support a higher density of housing in the new multi-unit development rules. We support a higher density of housing in the residential zones	Retain policy GRZ-P3, enabling multi-unit development		Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
FS547.097	Heron Point Limited		Support	The decision sought is supported to the extent that Policy 3 acknowledges the importance of providing a mix of housing densities and typologies through the delivery of housing supply	Allow	Accept in part	Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
S485.023	Elbury Holdings	GRZ-P3	Support	We support a higher density of housing in the new multi-unit development rules. We support a higher density of housing in the residential zones.	Retain Policy GRZ-P3, enabling multi-unit development.		Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
FS547.098	Heron Point Limited		Support	The decision sought is supported to the extent that Policy 3 acknowledges the importance of providing a mix of housing densities and typologies through the delivery of housing supply.	Allow	Accept in part	Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Intensity

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S519.023	Elbury Holdings	GRZ-P3	Support	We support a higher density of housing in the new multi-unit development rules.	Retain GRZ-P3.		Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
FS547.099	Heron Point Limited		Support	The decision sought is supported to the extent that Policy 3 acknowledges the importance of providing a mix of housing densities and typologies through the delivery of housing supply.	Allow	Retain Policy GRZ-P3, enabling multi-unit development	Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
S541.021	Elbury Holdings	GRZ-P3	Support	We support a higher density of housing in the new multi-unit development rules. We support a higher density of housing in the residential zones.	Retain Policy GRZ-P3, enabling multi-unit development.		Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
FS547.0100	Heron Point Limited		Support	The decision sought is supported to the extent that Policy 3 acknowledges the importance of providing a mix of housing densities and typologies through the delivery of housing supply.	Allow	Retain Policy GRZ-P3, enabling multi-unit development	Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
S331.063	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	GRZ-P4	Support in part	The submitter supports in part policy GRZ-P4 and consider educational facilities to meet the outlined intentions. However, often schools are located in residential zones to support the surrounding residential catchments. It could be considered that schools are not of a 'residential scale'. Therefore, the ministry requests educational facilities to be removed from GRZ-P4(c).	Amend policy GRZ-P4 as follows: Enable non-residential activities that: a. do not detract from the vitality and viability of the General Residential zone; b. support the social and economic well-being of the community; c. are of a ~~residential~~ scale **expected in the General Residential zone**; and d. are consistent with the scale, character and amenity of the General Residential zone.		Reject	Key Issues: Plan wide
FS243.155	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Support	Kāinga Ora supports provisions that enable housing with good access to jobs, amenities and services and the co-location of activities to contribute to economic, social, environmental, and cultural wellbeing.	Allow	Amend policy GRZ-P4 as follows:	Reject	Key Issues: Plan wide

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				As such, Kāinga Ora supports the enablement of activities within the General Residential zone that may not residential but will contribute to the achievement of good housing outcomes.			
S165.011	Arvida Group Limited	GRZ-P5	Support	GRZ-P5 is considered to be well framed and recognises that retirement villages are predominantly residential in nature and are usually located within residential neighbourhoods. Retirement villages, which maintain a similar form and scale to other types of residential development, simply become another form of residential activity that contributes to the diverse needs of the community.	Retain Policy GRZ-P5	Accept in part	Key Issue: Retirement Villages
S218.003	Summerset Group Holdings Limited	GRZ-P5	Support in part	expresses support for the submission of the Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand (submission 520) in its entirety.	Amend Policy GRZ-P5 Provide for a diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons in the General Residential Zone, such as retirement villages, where they: (a) compliment the character and amenity values of the surrounding area, recognising the functional and operational needs of retirement villages may require greater density than the surrounding area to enable efficient provision of services;~~(b) contribute to the diverse needs of the community;~~ (c) do not adversely affect road safety~~or the efficiency of the transport network;~~ and (d) can be serviced by adequate development infrastructure.	Accept in part	Key Issue: Retirement Villages

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S520.003	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	GRZ-P5	Support in part	Support in principle the inclusion of a retirement village-specific policy (GRZ-P5) in the General Residential chapter. Oppose the qualifications that apply to the policy direction to "provide for" retirement villages.	Amend Policy GRZ-P5 Provide for **a diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons in the General Residential Zone, such as** retirement villages, where they: (a) compliment the character and amenity values of the surrounding area, **recognising the functional and operational needs of retirement villages may require greater density than the surrounding area to enable efficient provision of services;**~~(b) contribute to the diverse needs of the community;~~ (c) do not adversely affect road safety ~~or the efficiency of the transport network;~~ and (d) can be serviced by adequate development infrastructure.	Accept in part	Key Issue: Retirement Villages
S554.021	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited	GRZ-P5	Support in part	KFO supports the intent of Policy GRZ-P5, but considers it should also recognize alternative means to addressing shortages in infrastructure capacity provided for by Council. There may be cases where private solutions can provide adequate capacity to support land use and subdivision in the	Amend Policy GRZ-P5 as follows: Provide for retirement villages where they: a) compliment the character and amenity values of the surrounding area; b) contribute to the diverse needs of the community; c) do not adversely affect road safety or the efficiency of the transport network; and	Reject	Key Issue: Infrastructure

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				General Residential Zone, or Developer Agreements can be entered into. There are options for connections to the reticulated network may be made to the boundary but are unable to be connected until such time as there is an upgrade of the Council wastewater or potable water system. During this time, an interim onsite solution may be able to adequately address the infrastructure shortfall. The current General Residential Zone does not provide for adequate land within the zone to deliver a retirement village on scale. A retirement village typically needs 5- 10 ha of vacant land. By not extending the existing General Residential Zone, there is no provision within the pFNDP to establish a new retirement village for which analysis shows there is a demand.	d) can be serviced by adequate development infrastructure **or private infrastructure solutions**.			
FS32.024	Jeff Kemp		Support in part	The submitter supports the overall intent and purpose of the original submission as it is the only viable and practical option to enable planned and coordinated development in and around Kerikeri and the Waipapa area. The submitter notes that the documentation on proposed traffic movements is unclear. The original submission has not provided details on potential traffic movements and intersections for Waitotara Dive and Waipapa Road and how these might link to State Highway 10. For example, it is unclear if the new link from State Highway 10 through to the Kerikeri Town Centre is going to be a primary	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to consideration of traffic movements, flood mitigation measures and amending the zoning as depicted in the original submission.	Reject	Key Issue: Infrastructure

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				route and the link through to Waipapa Road a secondary route. The submitter notes it is unclear if the proposed flood mitigation measures will increase or reduce flooding along Waitotara Drive. The submitter also supports the proposed zoning as depicted within the original submission is an efficient use of land.				
FS547.110	Heron Point Limited		Support	The decision sought is supported to the extent that Policy 3 acknowledges the importance of providing a mix of housing densities and typologies through the delivery of housing supply	Allow	Retain Policy GRZ-P3, enabling multi-unit development.	Reject	Key Issue: Infrastructure
FS389.027	Smartlife Trust		Oppose	All of submission S554 in relation to the proposed Structure Plan for the landholding. In particular, the documents / plans which refer to a future access point through the Further Submitters land	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept	Key Issue: Infrastructure
S512.040	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	GRZ-P6	Support	Fire and Emergency support the encouragement and support for on-site water storage. On-site water storage lessens demand on reticulated water supplies and increases resilience in the face of climate change	retain GRZ-P6		Accept	Key Issue: Infrastructure
S554.022	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited	GRZ-P6	Support	KFO supports Policy GRZ-P6 as appropriately recognising that on-site water storage may be required in some cases.	Retain the policy as notified.		Accept	Key Issue: Infrastructure
FS32.025	Jeff Kemp		Support in part	The submitter supports the overall intent and purpose of the original submission as it is the only viable and practical option to enable planned and coordinated development in and around Kerikeri and the Waipapa area. The submitter notes that the documentation on proposed traffic	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to consideration of traffic movements, flood mitigation measures and amending the zoning as depicted in the original submission.	Accept	Key Issue: Infrastructure

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				movements is unclear. The original submission has not provided details on potential traffic movements and intersections for Waitotara Dive and Waipapa Road and how these might link to State Highway 10. For example, it is unclear if the new link from State Highway 10 through to the Kerikeri Town Centre is going to be a primary route and the link through to Waipapa Road a secondary route. The submitter notes it is unclear if the proposed flood mitigation measures will increase or reduce flooding along Waitotara Drive. The submitter also supports the proposed zoning as depicted within the original submission is an efficient use of land.				
FS547.102	Heron Point Limited		Support	The decision sought is supported.	Allow	Retain the policy as notified	Accept	Key Issue: Infrastructure
FS547.112	Heron Point Limited		Support	The decision sought is supported.	Allow	Retain the policy as notified	Accept	Key Issue: Infrastructure
FS389.028	Smartlife Trust		Oppose	All of submission S554 in relation to the proposed Structure Plan for the landholding. In particular, the documents / plans which refer to a future access point through the Further Submitters land	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Infrastructure
S554.023	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited	GRZ-P7	Support	KFO supports Policy GRZ-P7 as it appropriately recognises that small-scale renewable energy generation can have benefits for residential development.	Retain the policy as notified.		Accept	Key Issue: Infrastructure
FS32.026	Jeff Kemp		Support in part	The submitter supports the overall intent and purpose of the original submission as it is the only viable and practical option to enable planned and coordinated development in and around Kerikeri and the Waipapa area.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to consideration of traffic movements, flood mitigation measures and amending the zoning as	Accept	Key Issue: Infrastructure

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				The submitter notes that the documentation on proposed traffic movements is unclear. The original submission has not provided details on potential traffic movements and intersections for Waitotara Dive and Waipapa Road and how these might link to State Highway 10. For example, it is unclear if the new link from State Highway 10 through to the Kerikeri Town Centre is going to be a primary route and the link through to Waipapa Road a secondary route. The submitter notes it is unclear if the proposed flood mitigation measures will increase or reduce flooding along Waitotara Drive. The submitter also supports the proposed zoning as depicted within the original submission is an efficient use of land.		depicted in the original submission.		
FS547.103	Heron Point Limited		Support	The decision sought is supported.	Allow	Retain the policy as notified	Accept	Key Issue: Infrastructure
FS547.113	Heron Point Limited		Support	The decision sought is supported.	Allow	The decision sought is supported.	Accept	Key Issue: Infrastructure
FS389.029	Smartlife Trust		Oppose	All of submission S554 in relation to the proposed Structure Plan for the landholding. In particular, the documents / plans which refer to a future access point through the Further Submitters land	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Infrastructure
S271.038	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	GRZ-P8	Support in part	The Residential Zone borders commercial areas, to ensure real integration, connectivity must be ensured in the residential zones as well.	Amend GRZ-P8 Manage land use and subdivision to address the effects of the activity requiring resource consent, including (but not limited to) consideration of the following matters where relevant to the application: a. consistency with the scale, design, amenity and character of the residential environment;		Support in part	Key Issue – GRZ Policies

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					b. the location, scale and design of buildings or structures, potential for shadowing and visual dominance;**c. alignment with any strategic or spatial document;d. provisions made to ensure connectivity;** e. for residential activities: i. provision for outdoor living space; ii. privacy for adjoining sites; iii. access to sunlight; f. for non-residential activities: i. scale and compatibility with residential activities ii. hours of operation g. at zone interfaces, any setbacks, fencing, screening or landscaping required to address potential conflicts; h. the adequacy and capacity of available or programmed development infrastructure to accommodate the proposed activity, including: i. opportunities for low impact design principles ii. ability of the site to address stormwater and soakage; i. managing natural hazards; and j. any historical, spiritual, or cultural		

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					association held by tangata whenua, with regard to the matters set out in Policy TW-P6.			
FS25.078	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Support	Supports the concept of achieving good urban design outcomes. However, any urban design guidelines would need to be carefully considered and appropriately drafted.	Allow	Allow the original submission, subject to appropriate wording.	Support in part	Key Issue – GRZ Policies
FS325.052	Turnstone Trust Limited		Support	TT supports the concept of achieving good urban design outcomes. However, any urban design guidelines would need to be carefully considered and appropriately drafted.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate wording.	Support in part	Key Issue – GRZ Policies
FS570.761	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	allow the original submission	Support in part	Key Issue – GRZ Policies
FS566.775	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Support in part	Key Issue – GRZ Policies
FS569.797	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Support in part	Key Issue – GRZ Policies
S554.024	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited	GRZ-P8	Support	KFO supports Policy GRZ-P8 as it appropriately recognises the need to manage development, including managing various competing activities to ensure a well-functioning urban environment.	Retain the policy as notified.		Support in part	Key Issue – GRZ Policies
FS32.027	Jeff Kemp		Support in part	The submitter supports the overall intent and purpose of the original submission as it is the only viable and practical option to enable planned and coordinated development in and around Kerikeri and the Waipapa area. The submitter notes that the documentation on proposed traffic	Allow	Support in part	Support in part	Key Issue – GRZ Policies

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				movements is unclear. The original submission has not provided details on potential traffic movements and intersections for Waitotara Dive and Waipapa Road and how these might link to State Highway 10. For example, it is unclear if the new link from State Highway 10 through to the Kerikeri Town Centre is going to be a primary route and the link through to Waipapa Road a secondary route. The submitter notes it is unclear if the proposed flood mitigation measures will increase or reduce flooding along Waitotara Drive. The submitter also supports the proposed zoning as depicted within the original submission is an efficient use of land.				
FS389.030	Smartlife Trust		Oppose	All of submission S554 in relation to the proposed Structure Plan for the landholding. In particular, the documents / plans which refer to a future access point through the Further Submitters land	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue – GRZ Policies
S561.070	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	GRZ-P8	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports this policy in part, but request GRZ-P8 a. be amended as per out relief. This is to be consistent with Objectives GRZ-O1 and GRZ-P1.	Amend as follows: Manage land use and subdivision to address the effects of the activity requiring resource consent, including (but not limited to) consideration of the following matters where relevant to the application: a. consistency with the scale, design, amenity and character of the **planned** residential environment;		Accept	Key Issue – GRZ Policies
FS32.124	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	The original submission seeks to amend the FNDP in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Reject	Key Issue – GRZ Policies

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes. The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts. The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.				
FS23.342	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Accept	Key Issue – GRZ Policies
FS47.084	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Reject	Key Issue – GRZ Policies

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document				
FS348.157	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Reject	Key Issue – GRZ Policies
S416.046	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	GRZ-P8	Support in part	Policies in each zone provide for managing land use and subdivision to address the effects of the activity at zone interfaces by requiring the provision of 'setbacks, fencing, screening or landscaping required to address potential conflicts'. KiwiRail seeks an amendment to provide for the consideration of setbacks to the railway corridor or transport network, thus supporting safety and the railway setback rule sought	Insert additional matter as follows:**the location and design of buildings adjacent to the railway corridor**		Accept in part	Key Issue – Plan wide or urban wide submissions
FS243.132	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the requested 5m setback; a considerably reduced set back would provide adequate space for maintenance activities within sites adjacent to the rail network. In doing so, it will continue to protect the safe, efficient, and effective operation of the rail infrastructure while balancing the cost on landowners. The amendments are unnecessary.	Disallow	Insert additional matter as follows: the location and design of buildings adjacent to the railway corridor	Reject	Key Issue – Plan wide or urban wide submissions
S529.103	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	GRZ-P8	Support in part	The Residential Zone borders commercial areas, to ensure real integration, connectivity must be	Amend GRZ-P8 Manage land use and subdivision to address the effects of the activity requiring resource consent, including (but not limited to) consideration of the following matters where		Accept in part	Key Issue – GRZ Policies

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				ensured in the residential zones as well.	relevant to the application: a. consistency with the scale, design, amenity and character of the residential environment;b. the location, scale and design of buildings or structures, potential for shadowing and visual dominance;**c. alignment with any strategic or spatial document;d. provisions made to ensure connectivity;** e. for residential activities: i. provision for outdoor living space; ii. privacy for adjoining sites; iii. access to sunlight; f. for non-residential activities: i. scale and compatibility with residential activities ii. hours of operation g. at zone interfaces, any setbacks, fencing, screening or landscaping required to address potential conflicts; h. the adequacy and capacity of available or programmed development infrastructure to accommodate the proposed activity, including: i. opportunities for low impact design principles ii. ability of the site to address stormwater and soakage;		

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					i. managing natural hazards; and j. any historical, spiritual, or cultural association held by tangata whenua, with regard to the matters set out in Policy TW-P6.			
FS570.1991	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Key Issue – GRZ Policies
FS566.2005	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Key Issue – GRZ Policies
FS569.2027	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Key Issue – GRZ Policies
S524.038	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	GRZ-P8	Support in part	The Residential Zone borders commercial areas, to ensure real integration, connectivity must be ensured in the residential zones as well.	Amend GRZ-P8 Manage land use and subdivision to address the effects of the activity requiring resource consent, including (but not limited to) consideration of the following matters where relevant to the application: a. consistency with the scale, design, amenity and character of the residential environment; b. the location, scale and design of buildings or structures, potential for shadowing and visual dominance;**c. alignment with any strategic or spatial document;d. provisions made to ensure connectivity;** e. for residential activities: i. provision for outdoor living space; ii. privacy for adjoining sites; iii. access to sunlight; f. for non-residential activities:		Accept in part	Key Issue – GRZ Policies

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					i. scale and compatibility with residential activities ii. hours of operation g. at zone interfaces, any setbacks, fencing, screening or landscaping required to address potential conflicts; h. the adequacy and capacity of available or programmed development infrastructure to accommodate the proposed activity, including: i. opportunities for low impact design principles ii. ability of the site to address stormwater and soakage; i. managing natural hazards; and j. any historical, spiritual, or cultural association held by tangata whenua, with regard to the matters set out in Policy TW-P6.			
FS566.1856	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Key Issue – GRZ Policies
S446.039	Kapiro Conservation Trust	GRZ-P8	Support in part	The Residential Zone borders commercial areas, to ensure real integration, connectivity must be ensured in the residential zones as well.	Amend GRZ-P8 Manage land use and subdivision to address the effects of the activity requiring resource consent, including (but not limited to) consideration of the following matters where relevant to the application: a. consistency with the scale, design, amenity and character of the residential		Accept in part	Key Issue – GRZ Policies

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					environment; b. the location, scale and design of buildings or structures, potential for shadowing and visual dominance;**c. alignment with any strategic or spatial document;d. provisions made to ensure connectivity;** e. for residential activities: i. provision for outdoor living space; ii. privacy for adjoining sites; iii. access to sunlight; f. for non-residential activities: i. scale and compatibility with residential activities ii. hours of operation g. at zone interfaces, any setbacks, fencing, screening or landscaping required to address potential conflicts; h. the adequacy and capacity of available or programmed development infrastructure to accommodate the proposed activity, including: i. opportunities for low impact design principles ii. ability of the site to address stormwater and soakage; i. managing natural hazards; and j. any historical, spiritual, or cultural		

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					association held by tangata whenua, with regard to the matters set out in Policy TW-P6.		
FS569.1798	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Accept in part	Key Issue – GRZ Policies
FS570.1798	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Accept in part	Key Issue – GRZ Policies
S438.014	New Zealand Motor Caravan Association	Rules	Support in part	The General Residential Zone probably needs to be protected for housing.	Amend General Residential Zone rules to provide for camping grounds as discretionary activities.	Accept	Key Issue – Plan wide or urban wide submissions
S438.015	New Zealand Motor Caravan Association	Rules	Support in part	Camping sites are unlikely in the General Residential Zone and there is a risk of some incompatibilities.	Amend General Residential Zone rules to provide for camping sites 6 guests and over as a discretionary activity (inferred).	Accept	Key Issue – Plan wide or urban wide submissions
S428.010	Kapiro Residents Association	Rules	Support in part	We support the principle of PDP provisions controlling the area of impermeable surface per site, and consider it is probably also necessary to monitor and limit the total cumulative impermeable area in residential/urban zones.	Amend to provide for greater limits on impermeable areas (and/or requirements for minimum permeable areas) for subdivision, use and development. In urban/residential zones, it will also be necessary to adopt measures to limit the cumulative total impermeable surface and/or protect a specified cumulative total permeable area.	Reject	Key Issue: Impermeable surfaces
S428.021	Kapiro Residents Association	Rules	Support in part	It should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings, for example, with requirements for permeable open areas including garden/landscaped ground. Developments should use permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths. The PDP should require all new buildings to store/use roof water wherever possible, to avoid the need for expensive reticulation systems and reduce the need for water top-ups via water tankers. New buildings connected to a public water supply	Amend PDP to include objectives, policies and rules/standards that require best practice environmentally sustainable techniques for new developments, including - • Permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths etc. • Best practice for lowest environmental impact and water sensitive designs, requiring greywater recycling techniques and other technologies to ensure efficient use of water, rain storage tanks for properties connected to a	Accept in part	Key Issue: Impermeable surfaces

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				should be required to collect roof water in storage vessels to use for gardens and flushing toilets (at minimum) and contribute to other household water uses such as laundry connections. Water storage vessels do not need to be a traditional round tank - other useful shapes exist, such as rectangular upright vessels that are easy to install against the side of a house or garage, or short flat vessels designed to be completely buried underground or placed under the foundations of new builds. Greywater harvesting and re-use should also be required for new buildings. These types of water-saving measures would also reduce future Council infrastructure costs for additional water supplies and wastewater. Passive heating and cooling designs, for example, reduce energy consumption and the on-going costs of heating/cooling. Solar panels with batteries, for example, can be purchased on lease-to-buy schemes so that the owner/occupier only pays the amount that they would have paid anyway for grid electricity. Additional electricity generation by households will be essential for powering EVs in future because current national generation capacity is not sufficient.	public water supply, additional water storage for buildings that rely solely on roof water (to cope with drought), and other measures • Renewable energy technologies and energy-efficient technologies, and similar requirements that foster improved environmental design/technologies and lower lifecycle climate impacts • Specified area (percentage) of tree canopy cover and green corridors should be required within new subdivisions. These will be increasingly important for shade/cooling for buildings and pedestrians in future.		
S554.025	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited	Rules	Support	KFO are generally supportive of the proposed rules within the General Residential Zone. However, the rule framework does not provide for hotels/motels as an activity, suitable to be located within the General Residential Zone. Hotels/motels as an activity would be consistent with proposed Policy GRZ-	Insert a new rule that provides for hotels/motels as a restricted discretionary activity in the GRZ, with matters of discretion that reflect the issues in Policy GRZ-P4.	Reject	Key Issue General Residential Zone - Rules

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				P4 as a non-residential activity that is of a residential scale and supports the social and economic wellbeing of the community.				
FS323.7	Nicole Wooster		Oppose	The scale of these facilities can range from small scale to a large-scale accommodation activity. While a small boutique could be compatible for low density residential development a large motel would not be.	Disallow		Accept	Key Issue General Residential Zone - Rules
FS32.028	Jeff Kemp		Support in part	The submitter supports the overall intent and purpose of the original submission as it is the only viable and practical option to enable planned and coordinated development in and around Kerikeri and the Waipapa area. The submitter notes that the documentation on proposed traffic movements is unclear. The original submission has not provided details on potential traffic movements and intersections for Waitotara Dive and Waipapa Road and how these might link to State Highway 10. For example, it is unclear if the new link from State Highway 10 through to the Kerikeri Town Centre is going to be a primary route and the link through to Waipapa Road a secondary route. The submitter notes it is unclear if the proposed flood mitigation measures will increase or reduce flooding along Waitotara Drive. The submitter also supports the proposed zoning as depicted within the original submission is an efficient use of land.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to consideration of traffic movements, flood mitigation measures and amending the zoning as depicted in the original submission.	Reject	Key Issue General Residential Zone - Rules
FS389.031	Smartlife Trust		Oppose	All of submission S554 in relation to the proposed Structure Plan for the landholding. In particular, the	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept	Key Issue General Residential Zone - Rules

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				documents / plans which refer to a future access point through the Further Submitters land				
S559.028	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rēhia	Rules	Support	It is not clear from either the subdivision or zone rules regarding wastewater infrastructure that requires servicing capacity to be confirmed at the time of a subdivision or land use consent application. Greater certainty about the ability of existing infrastructure to service this type of 'Plan enabled' development is still required rather than fully relying on permitted rule standards to demonstrate this at the time of a land use consent proposal.	Insert a permitted or controlled activity rule which provides greater certainty regarding the ability of existing infrastructure to service plan-enabled development (inferred).		Reject	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
FS151.336	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
FS243.126	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Support	Kāinga Ora supports development aligned with the provision of adequate climate-resilient services and infrastructure.	Allow	Insert a permitted or controlled activity rule which provides greater certainty regarding the ability of existing infrastructure to service plan-enabled development.	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
FS570.2218	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
FS348.055	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
FS566.2232	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Intensity

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS569.2254	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
S512.049	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Rules	Not Stated	Fire and Emergency support an activity for emergency service facilities being listed as an activity in zones. Please see Table 1 of the submission for the location of existing fire stations. Note that these are found in a range of zones. New fire stations may be necessary in order to continue to achieve emergency response time commitments in situations where development occurs, and populations change. In this regard it is noted that Fire and Emergency is not a requiring authority under section 166 of the RMA, and therefore does not have the ability to designate land for the purposes of fire stations. Provisions within the rules of the district plan are therefore, the best way to facilitate the development of any new fire stations within the district as urban development progresses. Fire and Emergency request that emergency service facilities are included as a permitted activity in all zones. The draft Plan currently only includes emergency services facilities as an activity in some zones and with varying activity status. In addition, fire stations have specific requirements with relation to setback distances and vehicle crossings. Fire and Emergency request that emergency service facilities are exempt from these standards.	Insertnew rule for Emergency service facilities included as a permitted activity Emergencyservice facilities are exempt from standards relating to setback distances, vehiclecrossings		Accept in part	Key Issue: Plan wide and urban wide issues
FS36.075	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency		Oppose	Supports the location of Emergency Service Facilities in the General Residential Zone. However, vehicle crossing standards still need to be	Allow in part	Amend new permitted activity rule for Emergency Services Facilities to consider the	Reject	Key Issue: Plan wide and urban wide issues

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				considered to ensure that the safety and efficiency of the crossing place and transport system is appropriately addressed for Emergency Service Facilities. The rule should recognise that at least the minimum vehicle crossing standard for the general residential zone should be met.		safety and efficiency of the crossing and transport system and to require compliance with the minimum vehicle crossing standard.		
S561.115	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Rules	Not Stated	Introduce a framework of Objectives; Policies; Standards and rules; Matters of discretion; and Assessment Criteria to support the proposed Medium density residential zone.	Insert new provisions as set out in Appendix 4 of the submission to supportthe introduction of the proposed Medium densityresidential zone.		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone selection
FS32.169	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	The original submission seeks to amend the FNDP in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes. The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts. The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone selection

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS348.019	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	There is no requirement for the proposed medium density zone.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone selection
FS23.387	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone selection
FS47.129	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone selection
FS348.202	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone selection
S521.024	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	Rules	Support in part	It should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings, for example, with requirements for permeable open areas including garden/landscaped	Amend PDP to include objectives, policies and rules/standards that require best practice environmentally sustainable techniques for new developments, including -		Accept in part	Key Issue: Impermeable surfaces

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				ground. Developments should use permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths. The PDP should require all new buildings to store/use roof water wherever possible, to avoid the need for expensive reticulation systems and reduce the need for water top-ups via water tankers. New buildings connected to a public water supply should be required to collect roof water in storage vessels to use for gardens and flushing toilets (at minimum) and contribute to other household water uses such as laundry connections. Water storage vessels do not need to be a traditional round tank - other useful shapes exist, such as rectangular upright vessels that are easy to install against the side of a house or garage, or short flat vessels designed to be completely buried underground or placed under the foundations of new builds. Greywater harvesting and re-use should also be required for new buildings. These types of water-saving measures would also reduce future Council infrastructure costs for additional water supplies and wastewater. Passive heating and cooling designs, for example, reduce energy consumption and the on-going costs of heating/cooling. Solar panels with batteries, for example, can be purchased on lease-to-buy schemes so that the owner/occupier only pays the amount that they would have paid anyway for grid electricity. Additional electricity generation by households will be essential for powering EVs in	• Permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths etc. • Best practice for lowest environmental impact and water sensitive designs, requiring greywater recycling techniques and other technologies to ensure efficient use of water, rain storage tanks for properties connected to a public water supply, additional water storage for buildings that rely solely on roof water (to cope with drought), and other measures • Renewable energy technologies and energy-efficient technologies, and similar requirements that foster improved environmental design/technologies and lower lifecycle climate impacts • Specified area (percentage) of tree canopy cover and green corridors should be required within new subdivisions. These will be increasingly important for shade/cooling for buildings and pedestrians in future.		

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				future because current national generation capacity is not sufficient				
FS243.178	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose	Kāinga Ora supports provisions that responds to the impacts of climate change by increasing resilience and enabling adaptation however prescriptive rules/standards such as those suggested would create additional burden and complexity to development proposals. The appropriate mechanism for these techniques would be through non-statutory design guidelines. It is also unclear on what the specific amendments or relief sought to the provisions in the PDP. Further clarity required to the proposed amendments to the provisions.	Allow in part	Amend PDP to include objectives, policies and rules/standards that require best practice environmentally sustainable techniques for new developments, including -	Reject	Key Issue: Impermeable surfaces
FS566.1734	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: Impermeable surfaces
S529.228	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	Rules	Support in part	It should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings, for example, with requirements for permeable open areas including garden/landscaped ground. Developments should use permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths. The PDP should require all new buildings to store/use roof water wherever possible, to avoid the need for expensive reticulation systems and reduce the need for water top-ups via water tankers. New buildings connected to a public water supply should be required to collect roof water in storage vessels to use for gardens and flushing toilets (at minimum) and contribute to other household water uses such as laundry connections.	Amend PDP to include objectives, policies and rules/standards that require best practice environmentally sustainable techniques for new developments, including - • Permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths etc. • Best practice for lowest environmental impact and water sensitive designs, requiring greywater recycling techniques and other technologies to ensure efficient use of water, rain storage tanks for properties connected to a public water supply, additional water storage for buildings that rely solely on roof water (to cope with drought), and other measures		Accept in part	Key Issue: Impermeable surfaces

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				Water storage vessels do not need to be a traditional round tank - other useful shapes exist, such as rectangular upright vessels that are easy to install against the side of a house or garage, or short flat vessels designed to be completely buried underground or placed under the foundations of new builds. Greywater harvesting and re-use should also be required for new buildings. These types of water-saving measures would also reduce future Council infrastructure costs for additional water supplies and wastewater. Passive heating and cooling designs, for example, reduce energy consumption and the on-going costs of heating/cooling. Solar panels with batteries, for example, can be purchased on lease-to-buy schemes so that the owner/occupier only pays the amount that they would have paid anyway for grid electricity. Additional electricity generation by households will be essential for powering EVs in future because current national generation capacity is not sufficient.	• Renewable energy technologies and energy-efficient technologies, and similar requirements that foster improved environmental design/technologies and lower lifecycle climate impacts • Specified area (percentage) of tree canopy cover and green corridors should be required within new subdivisions. These will be increasingly important for shade/cooling for buildings and pedestrians in future.		
FS243.180	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose	Kāinga Ora supports provisions that responds to the impacts of climate change by increasing resilience and enabling adaptation however prescriptive rules/standards such as those suggested would create additional burden and complexity to development proposals. The appropriate mechanism for these techniques would be through non-statutory design guidelines. It is also unclear on what the specific amendments or relief sought to the provisions in the PDP. Further clarity	Allow in part	Amend PDP to include objectives, policies and rules/standards that require best practice environmentally sustainable techniques for new developments, including -	Reject	Key Issue: Impermeable surfaces

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				required to the proposed amendments to the provisions.				
FS570.2115	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: Impermeable surfaces
FS566.2129	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: Impermeable surfaces
FS569.2151	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: Impermeable surfaces
S529.217	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	Rules	Support in part	We support the principle of PDP provisions controlling the area of impermeable surface per site, and consider it is probably also necessary to monitor and limit the total cumulative impermeable area in residential/urban zones.	Amend to provide for greater limits on impermeable areas (and/or requirements for minimum permeable areas) for subdivision, use and development. In urban/residential zones, it will also be necessary to adopt measures to limit the cumulative total impermeable surface and/or protect a specified cumulative total permeable area.		Reject	Key Issue: Impermeable surfaces
FS570.2104	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Impermeable surfaces
FS566.2118	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Impermeable surfaces
FS569.2140	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Impermeable surfaces
S521.013	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	Rules	Support in part	We support the principle of PDP provisions controlling the area of impermeable surface per site, and consider it is probably also necessary to monitor and limit the total cumulative impermeable area in residential/urban zones.	Amend to provide for greater limits on impermeable areas (and/or requirements for minimum permeable areas) for subdivision, use and development. In urban/residential zones, it will also be necessary to adopt measures to limit the cumulative total impermeable surface and/or protect a specified cumulative total permeable area.		Accept in part	Key Issue: Impermeable surfaces

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS566.1723	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: Impermeable surfaces
S449.033	Kapiro Conservation Trust	Rules	Support in part	In too many multi-unit developments in other districts, the only outdoor space is the concrete used to move and park cars. Especially where these developments take place alongside each other the importance of outdoor space increases. Outdoor spaces provide the opportunity for people to connect, to create a sense of community. When designed well, working within well designed rules, multi-unit developments could enhance the sense of community with Kerikeri and become a real asset.	Amend the PDP provisions for multi-unit developments: • include requirements for outdoor space beyond the area needed to move and park vehicles private, including private and shared outdoor space on the north, east or west side of a building • where multi-unit developments take place alongside each other, the rules for shared 'greenspace' reflects the greater density and the need for places for people to share and connect, pedestrian walkways and access to community facilities and amenities.		Reject	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
FS569.1832	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Reject	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
FS570.1849	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Reject	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
S489.041	Radio New Zealand	Notes	Support in part	Part of the zone is within 1,000m of RNZ's facilities and RNZ seeks the addition of a note	Insert a note as follows:**There is a risk that significant tall structures (ie. higher than 40m) within 1,000m of Radio New Zealand's Facilities at Waipapakauri or Ōhaeawai, could present a safety risk from electro magnetic coupling. Developers of such structures should consult with Radio New Zealand at the planning stage to ensure such risks**		Reject	Key issue: Plan wide and urban wide submissions

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					are avoided		
S368.066	Far North District Council	GRZ-R1	Support in part	The 'New buildings or structures, and extensions or alterations to existing buildings or structures' rule in each zone needs to be amended to include activities that are permitted, controlled and restricted discretionary, where applicable within the zone. As currently drafted a breach of this rule makes the activity 'discretionary', which was not the intent if the activity itself is permitted, controlled or restricted discretionary ... the standards in PER-2 should apply.	Amend GRZ-R1 " ... New buildings or structures, and extensions or alterations to existing buildings or structures Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The new building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure, will accommodate a permitted (where applicable, words to the effect...'or controlled, or restricted discretionary') activity ... "	Accept	Key issue: Plan wide and urban wide submissions
S512.095	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	GRZ-R1	Support in part	Many zones hold objectives and policies related to servicing developments with appropriate infrastructure. Noting that NH-R5 requires adequate firefighting water supply for vulnerable activities (including residential), Fire and Emergency consider that inclusion of an additional standard on infrastructure servicing within individual zone chapters may be beneficial.	Insertnew standard and/or matter of discretion across zones on infrastructureservicing (including emergencyresponse transport/access and adequate water supply for firefighting)	Reject	Key issue: Plan wide and urban wide submissions
S482.001	House Movers Section of New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc	GRZ-R1	Support in part	The Proposed Plan definition of "building" does not clearly include relocated buildings, and the existence of a separate definition of relocate buildings in the Proposed Plan appears to create a distinction between "buildings" and "relocated buildings". It is not clear that the permitted activity status applied in most zones to "new buildings and structures" also applies to the relocation of buildings. It is submitted that relocated buildings should have the same status as new buildings, and subject to the same	amend GRZ-R1 to: provide for relocated building as a permitted activity when relocated buildings meet performance standards and criteria (see schedule 1). insert a performance standard for use of a pre inspection report (schedule 2) restricted discretionary activity status for relocated buildings that do not meet the permitted activity status standards	Accept in part	Key issue: Plan wide and urban wide submissions

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				performance standards unless there is any specific overlay or control which applies e.g. historic heritage				
FS23.147	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	It is important that provision is made in all zones for relocatable buildings to enable choice, reuse of existing housing, and to make it clear what the activity status is for such buildings. This is particularly the case in urban zones.	Allow	Allow the relief sought.	Accept in part	Key issue: Plan wide and urban wide submissions
S431.121	John Andrew Riddell	GRZ-R1	Not Stated	The amendment is necessary in order to achieve the purpose of the Act.	Amend the rule so that any proposal to set a building or structure less than 20 metres back from the coastal marine area, or from rivers and banks is a non-complying activity		Accepted in part	Key issue: Plan wide and urban wide submissions
FS332.121	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accepted in part	Key issue: Plan wide and urban wide submissions
S338.022	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	GRZ-R1	Not Stated	The current height restriction of 8m in the General Residential zone should be strictly adhered to. Exceptions to this height limit should not be allowed for multi-unit developments or other purpose.	Amend Rule GRZ-R1 to remove the option of exceeding the height limit through the resource consent process.		Reject	Key Issue General Residential Zone - Standards
FS570.963	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue General Residential Zone - Standards
FS566.977	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue General Residential Zone - Standards
FS569.999	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue General Residential Zone - Standards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S529.029	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	GRZ-R1	Support in part	The current height restriction of 8m in the General Residential zone should be strictly adhered to. Exceptions to this height limit should not be allowed for multi-unit developments or other purpose.	Amend Rule GRZ-R1 to remove the option of exceeding the height limit through the resource consent process		Reject	Key Issue General Residential Zone - Standards
FS570.1919	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue General Residential Zone - Standards
FS566.1933	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue General Residential Zone - Standards
FS569.1955	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue General Residential Zone - Standards
S522.041	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	GRZ-R1	Support in part	The current height restriction of 8m in the General Residential zone should be strictly adhered to. Exceptions to this height limit should not be allowed for multi-unit developments or other purpose.	Amend Rule GRZ-R1 to remove the option of exceeding the height limit through the resource consent process		Reject	Key Issue General Residential Zone - Standards
FS566.1780	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Reject	Reject	Key Issue General Residential Zone - Standards
S449.030	Kapiro Conservation Trust	GRZ-R1	Support in part	The current height restriction of 8m in the General Residential zone should be strictly adhered to. Exceptions to this height limit should not be allowed for multi-unit developments or other purpose.	Amend Rule GRZ-R1 to remove the option of exceeding the height limit through the resource consent process		Reject	Key Issue General Residential Zone - Standards
FS569.1829	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Reject	Key Issue General Residential Zone - Standards
FS570.1846	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Reject	Key Issue General Residential Zone - Standards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S268.001	Brad Hedger	GRZ-R2	Support in part	Unable to determine how effects from climate change has been considered for maintaining this level of impermeable surface coverage. The changes in regards to rainfall are significant currently designers are adding an additional 20% to intensities for climate change, this will increase stormwater run off from entire catchments and the effects will increase especially in regards to ground water recharge and overland flow paths. This is also supported from the work that NRC has done on river/stream catchments which show the effects from flooding increasing due to development and effects from climate change. The NRC assessment is limited to stream flows and flooding, the effects from development and overland flow paths to streams and rivers does not seem to be considered. In my opinion properties downstream of development will be receiving between 5-10% more % of area, so on smaller sites it triggers management basically as soon as a house is built i.e. 300m2 lot 150m2 is threshold, where as a 4ha site is triggered once 20,000m3 of area is covered and this may be located right on a boundary discharging to a downstream property or stream, obvious the runoff volume from the 4 ha property will have a much large effect that 300 m2 property that will effectively have mitigation. I note also the current residential zone controlled activity has a more restrictive requirement than the permitted zone as it has a m2 limit.	Amend PER-1 of GRZ-R2: The impermeable surface coverage of any site is no more than 50% **or 300m2, which ever is the lesser.**	Reject	Key Issue: Impermeable Surfaces

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S481.002	Puketotara Lodge Ltd	GRZ-R2	Not Stated	The submitter seeks to ensure that the PDP adequately controls effects from stormwater discharge, particularly between sites or adjacent sites. The Operative Far North Plan contains a stormwater management rule in each zone, along with matters of discretion which Council can consider where the impermeable surface area exceeds what is allowed under the permitted activity rule. There is no specific "stormwater management" rule in the Rural Production zone in the PDP, however there is a rule relating to impermeable surface coverage. It is submitted that additional matters should be added to the list of relevant matters for discretion in the impermeable coverage rule in all zones, in order to better control effects between sites or adjacent sites,	Amend point c of the matters of discretion as follows: c. the availability of land for disposal of effluent and stormwater on the site without adverse effects on ~~adjoining~~ **adjacent** waterbodies (including groundwater and aquifers) or on ~~adjoining~~ **adjacent** sites; Insert the following as additional matters of discretion: • **Avoiding nuisance or damage to adjacent or downstream properties;** • **The extent to which the diversion and discharge maintains pre-developmentstormwater run-off flows and volumes;** • **The extent to which the diversion and discharge mimics natural run-off patterns.**	Accept in part	Key Issue: Plan wide and urban wide submissions
S283.013	Trent Simpkin	GRZ-R2	Oppose	The impermeable surfaces rule is one of the most common rules breached when designing homes. The low thresholds means therefore means many homes will still require a resource consent for Impermeable surfaces. all RC's breaching impermeable surfaces require a TP10/Stormwater report from an engineer (already). This is a detailed design of the strormwater management onsite and shouldn't	Amend to increase impermeable surface coverage maximum to be realistic based on the site of lots allowed for the zone and/or insert a PER-2 which says if a TP10 report is provided by an engineer, the activity is permitted (inferred)	Reject	Key Issue: Plan wide and urban wide submissions

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				require FNDC to look at it and tick the box to say its acceptable. Why don't we have a PER-2 which says that if a TP10 report is provided by an engineer, it's permitted? (one solution to reduce the number of RC's for Council to process, and assist with getting back to realistic processing times). This submission point applies to all zones.				
FS45.15	Tristan Simpkin		Support	Support as per Reasons given in submission	Allow		Reject	Key Issue: Plan wide and urban wide submissions
FS570.827	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	Key Issue: Plan wide and urban wide submissions
FS566.841	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	Key Issue: Plan wide and urban wide submissions
FS569.863	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	Key Issue: Plan wide and urban wide submissions
S561.071	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	GRZ-R2	Support in part	Kāinga Ora considers that impermeable surface coverage is a development control that fits with other standards rather than as a rule in the activity status table. Kāinga Ora requests a higher permitted impermeable surface coverage to enable more efficient development of urban land while still managing stormwater runoff.	Delete impermeable surfaces from the Rules section and add it as a Standard instead. Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The impermeable surface coverage of any site is no more than ~~50%~~ **60%.** Note: Where a development is utilising more than one site, including for multi-unit development or retirement villages, the percentage coverage		Reject	Key Issue: Impermeable Surfaces

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					must be calculated over the gross site area of all affected sites.			
FS307.2	Ngā Kaingamaha o Ngāti Hine Charitable Trust		Support	Agree that the impermeable surface coverage permitted standard should be 60% instead of the prescribed 50%. This supports the rationale for enabling higher intensity in the GRZ.	Allow		Reject	Key Issue: Impermeable Surfaces
FS32.125	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	The original submission seeks to amend the FNDP in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes. The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts. The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Allow	Key Issue: Impermeable Surfaces
FS547.106	Heron Point Limited		Neutral	The submitter has an interest in this submission point. In the instance where impervious surface allowances for the General Residential Zone are	Allow in part	Amend Rule GRZ-R2 to increase the threshold to at least 60% and requests that where a	Reject	Key Issue: Impermeable Surfaces

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				increased, the submitter considers that there should be provisions relating to the on-site management and disposal of stormwater for both reticulated and non-reticulated site to manage downstream environmental effects		development is utilising more than one site, including for multi-unit development or retirement villages, the percentage coverage must be calculated over the gross site area of all affected sites.		
FS547.116	Heron Point Limited		Neutral	The submitter has an interest in this submission point. In the instance where impervious surface allowances for the General Residential Zone are increased, the submitter considers that there should be provisions relating to the on-site management and disposal of stormwater for both reticulated and non-reticulated site to manage downstream environmental effects.	Allow in part	Amend	Reject	Key Issue: Impermeable Surfaces
FS348.009	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	In view of climate change impacts, the proposal to increase impermeable surface percentage should not be considered.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept	Key Issue: Impermeable Surfaces
FS23.343	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Reject	Key Issue: Impermeable Surfaces
FS47.085	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan.	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Accept	Key Issue: Impermeable Surfaces

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document				
FS348.158	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept	Key Issue: Impermeable Surfaces
S328.002	Traverse Ltd	GRZ-R2	Not Stated	Given the 600m² minimum controlled activity and 300m² discretionary activity lot sizes, restricting impermeable surface coverage to 50% is likely to trigger a resource consent requirement more often than not. It is requested that this be increased to at least 60%.	Amend Rule GRZ-R2 to increase the threshold to at least 60%.		Reject	Key Issue: Impermeable Surfaces
FS547.104	Heron Point Limited		Neutral	The submitter has an interest in this submission point. In the instance where impervious surface allowances for the General Residential Zone are increased, the submitter considers that there should be provisions relating to the on-site management and disposal of storm water for both reticulated and non-reticulated site to manage downstream environmental effects	Allow in part	Amend Rule GRZ-R2 to increase the threshold to at least 60%.	Reject	Key Issue: Impermeable Surfaces
FS547.114	Heron Point Limited		Neutral	The submitter has an interest in this submission point. In the instance where impervious surface allowances for the General Residential Zone are increased, the submitter considers that there should be provisions relating to the on-site management and disposal of stormwater for both reticulated and	Not stated	Amend Rule GRZ-R2 to increase the threshold to at least 60%.	Reject	Key Issue: Impermeable Surfaces

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				non-reticulated site to manage downstream environmental effects.				
S400.003	BR and R Davies	GRZ-R2	Oppose	Given the 600m² minimum controlled activity and 300m² discretionary activity lot sizes, restricting impermeable surface coverage to 50% is likely to trigger a resource consent requirement more often than not. It is requested that this be increased to at least 60%.	Amend Rule GRZ-R2 to increase the impermeable surface threshold to at least 60%		Reject	Key Issue: Impermeable Surfaces
FS547.105	Heron Point Limited		Neutral	The submitter has an interest in this submission point. In the instance where impervious surface allowances for the General Residential Zone are increased, the submitter considers that there should be provisions relating to the on-site management and disposal of storm water for both reticulated and non-reticulated site to manage downstream environmental effects	Allow in part	Amend Rule GRZ-R2 to increase the threshold to at least 60%. and requests that where a development is utilising more than one site, including for multi-unit development or retirement villages, the percentage coverage must be calculated over the gross site area of all affected sites	Reject	Key Issue: Impermeable Surfaces
FS547.115	Heron Point Limited		Neutral	The submitter has an interest in this submission point. In the instance where impervious surface allowances for the General Residential Zone are increased, the submitter considers that there should be provisions relating to the on-site management and disposal of stormwater for both reticulated and non-reticulated site to manage downstream environmental effects.	Not stated	Amend Rule GRZ-R2 to increase the threshold to at least 60%.	Reject	Key Issue: Impermeable Surfaces
S443.008	Kapiro Conservation Trust	GRZ-R2	Support in part	We support the principle of PDP provisions controlling the area of impermeable surface per site, and consider it is probably also necessary to monitor and limit the total cumulative impermeable area in residential/urban zones.	Amend GRZ-R2 to provide for greater limits on impermeable areas (and/or requirements for minimum permeable areas) and adopt measures to limit the cumulative total impermeable surface and/or protect a specified cumulative total permeable area.		Reject	Key Issue: Impermeable Surfaces

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS569.1753	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Reject	Key Issue: Impermeable Surfaces
FS570.1733	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Reject	Key Issue: Impermeable Surfaces
S138.016	Kairos Connection Trust and Habitat for Humanity Northern Region Ltd	GRZ-R3	Support in part	Concerned that the Council is proposing to remove the permitted activity ability to locate multiple standalone residential units on a single site. The rationale for this change is unclear and is not in keeping with its apparent intention to enable a greater variety of housing typologies. For community housing providers, there will not necessarily be the need or desire to subdivide a site, or develop a multi-unit type of development. Kairos and Habitat asks that the Council retain the ability to locate multiple standalone residential units on a site, and accepts that the density of these units might as a permitted activity be limited to 1 unit per 600m² of site area or 1 unit per 300m² as a Discretionary Activity.	Amend Rule GRZ-R3 'Residential activity (standalone residential units) as follows:*Activity status: PermittedWhere:PER-1The number of standalone residential units on a site does not exceed one* **unit per 600m² of site area**; and *The site does not contain a multi-unit development. Activity status: Restricted discretionaryWhere:RD-1The number of standalone residential units on a site does not exceed one unit per 300m² of site area; and The site does not contain a multi-unit development.*		Accept in Part	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
S158.010	Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	GRZ-R3	Support	The permitted activity status is appropriate in the context of the establishment and operation of supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided for by Ara Poutama; i.e. people living in a residential situation, who are subject to support and/or supervision by Ara Poutama.	Retain the land use activity rule applying to "residential activities" in the General Residential zone, Rule GRZ-R3.		Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
S259.017	Nicole Wooster	GRZ-R3	Support in part	The family has interests in a property located in the General Resdential zone (Kerikeri). The property is 2,000m2 as	Amend rule to consider allowing for the same level of density provided in the subdivision		Accept	Key Issue: Residential Intensity

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				it was created before Council expanded the wastewater network last year, which it is now connected to. Due to the private convenants registered against the title and surrounding properties the land cannot be subdivided. Therefore, it is only through having more than one residential unit on the sites that an appropriate level of infilling will occur to get the outcomes sought by Council in this zone. However, this rule would require a discretionary consent even if all other rules / standards were complied with. If the purpose of this control is due to uncertainty in additional capacity in the council wastewater network, then this would be addressed at the building consent stage and does not need to be regulated through a resource consent.	allotment standards for this rule as a permitted activity.		
S328.003	Traverse Ltd	GRZ-R3	Not Stated	GRZ-R3 limits the number of permitted residential units to one per title. Given the 600m² minimum lot size for controlled activity subdivision, this rule should be amended to allow residential units at a density of 600m² per residential unit.	Amend Rule GRZ-R3 to allow residential units at a density of 600m² per residential unit.	Accept	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
S400.004	BR and R Davies	GRZ-R3	Oppose	Rule GRZ-R3 limits the number of permitted residential units to one per title. Given the 600m² minimum lot size for controlled activity subdivision, this rule should be amended to allow residential units at a density of 600m² per residential unit	Amend Rule GRZ-R3 to allow residential units at a density of 600m² per residential unit	Accept	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
S413.003	Roman Catholic Bishop of the Diocese of Auckland	GRZ-R3	Oppose	There are many Residential Zoned sites in which have areas larger than double the minimum lot size prescribed under subdivision rules. The number of residential units allowed on a site must be related to the site area as in the	Amend this rule as follows: GRZ-R3 Residential activity Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1~~The number of standalone resdential units on a site does not~~	Accept in Part	Key Issue: Residential Intensity

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				Operative District Plan. This will give adjoining property owners certainty that existing amenity values will not be compromised by overcrowding.	~~exceed one; and~~The site ~~does not contain a multi unit development.~~**Residential Unit The number of residential units on a site does not exceed one per the minimum lot size permitted in the subdivision standard for the zone. PER - 2 Minor Residential Unit A minor residential unit constructed within an existing residential site of 500m2 or more, either attached at ground level or an upper level while complying with the standards S1-S7**			
S559.030	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rēhia	GRZ-R3	Oppose	Keeping this as a permitted activity would continue to give organisations such as us the ability to provide community housing, in a fashion that does not require subdivision. Furthermore, if it is removed, it would restrict the ability of whanau purchasing land together and living as whanau unit on one block of land with multiple dwellings, something that is culturally appropriate.	Amend GRZ-R3 to reinstate the permitted activity status to locate multiple standalone residential units on a single site (inferred).		Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
FS151.338	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
FS243.127	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Support	Kāinga Ora supports provisions that sure housing choice by enabling a range of housing typologies at various densities. Multi-unit developments can be in the form of detached units and attached units.	Allow	Amend GRZ-R3 to reinstate the permitted activity status to locate multiple standalone residential units on a single site	Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Intensity

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS570.2220	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
FS348.057	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
FS566.2234	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
FS569.2256	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
S561.072	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	GRZ-R3	Support in part	Kāinga Ora requests an additional permitted unit to support affordable housing outcomes. Requiring a proposal for two units on an existing residential site to go through a restricted discretionary resource consent application appears unreasonable.	Amend GRZ-R3 as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 1. The number of standalone residential units on a site does not exceed ~~one~~ **two**; and~~2. The site does not contain a multi-unit development.~~ Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-1: **Restricted** Discretionary		Reject	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
FS307.3	Ngā Kaingamaha o Ngāti Hine Charitable Trust		Support	Agree that there should be provision for more than one dwelling per site to support affordable housing outcomes. It is also agreed that the activity status where compliance is not achieved with PER-1 be a restricted discretionary activity to support provision for higher residential intensity options in the GRZ	Allow		Reject	Key Issue: Residential Intensity

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				in line with affordable housing outcomes.				
FS32.126	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	The original submission seeks to amend the FNDP in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes. The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts. The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
FS348.0010	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	This is a doubling of the residential intensity without consideration of the effects.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
FS23.344	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Intensity

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.				
FS47.086	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Accept	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
FS348.159	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
S419.003	LMD Planning Consultancy	GRZ-R3	Oppose	There are many residential zoned sites in which have areas larger than double the minimum lot size prescribed under subdivision rules. The number of residential units allowed on a site must be related to the site area as in the Operative District Plan. This will give adjoining property owners certainty that existing amenity values will not be compromised by overcrowding	Amend Rule GRZ-R3 as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The number of ~~standalone~~ residential units on a site does not exceed one per the minimum lot size permitted in the subdivision standard for the zone; and~~The site does not contain a multi-unit development.~~**PER-**		Accept In part	Key Issue: Residential Intensity

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					2Minor Residential UnitA minor residential unit constructed within an existing residential site of 500m² or more, either attached at ground level or an upper level while complying with the standards S1-S7			
FS566.1242	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
S296.001	Rosemary Archibald	GRZ-R4	Oppose	Opposes the maximum of 6 guests per night in the visitor accommodation in the Residential Zone. Submitter has existing use rights as the motel accommodation has been in continuous use since the 1960s. Submitter wishes to amend the provision to allow up to 20 guests per night at Driftwood, 333 State Highway 10, Cable Bay 0420.	Amend the provision for Driftwood at 333 State Highway 10, Cable Bay 0420, to allow up to 20 guests per night, or six rooms per night.		Reject	Key Issue: GRZ Rules
S214.001	Airbnb	GRZ-R4	Support in part	The proposed district plan allows for visitor accommodation as a permitted activity for less than or equal to 6-10 guests on site. If these conditions are not met, the activity is discretionary except in the settlement zone where it is restricted discretionary. Airbnb supports the overall approach to allow visitor accommodation to occur in all zones and commends the Council's leadership in this space. We would, however, recommend that restrictions around the number of guests be standardised to 10 across the district to account for the range of families that tend to stay in this type of	Amend rules to standardise the guest limit cap for visitor accommodation to 10 across all zones and make the defauly non-permitted status restricted discretionary (as opposed to Discretionary) across all zones.		Reject	Key Issue: Plan wide and urban wide issues

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				accommodation and would also recommend that properties that do not meet permitted status default to restricted discretionary as opposed to discretionary. This would increase certainty for our Hosts and unlock the full potential of residential visitor accommodation in the district. Airbnb strongly believes that consistency for guests and hosts is important and that a national approach is the most effective way to address these concerns. Kiwis agree with 64% expressing support for national regulation. One example of this type of standardised approach across councils is the Code of Conduct approach as piloted in New South Wales (NSW), Australia (with a robust compliance and enforcement mechanism, perating on a 'two strike' basis whereby bad actors are excluded from participating in the industry for a period of 5 years after repeated breaches of the Code).				
FS23.063	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Support standardizing the number applying to permitted visitor accommodation activities across all zones. Taking a consistent approach will make it easier for the plan provisions to be applied and understood. The effects are not likely to differ significantly in residential zones	Allow	Allow original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Plan wide and urban wide issues
S328.004	Traverse Ltd	GRZ-R5	Not Stated	This rule sets out the permitted activity requirements for a "home business". A "home business" is defined as a commercial activity that is: a. undertaken or operated by at least one resident of the site; and b. incidental to the use of the site for a residential activity. As a permitted activity PER-3 provides	Amend Rule GRZ-R5 to clarify if it is intended to include industrial activities otherwise addressed as a non-complying activity under Rule GRZ-R16		Accept	Key Issue: GRZ Rules

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				for all manufacturing, altering, dismantling or processing of any materials associated with an activity where it is carried out within a building. Some of the activities in PER-3 fall within the definition of "industrial activities" rather than commercial activities. It is therefore unclear whether these industrial activities are also permitted in the GRZ, in addition to commercial activities, noting that 'industrial activities' are otherwise non-complying activities in this zone			
S400.005	BR and R Davies	GRZ-R5	Oppose	This rule sets out the permitted activity requirements for a "home business". A "home business" is defined as a commercial activity that is: a. undertaken or operated by at least one resident of the site; and b. incidental to the use of the site for a residential activity. As a permitted activity PER-3 provides for all manufacturing, altering, dismantling or processing of any materials associated with an activity where it is carried out within a building. Some of the activities in PER-3 fall within the definition of "industrial activities" rather than commercial activities. It is therefore unclear whether these industrial activities are also permitted in the GRZ, in addition to commercial activities, noting that 'industrial activities' are otherwise non-complying activities in this zone	Amend Rule GRZ-R5 to clarify if it includes industrial activities otherwise addressed as a non-complying activity under Rule GRZ-R16	Accept	Key Issue: GRZ Rules
S425.056	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust	GRZ-R5	Support	PHTTCCT support the provision for home business in zones. It is considered that providing for this activity as a permitted activity, particularly throughout the zones that adjoin the Trail, will help activate the Trail and ensure that that the potential	retain as notifed	Accept In Part	Key Issue: GRZ Rules

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				in terms of social and economic impact can be realised (noting the comments made in the Transport Chapter in regards to parking).				
S431.139	John Andrew Riddell	GRZ-R5	Not Stated	The amendment is necessary in order to achieve the purpose of the Act.	Amend PER-4 of Rule GRZ-R5 so that the hours of operation apply to when the business is open to the public		Accept	Key Issue: GRZ Rules
FS332.139	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept	Key Issue: GRZ Rules
S331.064	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	GRZ-R6	Support in part	The submitter supports in part rule GRZ-R6 Educational facility, however, in the first instance, the Ministry recommends the inclusion of a new provision (see submission S331.017) to provide for educational facilities as a permitted activity in the General Residential zone in the Infrastructure Chapter. In conjunction with this relief, the Ministry seeks the removal of this rule from the General Residential zone to limit rule duplication. However, if this relief is not granted, the Ministry support the permitted activity standards to provide for small day care facilities in the General Residential Zone. However, educational facilities with student attendance higher than 4 will likely be required to support the rural lifestyle environment and suggest student attendance not exceeding 30 to align with Ministry pre-school licences. The Ministry request that all educational facilities are enabled in the General Residential Zone to serve the education needs of the residential community and suggest a restricted	Delete rule GRZ-R6 Educational facility as per submission S331.017 or Amend rule GRZ-R6 Educational facility, as follows: Educational facility Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The educational facility is within a residential unit or accessory building. PER-2 The number of students attending at one time does not exceed **30**~~four~~, excluding those who reside onsite. Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-1 or PER-2: **Restricted** ~~D~~**d**iscretionary **Matters of discretion are restricted to: a. Design and layout.** **b. Transport safety and efficiency.** **c. Scale of activity and hours of operation.**		Accept in Part	Key Issue: Plan wide and urban wide issues

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				discretionary activity status where compliance with the permitted standards cannot be achieved, and the following matters of discretion.	**d. Infrastructure servicing.**		
S158.013	Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	GRZ-R7	Neutral	The definition of "residential activity" entirely captures supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided for by Ara Poutama; i.e. people living in a residential situation, who are subject to support and/or supervision by Ara Poutama, and therefore a separate definition of "supported residential care activities" is unnecessary. However, should Council see it as being absolutely necessary to implement the separate definition of "supported residential care activity", then Ara Poutama requests that the permitted rule applying to supported residential care activities in the General Residential Zone is retained as notified. The permitted activity status is appropriate in the context of the establishment and operation of supported and transitional accommodation activities. Such activities are an important component of the rehabilitation and reintegration process for people under Ara Poutama's supervision. They enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural well-being and for their health and safety.	Delete the reference to "supported residential care activity" from the General Residential Zone. BUT - If Council are to retain the "supported residential care activity" definition, then retain as notified the land use activity rule applying to "supported residential care activities" in the General Residential Zone (Rule GRZ-R7).	Accept	Key Issue: GRZ Rules
S69.004	Robyn Josephine Baker	GRZ-R9	Oppose	To allow/encourage multi-unit developments within the general residential zone is untenable without the supporting infrastructure for fresh water, sewage treatment, roading etc. is totally inadequate as things currently stand.	Delete rule GRZ-R9	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Intensity

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				To think FNDC has resources and funding to cope with even more housing developments especially in Mangonui, Coopers Beach & Taipa, is absurd. People moving to the region are generally doing so to get away from the high density rabbit-hutch environment that the main population centres have become. Why create the same problem here?			
S146.002	Trevor John Ashford	GRZ-R9	Support in part	Rule GRZ-R9 does not take into consideration the capacity of existing infrastructure, namely water supply, stormwater and wastewater, as required under Policy GRZ-P3. This rule could result in extra loadings on already straining infrastructure, which could result in discharges of untreated sewage to waterways or the sea, reductions in quality or shortages of drinking water, or exacerbated damage during stormwater events.	Amend GRZ-R9 to only allow multi-unit development in areas where all infrastructure has been upgraded and maintained to allow for the maximum development potential under this rule and subdivision rules.	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
S41.002	Joel Vieviorka	GRZ-R9	Oppose	Rule GRZ-R9 does not take into consideration the capacity of existing infrastructure, namely water supply, stormwater and wastewater, as required under Policy GRZ-P3. This rule could result in extra loadings on already straining infrastructure, which could result in discharges of untreated sewage to waterways or the sea, reductions in quality or shortages of drinking water, or exacerbated damage during stormwater events.	Amend Rule GRZ-R9 to only allow multi-unit development in areas where all infrastructure has been upgraded and maintained to allow for the maximum development potential under this rule and subdivision rules.	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
S163.005	Julianne Sally Bainbridge	GRZ-R9	Support in part	Rule GRZ-R9 does not take into consideration the capacity of existing infrastructure, namely water supply, stormwater and wastewater, as required under Policy GRZ-P3. This rule could result in extra loadings	Amend GRZ-R9 to only allow multi-unit development in areas where all infrastructure has been upgraded and maintained to allow for the maximum development potential under this rule and subdivision rules.	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Intensity

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				on already straining infrastructure, which could result in discharges of untreated sewage to waterways or the sea, reductions in quality or shortages of drinking water, or exacerbated damage during stormwater events.			
S410.002	Kerry-Anne Smith	GRZ-R9	Support in part	Rule GRZ-R9 does not take into consideration the capacity of existing infrastructure, namely water supply, stormwater and wastewater, as required under Policy GRZ-P3. This rule could result in extra loadings on already straining infrastructure, which could result in discharges of untreated sewage to waterways or the sea, reductions in quality or shortages of drinking water, or exacerbated damage during stormwater events.	Amend GRZ-R9 to only allow multi-unit development in areas where all infrastructure has been upgraded and maintained to allow for the maximum development potential under this rule and subdivision rules.	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
S411.002	Roger Myles Smith	GRZ-R9	Support in part	Rule GRZ-R9 does not take into consideration the capacity of existing infrastructure, namely water supply, stormwater and wastewater, as required under Policy GRZ-P3. This rule could result in extra loadings on already straining infrastructure, which could result in discharges of untreated sewage to waterways or the sea, reductions in quality or shortages of drinking water, or exacerbated damage during stormwater events.	Amend GRZ-R9 to only allow multi-unit development in areas where all infrastructure has been upgraded and maintained to allow for the maximum development potential under this rule and subdivision rules.	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
S470.002	Helmut Friedrick Paul Letz and Angelika Eveline Letz	GRZ-R9	Support in part	Rule GRZ-R9 does not take into consideration the capacity of existing infrastructure, namely water supply, stormwater and wastewater, as required under Policy GRZ-P3. This rule could result in extra loadings on already straining infrastructure, which could result in discharges of untreated sewage to waterways or the sea, reductions in quality or shortages	Amend GRZ-R9 to only allow multi-unit development in areas where all infrastructure has been upgraded and maintained to allow for the maximum development potential under this rule and subdivision rules.	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Intensity

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				of drinking water, or exacerbated damage during stormwater events.			
S40.002	Martin John Yuretich	GRZ-R9	Support in part	Rule GRZ-R9 does not take into consideration the capacity of existing infrastructure, namely water supply, stormwater and wastewater, as required under Policy GRZ-P3. This rule could result in extra loadings on already straining infrastructure, which could result in discharges of untreated sewage to waterways or the sea, reductions in quality or shortages of drinking water, or exacerbated damage during stormwater events.	Amend GRZ-R9 to only allow multi-unit development in areas where all infrastructure has been upgraded and maintained to allow for the maximum development potential under this rule and subdivision rules.	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
S257.019	Te Hiku Community Board	GRZ-R9	Support in part	Support a higher density of housing in the new multi-unit development rules and a higher density of housing in the residential zones	Retain rule GRZ-R9, enabling multi-unit development up to three residential units per site.	Accept	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
S541.002	Elbury Holdings	GRZ-R9	Support in part	Rule GRZ-R9 does not take into consideration the capacity of existing infrastructure, namely water supply, stormwater and wastewater, as required under Policy GRZ-P3. These systems already appear to be at capacity in some areas, for example, wastewater and water supplies in Paihia and Taipa-Mangonui. This rule could result in extra loadings on already straining infrastructure, which could result in discharges of untreated sewage to waterways or the sea, reductions in quality or shortages of drinking water, or exacerbated damage during stormwater events.	Amend GRZ-R9 to only allow multi-unit development in areas where all infrastructure has been upgraded and maintained to allow for the maximum development potential under this rule and subdivision rules.	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
S541.022	Elbury Holdings	GRZ-R9	Support	We support a higher density of housing in the new multi-unit development rules. We support a higher density of housing in the residential zones.	Retain Rule GRZ-R9, enabling multi-unit development up to three residential units per site.	Accept	Key Issue: Residential Intensity

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S519.004	Elbury Holdings	GRZ-R9	Support in part	Rule GRZ-R9 does not take into consideration the capacity of existing infrastructure, namely water supply, stormwater and wastewater, as required under Policy GRZ-P3. This rule could result in extra loadings on already straining infrastructure, which could result in discharges of untreated sewage to waterways or the sea, reductions in quality or shortages of drinking water, or exacerbated damage during stormwater events. These effects are already being seen in some of our communities, so it seems irresponsible to make them worse.	Amend GRZ-R9 to only allow multi-unit development in areas where all infrastructure has been upgraded and maintained to allow for the maximum development potential under this rule and subdivision rules.	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
S519.024	Elbury Holdings	GRZ-R9	Support	We support a higher density of housing in the residential zones.	Retain GRZ-R9.	Accept	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
S427.021	Kapiro Residents Association	GRZ-R9	Support in part	We agree that multi-unit developments such as terraced housing and low rise apartment blocks can contribute to the greater vibrancy of Kerikeri, and allow for the construction of a greater variety of housing types and sizes. However, one of our concerns is that the rules around outdoor space are inadequate, and there is a danger that in the drive for higher density, the planning rules will not achieve the overall goal of protecting what is valued by the community. We believe that intensification in urban zones should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings (e.g. apartment blocks) with permeable areas including garden/landscaped ground. In too many multi-unit developments in other districts, the only outdoor space is the concrete used to move and park cars. Especially where these developments take place alongside	Amend the PDP provisions for multi-unit developments to: • include requirements for outdoor space beyond the area needed to move and park vehicles private, including private and shared outdoor space on the north, east or west side of a building • where multi-unit developments take place alongside each other, the rules for shared 'greenspace' reflects the greater density and the need for places for people to share and connect, pedestrian walkways and access to community facilities and amenities.	Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Intensity

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				each other the importance of outdoor space increases. Outdoor spaces provide the opportunity for people to connect, to create a sense of community. When designed well, working within well designed rules, multi-unit developments could enhance the sense of community with Kerikeri and become a real asset.			
S485.004	Elbury Holdings	GRZ-R9	Support in part	Rule GRZ-R9 does not take into consideration the capacity of existing infrastructure, namely water supply, stormwater and wastewater, as required under Policy GRZ-P3. This rule could result in extra loadings on already straining infrastructure, which could result in discharges of untreated sewage to waterways or the sea, reductions in quality or shortages of drinking water, or exacerbated damage during stormwater events.	Amend GRZ-R9 to only allow multi-unit development in areas where all infrastructure has been upgraded and maintained to allow for the maximum development potential under this rule and subdivision rules.	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
S485.024	Elbury Holdings	GRZ-R9	Support	We support a higher density of housing in the new multi-unit development rules. We support a higher density of housing in the residential zones.	Retain Rule GRZ-R9, enabling multi-unit development up to three residential units per site.	Accept	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
S328.006	Traverse Ltd	GRZ-R9	Not Stated	If the requested relief for Rule GRZ-R3 (S328.003) is accepted, then Rule GRZ-R9 should be amended to clarify that it only applies where the residential units are not otherwise permitted by Rule GRZ-R3	Amend Rule GRZ-R9 if relief sought through S328.003 is granted, to clarify that it only applies where the residential units are not otherwise permitted by Rule GRZ-R3	Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
S348.004	Sapphire Surveyors Limited	GRZ-R9	Support in part	Rule GRZ-R9 does not take into consideration the capacity of existing infrastructure, namely water supply, stormwater and wastewater, as required under Policy GRZ-P3. This rule could result in extra loadings on already straining infrastructure, which could result in discharges of untreated sewage to waterways or the sea, reductions in quality or shortages	Amend GRZ-R9 to only allow multi-unit development in areas where all infrastructure has been upgraded and maintained to allow for the maximum development potential under this rule and subdivision rules.	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Intensity

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				of drinking water, or exacerbated damage during stormwater events.			
S358.019	Leah Frieling	GRZ-R9	Support in part	We support a higher density of housing in the new multi-unit development rules. We support a higher density of housing in the residential zones	Retain rule GRZ-R9	Accept	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
S400.007	BR and R Davies	GRZ-R9	Oppose	If the requested relief for Rule GRZ-R3 is accepted, then Rule GRZ-R9 should be amended to clarify that it only applies where the residential units are not otherwise permitted by Rule GRZ-R3	Amend Rule GRZ-R9 to clarify that it only applies where the residential units are not otherwise permitted by Rule GRZ-R3	Accept	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
S395.002	Sean Jozef Vercammen	GRZ-R9	Support in part	Rule GRZ-R9 does not take into consideration the capacity of existing infrastructure, namely water supply, stormwater and wastewater, as required under Policy GRZ-P3. This rule could result in extra loadings on already straining infrastructure, which could result in discharges of untreated sewage to waterways or the sea, reductions in quality or shortages of drinking water, or exacerbated damage during stormwater events.	Amend GRZ-R9 to only allow multi-unit development in areas where all infrastructure has been upgraded and maintained to allow for the maximum development potential under this rule and subdivision rules.	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
S357.019	Sean Frieling	GRZ-R9	Support in part	We support a higher density of housing in the new multi-unit development rules. We support a higher density of housing in the residential zones We support a higher density of subdivision as a restricted discretionary activity instead of a discretionary activity in the residential zone, as these areas should be encouraged for more housing and amenity value is of less of a concern to the provision of housing in these areas that do not have landscape or heritage overlays. We feel that it should be restricted discretionary to ensure that the assessment criteria that	Retain rule GRZ-R9, enabling multi-unit development up to three residential units per site.	Accept	Key Issue: Residential Intensity

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				neighbours can have weighting over as an affected party is limited, to ensure that more housing can be provided with less likelihood of a hearing, as there should be a strong push to enable more housing in urban centres. The rules should only be allowed in areas where all infrastructure has been upgraded and maintained to allow for the maximum development potential under this rule and subdivision rules.			
S472.019	Michael Foy	GRZ-R9	Support	We support a higher density of housing in the new multi-unit development rules. We support a higher density of housing in the residential zones	Retain rule GRZ-R9, enabling multi-unit development up to three residential units per site.	Accept	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
S547.002	LJ King Limited	GRZ-R9	Support in part	Rule GRZ-R9 does not take into consideration the capacity of existing infrastructure, namely water supply, stormwater and wastewater, as required under Policy GRZ-P3. This rule could result in extra loadings on already straining infrastructure, which could result in discharges of untreated sewage to waterways or the sea, reductions in quality or shortages of drinking water, or exacerbated damage during stormwater events	Amend GRZ-R9 to only allow multi-unit development in areas where all infrastructure has been upgraded and maintained to allow for the maximum development potential under this rule and subdivision rules. These areas could be shown on one of the FNDC GIS Maps or as an overlay	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
S547.023	LJ King Limited	GRZ-R9	Support in part	We support a higher density of housing in the residential zones	Retain GRZ-R9	Accept	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
S544.002	Kelvin Richard Horsford	GRZ-R9	Support in part	Rule GRZ-R9 does not take into consideration the capacity of existing infrastructure, namely water supply, stormwater and wastewater, as required under Policy GRZ-P3. This rule could result in extra loadings on already straining infrastructure, which could result in discharges of untreated sewage to waterways or the sea, reductions in quality or shortages	Amend GRZ-R9 to only allow multi-unit development in areas where all infrastructure has been upgraded and maintained to allow for the maximum development potential under this rule and subdivision rules. These areas could be shown on one of the FNDC GIS Maps	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Intensity

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				of drinking water, or exacerbated damage during stormwater events			
S413.005	Roman Catholic Bishop of the Diocese of Auckland	GRZ-R9	Oppose	Currently there are many 600m2 Residential zoned serviced sites in the District. Imagine the worst-case future scenario of all these sites developed to contain 3 families. It will be a disaster for the urban centres of the District in terms of amenity values.	Amend the rule as follows: Activity status: Controlled Where: CON-1 The **minimum** site area per unit in a multi-unit development is ~~at least 600m2~~ **the minimum lot size allowed as a controlled activity in the subdivision rule for the zone**~~The number of residential units in a multi-unit development on a site does not exceed three; and~~~~There is no standalone residential unit on the site.~~ CON-2 The minimum net internal floor area, ~~excluding outdoor living space,~~ of a residential unit within a multi unit development shall be 1.1 bedroom = 45m2 2. 2 bedroom = 62m2 3. 3 bedroom = 82m2 Matters of discretion are restricted to: a. The effects on the neighbourhood character, residential amenity and the surrounding residential area from all of the following. i. building intensity, scale, location,	Accept in Part	Key Issue: Residential Intensity

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					form and appearance. ii. location and design of parking and access. iii. location of outdoor living space in relation to neighbouring sites.		
S439.002	John Joseph and Jacqueline Elizabeth Matthews	GRZ-R9	Support in part	Rule GRZ-R9 does not take into consideration the capacity of existing infrastructure, namely water supply, stormwater and wastewater, as required under Policy GRZ-P3. This rule could result in extra loadings on already straining infrastructure, which could result in discharges of untreated sewage to waterways or the sea, reductions in quality or shortages of drinking water, or exacerbated damage during stormwater events.	Amend Rule GRZ-R9 to only allow multi-unit development in areas where all infrastructure has been upgraded and maintained to allow for the maximum development potential under this rule and subdivision rules.	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
S561.073	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	GRZ-R9	Support in part	Kāinga Ora considers that multiunit developments can be in the form of detached units and attached units and should be restricted discretionary activity status for three or more units.	Amend GRZ-R9 as follows: Activity status: ~~Controlled~~ **Restricted Discretionary** Where:~~CON~~**RD**-1~~1. The site area per multi-unit development is at least 600m2; and~~ 2. The number of residential units ~~in a multi-unit development~~ on a site ~~does not~~ exceeds **two**~~three~~; and~~3. There is no standalone residential unit on the site.CON~~**RD**-2 The minimum net internal floor area, excluding outdoor living space, of a residential unit within a multi-unit	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Intensity

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					development shall be: 1. 1 bedroom = 45m2 2. 2 bedroom = 62m2 3. 3 bedroom = 82m2 Matters of discretion are restricted to: a. the effects on the neighbourhood character, residential amenity and the surrounding residential area from all of the following. i. building ~~intensity~~, scale, location, form and appearance. ii. location and design of parking and access. iii. location of outdoor living space in relation to neighbouring sites. Activity status for more than ~~three~~ **two** units: **Restricted** Discretionary			
FS307.4	Ngā Kaingamaha o Ngāti Hine Charitable Trust		Support	Agree that multiunit developments can be in the form of detached or attached units and should be restricted discretionary for three or more units. This assist provision of higher density residential development in line with affordable housing outcomes.	Allow		Reject	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
FS32.127	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	The original submission seeks to amend the FNDP in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept	Key Issue: Residential Intensity

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes. The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts. The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.				
FS348.011	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	Multi-unit developments change the character of an area and should remain a controlled activity. The degree of residential intensity in the District Plan is already sufficient to meet needs.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
FS23.345	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
FS47.087	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Accept	Key Issue: Residential Intensity

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document				
FS348.160	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
S555.002	Ngā Kaingamaha o Ngāti Hine Charitable Trust	GRZ-R9	Support in part	The salient reasoning for this is that where the site generously exceeds 600m² as per CON-1.1. and CON-1.2, more than three dwellings per site may be able to comfortably be established while meeting all standards. Consequently, assuming development can satisfy the matters of discretion, the dwellings will align with the intent of the objectives and policies of the General Residential zone. Further we note that the residential intensity of a large scale multi-unit development is not dissimilar to a retirement village which is provided for as restricted discretionary activity under rule GRZ-R10 Without the specificity for the definition of "building intensity" any application for resource consent seeking more than three dwellings would require notification when giving regard to the	Amend the status of activities not complying with CON-1 and CON-2 of Rule GRZ-R9 from discretionary to restricted discretionary. The matters of discretion shall be limited to the same as the controlled activities. AND Delete 'building intensity' from the matters of discretion outlined in subpoint a.i. of Rule GRZ-9.		Reject	Key Issue: Residential Intensity

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				surrounding area which may be traditionally low density				
FS243.131	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Support	Kāinga Ora supports provisions that sure housing choice by enabling a range of housing typologies at various densities	Allow	Amend the status of activities not complying with CON-1 and	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
FS243.189	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Support	Kāinga Ora supports District Plan provisions that provide for a range of housing typologies and increased intensity within urban areas to match this changing demand. As such, activity status and matters of discretion should enable greater housing choice.	Allow	Amend the status of activities not complying with CON-1 and	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
S377.002	Rua Hatu Trust	GRZ-R9	Support in part	Rule GRZ-R9 does not take into consideration the capacity of existing infrastructure, namely water supply, stormwater and wastewater, as required under Policy GRZ-P3. This rule could result in extra loadings on already straining infrastructure, which could result in discharges of untreated sewage to waterways or the sea, reductions in quality or shortages of drinking water, or exacerbated damage during stormwater events.	Amend GRZ-R9 to only allow multi-unit development in areas where all infrastructure has been upgraded and maintained to allow for the maximum development potential under this rule and subdivision rules.		Reject	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
FS243.184	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment as infrastructure in some locations may not need to be upgraded to allow for development. This amendment will restrict and slow-down urban development and growth in the region.	Disallow	Amend GRZ-R9 to only allow multi-unit development in areas where all infrastructure has been upgraded and maintained to allow for the maximum development potential under this rule and subdivision rules.	Accept	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
S512.041	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	GRZ-R9	Support in part	Seeks specific reference to emergency response access and infrastructure servicing. Fire and Emergency have previously found that multi-unit residential developments	amend GRZ-R9 a. the effects on the neighbourhood character, residential amenity and the surrounding residential area from all of the following.		Reject	Key Issue: Plan wide and urban wide issues

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				have posed more significant fire risks and/or inadequate emergency response access.	i. building intensity, scale, location, form and appearance. ii. location and design of parking and access **(including emergency response access).** iii. location of outdoor living space in relation to neighbouring sites.**iv. Infrastructure servicing (including adequate firefighting water supplies compliant with SNZ PAS 4509:2008 New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice.**			
FS243.185	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes elements of the proposed change sought that may be inconsistent with NZ Standards and seeks further clarification/reasoning for the amended changes.	Disallow	(a number of submission points and relief sought)	Accept	Key Issue: Plan wide and urban wide issues
S338.026	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	GRZ-R9	Not Stated	We agree that multi-unit developments such as terraced housing and low rise apartment blocks can contribute to the greater vibrancy of Kerikeri, and allow for the construction of a greater variety of housing types and sizes. However, one of our concerns is that the rules around outdoor space are inadequate, and there is a danger that in the drive for higher density, the planning rules will not achieve the overall goal of protecting what is valued by the community. We believe that intensification in urban zones should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings (e.g. apartment blocks) with permeable	Amend the PDP provisions for multi-unit developments to: • include requirements for outdoor space beyond the area needed to move and park vehicles private, including private and shared outdoor space on the north, east or west side of a building • where multi-unit developments take place alongside each other, the rules for shared 'greenspace' reflects the greater density and the need for places for people to share and connect, pedestrian walkways		Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Intensity

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				areas including garden/landscaped ground. In too many multi-unit developments in other districts, the only outdoor space is the concrete used to move and park cars. Especially where these developments take place alongside each other the importance of outdoor space increases. Outdoor spaces provide the opportunity for people to connect, to create a sense of community. When designed well, working within well designed rules, multi-unit developments could enhance the sense of community with Kerikeri and become a real asset.	and access to community facilities and amenities.			
FS570.967	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
FS566.981	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
FS569.1003	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
S529.032	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	GRZ-R9	Support in part	We agree that multi-unit developments such as terraced housing and low rise apartment blocks can contribute to the greater vibrancy of Kerikeri, and allow for the construction of a greater variety of housing types and sizes. However, one of our concerns is that the rules around outdoor space are inadequate, and there is a danger that in the drive for higher density, the planning rules will not achieve the overall goal of protecting what is valued by the community. We believe that intensification in urban zones should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings	Amend the PDP provisions for multi-unit developments: • include requirements for outdoor space beyond the area needed to move and park vehicles private, including private and shared outdoor space on the north, east or west side of a building • where multi-unit developments take place alongside each other, the rules for shared 'greenspace' reflects the greater density and the need for places for people to share and connect, pedestrian walkways		Reject	Key Issue: Residential Intensity

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				(e.g. apartment blocks) with permeable areas including garden/landscaped ground. In too many multi-unit developments in other districts, the only outdoor space is the concrete used to move and park cars. Especially where these developments take place alongside each other the importance of outdoor space increases. Outdoor spaces provide the opportunity for people to connect, to create a sense of community. When designed well, working within well designed rules, multi-unit developments could enhance the sense of community with Kerikeri and become a real asset.	and access to community facilities and amenities.			
FS570.1922	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
FS566.1936	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
FS569.1958	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
S569.002	Rodney S Gates and Cherie R Gates	GRZ-R9	Support in part	Rule GRZ-R9 does not take into consideration the capacity of existing infrastructure, namely water supply, stormwater and wastewater, as required under Policy GRZ-P3. This rule could result in extra loadings on already straining infrastructure, which could result in discharges of untreated sewage to waterways or the sea, reductions in quality or shortages of drinking water, or exacerbated damage during stormwater events	Amend GRZ-R9 to only allow multi-unit development in areas where all infrastructure has been upgraded and maintained to allow for the maximum development potential under this rule and subdivision rules.		Reject	Key Issue: Residential Intensity

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS348.233	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
S419.005	LMD Planning Consultancy	GRZ-R9	Oppose	Currently there are many 600m² residential zoned serviced sites in the District. Imagine the worst-case future scenario of all these sites developed to contain three families. It will be a disaster for the urban centres of the District in terms of amenity values.	Amend Rule GRZ-R9 as follows: Activity status: Controlled Where: CON-1 The **minimum** site area per **unit in a** multi-unit development is ~~at least 600m²~~ **the minimum lot size allowed as a controlled activity in the subdivision rule for the zone**; and~~The number of residential units in a multi-unit development on a site does not exceed three; and~~ ~~There is no standalone residential unit on the site.~~ CON-2 The minimum net internal floor area~~, excluding outdoor living space,~~ of a residential unit within a multi-unit development shall be: 1 bedroom = 45m²2 bedroom = 62m² 3 bedroom = 82m²Matters of discretion are restricted to: the effects on the neighbourhood character, residential amenity and the surrounding residential area from all of the following. building intensity, scale, location, form and appearance.location and		Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Intensity

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					design of parking and access.location of outdoor living space in relation to neighbouring sites.			
FS566.1244	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
S464.002	LJ King Ltd	GRZ-R9	Support in part	Rule GRZ-R9 does not take into consideration the capacity of existing infrastructure, namely water supply, stormwater and wastewater, as required under Policy GRZ-P3. This rule could result in extra loadings on already straining infrastructure, which could result in discharges of untreated sewage to waterways or the sea, reductions in quality or shortages of drinking water, or exacerbated damage during stormwater events.	Amend GRZ-R9 to only allow multi-unit development in areas where all infrastructure has been upgraded and maintained to allow for the maximum development potential under this rule and subdivision rules. These areas could be shown on one of the FNDC GIS Maps or as an overlay.		Reject	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
FS566.1547	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
S464.025	LJ King Ltd	GRZ-R9	Support in part	We support a higher density of housing in the residential zones.	Retain GRZ-R9.		Accept	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
FS566.1568	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
S522.020	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	GRZ-R9	Support in part	We agree that multi-unit developments such as terraced housing and low rise apartment blocks can contribute to the greater vibrancy of Kerikeri, and allow for the construction of a greater variety of housing types and sizes. However,	Amend the PDP provisions for multi-unit developments: • include requirements for outdoor space beyond the area needed to move and park vehicles private,		Reject	Key Issue: Residential Intensity

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				one of our concerns is that the rules around outdoor space are inadequate, and there is a danger that in the drive for higher density, the planning rules will not achieve the overall goal of protecting what is valued by the community. We believe that intensification in urban zones should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings (e.g. apartment blocks) with permeable areas including garden/landscaped ground. In too many multi-unit developments in other districts, the only outdoor space is the concrete used to move and park cars. Especially where these developments take place alongside each other the importance of outdoor space increases. Outdoor spaces provide the opportunity for people to connect, to create a sense of community. When designed well, working within well designed rules, multi-unit developments could enhance the sense of community with Kerikeri and become a real asset.	including private and shared outdoor space on the north, east or west side of a building • where multi-unit developments take place alongside each other, the rules for shared 'greenspace' reflects the greater density and the need for places for people to share and connect, pedestrian walkways and access to community facilities and amenities.			
FS566.1759	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
S543.002	LJ King Limited	GRZ-R9	Support in part	Rule GRZ-R9 does not take into consideration the capacity of existing infrastructure, namely water supply, stormwater and wastewater, as required under Policy GRZ-P3. This rule could result in extra loadings on already straining infrastructure, which could result in discharges of untreated sewage to waterways or the sea, reductions in quality or shortages of drinking water, or exacerbated damage during stormwater events.	Amend GRZ-R9 to only allow multi-unit development in areas where all infrastructure has been upgraded and maintained to allow for the maximum development potential under this rule and subdivision rules. These areas could be shown on one of the FNDC GIS Maps or as an overlay		Reject	Key Issue: Residential Intensity

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS566.2163	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
S543.023	LJ King Limited	GRZ-R9	Support in part	We support a higher density of housing in the residential zones	Retain GRZ-R9		Accept	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
FS566.2184	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
S165.012	Arvida Group Limited	GRZ-R10	Support	The recognition of Retirement Villages as a Restricted Discretionary activity is supported on the basis that the restricted matters of discretion are clearly set out in the Rule at clauses (a) to (f). Additionally, retirement villages often include healthcare facilities, such as rest home and hospital level care suites, as well as commercial facilities, which may require larger, but not necessarily taller buildings. Restricted discretionary is therefore considered to be an appropriate activity class for retirement villages.	Retain Rule GRZ-R10		Accept in part	Key Issue: Retirement Villages
S218.005	Summerset Group Holdings Limited	GRZ-R10	Support in part	expresses support for the submission of the Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand (submission 520) in its entirety.	Insert new Rule GRZ-RXX Retirement Village Activity status: Permitted Amend GRZ-R10 Construction of Retirement village buildings Activity status: Restricted discretionary~~WhereRD-1The activity will be accommodated within a new building or structure, or extensions to an existing building or structure which comply with~~		Accept in part	Key Issue: Retirement Villages

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					~~standards:GRZ-S1 Maximum heightGRZ-S2 Height in relation to boundaryGRZ-S3 Setback (excluding from MHWS or wetland, lake and river margins)GRZ-S4 Setback from MHWSGRZ-S5 Façade lengthGRZ-S6 Outdoor living spaceGRZ-S7 Outdoor storage~~ Matters of discretion are restricted to: ai. the effects of any breach of GRZ-S1, GRZ-S2, GRZ-S3, GRZ-S4, GRZ-S5, and GRZ-S7. a. safe integration of vehicle and pedestrian access with the adjoining road network. b. provision of~~ landscaping and bunding, on-site amenity for residents, recreational facilities and~~ stormwater systems.~~c. design and layout of pedestrian circulation.~~ d. residential amenity for surrounding sites in respect of outlook and privacy. e. the effects arising from the quality of the interface between the retirement village and adjacent street or public open spaces~~visual quality and interest in the form and layout of the retirement village,~~		

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					~~including buildings, fencing, location and scale of utility areas and external storage areas.~~ f. the benefits associated with the construction, development, use and provision of accommodation to meet the needs of the elderly. g. the need to provide for the efficient use of larger sites. h. the functional and operational needs of retirement villages. Activity status where compliance not achieved with RD-1: Discretionary		
S218.006	Summerset Group Holdings Limited	GRZ-R10	Not Stated	expresses support for the submission of the Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand (submission 520) in its entirety.	Insert the following notification presumption An application for resource consent under this rule is precluded from being publicly notified. An application for resource consent under this rule that complies with GRZ-S1, GRZ-S2, GRZ-S3, GRZ-S4, and GRZ-S5 is precluded from being limited notified.	Reject	Key Issue: Retirement Villages
S520.005	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	GRZ-R10	Support in part	Support in principle the inclusion of a retirement village-specific rule (GRZ-R10) in the General Residential chapter and the application of restricted discretionary activity status to a retirement village. Effects of any breaches of the standards can be addressed through tailored matters of discretion not a Discretionary activity. Do not support matters of discretion relating to internal amenity.	Insert new Rule**GRZ-RXX Retirement VillageActivity status: Permitted** Amend GRZ-R10**Construction of** Retirement village **buildings** Activity status: Restricted discretionary~~WhereRD-1The activity will be accommodated within a new building or structure,~~	Accept in part	Key Issue: Retirement Villages

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					~~or extensions to an existing building or structure which comply with standards:GRZ-S1 Maximum heightGRZ-S2 Height in relation to boundaryGRZ-S3 Setback (excluding from MHWS or wetland, lake and river margins)GRZ-S4 Setback from MHWSGRZ-S5 Façade lengthGRZ-S6 Outdoor living spaceGRZ-S7 Outdoor storage~~ Matters of discretion are restricted to:**ai. the effects of any breach of GRZ-S1, GRZ-S2, GRZ-S3, GRZ-S4, GRZ-S5, and GRZ-S7.** a. safe integration of vehicle and pedestrian access with the adjoining road network. b. provision of ~~landscaping and bunding, on-site amenity for residents, recreational facilities and~~ stormwater systems.~~c. design and layout of pedestrian circulation.~~ d. residential amenity for surrounding sites in respect of outlook and privacy. e.**the effects arising from the quality of the interface between the retirement village and adjacent street or public open spaces** ~~visual quality and interest in~~		

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					~~the form and layout of the retirement village, including buildings, fencing, location and scale of utility areas and external storage areas.~~ f. the benefits associated with **the construction, development, use and** provision of accommodation to meet the needs of the elderly. g. **the need to provide for the efficient use of larger sites.** h. **the functional and operational needs of retirement villages**.~~Activity status where compliance not achieved with RD-1: Discretionary~~		
S520.006	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	GRZ-R10	Not Stated	A key consenting issue for retirement village operators across the country relates to the delays, costs and uncertainties associated with notification processes. Applications for retirement villages in the General Residential Zone should not be publicly notified. Limited notification should only be used where a retirement village application proposes a breach of one of GRZ-S1, GRZ-S2, GRZ-S3, GRZ-S4, or GRZ-S5 and the relevant effects threshold in the RMA is met.	Insert the following notification presumption**An application for resource consent under this rule is precluded from being publicly notified.An application for resource consent under this rule that complies with GRZ-S1, GRZ-S2, GRZ-S3, GRZ-S4, and GRZ-S5 is precluded from being limited notified.**	Reject	Key Issue: Retirement Villages
S324.001	Per Lugnet	GRZ-R10	Support in part	Lot 9, 9 Midgard Rd can currently be used for a 3 unit development with	Issue a Landuse Consent that preserves the present property rights without adding	Deferred	Key Issue: GRZ Rules

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				more than 50% impermeable surface and no setback from the stub of the road reserve. These rights must be preserved. Zoned Commercial in the operative district plan.	additional costs when the property is developed.		
S368.024	Far North District Council	GRZ-R10	Support in part	The rule does not provide for the establishment of a retirement village in existing buildings. This would result in any attempt to convert existing buildings/residential units to retirement villages a discretionary activity. A minor change to the wording is required to provide for existing buildings	Amend GRZ-R10 RD-1 The activity will be accommodated within a ~~new~~ building or structure, or extensions to an existing building or structure which comply with standards: GRZ-S1 Maximum height GRZ-S2 Height in relation to boundary GRZ-S3 Setback (excluding from MHWS or wetland, lake and river margins) GRZ-S4 Setback from MHWS GRZ-S5 Fa9ade length GRZ-S6 Outdoor living space GRZ-S7 Outdoor storage	Reject	Key Issue: Retirement Villages
S328.007	Traverse Ltd	GRZ-R10	Not Stated	Compliance with RD-1 of Rule GRZ-R10 requires that the activity will be accommodated within a new building or structure or extensions to an existing building or structure which meets the standards. This could be interpreted as meaning a singular building or structure, which is unrealistic for a retirement village and presumably not what was intended.	Amend RD-1 of Rule GRZ-R10 as follows: The activity will be accommodated within ~~a~~ new building**s** or structure**s** or extensions to ~~an~~ existing building**s** or structure**s** which comply with the following standards...	Reject	Key Issue: Retirement Villages

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S400.008	BR and R Davies	GRZ-R10	Oppose	Compliance with RD-1 requires that the activity will be accommodated within a new building or structure or extensions to an existing building or structure which comply with the following standards ... This could be interpreted as meaning a singular building or structure, which is unrealistic for a retirement village and presumably not what was intended.	Amend RD-1 of Rule GRZ-R10 as follows: The activity will be accommodated within ~~a~~ new building**s** or structure**s** or extensions to ~~an~~ existing building**s** or structure**s** which comply with the following standards...		Reject	Key Issue: Retirement Villages
S512.096	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	GRZ-R10	Support in part	Many zones hold objectives and policies related to servicing developments with appropriate infrastructure. Noting that NH-R5 requires adequate firefighting water supply for vulnerable activities (including residential), Fire and Emergency consider that inclusion of an additional standard on infrastructure servicing within individual zone chapters may be beneficial	Insertnew standard and/or matter of discretion across zones on infrastructureservicing (including emergency response transport/access and adequate watersupply for firefighting)		Reject	Key Issue: Plan wide and urban wide issues
S431.122	John Andrew Riddell	GRZ-R10	Not Stated	The amendment is necessary in order to achieve the purpose of the Act.	Amend the rule so that any proposal to set a building or structure less than 20 metres back from the coastal marine area, or from rivers and banks is a non-complying activity		Accept in part	Key Issue: Plan wide and urban wide issues
FS332.122	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part	Key Issue: Plan wide and urban wide issues
S338.025	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	GRZ-R10	Not Stated	The current height restriction of 8m in the General Residential zone should be strictly adhered to. Exceptions to this height limit should not be allowed for multi-unit developments or other purpose.	Amend Rule GRZ-R10 to remove the option of exceeding the height limit through the resource consent process.		Reject	Key Issue: GRZ Standards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS570.966	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: GRZ Standards
FS566.980	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: GRZ Standards
FS569.1002	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: GRZ Standards
S529.030	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	GRZ-R10	Support in part	The current height restriction of 8m in the General Residential zone should be strictly adhered to. Exceptions to this height limit should not be allowed for multi-unit developments or other purpose	Amend Rule GRZ-R10 to remove the option of exceeding the height limit through the resource consent process		Reject	Key Issue: GRZ Standards
FS570.1920	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: GRZ Standards
FS566.1934	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: GRZ Standards
FS569.1956	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: GRZ Standards
S522.042	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	GRZ-R10	Support in part	The current height restriction of 8m in the General Residential zone should be strictly adhered to. Exceptions to this height limit should not be allowed for multi-unit developments or other purpose.	Amend Rule GRZ-R10 to remove the option of exceeding the height limit through the resource consent process		Reject	Key Issue: GRZ Standards
FS566.1781	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: GRZ Standards
S449.031	Kapiro Conservation Trust	GRZ-R10	Support in part	The current height restriction of 8m in the General Residential zone should be strictly adhered to. Exceptions to this height limit should not be allowed for	Amend Rule GRZ-R10 to remove the option of exceeding the height limit through the resource consent process		Reject	Key Issue: GRZ Standards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				multi-unit developments or other purpose.				
FS569.1830	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Reject	Key Issue: GRZ Standards
FS570.1847	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Reject	Key Issue: GRZ Standards
S125.001	Lynley Newport	GRZ-R11	Support	Support inclusion of Minor Residential Unit provision in other zones.	Retain GRZ-R11		Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
S413.004	Roman Catholic Bishop of the Diocese of Auckland	GRZ-R11	Oppose	A minor residential unit can be easily constructed within an existing residential site either attached at ground level or an upper level while complying with the standards S1-S7.2. Families who live in the existing Residential zone are generally either family with young children who prefer to live close to schools OR older persons who prefer to live close to town facilities. Both types of families can have a social and economic gain by having a Minor Residential unit on their property either to accommodate a family member or a tenant.	Amend to include within GRZ R3 as stated in submission point 3 to include Minor Residential Unit as a Permitted activity		Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
S419.004	LMD Planning Consultancy	GRZ-R11	Oppose	1. A minor residential unit can be easily constructed within an existing residential site either attached at ground level or an upper level while complying with the standards S1-S7. 2. Families who live in the existing Residential zone are generally either family with young children who prefer to live close to schools OR older persons who prefer to live close to town facilities. Both types of families can have a social and economic gain by having a Minor Residential unit on	Amend to include within Rule GRZ R3 to include a minor residential unit as a permitted activity (refer to submission point S419.003)		Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Intensity

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				their property either to accommodate a family member or a tenant.				
FS566.1243	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Intensity
S428.022	Kapiro Residents Association	Standards	Support in part	It should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings, for example, with requirements for permeable open areas including garden/landscaped ground. Developments should use permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths. The PDP should require all new buildings to store/use roof water wherever possible, to avoid the need for expensive reticulation systems and reduce the need for water top-ups via water tankers. New buildings connected to a public water supply should be required to collect roof water in storage vessels to use for gardens and flushing toilets (at minimum) and contribute to other household water uses such as laundry connections. Water storage vessels do not need to be a traditional round tank - other useful shapes exist, such as rectangular upright vessels that are easy to install against the side of a house or garage, or short flat vessels designed to be completely buried underground or placed under the foundations of new builds. Greywater harvesting and re-use should also be required for new buildings. These types of water-saving measures would also reduce future Council infrastructure costs for additional water supplies and wastewater.	Amend PDP to include objectives, policies and rules/standards that require best practice environmentally sustainable techniques for new developments, including - • Permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths etc. • Best practice for lowest environmental impact and water sensitive designs, requiring greywater recycling techniques and other technologies to ensure efficient use of water, rain storage tanks for properties connected to a public water supply, additional water storage for buildings that rely solely on roof water (to cope with drought), and other measures • Renewable energy technologies and energy-efficient technologies, and similar requirements that foster improved environmental design/technologies and lower lifecycle climate impacts • Specified area (percentage) of tree canopy cover and green corridors should be required within new subdivisions. These will be increasingly important for shade/cooling for buildings and pedestrians in future.		Accept in part	Key Issue: Impermeable surfaces

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				Passive heating and cooling designs, for example, reduce energy consumption and the on-going costs of heating/cooling. Solar panels with batteries, for example, can be purchased on lease-to-buy schemes so that the owner/occupier only pays the amount that they would have paid anyway for grid electricity. Additional electricity generation by households will be essential for powering EVs in future because current national generation capacity is not sufficient.				
S561.116	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Standards	Not Stated	Introduce a framework of Objectives; Policies; Standards and rules; Matters of discretion; and Assessment Criteria to support the proposed Medium density residential zone.	Insert new provisions as set out in Appendix 4 of the submission to supportthe introduction of the proposed Medium densityresidential zone.		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS32.170	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	The original submission seeks to amend the FNDP in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes. The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				reallocating the goal posts. The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.				
FS348.020	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	There is no requirement for the proposed medium density zone.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS23.388	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS47.130	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS348.203	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	submission be disallowed		
S529.229	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	Standards	Support in part	It should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings, for example, with requirements for permeable open areas including garden/landscaped ground. Developments should use permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths. The PDP should require all new buildings to store/use roof water wherever possible, to avoid the need for expensive reticulation systems and reduce the need for water top-ups via water tankers. New buildings connected to a public water supply should be required to collect roof water in storage vessels to use for gardens and flushing toilets (at minimum) and contribute to other household water uses such as laundry connections. Water storage vessels do not need to be a traditional round tank - other useful shapes exist, such as rectangular upright vessels that are easy to install against the side of a house or garage, or short flat vessels designed to be completely buried underground or placed under the foundations of new builds. Greywater harvesting and re-use should also be required for new buildings. These types of water-saving measures would also reduce future Council infrastructure costs for additional water supplies and wastewater. Passive heating and cooling designs, for example, reduce energy consumption and the on-going costs of heating/cooling. Solar panels with batteries, for example, can be purchased on lease-to-buy schemes so	Amend PDP to include objectives, policies and rules/standards that require best practice environmentally sustainable techniques for new developments, including - • Permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths etc. • Best practice for lowest environmental impact and water sensitive designs, requiring greywater recycling techniques and other technologies to ensure efficient use of water, rain storage tanks for properties connected to a public water supply, additional water storage for buildings that rely solely on roof water (to cope with drought), and other measures • Renewable energy technologies and energy-efficient technologies, and similar requirements that foster improved environmental design/technologies and lower lifecycle climate impacts • Specified area (percentage) of tree canopy cover and green corridors should be required within new subdivisions. These will be increasingly important for shade/cooling for buildings and pedestrians in future.	Accept in part	Key Issue: Impermeable surfaces

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				that the owner/occupier only pays the amount that they would have paid anyway for grid electricity. Additional electricity generation by households will be essential for powering EVs in future because current national generation capacity is not sufficient.				
FS570.2116	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: Impermeable surfaces
FS566.2130	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: Impermeable surfaces
FS569.2152	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: Impermeable surfaces
S521.025	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	Standards	Support in part	It should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings, for example, with requirements for permeable open areas including garden/landscaped ground. Developments should use permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths. The PDP should require all new buildings to store/use roof water wherever possible, to avoid the need for expensive reticulation systems and reduce the need for water top-ups via water tankers. New buildings connected to a public water supply should be required to collect roof water in storage vessels to use for gardens and flushing toilets (at minimum) and contribute to other household water uses such as laundry connections. Water storage vessels do not need to be a traditional round tank - other useful shapes exist, such as rectangular upright vessels that are	Amend PDP to include objectives, policies and rules/standards that require best practice environmentally sustainable techniques for new developments, including - • Permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths etc. • Best practice for lowest environmental impact and water sensitive designs, requiring greywater recycling techniques and other technologies to ensure efficient use of water, rain storage tanks for properties connected to a public water supply, additional water storage for buildings that rely solely on roof water (to cope with drought), and other measures • Renewable energy technologies and energy-efficient technologies, and similar requirements that foster improved environmental		Accept in part	Key Issue: Impermeable surfaces

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				easy to install against the side of a house or garage, or short flat vessels designed to be completely buried underground or placed under the foundations of new builds. Greywater harvesting and re-use should also be required for new buildings. These types of water-saving measures would also reduce future Council infrastructure costs for additional water supplies and wastewater. Passive heating and cooling designs, for example, reduce energy consumption and the on-going costs of heating/cooling. Solar panels with batteries, for example, can be purchased on lease-to-buy schemes so that the owner/occupier only pays the amount that they would have paid anyway for grid electricity. Additional electricity generation by households will be essential for powering EVs in future because current national generation capacity is not sufficient.	design/technologies and lower lifecycle climate impacts • Specified area (percentage) of tree canopy cover and green corridors should be required within new subdivisions. These will be increasingly important for shade/cooling for buildings and pedestrians in future.			
FS566.1735	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: Impermeable surfaces
S427.019	Kapiro Residents Association	GRZ-S1	Support in part	Allowing exceptions to the height limit of 8m would undermine the Council's objective, specifically the objective GRZ-S1: "The General Residential zone provides a variety of densities, housing types and lot sizes that respond to: ... c. the amenity and character of the receiving residential environment; and d. historic heritage."	Retain proposed maximum height restriction of 8m in the General Residential Zone and exceptions to these height limits should not be allowed for multi-unit developments or other purpose [inferred].		Accept in part	Key Issue: GRZ Standards
S561.074	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	GRZ-S1	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports a maximum height of 8m in the GRZ only if the Medium Density Residential Zone is	Retain maximum height as 8m for General Residential Zone, if Medium Density Residential Zone is accepted with an 11m		Accept	Key Issue: GRZ Standards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				accepted as part of the notified District Plan. Otherwise, a maximum building height of 11m is requested in the General Residential Zone to provide for three-storey typologies including apartments, across the District. Further, amend the matters of discretion to read "planned" character and amenity.	building height. Otherwise, amend maximum height from 8m to 11m within the General Residential zone. Amend the matters of discretion to read; a. the **planned** character and amenity of the surrounding built environment;			
FS32.128	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	The original submission seeks to amend the FNDP in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes. The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts. The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Reject	Key Issue: GRZ Standards
FS348.012	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The proposed maximum height is yet another attempt to permit greater intensity beyond the needs established in the District Plan, all references to the	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Reject	Key Issue: GRZ Standards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				proposed medium density zone should be removed.				
FS23.346	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Accept	Key Issue: GRZ Standards
FS47.088	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Reject	Key Issue: GRZ Standards
FS348.161	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Reject	Key Issue: GRZ Standards
S338.021	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	GRZ-S1	Not Stated	The current height restriction of 8m in the General Residential zone should be strictly adhered to. Exceptions to these height limits should not be allowed for	Retain Standard GRZ-S1		Accept	Key Issue: GRZ Standards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				multi-unit developments or other purpose.				
FS570.962	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Key Issue: GRZ Standards
FS566.976	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Key Issue: GRZ Standards
FS569.998	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Key Issue: GRZ Standards
S529.027	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	GRZ-S1	Support in part	The current height restriction of 8m in the General Residential zone should be strictly adhered to. Exceptions to these height limits should not be allowed for multi-unit developments or other purpose	Retain Standard GRZ-S1		Accept	Key Issue: GRZ Standards
FS570.1917	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Key Issue: GRZ Standards
FS566.1931	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Key Issue: GRZ Standards
FS569.1953	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Key Issue: GRZ Standards
S522.018	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	GRZ-S1	Support in part	The current height restriction of 8m in the General Residential zone should be strictly adhered to. Exceptions to these height limits should not be allowed for multi-unit developments or other purpose	Retain Standard GRZ-S1		Accept	Key Issue: GRZ Standards
FS566.1757	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Accept	Accept	Key Issue: GRZ Standards
S449.028	Kapiro Conservation Trust	GRZ-S1	Support in part	The current height restriction of 8m in the General Residential zone should be strictly adhered to. Exceptions to these	Retain Standard GRZ-S1		Accept	Key Issue: GRZ Standards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				height limits should not be allowed for multi-unit developments or other purpose				
FS569.1827	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Accept	Key Issue: GRZ Standards
FS570.1844	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Accept	Key Issue: GRZ Standards
S431.181	John Andrew Riddell	GRZ-S2	Not Stated	Not stated	Retain the approach varying the required height to boundary depending on the orientation of the relevant boundary.		Accept	Key Issue: GRZ Standards
S283.039	Trent Simpkin	GRZ-S2	Support in part	Support the use of the new daylight angles for the different North East South West boundaries. However, ii) Chimneys - 1.2m in width is not a very wide chimney. To keep chimneys in proportions with house designs it is best to allow up to 2m width please, as part of this rule. Some fires now need double flue systems which take up quite a large amount of chimney space.	Retain the new daylight 35/45/55 angles on the different boundaries. Amend the chimney exemption to a 2m width, instead of 1.2m.		Reject	Key Issue: GRZ Standards
FS45.16	Tristan Simpkin		Support	Support as per Reasons given in submission	Allow		Reject	Key Issue: GRZ Standards
FS570.853	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	Key Issue: GRZ Standards
FS566.867	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	Key Issue: GRZ Standards
FS569.889	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	Key Issue: GRZ Standards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S324.002	Per Lugnet	GRZ-S3	Support in part	Lot 9, 9 Midgard Rd can currently be used for a 3 unit development with more than 50% impermeable surface and no setback from the stub of the road reserve. These rights must be preserved. Zoned Commercial in the operative district plan.	Issue a Landuse Consent that preserves the present property rights without adding additional costs when the property is developed	Deferred	Key Issue: GRZ rules
S512.072	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	GRZ-S3	Support in part	Setbacks play a role in reducing spread of fire as well as ensuring Fire and Emergency personnel can get to a fire source or other emergency. An advice note is recommended to raise to plan users (e.g. developers) early on in the resource consent process that there is further control of building setbacks and firefighting access through the New Zealand Building Code (NZBC).	Insertadvice note to setback standard**Buildingsetback requirements are further controlled by the Building Code. This includesthe provision for firefighter access to buildings and egress from buildings.Plan users should refer to the applicable controls within the Building Code toensure compliance can be achieved at the building consent stage.Issuance of a resource consent does not imply that waivers of Building Coderequirements will be considered/granted**	Reject	Key Issue: Plan wide and urban wide rules
S283.006	Trent Simpkin	GRZ-S3	Oppose	General Residential Setbacks needs 'no setback' for 10m. The old/current district plan allows for no setback for 10m along a boundary in the general residential zone. This is a very handy rule as residential sites often have retaining walls taking surcharge (and are therefore a building) which can take advantage of this provision. Designing homes to fit on tight residential sections is tricky, and having this 10m provision	Amend to allow a 10m 'no setback' on any boundary.	Accept	Key Issue: GRZ standards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				for 'no setback' assists designers greatly.				
FS45.17	Tristan Simpkin		Support	Support as per Reasons given in submission	Allow		Accept	Key Issue: GRZ standards
FS570.820	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Key Issue: GRZ standards
FS566.834	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Key Issue: GRZ standards
FS569.856	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Key Issue: GRZ standards
S287.006	Tristan Simpkin	GRZ-S3	Oppose	General Residential Setbacks needs 'no setback' for 10m. The old/current district plan allows for no setback for 10m along a boundary in the general residential zone. This is a very handy rule as residential sites often have retaining walls taking surcharge (and are therefore a building) which can take advantage of this provision. Designing homes to fit on tight residential sections is tricky, and having this 10m provision for 'no setback' assists designers greatly.	Amend to allow a 10m 'no setback' on any boundary.		Accept	Key Issue: GRZ standards
FS29.27	Trent Simpkin		Support	Agree fully with including the 10m no setback provision as is in the current district plan. So many times when designing a home we might have a part of a retaining wall, or pool fence, balustrade etc (which are all classed as 'buildings') protrude into the setback which is what this 10m provision is great for, whereas now we'd have to get a resource consent for these minor	Allow		Accept	Key Issue: GRZ standards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				items. Council should be looking to reduce the number of minor resource consents being processed, not increase them.				
FS570.877	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Key Issue: GRZ standards
FS566.891	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Key Issue: GRZ standards
FS569.913	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Key Issue: GRZ standards
S561.075	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	GRZ-S3	Support in part	Amend the matters of discretion to read "planned" character and amenity.	Amend the matters of discretion to read; a. the **planned** character and amenity of the surrounding built environment		Accept	Key Issue: GRZ standards
FS32.129	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	The original submission seeks to amend the FNDP in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes. The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Reject	Key Issue: GRZ standards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts. The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.				
FS23.347	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Accept	Key Issue: GRZ standards
FS47.089	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Reject	Key Issue: GRZ standards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS348.162	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Reject	Key Issue: GRZ standards
S416.057	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	GRZ-S3	Support in part	For health and safety reasons, KiwiRail seek a setback for structures from the rail corridor boundary. While KiwiRail do not oppose development on adjacent sites, ensuring the ability to access and maintain structures without requiring access to rail land is important. Parts of the KiwiRail network adjoin commercial, mixed use, industrial and open space zones. These zone chapters do not currently include provision for boundary setbacks for buildings and structures. KiwiRail seek a boundary setback of 5m from the rail corridor for all buildings and structures. KiwiRail considers that a matter of discretion directing consideration of impacts on the safety and efficiency of the rail corridor is appropriate in situations where the 5m setback standard is not complied with in all zones adjacent to the railway corridor. Building setbacks are essential to address significant safety hazards associated with the operational rail corridor. The Proposed Plan enables a 1m setback from side and rear boundaries shared with the rail corridor, increasing the risk that poles, ladders, or even ropes for abseiling equipment, could protrude into the rail corridor and increasing the risk of collision with a train or electrified overhead lines. Further, there is a 600mm eave allowance within side and rear yards which restricts potential	Insert a railway setback (refer to submission for examples) Insert the following matters of discretion into the standard:**the location and design of the building as it relates to the ability to safely use, access and maintain buildings without requiring access on, above or over the rail corridorthe safe and efficient operation of the rail network**		Accept in part	Key Issue: Plan wide and urban wide issues

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				access to roofs from of buildings even further and results in an effective yard setback of 400mm. KiwiRail consider that a 5m setback is appropriate in providing for vehicular access to the rear of buildings (e.g. a cherry picker) and allowing for scaffolding to be erected safely. This setback provides for the unhindered operation of buildings, including higher rise structures and for the safer use of outdoor deck areas at height. This in turn fosters visual amenity, as lineside properties can be regularly maintained. One option is a cross-reference between the standards of each zone to avoid repetition, or to create a standard rail corridor setback rule and replicate it in each zone. The provision of a setback can ensure that all buildings on a site can be accessed and maintained for the life of that structure, without the requirement to gain access to rail land, including by aspects such as ladders, poles or abseil ropes. This ensures that a safe amenity is provided on the adjacent sites for the occupants, in line with delivery policy direction such as GRZ-O2, clause 4 whereby safety is a specific objective for achieving zone appropriate character and amenity values. It is noted that some zones (Heavy Industrial, Rural production)) have wider yards than sought by KiwiRail. This is supported, but the yard purpose is not linked to safety matters relating to a site's proximity to the railway and therefore any applications for reductions may not consider this requirement.			

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS243.143	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the requested 5m setback; a considerably reduced set back would provide adequate space for maintenance activities within sites adjacent to the rail network. In doing so, it will continue to protect the safe, efficient, and effective operation of the rail infrastructure while balancing the cost on landowners. The amendments are unnecessary.	Disallow	Insert a railway setback (refer to submission for examples) Insert the following matters of discretion into the standard:	Reject	Key Issue: Plan wide and urban wide issues
S126.001	Lynley Newport	GRZ-S5	Oppose	To date, Council has not concerned itself overly with the appearance of buildings in its residential zones. This is as it should be. To now find a somewhat retro standard, potentially useful in areas of special architectural character, but nowhere else, inserted into residential zone standards to insist on a recess to be set into a building if it is more than 20m long where it adjoins a road or public land, is disappointing to say the least.	Delete Standard GRZ-S5 in its entirety and all references to it.		Accept in part	Key Issue: GRZ Standards
FS327.001	LMD Planning Consultancy		Support	GRZ- S5 which imposes a restriction on how a residential building more than 20m long along a road frontage is designed, is overly restrictive and unnecessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part	Key Issue: GRZ Standards
S561.076	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	GRZ-S5	Oppose	Kāinga Ora does not consider that this should be a standard. Architectural modulation should be a design consideration rather than a standard for multi-unit developments.	Delete this standard.		Accept in part	Key Issue: GRZ Standards
FS32.130	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	The original submission seeks to amend the FNDP in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Reject	Key Issue: GRZ Standards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes. The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts. The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.				
FS23.348	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: GRZ Standards
FS47.090	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Reject	Key Issue: GRZ Standards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document				
FS348.163	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Reject	Key Issue: GRZ Standards
S328.008	Traverse Ltd	GRZ-S6	Not Stated	GRZ-S6 requires 50m² of outdoor living space for ground floor units. This is very restrictive on lots the size of those provided for in the GRZ. It is requested that this standard be deleted, or at least reduced to something not exceeding 20m².	Delete Standard GRZ-S6 or reduce the threshold for ground floor units to something not exceeding 20m².		Accept in part	Key Issue: GRZ Standards
S400.009	BR and R Davies	GRZ-S6	Oppose	GRZ-S6 requires 50m² of outdoor living space for ground floor units. This is very restrictive on lots the size of those provided for in the GRZ. It is requested that this standard be deleted, or at least reduced to something not exceeding 20m².	Delete Standard GRZ-S6 or reduce the threshold for ground floor units to something not exceeding 20m².		Accept in part	Key Issue: GRZ Standards
S512.093	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	GRZ-S6	Support in part	Fire and Emergency support the provision of an outdoor living space on the premise that while not directly intended, may provide access for emergency services and space for emergency egress. Fire and Emergency acknowledge that firefighting access requirements are managed through the NZBC however consider it important that these controls are bought to the attention of plan users (i.e. developers) in the resource consent process so that they can incorporate the NZBC requirements early on in their building design. The	add advice note to GRZ-S6 Advice note:**Site layout requirements are further controlled by the Building Code. This includes the provision for firefighter access to buildings and egress from buildings. Plan users should refer to the applicable controls within the Building Code to ensure compliance can be achieved at the**		Reject	Key Issue: Plan wide and urban wide issues

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				NZBC requirements will have an influence over how a site is deigned and consequential site layout therefore Fire and Emergency consider it important that developers incorporate these requirements into their site layout at resource consent so that Council are able to assess this design to ensure compliance with the RMA. Fire and Emergency therefore request that, as a minimum, an advice note is included directing plan users to the requirements of the NZBC.	**building consent stage. Issuance of a resource consent does not imply that waivers of Building Code requirements will be considered/granted**			
S561.077	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	GRZ-S6	Support in part	Kāinga Ora considers that the requirement of 50m2 of outdoor living space per dwelling is excessive as a minimum and request that it be amended to 30m2. Further, amend the matters of discretion to read "planned" amenity.	Amend GRZ-S6 as follows: 1. Each residential unit must have an exclusive outdoor living space: i. of at least ~~50m2~~ **30m2** at ground level with a minimum dimension of 5m; or ii. at least 8m2 (with a minimum dimension of 2m) where the residential unit is not on the ground floor. Amend the matters of discretion to read ; a. the **planned** residential amenity for the occupants....		Accept in part	Key Issue: GRZ Standards
FS307.5	Ngā Kaingamaha o Ngāti Hine Charitable Trust		Support	Agree that the outdoor living space requirement of 50m2 is excessive and that 30m2 is more appropriate, with a minimum dimension of 5m. Also agree to amend the wording to the matters of discretion to read "planned" amenity. This assists the provision of higher intensity housing options in line with affordable housing options.	Allow		Accept in part	Key Issue: GRZ Standards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS32.131	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	The original submission seeks to amend the FNDP in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes. The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts. The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Reject	Key Issue: GRZ Standards
FS348.013	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The only purpose of this proposal is further residential intensification beyond what is needed.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Reject	Key Issue: GRZ Standards
FS23.349	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: GRZ Standards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS47.091	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Reject	Key Issue: GRZ Standards
FS348.164	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept in part	Key Issue: GRZ Standards
S502.027	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	GRZ-S6	Support in part	As outdoor living space is a national standard definition clarification is therefore needed within the applicable rules to determine if outdoor living space is to include decks partially covered with a roof. Part 2 is not required especially iii. as why apply this restriction. Many people prefer their outdoor space to the south to take advantage of the shade. This restriction is not needed for the Northland climate.	Amend GRZ-S6 1. Each residential unit must have an exclusive outdoor living space: i. of at least 50m2 at ground level with a minimum dimension of 5m; or ii. at least 8m2 (with a minimum dimension of 2m) where the residential unit is not on the ground floor. 2. The outdoor living space must: i. be directly accessibl~~e~~ from a habitable room in the residential unit; ii. be free of buildings, storage, parking spaces and manoeuvring areas;~~iii. be oriented to the north,~~		Accept in part	Key Issue: GRZ Standards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					~~east or west side (or a combination) of the residential unit.~~**Note: Outdoor Living Space includes decks which are open on at least two sides and covered/partially covered with a roof.**			
FS327.005	LMD Planning Consultancy		Support	The orientation of outdoor areas is not that important for Northland.	Allow in part	Amend GRZ-S6 to delete orientation of outdoor areas (inferred).	Accept in part	Key Issue: GRZ Standards
S126.002	Lynley Newport	GRZ-S7	Oppose	Standard GRZ-S7 relating to outdoor storage is stretching into civil law matters and will do nothing other than encouraging 1.8m high solid walls around every residential section in town because a homeowner doesn't want people to look into their outdoor area in case what they have in that area might be classed as 'storage' (an ill-defined term at best).	Delete Standard GRZ-S7 in its entirety and all references to it.		Reject	Key Issue: GRZ Standards
FS327.002	LMD Planning Consultancy		Support	This standard is likely to encouraging 1.8m high solid walls around every residential section in town.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject	Key Issue: GRZ Standards
S561.078	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	GRZ-S7	Support in part	Amend the matters of discretion to read "planned" amenity.	Amend GRZ-S7 matters of discretion to read; a. the **planned** streetscape and amenity of.... b. the **planned** amenity of....		Accept	Key Issue: GRZ Standards
FS32.132	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	The original submission seeks to amend the FNDP in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Reject	Key Issue: GRZ Standards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes. The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts. The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.				
FS23.350	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Accept	Key Issue: GRZ Standards
FS47.092	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Reject	Key Issue: GRZ Standards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document				
FS348.165	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Reject	Key Issue: GRZ Standards