



Proposed Far North District Plan

Volume 6 - Summary of Decisions Requested

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
P S Yates Family Trust (S333)	S333.072	Coastal environment	CE-S5	Support in part	As drafted, the standard may trigger the need for an engineering report for a resource consent for an activity anywhere on a site subject to a coastal hazard overlay. In most instances, the coastal hazard overlays are limited in area on a property. The related rules in this section consistently refer to 'location' which limits the assessment to the location of the activity sought, relative to the overlay. The standard should also refer to location to avoid this potential interpretation.	Amend Standard CE-S5 as follows: <i>Any application for a resource consent in relation to a site location</i> that is potentially affected by a coastal hazard must be accompanied by a report prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced engineer that addresses the matters identified in the relevant objectives, policies, performance standards and matters of control/discretion
Omata Estate (S548)	S548.004	Coastal environment	CE-S5	Oppose	a site specific engineering report should be dependent on the natural and scale of a proposal and the proximity of the proposal to an area identified as being potential affected by the coastal hazard. Applying a blanket requirement to provide a site-specific engineering report for any resource consent applications for a site potentially affected by a coastal hazard would result in undue cost constraints to applicants and does not meet the requirements of s32.	delete CE-S5
Northland Regional Council (S359)	S359.043	Earthworks	Objectives	Support in part	There appears to be some overlap between the earthwork's provisions in the proposed plan and the Proposed Regional Plan. This becomes problematic (and potentially costly) for applicants.	Amend provisions to avoid duplicating regional council functions where possible.
Bentzen Farm Limited (S167)	S167.083	Earthworks	EW-O1	Support in part	The definition of earthworks captures many rural activities, which should be exempt from the rules (ie they can occur subject to standards, without	Amend Objective EW-01 as follows: Earthworks are enabled where

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					the need for resource consent). The objective as drafted seeks to enable earthworks associated with subdivision and development, however neglects to enable earthworks associated with rural activities which are otherwise provided for under policy EW-P1.	they are required for rural land uses and development and to facilitate the efficient subdivision and development of land, while managing adverse effects on waterbodies, coastal marine area, public safety, surrounding land and infrastructure.
Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)	S168.081	Earthworks	EW-01	Support in part	The definition of earthworks is broadly cast as means the alteration or disturbance of land, including by moving, removing, placing, blading, cutting, contouring, filling or excavation of earth (or any matter constituting the land including soil, clay, sand and rock); but excludes gardening, cultivation, and disturbance of land for the installation of fence posts. As such it captures many rural activities, which should be exempt from the rules (ie they can occur subject to standards, without the need for resource consent). The objective as drafted seeks to enable earthworks associated with subdivision and development, however neglects to enable earthworks associated with rural activities which are otherwise provided for under policy EW-P1.	Amend Objective EW-01 as follows: Earthworks are enabled where they are required for rural land uses and development and to facilitate the efficient subdivision and development of land, while managing adverse effects on waterbodies, coastal marine area, public safety, surrounding land and infrastructure.
Russell Protection Society (INC) (S179)	S179.081	Earthworks	EW-01	Support	The natural marine environment, especially estuarine areas is being progressively degraded through land use activities in the Bay of Islands. the Objectives and Polices of this section contain a fundamental contradiction between 'efficiency' and 'protection of environmental values' unfortunately the rules and standards to not provide adequate direction as to how to appropriately manage this tension especially where significant resources are involved. it should be evident by now that standard erosion	Retain EW-01

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					control methods are largely ineffectual. This is because parts of the Bay of Islands are characterised by heavy clay soils, steep topography and heavy rainfalls. examination of streams during storm events reveal heavy sediment loads, particularly below recent subdivisions	
The Shooting Box Limited (S187)	S187.072	Earthworks	EW-01	Support in part	The definition of earthworks is broadly cast as means the alteration or disturbance of land, including by moving, removing, placing, blading, cutting, contouring, filling or excavation of earth (or any matter constituting the land including soil, clay, sand and rock); but excludes gardening, cultivation, and disturbance of land for the installation of fence posts. As such it captures many rural activities, which should be exempt from the rules (ie they can occur subject to standards, without the need for resource consent). The objective as drafted seeks to enable earthworks associated with subdivision and development, however neglects to enable earthworks associated with rural activities which are otherwise provided for under policy EW-P1.	Amend Objective EW-01 as follows: Earthworks are enabled where they are required for rural land uses and development and to facilitate the efficient subdivision and development of land, while managing adverse effects on waterbodies, coastal marine area, public safety, surrounding land and infrastructure.
Wendover Two Limited (S222)	S222.075	Earthworks	EW-01	Support in part	The definition of earthworks is broadly cast as means the alteration or disturbance of land, including by moving, removing, placing, blading, cutting, contouring, filling or excavation of earth (or any matter constituting the land including soil, clay, sand and rock); but excludes gardening, cultivation, and disturbance of land for the installation of fence posts. As such it captures many rural activities, which should be exempt from the rules (ie they can occur subject to standards, without the need for resource consent). The objective as drafted seeks to enable earthworks associated with subdivision and development, however neglects to enable	Amend Objective EW-01 as follows: Earthworks are enabled where they are required for rural land uses and development and to facilitate the efficient subdivision and development of land, while managing adverse effects on waterbodies, coastal marine area, public safety, surrounding land and infrastructure.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					earthworks associated with rural activities which are otherwise provided for under policy EW-P1.	
Matauri Trustee Limited (S243)	S243.101	Earthworks	EW-O1	Support in part	<p>The definition of earthworks is broadly cast as meaning the alteration or disturbance of land, including by moving, removing, placing, blading, cutting, contouring, filling or excavation of earth (or any matter constituting the land including soil, clay, sand and rock); but excludes gardening, cultivation, and disturbance of land for the installation of fence posts.</p> <p>As such it captures many rural activities, which should be exempt from the rules (i.e. they can occur subject to standards, without the need for resource consent).</p> <p>The objective as drafted seeks to enable earthworks associated with subdivision and development, however neglects to enable earthworks associated with rural activities which are otherwise provided for under policy EW-P1.</p>	Amend Objective EW-01 as follows: Earthworks are enabled where they are required for rural land uses and development and to facilitate the efficient subdivision and development of land, while managing adverse effects on waterbodies, coastal marine area, public safety, surrounding land and infrastructure.
P S Yates Family Trust (S333)	S333.073	Earthworks	EW-O1	Support in part	<p>The definition of earthworks is broadly cast as means the alteration or disturbance of land, including by moving, removing, placing, blading, cutting, contouring, filling or excavation of earth (or any matter constituting the land including soil, clay, sand and rock); but excludes gardening, cultivation, and disturbance of land for the installation of fence posts. As such it captures many rural activities, which should be exempt from the rules (ie they can occur subject to standards, without the need for resource consent). The objective as drafted seeks to enable earthworks associated with subdivision and development, however neglects to enable earthworks associated with rural activities which are otherwise provided for under policy EW-P1.</p>	Amend Objective EW-01 as follows: Earthworks are enabled where they are required for rural land uses and development and to facilitate the efficient subdivision and development of land, while managing adverse effects on waterbodies, coastal marine area, public safety, surrounding land and infrastructure.
Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand (S421)	S421.190	Earthworks	EW-O1	Support	Federated Farmers supports objectives EW-01, EW-2 and EW-03 as currently drafted in the proposed district plan	Retain Objective EW-01 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Waiaua Bay Farm Limited (S463)	S463.067	Earthworks	EW-01	Support	It is appropriate to provide for earthworks that are appropriately managed with respect to effects on the surrounding environment.	Retain objective EW-01
Russell Protection Society (INC) (S179)	S179.110	Earthworks	EW-02	Support	The natural marine environment, especially estuarine areas is being progressively degraded through land use activities in the Bay of Islands. the Objectives and Policies of this section contain a fundamental contradiction between 'efficiency' and 'protection of environmental values' unfortunately the rules and standards do not provide adequate direction as to how to appropriately manage this tension especially where significant resources are involved. it should be evident by now that standard erosion control methods are largely ineffectual. This is because parts of the Bay of Islands are characterised by heavy clay soils, steep topography and heavy rainfalls. examination of streams during storm events reveal heavy sediment loads, particularly below recent subdivisions	Retain EW-02
Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand (S421)	S421.191	Earthworks	EW-02	Support	Federated Farmers supports objectives EW-01, EW-2 and EW-03 as currently drafted in the proposed district plan	Retain Objective EW-02 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent
Russell Protection Society (INC) (S179)	S179.111	Earthworks	EW-03	Support	The natural marine environment, especially estuarine areas is being progressively degraded through land use activities in the Bay of Islands. the Objectives and Policies of this section contain a fundamental contradiction between 'efficiency' and 'protection of environmental values' unfortunately the rules and standards do not provide adequate direction as to how to appropriately manage this tension especially where significant resources are involved. it should be evident by now that standard erosion control methods are largely ineffectual. This is because parts of the Bay of Islands are characterised by heavy clay soils, steep topography and heavy rainfalls. examination of streams during storm events reveal heavy	Retain EW-03

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					sediment loads, particularly below recent subdivisions.	
Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand (S421)	S421.192	Earthworks	EW-O3	Support	Federated Farmers supports objectives EW-01, EW-2 and EW-03 as currently drafted in the proposed district plan	Retain Objective EW-O3 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent
Transpower New Zealand Ltd (S454)	S454.100	Earthworks	EW-O3	Support	Transpower supports the inclusion of an objective in the FNPD to ensure the stability of infrastructure such as the National Grid is not compromised.	Retain EW-O3
Northland Regional Council (S359)	S359.044	Earthworks	Policies	Support in part	There appears to be some overlap between the earthwork's provisions in the proposed plan and the Proposed Regional Plan. This becomes problematic (and potentially costly) for applicants.	Amend provisions to avoid duplicating regional council functions where possible.
Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation) (S364)	S364.072	Earthworks	Policies	Support in part	The Director-General submits that the earthworks rules and policies should recognise the potential threat posed by Kauri Dieback where it can be easily spread through soil movements.	Amend earthworks policies and rules to allow consideration and management of kauri dieback.
Transpower New Zealand Ltd (S454)	S454.101	Earthworks	Policies	Not Stated	Earthworks can have an adverse effect on infrastructure such as the National Grid. Earthworks undertaken too close to National Grid infrastructure can have an adverse effect on the stability of structures which needs to be avoided. While the Earthworks chapter includes rules to manage earthworks in the vicinity of the National Grid, there is no policy that directly affects this issue. Transpower considers that a new policy is necessary.	Insert new policy as follows: Protect nationally and regionally significant infrastructure from the adverse effects of earthworks, including the National Grid Yard.
Horticulture New Zealand (S159)	S159.078	Earthworks	EW-P1	Support	Provisions for rural land use and farming activities in rural zones is supported.	Retain Policy EW-P1.
Manulife Forest Management (NZ) Ltd (S160)	S160.027	Earthworks	EW-P1	Oppose	The submitter opposes policy EW-P1 as it should be supporting all primary production.	Amend policy EW-P1 as follows: Enable earthworks necessary to provide for the District's social, economic and cultural well-being, and their health and safety where they provide for:

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. urban land uses and development within urban zones; 2. rural land uses and development including, farm tracks, land drainage, and other primary production activities within the Rural zones; 3. conservation and recreation activities; 4. land drainage and flood control works; and 5. installation, upgrade and maintenance of infrastructure.
Russell Protection Society (INC) (S179)	S179.082	Earthworks	EW-P1	Support	<p>The natural marine environment, especially estuarine areas is being progressively degraded through land use activities in the Bay of Islands. the Objectives and Polices of this section contain a fundamental contradiction between 'efficiency' and 'protection of environmental values' unfortunately the rules and standards to not provide adequate direction as to how to appropriately manage this tension especially where significant resources are involved. it should be evident by now that standard erosion control methods are largely ineffectual. This is because parts of the Bay of Islands are characterised by heavy clay soils, steep topography and heavy rainfalls. examination of streams during storm events reveal heavy sediment loads, particularly below recent subdivisions</p>	Retain EW-P1

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (S356)	S356.098	Earthworks	EW-P1	Support	not stated	Retain EW-P1 as notified
Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand (S421)	S421.193	Earthworks	EW-P1	Support	Federated Farmers supports the recognition of earthworks being necessary for rural land uses and development for the District's social, economic, and cultural well-being and health and safety.	Retain Policy EW-P1 (inferred) or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent
Northland Fish and Game Council (S436)	S436.039	Earthworks	EW-P1	Not Stated	For the reasons set out under 'general submissions 'wetlands'' of the submission (refer to submission points S436.001 and S436.002), amend Policy EW-P1 to enable restoration work for earthworks to enable restoration work for earthworks.	Amend point c. of Policy EW-P1 as follows: c. conservation, restoration and recreation activities;
Waiaua Bay Farm Limited (S463)	S463.068	Earthworks	EW-P1	Oppose	The policy fails to recognise the need for earthworks in the Special Purpose Zones.	Insert new point f. within Objective EW-P1 as follows: f. Land uses, development and subdivision anticipated in a Special Purpose Zone.
Russell Protection Society (INC) (S179)	S179.112	Earthworks	EW-P2	Support	The natural marine environment, especially estuarine areas is being progressively degraded through land use activities in the Bay of Islands. the Objectives and Polices of this section contain a fundamental contradiction between 'efficiency' and 'protection of environmental values' unfortunately the rules and standards to not provide adequate direction as to how to appropriately manage this tension especially where significant resources are involved. it should be evident by now that standard erosion control methods are largely ineffectual. This is because parts of the Bay of Islands are characterised by heavy clay soils, steep topography and heavy rainfalls. examination of streams during storm events reveal heavy sediment loads, particularly below recent subdivisions.	Retain EW-P2

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Russell Protection Society (INC) (S179)	S179.113	Earthworks	EW-P3	Support	The natural marine environment, especially estuarine areas is being progressively degraded through land use activities in the Bay of Islands. the Objectives and Polices of this section contain a fundamental contradiction between 'efficiency' and 'protection of environmental values' unfortunately the rules and standards to not provide adequate direction as to how to appropriately manage this tension especially where significant resources are involved. it should be evident by now that standard erosion control methods are largely ineffectual. This is because parts of the Bay of Islands are characterised by heavy clay soils, steep topography and heavy rainfalls. examination of streams during storm events reveal heavy sediment loads, particularly below recent subdivisions.	Retain EW-P3
Far North District Council (S368)	S368.090	Earthworks	EW-P3	Support in part	drafting error, use of "or" in e. incorrect, should be "and"	Amend EW-P3 a. controlling maximum depth and height and maximum area or volume of earthworks; b. requiring appropriate setbacks are maintained from adjoining property boundaries, waterbodies and the coastal environment; c. managing the location and design of infrastructure; d. managing impacts on natural drainage patterns and overland flow paths; and e. controlling the movement of dust and sediment beyond the area of development to avoid: i. nuisance effects and/or amenity effects on surrounding sites, and or ii. silt and sediment entering stormwater systems or waterbodies and the coastal

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						marine area.
Russell Protection Society (INC) (S179)	S179.114	Earthworks	EW-P4	Support	The natural marine environment, especially estuarine areas is being progressively degraded through land use activities in the Bay of Islands. the Objectives and Polices of this section contain a fundamental contradiction between 'efficiency' and 'protection of environmental values' unfortunately the rules and standards to not provide adequate direction as to how to appropriately manage this tension especially where significant resources are involved. it should be evident by now that standard erosion control methods are largely ineffectual. This is because parts of the Bay of Islands are characterised by heavy clay soils, steep topography and heavy rainfalls. examination of streams during storm events reveal heavy sediment loads, particularly below recent subdivisions	Retain EW-P4
Russell Protection Society (INC) (S179)	S179.115	Earthworks	EW-P5	Support	The natural marine environment, especially estuarine areas is being progressively degraded through land use activities in the Bay of Islands. the Objectives and Polices of this section contain a fundamental contradiction between 'efficiency' and 'protection of environmental values' unfortunately the rules and standards to not provide adequate direction as to how to appropriately manage this tension especially where significant resources are involved. it should be evident by now that standard erosion control methods are largely ineffectual. This is because parts of the Bay of Islands are characterised by heavy clay soils, steep topography and heavy rainfalls. examination of streams during storm events reveal heavy sediment loads, particularly below recent subdivisions	Retain EW-P5
Russell Protection	S179.116	Earthworks	EW-P6	Support	The natural marine environment, especially estuarine areas is being progressively degraded	Retain EW-P6

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Society (INC) (S179)					through land use activities in the Bay of Islands. the Objectives and Polices of this section contain a fundamental contradiction between 'efficiency' and 'protection of environmental values' unfortunately the rules and standards to not provide adequate direction as to how to appropriately manage this tension especially where significant resources are involved. it should be evident by now that standard erosion control methods are largely ineffectual. This is because parts of the Bay of Islands are characterised by heavy clay soils, steep topography and heavy rainfalls. examination of streams during storm events reveal heavy sediment loads, particularly below recent subdivisions	
Russell Protection Society (INC) (S179)	S179.117	Earthworks	EW-P7	Support	The natural marine environment, especially estuarine areas is being progressively degraded through land use activities in the Bay of Islands. the Objectives and Polices of this section contain a fundamental contradiction between 'efficiency' and 'protection of environmental values' unfortunately the rules and standards to not provide adequate direction as to how to appropriately manage this tension especially where significant resources are involved. it should be evident by now that standard erosion control methods are largely ineffectual. This is because parts of the Bay of Islands are characterised by heavy clay soils, steep topography and heavy rainfalls. examination of streams during storm events reveal heavy sediment loads, particularly below recent subdivisions	Retain EW-P7
Russell Protection Society (INC) (S179)	S179.118	Earthworks	EW-P8	Support	The natural marine environment, especially estuarine areas is being progressively degraded through land use activities in the Bay of Islands. the Objectives and Polices of this section contain a fundamental contradiction between 'efficiency' and 'protection of environmental values' unfortunately the rules and standards to not provide adequate direction as to how to	Retain EW-P8

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					appropriately manage this tension especially where significant resources are involved. it should be evident by now that standard erosion control methods are largely ineffectual. This is because parts of the Bay of Islands are characterised by heavy clay soils, steep topography and heavy rainfalls. examination of streams during storm events reveal heavy sediment loads, particularly below recent subdivisions	
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (S356)	S356.099	Earthworks	EW-P8	Support	not stated	Retain EW-P8 as notified
Waiaua Bay Farm Limited (S463)	S463.069	Earthworks	EW-P8	Oppose	Sub-clauses (a) to (t) are a list of assessment matters that are inappropriate to be included in a policy. They do not provide direction about how to achieve the overarching objectives. WBF recommends deletion of the policy and reliance on the other earthworks policies instead. If necessary, these assessment criteria can be relocated to rules and standards later in this chapter.	Delete Policy EW-P8
Summit Forests New Zealand Limited (S148)	S148.036	Earthworks	Rules	Not Stated	Unlike farming, plantation forestry and plantation forestry activities are not explicitly provided for such that the general provisions of EW-R6 and R7 would apply. No justification is provided for more stringent standards for earthworks associated with plantation forestry activities in the coastal environment or the ONL or ONF overlays, especially as those standards do not apply to other primary production activities.	Amend the provisions to provide for earthworks associated with plantation forestry and plantation forestry activities as a permitted activity subject to the provisions of the NES-PF.
Summit Forests New Zealand Limited (S148)	S148.038	Earthworks	Rules	Not Stated	The earthworks Matters of Discretion appear to exceed the scope of the District Council's functions under section 31 of the Resource Management Act and, contrary to its section 32 analysis, stray into the functions of the Regional Council.	Delete any Matters of Discretion that exceed the Council's functions under the RMA.
Reuben Wright (S178)	S178.013	Earthworks	Rules	Support in part	None of the rules prescribe any specific requirement for earthworks associated with any subdivision activity. There should be some link	Amend Earthworks Chapter to include a link between the Subdivision Chapter, where

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					between the Subdivision Chapter, where earthworks are usually required in some form and can be assessed as part of any subdivision application, and the Earthworks Chapter.	earthworks are usually required in some form and can be assessed as part of any subdivision application.
Reuben Wright (S178)	S178.014	Earthworks	Rules	Support in part	Rules EW-R13, EW-S4 and EW-S5 relate to erosion and sediment control. The District Council has no role in administering erosion and sediment control matters where these are specifically addressed in the Proposed Regional Plan for Northland under Rule C.8.3.1. Inclusion of these rules in the District Plan duplicates controls already in place and administered by the Regional Council. The rules should be removed.	[Amend to delete EW-R13, EW-S4 and EW-S5 relating to erosion and sediment control where these are specifically addressed in the Proposed Regional Plan for Northland under Rule C.8.3.1.]
Russell Protection Society (INC) (S179)	S179.083	Earthworks	Rules	Support in part	<p>The natural marine environment, especially estuarine areas is being progressively degraded through land use activities in the Bay of Islands. the Objectives and Polices of this section contain a fundamental contradiction between 'efficiency' and 'protection of environmental values' unfortunately the rules and standards to not provide adequate direction as to how to appropriately manage this tension especially where significant resources are involved. it should be evident by now that standard erosion control methods are largely ineffectual. This is because parts of the Bay of Islands are characterised by heavy clay soils, steep topography and heavy rainfalls. examination of streams during storm events reveal heavy sediment loads, particularly below recent subdivisions.</p> <p>It is suggested that Council has primary responsibility for developing these standards rather than simply relying on other agencies such as the regional council</p>	Insert new rules around erosion and sediment control
Haigh Workman Limited (S215)	S215.047	Earthworks	Rules	Not Stated	Permitted activity rules EW-R1 to EW-R11 allow earthworks for a number of specified activities; earthworks for any other activity (such as re-contouring a paddock prior to planting an orchard, excavating stormwater detention basins,	Insert one rule that permits earthworks for any purpose subject to the standards EW-S1 to EW-S12.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>constructing earth bunds as noise barriers or simply disposing of fill excavated as a result of a permitted activity) automatically becomes a Restricted Discretionary activity.</p> <p>The rules would be simpler and more effects based if they were condensed into one rule that allowed earthworks for any purpose subject to the standards EW-S1 to EW-S12</p>	
New Zealand Defence Force (S217)	S217.026	Earthworks	Rules	Not Stated	<p>EW-R14 is considered onerous and out of keeping with earthworks associated with other activities (such as for farming or rural industrial activities) which are permitted, subject to compliance with the applicable standards.</p>	<p>Insert new rule EW-RXX Earthworks for temporary military training activities Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The earthworks complies with standards: EW-S1 Maximum earthworks thresholds; EW-S2 Maximum depth and slope; EW-S4 Site reinstatement; EW-S7 Land stability; EW-S8 Nature of filling material; and EW-S9 Flood and coastal hazards Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-1: Restricted discretionary Matters of discretion are restricted to: a. the matters of discretion of any infringed standard.</p>
Carrington Estate Jade LP and	S351.009	Earthworks	Rules	Not Stated	<p>The submitter identifies that the operative district plan rule 18.6.6.1.11 Earthworks and Vegetation Clearance, within the Carrington Estate Zone has</p>	<p>Amend the earthworks rules to include reference to the Carrington Estate Development</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Carrington Farms Jade LP (S351)					not been replicated in the earthworks rules in the proposed district plan and submits that it should be included within the Carrington Estate zone or an exemption within the earthworks chapter.	Plan and Schedule as per operative district plan rule 18.6.6.1.11 Earthworks and Vegetation Clearance.
Northland Regional Council (S359)	S359.045	Earthworks	Rules	Support in part	There appears to be some overlap between the earthwork's provisions in the proposed plan and the Proposed Regional Plan. This becomes problematic (and potentially costly) for applicants.	Amend provisions to avoid duplicating regional council functions where possible.
Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation) (S364)	S364.001	Earthworks	Rules	Not Stated	Kauri Dieback is caused by a pathogen that is easily spread through soil movements, including when it is carried on footwear, equipment, and vehicles. The disease is threatening Kauri with functional extinction and requires collaborative work to manage the disease and control any further spread. Any land disturbance works within three times the radius of the canopy of the dripline of New Zealand Kauri Tree ("the kauri hygiene zone") can cause potential contamination of an uninfected site and spread the disease.	Insert provisions and clear guidance within the Earthworks chapter to address the management of Kauri Dieback to prevent spread of the disease.
Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation) (S364)	S364.073	Earthworks	Rules	Support in part	The Director-General submits that the earthworks rules and policies should recognise the potential threat posed by Kauri Dieback where it can be easily spread through soil movements.	Amend earthworks policies and rules to allow consideration and management of kauri dieback.
Haigh Workman Limited (S215)	S215.051	Earthworks	Notes	Not Stated	Standard EW-S7 is open to wide interpretation. The risk of instability of land at or beyond the property boundary is addressed by standard EW-S6. Standard EW-S7 is redundant and should be removed. The standard may have been intended to address the more general risk of earthworks being carried out on land subject to instability. To address this issue, the Earthworks rules could include a note similar to that in New Plymouth District Plan Standard EW-S1 but refer to 'Land Susceptible to Instability' as defined in the Proposed Far North District Plan.	Insert a note to the Rules: Earthworks on land defined as 'Land Susceptible to Instability' in the Definitions may result in instability. If there is reason to suspect that the earthworks may result in instability, a site-specific geotechnical assessment, undertaken in accordance with engineering best-practice, may be required to demonstrate compliance with this standard.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
BP Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited, Z Energy Limited (S335)	S335.007	Earthworks	Notes	Support in part	The Fuel Companies anticipate Note 6 is intended to mean that the NESCS applies in addition to the earthworks provisions in certain instances.	Amend Note 6 Where soil sampling and land disturbance is proposed on land where a hazardous activity or industry has been, is more likely than not have been or is currently operating, then the National Environmental Standard for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health Regulations 2011 also apply.
BP Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited, Z Energy Limited (S335)	S335.008	Earthworks	Notes	Support in part	Fuel Companies seek a specific exemption for earthworks undertaken in relation to the removal or replacement of underground fuel storage systems, noting that these are specifically addressed under the NESCS and should not be duplicated under the district plan.	Insert a new Note 7 Earthworks undertaken in relation to the removal or replacement of a fuel storage system as defined under the National Environmental Standard for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health Regulations 2011 are exempt from this chapter.
Te Hiku Iwi Development Trust (S399)	S399.069	Earthworks	Notes	Not Stated	As noted, the NPS-FW and NES apply. For avoidance of doubt reference to the setbacks prescribed by the NES would be helpful to ensure users of the plan are aware of this connection.	Amend Note 5 as follows: The Northland Regional Plan currently in force and the National Environment Standards for Freshwater 2020 include rules and regulations relating to earthworks to manage effects on freshwater and soil including setbacks . Consent may be required for earthworks in terms of the regional rules and regulations in those

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						documents in addition to this District Plan.
Haigh Workman Limited (S215)	S215.036	Earthworks	EW-R1	Oppose	Permitted activity rules EW-R1 to EW-R11 allow earthworks for a number of specified activities; earthworks for any other activity (such as re-contouring a paddock prior to planting an orchard, excavating stormwater detention basins, constructing earth bunds as noise barriers or simply disposing of fill excavated as a result of a permitted activity) automatically becomes a Restricted Discretionary activity. The rules would be simpler and more effects based if they were condensed into one rule that allowed earthworks for any purpose subject to the standards EW-S1 to EW-S12.	Delete Rule EW-R1
BP Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited, Z Energy Limited (S335)	S335.009	Earthworks	EW-R1	Oppose	It is not clear that typical operation, maintenance, and upgrade works at petroleum industry sites under any activity category, for instance the removal and replacement of underground assets like tanks or drainage devices, are provided for. Given all the proposed standards apply to all earthworks activities, the Fuel Companies are unclear why all earthworks cannot be permitted subject to compliance with standards, irrespective of what they are proposed in relation to. Amendments are necessary to provide more broadly for earthworks for a range of activities with a focus on effects, not activities.	Delete rule EW-R1 And include a new rule as follows: EW-R1 All Zones Earthworks Activity Status: Permitted Where: PER-1 Compliance with standards EW-S1 - EW-S9 is achieved.
John Andrew Riddell (S431)	S431.171	Earthworks	EW-R1	Not Stated	Reference correction	Delete references in the Plan to 'Moturua Island zone' and 'Motoura Island zone', and replace with 'Moturoa Island zone'
Waiaua Bay Farm Limited (S463)	S463.070	Earthworks	EW-R1	Support	The rule provides appropriately for permitted earthworks and a fallback restricted discretionary consenting pathway is an efficient method to address a breach of the permitted activity performance standards.	Retain Rule EW-R1
Haigh Workman	S215.037	Earthworks	EW-R2	Oppose	Permitted activity rules EW-R1 to EW-R11 allow earthworks for a number of specified activities; earthworks for any other activity (such as re-	Delete EW- R2

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Limited (S215)					contouring a paddock prior to planting an orchard, excavating stormwater detention basins, constructing earth bunds as noise barriers or simply disposing of fill excavated as a result of a permitted activity) automatically becomes a Restricted Discretionary activity. The rules would be simpler and more effects based if they were condensed into one rule that allowed earthworks for any purpose subject to the standards EW-S1 to EW-S12.	
BP Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited, Z Energy Limited (S335)	S335.010	Earthworks	EW-R2	Oppose	It is not clear that typical operation, maintenance, and upgrade works at petroleum industry sites under any activity category, for instance the removal and replacement of underground assets like tanks or drainage devices, are provided for. Given all the proposed standards apply to all earthworks activities, the Fuel Companies are unclear why all earthworks cannot be permitted subject to compliance with standards, irrespective of what they are proposed in relation to. Amendments are necessary to provide more broadly for earthworks for a range of activities with a focus on effects, not activities.	Delete rule EW-R2 And include a new rule as follows: EW-R1 All Zones Earthworks Activity Status: Permitted Where: PER-1 Compliance with standards EW-S1 - EW-S9 is achieved.
John Andrew Riddell (S431)	S431.172	Earthworks	EW-R2	Not Stated	Reference correction	Delete references in the Plan to 'Moturua Island zone' and 'Motoura Island zone', and replace with 'Moturoa Island zone'
Waiaua Bay Farm Limited (S463)	S463.071	Earthworks	EW-R2	Support	The rule provides appropriately for permitted earthworks and a fallback restricted discretionary consenting pathway is an efficient method to address a breach of the permitted activity performance standards.	Retain Rule EW-R2
Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited (S502)	S502.024	Earthworks	EW-R2	Oppose	It is requested that this rule is either deleted in its entirety or reworded such that it is enabling or specifically exempts activities of this nature from complying with the standards specified. This is generally because works of this nature are already exempt, covered by other rules or compliance with these standards would create a perverse outcome. The definition of earthworks under the PDP excludes the installation of fence posts.	Delete EW-R2 or reworded such that it is enabling or specifically exempts activities of this nature from complying with the standards specified

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>Excavation works for fence lines are limited to the installation of fence posts and as such, there should not be additional provision for fence lines. The majority of fences are located on the boundary, including stock fences, such that EW-S6 - Setbacks would be automatically breached if this was to apply, triggering consent. This is considered to be a perverse outcome.</p> <p>Service connections are generally required to go over a boundary line, in order to connect a private site to a public service, such as wastewater, water and stormwater. Therefore, earthworks for service connections will automatically require resource consent for a breach of EW-S6 Setbacks, as the associated earthworks will occur on the boundary. It is requested that this particular activity is excluded from having to meet the provisions of EW-S6 - Setbacks.</p> <p>Poles and Piles relate to construction of buildings or structures. It is considered that the earthworks provisions for these items will be bundled within EW-R1 Earthworks for buildings or structures, and extensions to existing buildings or structures, such that an additional rule covering these items is not required.</p> <p>Maximum earthworks thresholds are not considered relevant to the activities listed in this rule, as generally, these works will be very minor. As mentioned, poles and piles will be included as part of a building or structure under the PDP, and therefore, these minor earthworks volumes can be bundled. Service connection earthworks volumes are also anticipated to be minor and generally consist of a small trench for cabling. All of which are not anticipated to create adverse effects. The same can be said for maximum depth and slope, where poles and piles will be assessed under buildings and structures.</p> <p>Site reinstatement and nature of filling material are considered irrelevant to these activities, as generally, the fill material will consist of the material used to excavate the post hole or service</p>	

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					trench. Due to the minor nature of the volume of earthworks associated with these activities, no adverse effects are anticipated. Land Susceptible to Instability includes 'Land which has been subject to, or is within 20m of land that has been subject to past modification including un-documented (non-engineered) cuts and fill slopes exceeding 1.5m in vertical height.' By including items such as piles which would technically require the creation of a hole in many cases deeper than 1.5m, or digging a trench for services some of which are deeper than 1.5m would meet this definition. As a result, if these works are within 20m of another site, then it is creating a non-compliance with EW-S7 which would be a consent trigger. This is considered a perverse outcome.	
Manulife Forest Management (NZ) Ltd (S160)	S160.028	Earthworks	EW-R3	Oppose	The submitter opposes rule EW-R3 as the rule does not include primary production activities and it should do in order to provide clarity and certainty for landowners with plantation forestry and farming activities.	Amend rule EW-R3 to include primary production or plantation forestry.
Haigh Workman Limited (S215)	S215.038	Earthworks	EW-R3	Oppose	Permitted activity rules EW-R1 to EW-R11 allow earthworks for a number of specified activities; earthworks for any other activity (such as re-contouring a paddock prior to planting an orchard, excavating stormwater detention basins, constructing earth bunds as noise barriers or simply disposing of fill excavated as a result of a permitted activity) automatically becomes a Restricted Discretionary activity. The rules would be simpler and more effects based if they were condensed into one rule that allowed earthworks for any purpose subject to the standards EW-S1 to EW-S12.	Delete Rule EW-R3
BP Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited, Z Energy	S335.011	Earthworks	EW-R3	Oppose	It is not clear that typical operation, maintenance, and upgrade works at petroleum industry sites under any activity category, for instance the removal and replacement of underground assets like tanks or drainage devices, are provided for. Given all the proposed standards apply to all earthworks activities, the Fuel Companies are	Delete rule EW-R3 And include a new rule as follows: EW-R1 All Zones EarthworksActivity Status: Permitted Where: PER-1 Compliance with standards

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Limited (S335)					unclear why all earthworks cannot be permitted subject to compliance with standards, irrespective of what they are proposed in relation to. Amendments are necessary to provide more broadly for earthworks for a range of activities with a focus on effects, not activities.	EW-S1 - EW-S9is achieved.
John Andrew Riddell (S431)	S431.173	Earthworks	EW-R3	Not Stated	Reference correction	Delete references in the Plan to 'Moturua Island zone' and 'Motoura Island zone', and replace with 'Moturoa Island zone'
New Zealand Pork Industry Board (S55)	S55.022	Earthworks	EW-R4	Support in part	The proposed definition of farming excludes intensive indoor primary production. Therefore, any earthworks in relation to this activity would fall under rule EW-R14 as a Discretionary activity. Typical earthworks required as part of an intensive primary production activity would be similar to those required as part of any other farming activity, including building tracks, installing fences or culverts etc. There is no reason why earthworks for an intensive primary production activity would create more risk than those for a farming activity, so these should be permitted, subject to the same standards. Intensive primary production activities cover both intensive indoor primary production and intensive outdoor primary production, as per our suggested definitions.	Amend the definition of farming to account for intensive primary production activities within this rule.
Horticulture New Zealand (S159)	S159.080	Earthworks	EW-R4	Oppose	The earthworks rules differentiate between site 8ha and over or those under 8ha. Not sure why and is a bit artificial for growers as many horticultural sites are smaller than 8ha	Delete Rule EW-R4 Provide clarity on why there are different rules for greater and less than 8ha
Manulife Forest Management (NZ) Ltd (S160)	S160.029	Earthworks	EW-R4	Oppose	The submitter opposes rule EW-R4 as the rule should include all primary production activities to provide clarity and certainty for landowners with plantation forestry and farming activities.	Amend rule EW-R4 to include primary production or plantation forestry.
Haigh Workman Limited (S215)	S215.039	Earthworks	EW-R4	Oppose	Permitted activity rules EW-R1 to EW-R11 allow earthworks for a number of specified activities; earthworks for any other activity (such as re-contouring a paddock prior to planting an orchard,	Delete Rule EW-R4

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					excavating stormwater detention basins, constructing earth bunds as noise barriers or simply disposing of fill excavated as a result of a permitted activity) automatically becomes a Restricted Discretionary activity. The rules would be simpler and more effects based if they were condensed into one rule that allowed earthworks for any purpose subject to the standards EW-S1 to EW-S12.	
BP Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited, Z Energy Limited (S335)	S335.012	Earthworks	EW-R4	Oppose	It is not clear that typical operation, maintenance, and upgrade works at petroleum industry sites under any activity category, for instance the removal and replacement of underground assets like tanks or drainage devices, are provided for. Given all the proposed standards apply to all earthworks activities, the Fuel Companies are unclear why all earthworks cannot be permitted subject to compliance with standards, irrespective of what they are proposed in relation to. Amendments are necessary to provide more broadly for earthworks for a range of activities with a focus on effects, not activities.	Delete rule EW-R4 And include a new rule as follows: EW-R1 All Zones EarthworksActivity Status: Permitted Where: PER-1 Compliance with standards EW-S1 - EW-S9is achieved.
Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand (S421)	S421.194	Earthworks	EW-R4	Support in part	Federated Farmers supports these rules as they are currently drafted in the proposed district plan. Both rules provide for earthworks for farming activities as a permitted activity and then as a restricted discretionary activity if compliance is unable to be achieved with performance standard PER-1. We do query the fact that the rules are based on the size of sites rather than the potential effects of any earthworks undertaken. It is not clear why it is considered that sites of more than 8ha will have potentially less effects as implied through rule EW-04 having less performance standards to be met under PER-1. Federated Farmers also seeks that the rules be amended to include reference to ancillary rural earthworks. We have made a submission point earlier in our submission that seeks the inclusion of a definition for ancillary rural earthworks.	Amend to merge Rules EW-R4 and EW-R5 into one rule that deals with earthworks for farming activities (or wording of similar effect), deleting site sizes from the rule/rules and inserting reference in the rule/s to ancillary rural earthworks

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Waiaua Bay Farm Limited (S463)	S463.072	Earthworks	EW-R4	Support	The rule provides appropriately for permitted earthworks and a fallback restricted discretionary consenting pathway is an efficient method to address a breach of the permitted activity performance standards.	Retain Rule EW-R4
New Zealand Pork Industry Board (S55)	S55.023	Earthworks	EW-R5	Not Stated	The proposed definition of farming excludes intensive indoor primary production. Therefore, any earthworks in relation to this activity would fall under rule EW-R14 as a Discretionary activity. Typical earthworks required as part of an intensive primary production activity would be similar to those required as part of any other farming activity, including building tracks, installing fences or culverts etc. There is no reason why earthworks for an intensive primary production activity would create more risk than those for a farming activity, so these should be permitted, subject to the same standards.	Amend definition of farming to account for intensive primary production activities within this rule
Horticulture New Zealand (S159)	S159.081	Earthworks	EW-R5	Oppose	The earthworks rules differentiate between site 8ha and over or those under 8ha. Not sure why and is a bit artificial for growers as many horticultural sites are smaller than 8ha	Delete Rule EW-R5 Provide clarity on why there are different rules for greater and less than 8ha
Manulife Forest Management (NZ) Ltd (S160)	S160.030	Earthworks	EW-R5	Oppose	The submitter opposes rule EW-R5 as it should include all primary production activities to provide clarity and certainty for landowners with plantation forestry and farming activities.	Amend rule EW-R5 to include primary production or plantation forestry.
Haigh Workman Limited (S215)	S215.040	Earthworks	EW-R5	Oppose	Permitted activity rules EW-R1 to EW-R11 allow earthworks for a number of specified activities; earthworks for any other activity (such as re-contouring a paddock prior to planting an orchard, excavating stormwater detention basins, constructing earth bunds as noise barriers or simply disposing of fill excavated as a result of a permitted activity) automatically becomes a Restricted Discretionary activity. The rules would be simpler and more effects based if they were condensed into one rule that allowed earthworks for any purpose subject to the standards EW-S1 to EW-S12.	Delete Rule EW-R5

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
BP Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited, Z Energy Limited (S335)	S335.013	Earthworks	EW-R5	Oppose	It is not clear that typical operation, maintenance, and upgrade works at petroleum industry sites under any activity category, for instance the removal and replacement of underground assets like tanks or drainage devices, are provided for. Given all the proposed standards apply to all earthworks activities, the Fuel Companies are unclear why all earthworks cannot be permitted subject to compliance with standards, irrespective of what they are proposed in relation to. Amendments are necessary to provide more broadly for earthworks for a range of activities with a focus on effects, not activities.	Delete rule EW-R5 And include a new rule as follows: EW-R1 All Zones EarthworksActivity Status: Permitted Where: PER-1 Compliance with standards EW-S1 - EW-S9is achieved.
Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand (S421)	S421.195	Earthworks	EW-R5	Support in part	Federated Farmers supports these rules as they are currently drafted in the proposed district plan. Both rules provide for earthworks for farming activities as a permitted activity and then as a restricted discretionary activity if compliance is unable to be achieved with performance standard PER-1. We do query the fact that the rules are based on the size of sites rather than the potential effects of any earthworks undertaken. It is not clear why it is considered that sites of more than 8ha will have potentially less effects as implied through rule EW-04 having less performance standards to be met under PER-1. Federated Farmers also seeks that the rules be amended to include reference to ancillary rural earthworks. We have made a submission point earlier in our submission that seeks the inclusion of a definition for ancillary rural earthworks.	Amend to merge Rules EW-R4 and EW-R5 into one rule that deals with earthworks for farming activities (or wording of similar effect), deleting site sizes from the rule/rules and inserting reference in the rule/s to ancillary rural earthworks
John Andrew Riddell (S431)	S431.174	Earthworks	EW-R5	Not Stated	Reference correction	Delete references in the Plan to 'Motuora Island zone' and 'Motoura Island zone', and replace with 'Moturoa Island zone
Waiaua Bay Farm Limited (S463)	S463.073	Earthworks	EW-R5	Support	The rule provides appropriately for permitted earthworks and a fallback restricted discretionary consenting pathway is an efficient method to address a breach of the permitted activity performance standards.	Retain Rule EW-R5

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Haigh Workman Limited (S215)	S215.041	Earthworks	EW-R6	Oppose	Permitted activity rules EW-R1 to EW-R11 allow earthworks for a number of specified activities; earthworks for any other activity (such as re-contouring a paddock prior to planting an orchard, excavating stormwater detention basins, constructing earth bunds as noise barriers or simply disposing of fill excavated as a result of a permitted activity) automatically becomes a Restricted Discretionary activity. The rules would be simpler and more effects based if they were condensed into one rule that allowed earthworks for any purpose subject to the standards EW-S1 to EW-S12.	Delete Rule EW-R6
BP Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited, Z Energy Limited (S335)	S335.014	Earthworks	EW-R6	Oppose	It is not clear that typical operation, maintenance, and upgrade works at petroleum industry sites under any activity category, for instance the removal and replacement of underground assets like tanks or drainage devices, are provided for. Given all the proposed standards apply to all earthworks activities, the Fuel Companies are unclear why all earthworks cannot be permitted subject to compliance with standards, irrespective of what they are proposed in relation to. Amendments are necessary to provide more broadly for earthworks for a range of activities with a focus on effects, not activities.	Delete rule EW-R6 And include a new rule as follows: EW-R1 All Zones EarthworksActivity Status: Permitted Where: PER-1 Compliance with standards EW-S1 - EW-S9is achieved.
John Andrew Riddell (S431)	S431.175	Earthworks	EW-R6	Not Stated	Reference correction	Delete references in the Plan to 'Moturua Island zone' and 'Motoura Island zone', and replace with 'Moturoa Island zone
Haigh Workman Limited (S215)	S215.042	Earthworks	EW-R7	Oppose	Permitted activity rules EW-R1 to EW-R11 allow earthworks for a number of specified activities; earthworks for any other activity (such as re-contouring a paddock prior to planting an orchard, excavating stormwater detention basins, constructing earth bunds as noise barriers or simply disposing of fill excavated as a result of a permitted activity) automatically becomes a Restricted Discretionary activity. The rules would be simpler and more effects based if they were condensed into one rule that	Delete Rule EW-R17

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					allowed earthworks for any purpose subject to the standards EW-S1 to EW-S12.	
BP Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited, Z Energy Limited (S335)	S335.015	Earthworks	EW-R7	Oppose	It is not clear that typical operation, maintenance, and upgrade works at petroleum industry sites under any activity category, for instance the removal and replacement of underground assets like tanks or drainage devices, are provided for. Given all the proposed standards apply to all earthworks activities, the Fuel Companies are unclear why all earthworks cannot be permitted subject to compliance with standards, irrespective of what they are proposed in relation to. Amendments are necessary to provide more broadly for earthworks for a range of activities with a focus on effects, not activities.	Delete rule EW-R7 And include a new rule as follows: EW-R1 All Zones EarthworksActivity Status: Permitted Where: PER-1 Compliance with standards EW-S1 - EW-S9is achieved.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (S356)	S356.100	Earthworks	EW-R7	Support	not stated	Retain EW-R7 as notified
Waiaua Bay Farm Limited (S463)	S463.074	Earthworks	EW-R7	Support	The rule provides appropriately for permitted earthworks and a fallback restricted discretionary consenting pathway is an efficient method to address a breach of the permitted activity performance standards.	Retain Rule EW-R7
Top Energy Limited (S483)	S483.178	Earthworks	EW-R7	Not Stated	Top Energy notes that no particular benefit is provided by this rule when compared to earthworks for EW-1 - all of the same performance standards apply. Top Energy seeks an exemption from SW-1 Maximum earthworks thresholds where the works are associated with infrastructure owned by a network utility. Volume will otherwise be managed by Regional Council, and amenity and stability issues addressed by the remaining standards, and the more stringent earthworks provisions contained within the Overlays.	Delete Standard EW-S1 from Rule EW-R7
Haigh Workman Limited (S215)	S215.043	Earthworks	EW-R8	Oppose	Permitted activity rules EW-R1 to EW-R11 allow earthworks for a number of specified activities; earthworks for any other activity (such as re-contouring a paddock prior to planting an orchard, excavating stormwater detention basins,	Delete Rule EW-R8

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					constructing earth bunds as noise barriers or simply disposing of fill excavated as a result of a permitted activity) automatically becomes a Restricted Discretionary activity. The rules would be simpler and more effects based if they were condensed into one rule that allowed earthworks for any purpose subject to the standards EW-S1 to EW-S12.	
Chorus New Zealand Limited, Spark New Zealand Trading Limited, Spark TowerCo Limited, Vodafone New Zealand Limited (S282)	S282.014	Earthworks	EW-R8	Oppose	While earthworks undertaken by network utility operators are permitted they are also subject to maximum earthworks thresholds, maximum depth and slop and setbacks from site boundaries. The earthworks undertaken by most telecommunications operators are relatively minor given works are generally for pole infrastructure, cabinet foundations and underground services. As such, it is considered inappropriate to restrict infrastructure works that are typically of lesser effect when compared to other forms of development.	Amend EW-R8 to remove the need to comply with EW-S1, EW-S2 and EW-S6 for telecommunication pole foundations, service trenches and trenchless methods such as directional drilling.
BP Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited, Z Energy Limited (S335)	S335.016	Earthworks	EW-R8	Oppose	It is not clear that typical operation, maintenance, and upgrade works at petroleum industry sites under any activity category, for instance the removal and replacement of underground assets like tanks or drainage devices, are provided for. Given all the proposed standards apply to all earthworks activities, the Fuel Companies are unclear why all earthworks cannot be permitted subject to compliance with standards, irrespective of what they are proposed in relation to. Amendments are necessary to provide more broadly for earthworks for a range of activities with a focus on effects, not activities.	Delete rule EW-R8 And include a new rule as follows: EW-R1 All Zones EarthworksActivity Status: Permitted Where: PER-1 Compliance with standards EW-S1 - EW-S9is achieved.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (S356)	S356.101	Earthworks	EW-R8	Support	not stated	Retain EW-R8 as notified
John Andrew Riddell (S431)	S431.177	Earthworks	EW-R8	Not Stated	Reference correction	Delete references in the Plan to 'Moturua Island zone' and

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						'Motoura Island zone', and replace with 'Moturoa Island zone'
Top Energy Limited (S483)	S483.179	Earthworks	EW-R8	Not Stated	<p>Top Energy notes that no particular benefit is provided by this rule when compared to earthworks for EW-1 - all of the same performance standards apply.</p> <p>Top Energy seeks an exemption from SW-1 Maximum earthworks thresholds where the works are associated with infrastructure owned by a network utility.</p> <p>Volumes will otherwise be managed by Regional Council, an amenity and stability issues addressed by the remaining standards, and the more stringent earthworks provisions contained within the Overlays.</p>	Delete Standard EW-S1 from Rule EW-R8.
Haigh Workman Limited (S215)	S215.044	Earthworks	EW-R9	Oppose	<p>Permitted activity rules EW-R1 to EW-R11 allow earthworks for a number of specified activities; earthworks for any other activity (such as re-contouring a paddock prior to planting an orchard, excavating stormwater detention basins, constructing earth bunds as noise barriers or simply disposing of fill excavated as a result of a permitted activity) automatically becomes a Restricted Discretionary activity.</p> <p>The rules would be simpler and more effects based if they were condensed into one rule that allowed earthworks for any purpose subject to the standards EW-S1 to EW-S12.</p>	Delete Rule EW-R9
BP Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited, Z Energy Limited (S335)	S335.017	Earthworks	EW-R9	Oppose	<p>It is not clear that typical operation, maintenance, and upgrade works at petroleum industry sites under any activity category, for instance the removal and replacement of underground assets like tanks or drainage devices, are provided for. Given all the proposed standards apply to all earthworks activities, the Fuel Companies are unclear why all earthworks cannot be permitted subject to compliance with standards, irrespective of what they are proposed in relation to.</p> <p>Amendments are necessary to provide more broadly for earthworks for a range of activities with a focus on effects, not activities.</p>	<p>Delete rule EW-R9</p> <p>And include a new rule as follows:EW-R1 All Zones EarthworksActivity Status: Permitted Where: PER-1 Compliance with standards EW-S1 - EW-S9is achieved.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
John Andrew Riddell (S431)	S431.178	Earthworks	EW-R9	Not Stated	Reference correction	Delete references in the Plan to 'Moturoa Island zone' and 'Motoura Island zone', and replace with 'Moturoa Island zone'
Waiaua Bay Farm Limited (S463)	S463.075	Earthworks	EW-R9	Support	The rule provides appropriately for permitted earthworks and a fallback restricted discretionary consenting pathway is an efficient method to address a breach of the permitted activity performance standards.	Retain Rule EW-R9
Haigh Workman Limited (S215)	S215.045	Earthworks	EW-R10	Oppose	Permitted activity rules EW-R1 to EW-R11 allow earthworks for a number of specified activities; earthworks for any other activity (such as re-contouring a paddock prior to planting an orchard, excavating stormwater detention basins, constructing earth bunds as noise barriers or simply disposing of fill excavated as a result of a permitted activity) automatically becomes a Restricted Discretionary activity. The rules would be simpler and more effects based if they were condensed into one rule that allowed earthworks for any purpose subject to the standards EW-S1 to EW-S12.	Delete Rule EW-R10
Chorus New Zealand Limited, Spark New Zealand Trading Limited, Spark TowerCo Limited, Vodafone New Zealand Limited (S282)	S282.026	Earthworks	EW-R10	Support in part	While the intent of the rule is supported in allowing for earthworks associated with walkways and cycle tracks, it is considered appropriate to also extend the scope to cover access tracks for infrastructure activities.	Amend EW-R10 to include access tracks for infrastructure activities.
BP Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited, Z	S335.018	Earthworks	EW-R10	Oppose	It is not clear that typical operation, maintenance, and upgrade works at petroleum industry sites under any activity category, for instance the removal and replacement of underground assets like tanks or drainage devices, are provided for. Given all the proposed standards apply to all	Delete rule EW-R10 And include a new rule as follows: EW-R1 All Zones Earthworks Activity Status: Permitted Where: PER-1

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Energy Limited (S335)					earthworks activities, the Fuel Companies are unclear why all earthworks cannot be permitted subject to compliance with standards, irrespective of what they are proposed in relation to. Amendments are necessary to provide more broadly for earthworks for a range of activities with a focus on effects, not activities.	Compliance with standards EW-S1 - EW-S9is achieved.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (S356)	S356.102	Earthworks	EW-R10	Support	not stated	Retain EW-R10 as notified
John Andrew Riddell (S431)	S431.179	Earthworks	EW-R10	Not Stated	Reference correction	Delete references in the Plan to 'Motuua Island zone' and 'Motoura Island zone', and replace with 'Moturoa Island zone'
Waiaua Bay Farm Limited (S463)	S463.076	Earthworks	EW-R10	Support	The rule provides appropriately for permitted earthworks and a fallback restricted discretionary consenting pathway is an efficient method to address a breach of the permitted activity performance standards.	Retain Rule EW-R10
Haigh Workman Limited (S215)	S215.046	Earthworks	EW-R11	Oppose	Permitted activity rules EW-R1 to EW-R11 allow earthworks for a number of specified activities; earthworks for any other activity (such as re-contouring a paddock prior to planting an orchard, excavating stormwater detention basins, constructing earth bunds as noise barriers or simply disposing of fill excavated as a result of a permitted activity) automatically becomes a Restricted Discretionary activity. The rules would be simpler and more effects based if they were condensed into one rule that allowed earthworks for any purpose subject to the standards EW-S1 to EW-S12.	Delete Rule EW-R11
BP Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited, Z Energy Limited (S335)	S335.019	Earthworks	EW-R11	Oppose	It is not clear that typical operation, maintenance, and upgrade works at petroleum industry sites under any activity category, for instance the removal and replacement of underground assets like tanks or drainage devices, are provided for. Given all the proposed standards apply to all earthworks activities, the Fuel Companies are unclear why all earthworks cannot be permitted subject to compliance with standards, irrespective	Delete rule EW-R11 And include a new rule as follows: EW-R1 All Zones EarthworksActivity Status: Permitted Where: PER-1 Compliance with standards

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					of what they are proposed in relation to. Amendments are necessary to provide more broadly for earthworks for a range of activities with a focus on effects, not activities.	EW-S1 - EW-S9is achieved.
John Andrew Riddell (S431)	S431.180	Earthworks	EW-R11	Not Stated	Reference correction	Delete references in the Plan to 'Moturua Island zone' and 'Motoura Island zone', and replace with 'Moturoa Island zone'
Waiaua Bay Farm Limited (S463)	S463.077	Earthworks	EW-R11	Support	The rule provides appropriately for permitted earthworks and a fallback restricted discretionary consenting pathway is an efficient method to address a breach of the permitted activity performance standards.	Retain Rule EW-R11
BP Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited, Z Energy Limited (S335)	S335.020	Earthworks	EW-R12	Oppose	It is not clear that typical operation, maintenance, and upgrade works at petroleum industry sites under any activity category, for instance the removal and replacement of underground assets like tanks or drainage devices, are provided for. Given all the proposed standards apply to all earthworks activities, the Fuel Companies are unclear why all earthworks cannot be permitted subject to compliance with standards, irrespective of what they are proposed in relation to. Amendments are necessary to provide more broadly for earthworks for a range of activities with a focus on effects, not activities.	Delete rule EW-R12 And include a new rule as follows: EW-R1 All Zones EarthworksActivity Status: Permitted Where: PER-1 Compliance with standards EW-S1 - EW-S9is achieved.
Haigh Workman Limited (S215)	S215.048	Earthworks	EW-R13	Support in part	We support the requirement for erosion and sediment control to be implemented on all earthworks in accordance with Auckland Council GD05. Note these are guidelines only and may not provide the precision and certainty required for a permitted activity rule. However, the guidelines are comprehensive and should be implemented. Rule EW-R13 / EW-S5 is in addition to other earthworks rules in the Plan. As such, the matters of discretion where the standard is not met should be confined to erosion and sediment control issues.	Amend EW-R13 matters of discretion to erosion and sediment control issues only
BP Oil New Zealand	S335.021	Earthworks	EW-R13	Oppose	It is not clear that typical operation, maintenance, and upgrade works at petroleum industry sites	Delete rule EW-R13 And include a new rule as

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited, Z Energy Limited (S335)					under any activity category, for instance the removal and replacement of underground assets like tanks or drainage devices, are provided for. Given all the proposed standards apply to all earthworks activities, the Fuel Companies are unclear why all earthworks cannot be permitted subject to compliance with standards, irrespective of what they are proposed in relation to. Amendments are necessary to provide more broadly for earthworks for a range of activities with a focus on effects, not activities.	follows: EW-R1 All Zones EarthworksActivity Status: Permitted Where: PER-1 Compliance with standards EW-S1 - EW-S9is achieved.
Bentzen Farm Limited (S167)	S167.084	Earthworks	EW-R14	Oppose	The effects of earthworks are mostly the same irrespective of the purpose of the earthworks and can be anticipated and managed by standards. Subject to compliance with the full suite of standards, such earthworks should also be a permitted activity. The construction of the earthworks rule as drafted runs the risk of requiring earthworks for many activities not anticipated in EW-R1 - EWR13, yet provided for in the various underlying zones.	Delete Rule EW-R14 and replace with the following: EW-R14 General earthworks not provided for by EW-R1 - EWR13All zonesActivity status: PermittedWhere:PER-1The earthworks complies with standards:EW-S1 Maximum earthworks thresholds;EW-S2 Maximum depth and slope;EW-S4 Site reinstatement;EW-S6 Setbacks;EW-S7 Land stability;EW-S8 Nature of filling material; andEW-S9 Flood and coastal hazards.EW-S1 does not apply to Motoura Island or Orongo Bay zones".
Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)	S168.082	Earthworks	EW-R14	Oppose	The effects of earthworks are mostly the same irrespective of the purpose of the earthworks and can be anticipated and managed by standards. Subject to compliance with the full suite of standards, such earthworks should also be a permitted activity. The construction of the	Delete Rule EW-R14 and replace with the following: EW-R14 General earthworks not provided for by EW-R1 -

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>earthworks rule as drafted runs the risk of requiring earthworks for many activities not anticipated in EW-R1 - EWR13, yet provided for in the various underlying zones.</p>	<p>EWR13All zonesActivity status: PermittedWhere:PER-1The earthworks complies with standards:EW-S1 Maximum earthworks thresholds;EW-S2 Maximum depth and slope;EW-S4 Site reinstatement;EW-S6 Setbacks;EW-S7 Land stability;EW-S8 Nature of filling material; andEW-S9 Flood and coastal hazards.EW-S1 does not apply to Motoura Island or Orongo Bay zones</p>
<p>The Shooting Box Limited (S187)</p>	<p>S187.073</p>	<p>Earthworks</p>	<p>EW-R14</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>The effects of earthworks are mostly the same irrespective of the purpose of the earthworks and can be anticipated and managed by standards. Subject to compliance with the full suite of standards, such earthworks should also be a permitted activity. The construction of the earthworks rule as drafted runs the risk of requiring earthworks for many activities not anticipated in EW-R1 - EWR13, yet provided for in the various underlying zones.</p>	<p>Delete Rule EW-R14 and replace with the following:EW-R14 General earthworks not provided for by EW-R1 - EWR13All zonesActivity status: PermittedWhere:PER-1The earthworks complies with standards:EW-S1 Maximum earthworks thresholds;EW-S2 Maximum depth and slope;EW-S4 Site reinstatement;EW-S6 Setbacks;EW-S7 Land stability;EW-S8 Nature of filling material; andEW-S9 Flood and coastal hazards.EW-S1 does not apply</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						to Motoura Island or Orongo Bay zones".
Wendover Two Limited (S222)	S222.076	Earthworks	EW-R14	Oppose	The effects of earthworks are mostly the same irrespective of the purpose of the earthworks and can be anticipated and managed by standards. Subject to compliance with the full suite of standards, such earthworks should also be a permitted activity. The construction of the earthworks rule as drafted runs the risk of requiring earthworks for many activities not anticipated in EW-R1 - EWR13, yet provided for in the various underlying zones.	Delete Rule EW-R14 Activities not otherwise listed in this chapter and insert with the following: EW-R14 General earthworks not provided for by EW-R1 - EWR13 All zonesActivity status: PermittedWhere:PER-1The earthworks complies with standards:EW-S1 Maximum earthworks thresholds;EW-S2 Maximum depth and slope;EW-S4 Site reinstatement;EW-S6 Setbacks;EW-S7 Land stability;EW-S8 Nature of filling material; andEW-S9 Flood and coastal hazards.EW-S1 does not apply to Motoura Island or Orongo Bayzones.
Matauri Trustee Limited (S243)	S243.102	Earthworks	EW-R14	Oppose	The effects of earthworks are mostly the same irrespective of the purpose of the earthworks and can be anticipated and managed by standards. Subject to compliance with the full suite of standards, such earthworks should also be a permitted activity. The construction of the earthworks rule as drafted runs the risk of requiring earthworks for many activities not anticipated in EW-R1 - EWR13, yet provided for in	Delete Rule EW-R14 and replace with the following: EW-R14 General earthworks not provided for by EW-R1 - EWR13All zonesActivity status: PermittedWhere:PER-1The earthworks complies with standards:EW-S1

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					the various underlying zones.	Maximum earthworks thresholds;EW-S2 Maximum depth and slope;EW-S4 Site reinstatement;EW-S6 Setbacks;EW-S7 Land stability;EW-S8 Nature of filling material; andEW-S9 Flood and coastal hazards.EW-S1 does not apply to Motoura Island or Orongo Bay zones
P S Yates Family Trust (S333)	S333.074	Earthworks	EW-R14	Oppose	The effects of earthworks are mostly the same irrespective of the purpose of the earthworks and can be anticipated and managed by standards. Subject to compliance with the full suite of standards, such earthworks should also be a permitted activity. The construction of the earthworks rule as drafted runs the risk of requiring earthworks for many activities not anticipated in EW-R1 - EWR13, yet provided for in the various underlying zones.	Delete Rule EW-R14 and replace with the following: EW-R14 General earthworks not provided for by EW-R1 - EWR13All zonesActivity status: PermittedWhere:PER-1The earthworks complies with standards:EW-S1 Maximum earthworks thresholds;EW-S2 Maximum depth and slope;EW-S4 Site reinstatement;EW-S6 Setbacks;EW-S7 Land stability;EW-S8 Nature of filling material; andEW-S9 Flood and coastal hazards.EW-S1 does not apply to Motoura Island or Orongo Bay zones".

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
BP Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited, Z Energy Limited (S335)	S335.022	Earthworks	EW-R14	Oppose	It is not clear that typical operation, maintenance, and upgrade works at petroleum industry sites under any activity category, for instance the removal and replacement of underground assets like tanks or drainage devices, are provided for. Given all the proposed standards apply to all earthworks activities, the Fuel Companies are unclear why all earthworks cannot be permitted subject to compliance with standards, irrespective of what they are proposed in relation to. Amendments are necessary to provide more broadly for earthworks for a range of activities with a focus on effects, not activities.	Delete Rule EW-R14 OR Amend activity status to Restricted Discretionary
Horticulture New Zealand (S159)	S159.082	Earthworks	EW-R15	Oppose	Permitted activity status should be allowed if compliance with NZECP34	Amend Rule EW-R15 to include compliance with NZECP34
Transpower New Zealand Ltd (S454)	S454.003	Earthworks	EW-R15	Support	Transpower supports this definition however, notes that the NESETA also contains a definition of earthworks that differs from this one. The key difference between the two is that the NESETA does not contain an exclusion for fence posts and the associated drilling of vertical holes. The drilling of vertical holes in the vicinity of transmission facilities has the potential to adversely affect the stability of those facilities. Rather than include both earthworks definitions in the FNPDP, Transpower proposes to address this matter by making amendments to the earthworks rule EW-R15 for the National Grid Yard to ensure the drilling of vertical holes is captured where necessary.	Amend rule EW-R15 to ensure the drilling of vertical holes is captured where necessary.
Transpower New Zealand Ltd (S454)	S454.102	Earthworks	EW-R15	Not Stated	EW-R15 is a non-complying activity rule containing performance standards, which Transpower considers unusual. Transpower is not opposed to earthworks occurring within the National Grid Yard provided they are managed carefully to ensure effects on access and the stability of National Grid structures are carefully managed. As a result of addressing this issue in many jurisdictions across New Zealand, Transpower has developed a Permitted Activity earthwork rule allows that effectively manages the	Amend to replace EW-R15 with the following permitted activity rule in the Infrastructure chapter: 110kV Transmission lines and the National Grid Yard All zones Activity status: Permitted 1. The earthworks are no deeper than 300mm within 6 metres of the outer

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>activity. Transpower proposes that existing rule EW-R15 be replaced is standard be replaced with an earthworks rule.</p>	<p>visible edge of a foundation of a 110kV transmission line tower or pole.2. The earthworks are no deeper than 3 metres:a. between 6 metres and 12 metres from the outer visible edge of a foundation of a 110kV or a 220kV transmission line tower or pole; orb. between 6 metres and 10 metres from the outer visible edge of foundation of a 66kV transmission line tower or pole.3. The land disturbance does not compromise the stability of a transmission line tower or pole.4. The land disturbance does not result in a reduction in the ground to conductor clearance distances as required in Table 4 of the New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Safe Electrical Distances (NZECP 34:2001).5. The earthworks do not permanently physically impede access to a 110kV transmission line or National Grid support structure6. Clauses 1 - 5 do not apply to the following:a. Land disturbance undertaken as</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>part of agricultural, horticultural or domestic cultivation, or repair or resealing of a road, footpath, driveway or farm track.b. Excavation of a vertical hole, not exceeding 500mm in diameter, that is more than 1.5 metres from outer visible edge of foundation of a National Grid transmission line pole or stay wire.c. Earthworks that otherwise comply with Clause 2.4.1 of NZECP34Activity status when compliance not achieved: Noncomplying</p>
Top Energy Limited (S483)	S483.180	Earthworks	EW-R15	Support	<p>Top Energy supports the inclusion of reference to Top Energy in the wording of the rule but notes that as notified, the wording of the rule doesn't work as a noncomplying activity and needs to be redrafted so that the activities identified are a permitted activity with a noncomplying default, and notes potential overlap with I -R12 given it also applies to Top Energy's 110kv lines, however as currently drafted the Infrastructure Chapter only applies to network utility operators.</p>	<p>Amend provisions relating to earthworks within proximity to Top Energy's 110kv lines.</p>
PF Olsen Limited (S91)	S91.017	Earthworks	Standards	Oppose	<p>The proposed earthworks standards exceed, duplicate and overlap with the Regional rules in both the RWSP and the Proposed Regional Plan. The standards are poorly drafted and ill-considered and show a significant lack of understanding of earthworks process and application.</p>	<p>Amend the earthworks standards to ensure that they do not frustrate the activity that is being permitted and are meaningful to the activity that they are applied to. Delete the requirement for setbacks (EW-S6) to apply to plantation forestry. This is provided for under the NES-PF</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>and is beyond the scope of stringency provided for by section 6 of the National Environmental Standards for Plantation Forestry.</p> <p>Delete the requirement for nature of filling material (EW-S8) to apply to plantation forestry. This is provided for under the NES-PF.</p> <p>Delete the requirement for flood and coastal hazards (EW-S9) to apply to plantation forestry. This is beyond the scope of stringency provided for by section 6 of the National Environmental Standards for Plantation Forestry.</p>
Summit Forests New Zealand Limited (S148)	S148.037	Earthworks	Standards	Not Stated	The proposed standards exceed, duplicate, and overlap with the regional rules and, in the plantation forestry context, appear unworkable.	Delete any requirement for plantation forestry activity to meet the requirements of the standards EW-S1, S2, S3, S4, s5, S6, S7, S8, and S9. These are provided for under the NES-PF
Reuben Wright (S178)	S178.012	Earthworks	Standards	Support in part	Rules EW-S1- EW-S9 do not appear to have an activity status expressed where any application will comply with the various Rules. It is assumed any activity should be permitted where it complies with any one of the rules, and restricted discretionary where it does not comply. An activity status should be referenced for each rule.	Amend EW-S1- EW-S9 to clarify the activity status.
Russell Protection Society (INC) (S179)	S179.084	Earthworks	Standards	Support in part	The natural marine environment, especially estuarine areas is being progressively degraded through land use activities in the Bay of Islands. the Objectives and Polices of this section contain a fundamental contradiction between 'efficiency' and 'protection of environmental values' unfortunately the rules and standards to not provide adequate direction as to how to	Insert new standards around erosion and sediment control

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>appropriately manage this tension especially where significant resources are involved. it should be evident by now that standard erosion control methods are largely ineffectual. This is because parts of the Bay of Islands are characterised by heavy clay soils, steep topography and heavy rainfalls. examination of streams during storm events reveal heavy sediment loads, particularly below recent subdivisions.</p> <p>It is suggested that Council has primary responsibility for developing these standards rather than simply relying on other agencies such as the regional council</p>	
Northland Regional Council (S359)	S359.038	Earthworks	Standards	Support in part	There appears to be some overlap between the earthwork's provisions in the proposed plan and the Proposed Regional Plan. This becomes problematic (and potentially costly) for applicants.	Amend the matters of discretion to avoid duplicating regional council functions where possible.
Puketona Business Park Limited (S45)	S45.016	Earthworks	EW-S1	Not Stated	The Earthworks chapter of the PDP as notified is generally acceptable, however the proposed permitted thresholds for the Light Industrial zone are considered to be unnecessarily restrictive.	Amend Standard EW-S1 to raise the thresholds in the Light Industrial zone to 2,500 m ² in area and 2,500 m ³ in volume, beyond which restricted discretionary activity consent should be required, with the activity to be assessed against the matters of discretion already listed.
Summit Forests New Zealand Limited (S148)	S148.039	Earthworks	EW-S1	Not Stated	The earthworks Matters of Discretion appear to exceed the scope of the District Council's functions under section 31 of the Resource Management Act and, contrary to its section 32 analysis, stray into the functions of the Regional Council.	Delete any Matters of Discretion that exceed the Council's functions under the RMA.
Horticulture New Zealand (S159)	S159.079	Earthworks	EW-S1	Not Stated	Include a new PER rule for ancillary earthworks	Insert the following within Standard EW-S1 to apply to General Rural, Rural Production, Horticulture and Rural Lifestyle zones: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 For

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>any ancillary rural earthworks, there is no limit;PER-2 For other activities: 5,000m³ in any12-month period per site.Where standard is not met: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion are restricted to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. dust nuisance, sedimentation, land instability, erosion and contamination effects; and 2. the impact on the road network, of heavy vehicle and other vehicular traffic generated as a result of earthworks; and 3. the impact on visual amenity and landscape character; andthe impact on any overland flow paths.
Horticulture New Zealand (S159)	S159.083	Earthworks	EW-S1	Oppose	The provisions allow for 5,000m ³ volume and 2,500m ² area as a permitted activity, however a consent would be required for any earthworks that met volume requirements on 1/4 of a hectare. Thresholds need to be reflective of the activities that take place in certain environments	Amend Standard EW-S1 to delete the 2,500m ² area threshold

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Bentzen Farm Limited (S167)	S167.085	Earthworks	EW-S1	Support	The thresholds, per calendar year measurements method and activity status are supported.	Retain rule EW-S1
Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)	S168.083	Earthworks	EW-S1	Support	The thresholds, per calendar year measurements method and activity status are supported	Retain Rule EW-S1
Terra Group (S172)	S172.013	Earthworks	EW-S1	Support	Support this standard, as it will achieve positive outcomes for the proposed zone.	Retain as notified (inferred)
The Shooting Box Limited (S187)	S187.074	Earthworks	EW-S1	Support	The thresholds, per calendar year measurements method and activity status are supported.	Retain Rule EW-S1.
Wendover Two Limited (S222)	S222.077	Earthworks	EW-S1	Support	The thresholds, per calendar year measurements method and activity status are supported.	Retain rule EW-S1
Matauri Trustee Limited (S243)	S243.103	Earthworks	EW-S1	Support	The thresholds, per calendar year measurements method and activity status are supported.	Retain rule EW-S1
IDF Development s Limited (S253)	S253.011	Earthworks	EW-S1	Support	These thresholds adequately manage the potential effect arising from the earthworks, however the definition of earthworks needs to exclude work involving building foundations.	Retain the 5,000m ³ and 2,500m ² thresholds for the Rural Production zone (inferred)
Ti Toki Farms Limited (S262)	S262.011	Earthworks	EW-S1	Support in part	The submitter considers that the 200m ³ maximum volume of earthworks in the Light Industrial Zone is in conflict with the intent to enable industrial activity within the zone.	Retain the 2,500m ² area and amend the volume from 200m ³ to 500m ³ , in the Light Industrial Zone.
Mangonui Haulage (S318)	S318.006	Earthworks	EW-S1	Oppose	The submitter opposes EW-S1 as it relates to the volume of 200m ³ in the Light Industrial Zone but supports the Area of 2500m ² , as the new zone should enable minimal consenting requirements to facilitate ongoing development of land in the zone.	Amend EW-S1 volume from 200m ³ to 500m ³ , as it relates to the Light Industrial Zone the earthworks.
P S Yates Family Trust (S333)	S333.075	Earthworks	EW-S1	Support	The thresholds, per calendar year measurements method and activity status are supported.	Retain rule EW-S1
Waipapa Pine Limited and Adrian Broughton Trust (S342)	S342.009	Earthworks	EW-S1	Support in part	The 200m ³ threshold automatically triggers a resource consent in the Waipapa commercial area by reason of the land levels and is compounded by reason the definition of	amend to delete the 200m ³ threshold - support for 2500m ² threshold for the heavy industrial zone (inferred)

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					earthworks includes work associated with building foundations. The threshold should be increased to 500m ³ . The m ² threshold adequately manages the potential effect arising from the earthworks.	
Neil Construction Limited (S349)	S349.019	Earthworks	EW-S1	Oppose	A better outcome in these circumstances is to utilise the land more efficiently for rural residential use, adding much needed housing to Kerikeri in a way that does not impose any burden on the community in terms of providing or funding infrastructure.	amend to increase area and volume thresholds for permitted earthworks
Linda Gigger (S370)	S370.006	Earthworks	EW-S1	Support in part	These thresholds endeavour to manage the potential effect arising from the earthworks, however the 200m ³ threshold is reasonably low. The Light Industrial zone should enable minimal consenting requirements to facilitate the ongoing development of the submitter's land. The increase in the volume (m ³) threshold can be accommodated through the provision of suitable information at the time of the Building Consent application as well as the other standards which require confirmation of earthworks are in accordance with GD-05.	Amend the 200m ³ threshold for earthworks in the Light Industrial Zone, increasing the volume threshold to 500 m ³ . Retain the 2,500m ² area threshold for earthworks in the Light Industrial Zone
LD Family Investments Limited (S384)	S384.011	Earthworks	EW-S1	Support in part	These thresholds endeavour to manage the potential effect arising from the earthworks, however the 200m ³ threshold is in conflict with zoning the land for industrial activity. The new zone should enable minimal consenting requirements to facilitate the development of the land. The increase on the m ³ threshold can be accommodate through the provision of suitable information at the time of the Building Consent application as well as the other standards which require confirmation of earthworks are in accordance with GD-05.	Delete the 200m ³ threshold, and retain the 2500m ² threshold for the Light Industrial Zone. The volume threshold should be raised to 500m ³ .
Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand (S421)	S421.196	Earthworks	EW-S1	Support	Federated Farmers supports the proposed maximum earthwork thresholds for the Rural Production zone of 5000m ³ in volume and 2500m ² in area for all earthworks undertaken on a site in a single calendar year.	Retain the thresholds for the Rural Production zone outlined in Standard EW-S1, namely the maximum volume of 5000m ³ and

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						maximum area of 2500m ²
Waiaua Bay Farm Limited (S463)	S463.078	Earthworks	EW-S1	Support	This standard provides appropriate allowances and a range of suitable assessment criteria, to facilitate the assessment and processing of resource consent applications involving earthworks.	Retain Standard EW-S1
Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited (S502)	S502.025	Earthworks	EW-S1	Support in part	Provision has been made for the exclusion of certain activities due to the nature of the works. The activities stated to be excluded are normal practices which are not considered to create adverse effects on the environment. For example, the installation of a septic tank is required in most rural areas, where a new build is occurring. The excavations associated with the installation of the septic tank can be large, which would cause most sites zoned rural residential or settlement to breach the permitted earthworks threshold. Due to the nature of the excavations and the fact that they are temporary, noting that once the septic tank is installed, the open ground is filled over, it is considered this should be exempt from the maximum earthworks thresholds. Similar comments are made for maintenance of farm drains. Although sites greater than 8 hectares do not have to account for this rule for farming activities, sites less than 8 hectares, which provide productive activities (such as orchards), will have to take this into account. These simple activities will increase the total amount of earthworks on sites exponentially although effects are not considered to be adverse due to the nature of the earthworks.	Amend EW-S1 The following maximum volumes and area thresholds for all earthworks undertaken on a site within a single calendar year, excluding any excavation works associated with fence lines, posts, piles, trenching of drains or cables, dam maintenance, normal rural practices, such as maintenance of farm drains, service connections, excavations for building foundations, septic tanks and associated drainage fields....
Waitangi Limited (S503)	S503.051	Earthworks	EW-S1	Not Stated	Provision has been made for the exclusion of certain activities due to the nature of the works. The activities stated to be excluded are normal practices which are not considered to create adverse effects on the environment. For example, the installation of a septic tank is required in most rural areas, where a new build is occurring. Due to the nature of the excavations and the fact that they are temporary, noting that once the septic	Amend the first paragraph of Standard EW-S1 as follows: The following maximum volumes and area thresholds for all earthworks undertaken on a site within a single calendar year, excluding any excavation works associated with fence

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>tank is installed, the open ground is filled over, it is considered this should be exempt from the maximum earthworks thresholds. Similar comments are made for maintenance of farm drains. Although sites greater than 8 hectares do not have to account for this rule for farming activities, sites less than 8 hectares, which provide productive activities (such as orchards), will have to take this into account. These simple activities will increase the total amount of earthworks on sites exponentially although effects are not considered to be adverse due to the nature of the earthworks.</p> <p>As such, it is requested that these activities are excluded from this rule</p>	<p>lines, posts, piles, trenching of drains or cables, dam maintenance, normal rural practices, such as maintenance of farm drains, service connections, excavations for building foundations, septic tanks and associated drainage fields.</p>
Summit Forests New Zealand Limited (S148)	S148.058	Earthworks	EW-S2	Not Stated	The earthworks Matters of Discretion appear to exceed the scope of the District Council's functions under section 31 of the Resource Management Act and, contrary to its section 32 analysis, stray into the functions of the Regional Council.	Delete any Matters of Discretion that exceed the Council's functions under the RMA.
Bentzen Farm Limited (S167)	S167.086	Earthworks	EW-S2	Support	The maximum depth of any cut or height of any fill thresholds and activity status are supported.	Retain rule EW-S2
Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)	S168.084	Earthworks	EW-S2	Support	The maximum depth of any cut or height of any fill thresholds and activity status are supported	Retain Rule EW-S2
Terra Group (S172)	S172.014	Earthworks	EW-S2	Support in part	Support this standard in principal, however the wording of the EW-S2 (ii) restricts the potential for retaining structures to be addressed at land use consent stage, which often precedes building consent stage	Amend Standard EW-S2(ii) to read: 3m subject to it being retained by a engineered retaining wall, which has had building consent issued approved during building consent or land use consent stage.
The Shooting Box Limited (S187)	S187.075	Earthworks	EW-S2	Oppose	The maximum depth of any cut or height of any fill thresholds and activity status are supported.	Retain rule EW-S2.
Wendover Two Limited (S222)	S222.078	Earthworks	EW-S2	Support	The maximum depth of any cut or height of any fill thresholds and activity status are supported.	Retain rule EW-S2

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Matauri Trustee Limited (S243)	S243.104	Earthworks	EW-S2	Support	The maximum depth of any cut or height of any fill thresholds and activity status are supported	Retain standard EW-S2
P S Yates Family Trust (S333)	S333.076	Earthworks	EW-S2	Support	The maximum depth of any cut or height of any fill thresholds and activity status are supported	Retain rule EW-S2
BP Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited, Z Energy Limited (S335)	S335.023	Earthworks	EW-S2	Support in part	EW-S2 does not provide for the type of temporary earthworks activities which may be involved in upgrading of drainage systems. The rationale for seeking to control these earthworks is unclear and is likely to capture a range of works with limited potential for adverse effects. As a minimum seek that temporary cuts and fills are excluded from EW-S2.	Amend Standard EW-S2 The maximum depth of any cut or height of any fill shall not exceed: i. 1.5m, i.e. maximum permitted cut and fill height may be 3m; or ii. 3m subject to it being retained by an engineered retaining wall, which has had a building consent issued. Note: This standard does not apply to temporary cuts and fills.
Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand (S421)	S421.197	Earthworks	EW-S3	Support	Federated Farmers supports the inclusion of standard EW-S3 which deals with an accidental discovery protocol.	Retain Standard EW-S3 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent
Summit Forests New Zealand Limited (S148)	S148.059	Earthworks	EW-S4	Not Stated	The earthworks Matters of Discretion appear to exceed the scope of the District Council's functions under section 31 of the Resource Management Act and, contrary to its section 32 analysis, stray into the functions of the Regional Council.	Delete any Matters of Discretion that exceed the Council's functions under the RMA.
Far North District Council (S368)	S368.041	Earthworks	EW-S4	Support in part	Spelling error 'established' Relief sought	Amend EW-S4 As soon as practicable, but no later than six months from the commencement of works: i. the earthworks area shall be established, filled and/or recontoured in a manner consistent with the

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>surrounding land.</p> <p>ii. replanted with vegetation which is the same as, or of similar species, to that which existed on the site prior to the earthworks taking place (if any), except that where the site was vegetation with any plant pest, the site may be replanted with indigenous vegetation, from locally sourced genetic stocks or</p> <p>iii. sealed, paved, metaled or built over.</p>
Summit Forests New Zealand Limited (S148)	S148.060	Earthworks	EW-S5	Not Stated	The earthworks Matters of Discretion appear to exceed the scope of the District Council's functions under section 31 of the Resource Management Act and, contrary to its section 32 analysis, stray into the functions of the Regional Council.	Delete any Matters of Discretion that exceed the Council's functions under the RMA.
Haigh Workman Limited (S215)	S215.049	Earthworks	EW-S5	Support in part	<p>We support the requirement for erosion and sediment control to be implemented on all earthworks in accordance with Auckland Council GD05. Note these are guidelines only and may not provide the precision and certainty required for a permitted activity rule. However, the guidelines are comprehensive and should be implemented.</p> <p>Rule EW-R13 / EW-S5 is in addition to other earthworks rules in the Plan. As such, the matters of discretion where the standard is not met should be confined to erosion and sediment control issues.</p>	Amend EW-S5 matters of discretion to erosion and sediment control issues only
Summit Forests New	S148.061	Earthworks	EW-S6	Not Stated	The earthworks Matters of Discretion appear to exceed the scope of the District Council's	Delete any Matters of Discretion that exceed the Council's

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Zealand Limited (S148)					functions under section 31 of the Resource Management Act and, contrary to its section 32 analysis, stray into the functions of the Regional Council.	functions under the RMA.
Robert Adams (S153)	S153.001	Earthworks	EW-S6	Support in part	The setback is very arbitrary especially for engineered walls. Engineers are extremely well qualified to design retaining walls on or very close to boundaries to meet the needs of the designer and the client. The land is private property and should be able to be developed according to the wishes of the owner right up to their legal boundary. Engineers have been designing up to boundaries for many decades so it is not necessary for planners to interfere with the rights of property owners to develop their property as they wish. The yards already control the location of buildings relative to boundaries. This rule needs to be removed as it restricts good design and creates narrow 1.5m alleys up against houses which will be damp, useless spaces. This 3m limit is too restrictive and unnecessary as it doesn't take into account the reality of building in the Far North when sites are often steep and narrow.	Delete Standard EW-S6. If necessary, replace it with a rule that gives no setback to the boundary, and no limit on heights of retaining walls when designed by an Engineer.
Terra Group (S172)	S172.015	Earthworks	EW-S6	Support	Support this standard, as it will achieve positive outcomes for the proposed zone.	Retain as notified (inferred)
Reuben Wright (S178)	S178.015	Earthworks	EW-S6	Oppose	Rule EW-S6 Setback is ambiguous and unenforceable where earthworks as defined could include very minor works (including such things as forming a vehicular access) that generate no adverse effects but still require consent. The rule should be removed.	Delete Standard EW-S6 Setback.
BP Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited, Z Energy Limited (S335)	S335.024	Earthworks	EW-S6	Oppose	EW-S6 could result in resource consent being required for minor earthworks undertaken as part of the normal maintenance, upgrade and operation of a range of activities. The balance of standards provide adequate controls for these activities.	Delete Standard EW-S6

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Far North District Council (S368)	S368.084	Earthworks	EW-S6	Support in part	This standard does not exclude the forming of an approved driveway or crossing from a legal road or the installation and upgrading of utility connections and infrastructure. It is not the intention of this standard to require consent for these activities.	Amend EW-S6 to include This standard does not apply to a legal road boundary where: i. The earthworks are for the formation of an approved driveway or crossing. ii. The earthworks are for the installation and upgrading of utility connections and infrastructure.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (S409)	S409.050	Earthworks	EW-S6	Support in part	Standard EW-S6 should have a 20m setback from an archaeological site to be consistent with the submission's proposed wording of Rules HH-RS, HA-RS PER1, PER-2 and PER-3. Standards HA-S3 and EW-S3 already reference a 20m setback for works to cease from upon the discovery of any suspected sensitive material.	Amend Standard EW-S6 Setback as follows (or words to that effect): Earthworks must be setback by the following minimum distances: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. earthworks supported by engineered retaining walls - 1.5m from a site boundary; 2. earthworks not supported by engineered retaining walls - 3m from a site boundary; 3. earthworks must be setback by a minimum distance of 10m from coastal marine area. 4. earthworks must be setback by a minimum distance of 20m from the extent of an archaeological site

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>Note: setbacks from waterbodies is managed by the Natural Character chapter. In addition to the requirements of the District Plan, it should be noted that the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 ("HNZPTA") requires all applicants to obtain an authority from the HNZPTA before any archaeological site is modified or destroyed. This is the case regardless of whether the land on which the site is located is designated, or the activity is permitted under the District Plan or a resource or building consent has been granted.</p>
<p>Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited (S502)</p>	<p>S502.026</p>	<p>Earthworks</p>	<p>EW-S6</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>It is considered that the intention of this rule is to provide additional controls on major cut/fill faces near boundaries. The activities to be excluded from this rule are minor in nature and generally will not require engineered retaining walls, such that the setback provisions will be 3 metres. This is not considered practical when maintaining a farm drain that is near a boundary, or constructing an area for a septic tank, which is only required to be 1.5 metres from the boundary. Provision is also sought to exclude excavations which are less than 500mm depth and under an area of 50m² or 50m³ volume in the zone, as well as provision for any excavations beyond 3 metres from the site boundaries that are less than 1.5</p>	<p>Amend EW-S6 Earthworks must be setback by the following minimum distances: i. earthworks supported by engineered retaining walls - 1.5m from a site boundary ii. earthworks not supported by engineered retaining walls - 3m from a site boundary with the exception of any cut/fill faces less than 500mm in height/depth over an area of less than 50m² and a volume</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					metres in height, so that these can occur within 3 metres of the boundary. These works are considered to be minor and with other provisions of this section being applied to these earthworks, controls are in place to ensure any such works do not create any adverse effects	of less than 50m³ in any zone and with a cut/fill face of 1.5 metres in depth/height in the Rural Production Zone, which can be located within 3 metres from the boundary. iii. earthworks must be setback by a minimum distance of 10m from coastal marine area. This rule does not include any excavation works associated with fence lines, posts, piles, trenching of drains or cables, dam maintenance, normal rural practices, such as maintenance of farm drains, service connections, excavations for building foundations, septic tanks and associated drainage fields.
Summit Forests New Zealand Limited (S148)	S148.062	Earthworks	EW-S7	Not Stated	The earthworks Matters of Discretion appear to exceed the scope of the District Council's functions under section 31 of the Resource Management Act and, contrary to its section 32 analysis, stray into the functions of the Regional Council.	Delete any Matters of Discretion that exceed the Council's functions under the RMA.
Haigh Workman Limited (S215)	S215.050	Earthworks	EW-S7	Oppose	Standard EW-S7 is open to wide interpretation. The risk of instability of land at or beyond the property boundary is addressed by standard EW-S6. Standard EW-S7 is redundant and should be removed. The standard may have been intended to address	Delete Standard EW-S7.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					the more general risk of earthworks being carried out on land subject to instability. To address this issue, the Earthworks rules could include a note similar to that in New Plymouth District Plan Standard EW-S1 but refer to 'Land Susceptible to Instability' as defined in the Proposed Far North District Plan.	
Summit Forests New Zealand Limited (S148)	S148.063	Earthworks	EW-S8	Not Stated	The earthworks Matters of Discretion appear to exceed the scope of the District Council's functions under section 31 of the Resource Management Act and, contrary to its section 32 analysis, stray into the functions of the Regional Council.	Delete any Matters of Discretion that exceed the Council's functions under the RMA.
Summit Forests New Zealand Limited (S148)	S148.064	Earthworks	EW-S9	Not Stated	The earthworks Matters of Discretion appear to exceed the scope of the District Council's functions under section 31 of the Resource Management Act and, contrary to its section 32 analysis, stray into the functions of the Regional Council.	Delete any Matters of Discretion that exceed the Council's functions under the RMA.
Reuben Wright (S178)	S178.016	Earthworks	EW-S9	Oppose	Rule EW-S7 Land Stability is ambiguous and unenforceable where the definition of land instability is very detailed and onerous and relies on information that will not be contained in the District Plan (ie. NZ Geology WebMap). In addition, it is not clear how earthworks could be determined as resulting in any instability of land at or beyond any boundary and therefore infringe the rule. The common law of 'the right of support for the land in its natural state' should apply rather than attempting regulate land stability through the District Plan. The rule should be removed.	Delete Standard EW-S7.
Reuben Wright (S178)	S178.017	Earthworks	EW-S9	Oppose	Rule EW-S9 Flood and coastal hazards is specifically addressed in the Proposed Regional Plan for Northland under Rule C.8.3.1. Inclusion of these rules in the District Plan duplicates controls already in place and administered by the Regional Council. The rule should be removed.	Delete Standard EW-S9.
Anna Clarke (S563)	S563.001	Light	Overview	Support in part	This information is largely correct and I am pleased to see the council acknowledging the adverse effects that poor artificial	amend to include comment that poorly designed night time lighting can have adverse effects on

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>lighting can produce. There is however, also evidence to suggest that poor night time lighting also can worsen safety outcomes - I.e. causing hard shadows and glare that can create blind spots, and that increased night time lighting increases likelihood of activity into the night time hours - including crime, and making targets easier to identify. Several studies showing this are referenced at: https://www.darksky.org/light-pollution/lighting-crime-and-safety/</p>	<p>safety. Include a comment as to the significant natural and cultural heritage value of clear night sky observation to our region</p>
<p>Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation) (S364)</p>	<p>S364.074</p>	<p>Light</p>	<p>Objectives</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>The Director-General requests the addition of an objective, policy, and/or rule that acknowledges the potential adverse effects that bright lights can have on indigenous fauna. The additional objective/policy should seek to avoid, minimise/remedy, or mitigate adverse effects from lighting on indigenous fauna. The policy should apply for activities adjacent to or within SNAs.</p>	<p>Insert an objective, policy, and/or rule (inferred) with lighting recommendations in line with the following document, which New Zealand is a party to as part of the United Nations Convention on Migratory Species: National Light Pollution Guidelines for Wildlife Including Marine Turtles, Seabirds and Migratory Shorebirds -DAWE In summary, best practice lighting design incorporates the following design principles: 1.Start with natural darkness and only add light for specific purposes. 2.Use adaptive light controls to manage light timing, intensity and colour. 3.Light only the object or area intended - keep lights close to the ground, directed and shielded to avoid light spill. 4.Use the lowest intensity lighting appropriate for the task. 5. Use non-reflective, dark-coloured surfaces. 6. Use lights with reduced or filtered blue, violet and ultraviolet-wavelengths with a correlated</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						colour temperature of 2700K or warmer
Waiaua Bay Farm Limited (S463)	S463.079	Light	LIGHT-O1	Oppose	Sub-clauses (a) and (c) are ambiguous in terms of what adverse effects are required to be minimised, and which locations constitute "light sensitive areas" (this term is not defined).	Delete Objective LIGHT-O1
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (S356)	S356.103	Light	LIGHT-O2	Support	Support inclusion of the transport network being included in this objective.	Retain LIGHT-O2 as notified
Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation) (S364)	S364.075	Light	Policies	Support in part	The Director-General requests the addition of an objective, policy, and/or rule that acknowledges the potential adverse effects that bright lights can have on indigenous fauna. The additional objective/policy should seek to avoid, minimise/remedy, or mitigate adverse effects from lighting on indigenous fauna. The policy should apply for activities adjacent to or within SNAs.	<p>Insert an objective, policy, and/or rule (inferred) with lighting recommendations in line with the following document, which New Zealand is a party to as part of the United Nations Convention on Migratory Species: National Light Pollution Guidelines for Wildlife Including Marine Turtles, Seabirds and Migratory Shorebirds -DAWE</p> <p>In summary, best practice lighting design incorporates the following design principles:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.Start with natural darkness and only add light for specific purposes. 2.Use adaptive light controls to manage light timing, intensity and colour. 3.Light only the object or area intended - keep lights close to the ground, directed and shielded to avoid light spill. 4.Use the lowest intensity lighting appropriate for the task. 5. Use non-reflective, dark-

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						coloured surfaces. 6. Use lights with reduced or filtered blue, violet and ultraviolet-wavelengths with a correlated colour temperature of 2700K or warmer
Anna Clarke (S563)	S563.003	Light	LIGHT-P1	Support	Support the thoughtful management of light at night.	retain LIGHT-P1
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (S356)	S356.104	Light	LIGHT-P2	Support in part	Add additional matter to cover safety effects of light spill on the transport network.	Amend as follows: "Control the intensity, location, and direction of outdoor lighting to: a. ensure artificial lighting avoids conflict with existing light sensitive areas, other established uses, and the transport network; b. internalises light spill within the site, and minimises light spill at the site boundary; c. avoid adverse effects on views of the night sky and intrinsically dark landscapes; and d. manage adverse effects on the health, safety, and wellbeing of people and communities in the surrounding area, unless it is for critical health and safety reasons; and e. ensure the safety of the transport network is not

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						compromised.
Te Hiku Iwi Development Trust (S399)	S399.070	Light	LIGHT-P2	Not Stated	Adverse effects of lighting on wildlife are recognised in the overview and objectives, but not provided for in the policies.	Insert new point e. within Policy LIGHT-P2 as follows: e. manage adverse effects on indigenous fauna
Waiaua Bay Farm Limited (S463)	S463.080	Light	LIGHT-P2	Oppose	Sub-clause (a) and (c) impose policy directions in respect of undefined and subjective "light sensitive areas", "views of the night sky" and "intrinsically dark landscapes".	Delete Policy LIGHT-P2
Anna Clarke (S563)	S563.004	Light	LIGHT-P2	Support in part	Support the thoughtful management of light at night. However I would like to see the council adopt standards that will provide clearer guidance and better outcomes to ensure that this provision of the plan is met	amend LIGHT -P2 to Adopt standards and guidelines for best practice lighting. Make reference to: IDA-IES Model Lighting Ordinance - Lighting Ordinance Task Force - Cambridge Massachusetts 2011 (International Dark Skies Association, Illuminating Engineering Society) Aoraki Mackenzie Dark Sky Application Document: https://www.darksky.org/wpcontent/uploads/2018/03/Aoraki_Mackenzie_IDSP_Application.pdf Kaikoura lighting guidelines - under development, available upon request. International Dark Sky Association website: https://www.darksky.org/our-work/lighting
Director-General of Conservation (Department of	S364.076	Light	Rules	Support in part	The Director-General requests the addition of an objective, policy, and/or rule that acknowledges the potential adverse effects that bright lights can have on indigenous fauna. The additional objective/policy should seek to avoid,	Insert an objective, policy, and/or rule (inferred) with lighting recommendations in line with the following document, which New Zealand is a party to as part of the

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Conservation) (S364)					<p>minimise/remedy, or mitigate adverse effects from lighting on indigenous fauna. The policy should apply for activities adjacent to or within SNAs.</p>	<p>United Nations Convention on Migratory Species: National Light Pollution Guidelines for Wildlife Including Marine Turtles, Seabirds and Migratory Shorebirds -DAWE In summary, best practice lighting design incorporates the following design principles:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Start with natural darkness and only add light for specific purposes. 2. Use adaptive light controls to manage light timing, intensity and colour. 3. Light only the object or area intended - keep lights close to the ground, directed and shielded to avoid light spill. 4. Use the lowest intensity lighting appropriate for the task. 5. Use non-reflective, dark-coloured surfaces. 6. Use lights with reduced or filtered blue, violet and ultraviolet-wavelengths with a correlated colour temperature of 2700K or warmer
Carbon Neutral NZ Trust (S529)	S529.169	Light	Rules	Support in part	<p>Street lights for subdivisions/developments should be energy-efficient, suitable for nocturnal wildlife such as kiwi,12 and 'dark sky friendly' to minimise glare, minimise upward light and scattered light, and retain the visibility of stars.</p>	<p>Amend rules to ensure development lighting is energy-efficient, suitable for nocturnal wildlife such as kiwi,12 and 'dark sky friendly' to minimise glare, minimise upward light and scattered light, and retain the</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						visibility of stars (Inferred)
Jeff and Robby Kemp (S51)	S51.008	Light	LIGHT-R1	Support in part	The rule as it applies to the Rural Production Zone is supported however the rule should relate to sensitive activities as distinct from the zone itself.	Amend LIGHT-R1 to relate to sensitive activities as distinct from the zone itself.
Far North District Council (S368)	S368.042	Light	LIGHT-R1	Support in part	Drafting error	Amend LIGHT-R1 PER-1 Artificial light emitted undertaken on from a site complies with AS/NZS 4282:2019 - Control of the Obtrusive Effects of Outdoor Lighting;
Waiaua Bay Farm Limited (S463)	S463.081	Light	LIGHT-S1	Oppose	In WBF's view the matters of discretion require amendment to capture the likely lighting scenarios at Kauri Cliffs and to dispense with subjective and unenforceable criteria.	Amend points a, b and c of the matters of discretion for Standard LIGHT-S1 as follows: a. whether artificial lighting is for operation or functional purposes or provides a safety or wayfinding function; b. whether the adverse effects of lighting can be managed by adjustments to timing, duration, direction, intensity, focus, design, height, or type of lighting contributes to avoidable or unnecessary light spill; and c. adverse effects on the predominant character and amenity of the surrounding area, including views and

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						enjoyment of the night sky;
Anna Clarke (S563)	S563.002	Light	LIGHT-S1	Support in part	<p>It is great to see the council adopting concrete standards for light pollution control, and setting policy goals that aim to minimise unintended and adverse effects.</p> <p>However - the concrete standards as recommended here in the proposed plan are not likely to meet the policy goals, nor minimise adverse effects.</p> <p>Best practice lighting guidelines show ideal lighting values generally an order of magnitude lower than those recommended here.</p> <p>As per: IDA-IES Model Lighting Ordinance - Lighting Ordinance Task Force - Cambridge Massachusetts 2011 (International Dark Skies Association, Illuminating Engineering Society) See Lighting Zones 0,1, and 2 (relevant to Northland's rural and small towns characteristics)</p>	amend LIGHT -S1 to adopt lighting standards in line with international best practice, as given above - that are therefore able to achieve the policy objectives. (See submission Table F Maximum Vertical Illuminance at any point in plane of the property line)
Te Hiku Iwi Development Trust (S399)	S399.071	Noise	Overview	Not Stated	The Overview does not consider adverse effects of noise on indigenous fauna.	<p>Amend the third sentence of the first paragraph of the Overview as follows:</p> <p>Noise can be the cause of annoyance, impacting community health, wellbeing and the quality of living environments and adversely affecting fauna.</p>
NZ Agricultural Aviation Association (S182)	S182.019	Noise	Objectives	Not Stated	New objective as existing noise generating activities should be able to continue functioning	<p>Insert new objective: Lawfully established and permitted noise generating activities can continue to function and operate</p>
Te Hiku Iwi Development Trust (S399)	S399.073	Noise	Objectives	Not Stated	The objectives do not provide for adverse effects due to noise on indigenous fauna.	<p>Amend Objective NOISE-O1 as follows: Activities generate noise effects that are compatible with the role, function and character of each zone and do not compromise</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						community health, safety and wellbeing or ecological values . Alternatively, a separate objective relating to fauna could be inserted.
Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland (S516)	S516.064	Noise	Objectives	Not Stated	Objectives NOISE-O1 and NOISE-O2 are currently both framed as relating to activities generating noise. Based on evidence from the World Health Organisation, existing environmental noise causes significant harm to the health of communities. This public health matter warrants action as an important resource management issue to be addressed in the Noise chapter, and not just as a corollary to polluting activities.	Insert a new objective as follows: NOISE-O3 The health and wellbeing of people and communities are protected from significant levels of noise.
Puketona Business Park Limited (S45)	S45.019	Noise	NOISE-O1	Support	The Noise chapter of the PDP as notified is generally acceptable	Retain the objectives in the Noise chapter.
Ballance Agri-Nutrients Limited (S143)	S143.007	Noise	NOISE-O1	Support	Ballance supports the recognition of noisy activities that are compatible with the role, function and character of the General Rural Zone such as agricultural aviation and the operation of rural airstrips.	Retain the objective NOISE -O1
Horticulture New Zealand (S159)	S159.084	Noise	NOISE-O1	Support	The noise should reflect the underlying character of the zone	Retain Objective NOISE-O1
Waipapa Pine Limited and Adrian Broughton Trust (S342)	S342.010	Noise	NOISE-O1	Oppose	The submitters believe that the provisions associated with the Heavy Industrial Zone requires careful consideration and attention. The underlying zone intent describes quite clearly that the zone will create some objectionable effects in this respect. A balance needs to be struck between enabling	Not stated

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					heavy industrial activities to be able to operate effectively and efficiently within the Zone, whilst ensuring that the potential effects do not go over and beyond limits set under the PDP and within the s16 RMA 1991 requirements. To add further, the site is already managed by way of resource consent noise provisions and these consent conditions have been appropriately managed between the submitter and adjoining sites, and beyond. To this end, the submitter opposes the noise provisions until their own expert can consider the rules in context of their operations and underlying resource consenting requirements, and potential for growth.	
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (S356)	S356.105	Noise	NOISE-O1	Support	not stated	Retain NOISE-O1 as notified
Te Hiku Iwi Development Trust (S399)	S399.072	Noise	NOISE-O1	Not Stated	The objectives do not provide for adverse effects due to noise on indigenous fauna.	Amend Objective NOISE-O1 as follows: Activities generate noise effects that are compatible with the role, function and character of each zone and do not compromise community health, safety and wellbeing or ecological values . Alternatively, a separate objective relating to fauna could be inserted.
Puketona Business	S45.037	Noise	NOISE-O2	Support	The Noise chapter of the PDP as notified is generally acceptable	Retain the objectives in the Noise chapter.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Park Limited (S45)						
Ballance Agri-Nutrients Limited (S143)	S143.008	Noise	NOISE-O2	Support	Ballance supports the recognition that existing noisy activities, especially in the General Rural Zone, should be protected from reverse sensitivity effects.	retain the objective NOISE -O2
Horticulture New Zealand (S159)	S159.085	Noise	NOISE-O2	Support	Minimising potential reverse sensitivity effects is supported.	Retain Objective NOISE-O2
NZ Agricultural Aviation Association (S182)	S182.018	Noise	NOISE-O2	Support	support the objective that new sensitive activities are located and designed to avoid reverse sensitivity effects	retain NOISE-O2
Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga (S331)	S331.050	Noise	NOISE-O2	Support	The submitter supports objective NOISE-O2 and acknowledges the importance of reducing reverse sensitivity effects through the design and/or location of noise sensitive activities. The Ministry can design educational facilities to a high standard with insulation to minimise reverse sensitivity effects without needing to consider the location.	Retain objective NOISE-O2, as proposed.
Waipapa Pine Limited and Adrian Broughton Trust (S342)	S342.023	Noise	NOISE-O2	Oppose	The submitters believe that the provisions associated with the Heavy Industrial Zone requires careful consideration and attention. The underlying zone intent describes quite clearly that the zone will create some objectionable effects in this respect. A balance needs to be struck between enabling heavy industrial activities to be able to operate effectively and efficiently within the Zone, whilst ensuring that the potential effects do not go over and beyond limits set under the PDP and within the s16 RMA 1991 requirements. To add further, the site is already managed by	Delete the objectives (inferred)

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>way of resource consent noise provisions and these consent conditions have been appropriately managed between the submitter and adjoining sites, and beyond.</p> <p>To this end, the submitter opposes the noise provisions until their own expert can consider the rules in context of their operations and underlying resource consenting requirements, and potential for growth.</p>	
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (S356)	S356.106	Noise	NOISE-O2	Support in part	As per the attached s32 report, Waka considers that this objective should be reworded to focus on protecting health and wellbeing rather than reverse sensitivity	Amend as follows: New noise sensitive activities are designed and/or located to minimise conflict and reverse sensitivity effects protect health and wellbeing.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S416)	S416.037	Noise	NOISE-O2	Support	Specific recognition of the need to manage the effects of noise particularly through the design and placement of noise sensitive activities is supported.	Retain Objective NOISE-O2
Northland Fish and Game Council (S436)	S436.040	Noise	NOISE-O2	Support	<p>Existing game bird hunting activities are often constrained by surrounding land use, and generally becomes untenable when this land use changes; for example, when urban and lifestyle encroachment occurs near traditionally hunted sites.</p> <p>Recreational game bird hunting is a very popular activity in the rural environment. The game bird season involves the discharge of shotgun noise. This is not like other constant noises rather it is very brief in duration. Game bird hunting begins at 6:30am in the morning and concludes at 6:30pm at night for the length of the season.</p> <p>Introducing new dwelling areas near areas of recreational significance to hunters can have implications on the future of hunting in these areas. For example, complaints can be made</p>	Retain Objective NOISE-O2.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					under the Arms Act 1983 which makes clear that anyone discharging a firearm in a public place so as to deliberately endanger, frighten or annoy any other person is guilty of an offence. Shotgun noise may also be a particular issue for public places such as any equestrian arena in the vicinity of maimai used during the game bird hunting season.	
Top Energy Limited (S483)	S483.181	Noise	NOISE-O2	Oppose	The wording of this objective is inconsistent with the approach required in the RPS (see Policy 5.1.1, RPS) which is to "avoid" the potential for reverse sensitivity effects. The District Plan is required to give effect to the RPS and use of the word "manage" does not give effect to the "avoid" directive in the RPS.	Amend Objective NOISE - O2 as follows: New noise sensitive activities are designed and/or located to minimise conflict with (and avoid reverse sensitivity effects on) existing lawfully established noise generating activities.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S416)	S416.038	Noise	Policies	Support in part	The proposed Plan policies are supported but don't specifically cover railway corridor noise in all zones where rail is located in the district and a new policy is provided	Insert a new policy, Policy NOISE-P4, as follows: Ensure buildings for noise sensitive activities near railway corridors are designed and constructed to minimise the level of noise received within buildings.
Puketona Business Park Limited (S45)	S45.020	Noise	NOISE-P1	Support	The Noise chapter of the PDP as notified is generally acceptable	Retain the policies in the Noise chapter.
Waipapa Pine Limited and Adrian Broughton Trust (S342)	S342.011	Noise	NOISE-P1	Oppose	The submitters believe that the provisions associated with the Heavy Industrial Zone requires careful consideration and attention. The underlying zone intent describes quite clearly that the zone will create some objectionable effects in this	Not stated

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>respect. A balance needs to be struck between enabling heavy industrial activities to be able to operate effectively and efficiently within the Zone, whilst ensuring that the potential effects do not go over and beyond limits set under the PDP and within the s16 RMA 1991 requirements. To add further, the site is already managed by way of resource consent noise provisions and these consent conditions have been appropriately managed between the submitter and adjoining sites, and beyond. To this end, the submitter opposes the noise provisions until their own expert can consider the rules in context of their operations and underlying resource consenting requirements, and potential for growth.</p>	
Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland (S516)	S516.065	Noise	NOISE-P1	Not Stated	To protect public health it is essential to control types of activities and noise levels. However, in this proposed policy these actions are only listed in terms of upholding character and amenity, which are secondary issues to the protection of health.	Amend Policy NOISE-P1 as follows: Protect public health and uphold the character and amenity of each zone by controlling the types of activities and noise levels that are permitted in each zone.
Puketona Business Park Limited (S45)	S45.038	Noise	NOISE-P2	Support	The Noise chapter of the PDP as notified is generally acceptable	Retain the policies in the Noise chapter.
Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te	S331.051	Noise	NOISE-P2	Support in part	The submitter supports in part policy NOISE-P2 and acknowledges the importance of reducing reverse sensitivity effects through the design and location of noise sensitive activities. However,	Amend policy NOISE-P2 as follows: Ensure noise sensitive activities proposing to locate within the

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Mātauranga (S331)					both design and location are not needed to achieve this. The Ministry can design educational facilities to a high standard with insulation to minimise reverse sensitivity effects without needing to consider the location.	<p>Mixed Use, Light Industrial and Air Noise Boundary are located, and/or designed, constructed and operated in a way which will minimise adverse noise on community health, safety and wellbeing by having regard to:</p> <p>a) any existing noise generating activities and the level of noise that will be received within any noise sensitive building;</p> <p>b) the primary purpose and the frequency of use of the activity; and</p> <p>c) the ability to design and construct buildings accommodating noise sensitive activities with sound insulation and/or other mitigation measures to ensure the level of noise received within the building is minimised particularly at night.</p>
Waipapa Pine Limited and Adrian Broughton Trust (S342)	S342.021	Noise	NOISE-P2	Support	The submitters believe that the provisions associated with the Heavy Industrial Zone requires careful consideration and attention. The underlying zone intent describes quite clearly that the zone will create some objectionable	Not stated

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>effects in this respect. A balance needs to be struck between enabling heavy industrial activities to be able to operate effectively and efficiently within the Zone, whilst ensuring that the potential effects do not go over and beyond limits set under the PDP and within the s16 RMA 1991 requirements. To add further, the site is already managed by way of resource consent noise provisions and these consent conditions have been appropriately managed between the submitter and adjoining sites, and beyond. To this end, the submitter opposes the noise provisions until their own expert can consider the rules in context of their operations and underlying resource consenting requirements, and potential for growth.</p>	
<p>Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (S356)</p>	S356.107	Noise	NOISE-P2	Support in part	<p>Waka Kotahi considers that land near state highways need to also be considered in this policy.</p>	<p>Amend as follows: Ensure noise sensitive activities proposing to locate within the Mixed Use, Light Industrial, on land near state highways and Air Noise Boundary are located, designed, constructed and operated in a way which will minimise adverse noise on community health, safety and wellbeing by having regard to:</p>
<p>Top Energy Limited (S483)</p>	S483.182	Noise	NOISE-P2	Oppose	<p>Top Energy seeks amendments to this policy to achieve better alignment with the RPS</p>	<p>Amend Policy NOISE - P2 as follows, to achieve better alignment with the RPS objective</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						3.6 and policy 5.1.1: Ensure noise sensitive activities ... having regard to: a. any existing lawfully established noise generating activities and the level of noise that will be received within any noise sensitive building; b. the need to avoid any reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established noise generating activities. c. the primary purpose ... d. the ability to design ...
Puketona Business Park Limited (S45)	S45.039	Noise	NOISE-P3	Support	The Noise chapter of the PDP as notified is generally acceptable	Retain the policies in the Noise chapter.
Horticulture New Zealand (S159)	S159.086	Noise	NOISE-P3	Support	The noise should reflect the underlying character of the zone	Retain Policy NOISE-P3
New Zealand Defence Force (S217)	S217.009	Noise	NOISE-P3	Support	This policy seeks to ensure that noise effects are of a type, scale and level appropriate for the character of the receiving environment, while having regard to the temporary or permanent nature of adverse effects, which is appropriate.	Retain policy as drafted.
Waipapa Pine Limited and Adrian Broughton Trust (S342)	S342.022	Noise	NOISE-P3	Oppose	The submitters believe that the provisions associated with the Heavy Industrial Zone requires careful consideration and attention. The underlying zone intent describes quite clearly that the zone will create some objectionable effects in this respect. A balance needs to be struck between enabling heavy industrial activities to be able to operate effectively	Not stated

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					and efficiently within the Zone, whilst ensuring that the potential effects do not go over and beyond limits set under the PDP and within the s16 RMA 1991 requirements. To add further, the site is already managed by way of resource consent noise provisions and these consent conditions have been appropriately managed between the submitter and adjoining sites, and beyond. To this end, the submitter opposes the noise provisions until their own expert can consider the rules in context of their operations and underlying resource consenting requirements, and potential for growth.	
Te Hiku Iwi Development Trust (S399)	S399.074	Noise	NOISE-P3	Not Stated	The policies as written do not provide for management of adverse effects due to noise on indigenous fauna.	Insert new point e. in Policy NOISE-P3 as follows: e. Any adverse effects on indigenous fauna and habitats
PF Olsen Limited (S91)	S91.018	Noise	Rules	Oppose	The chapter on noise states that the noise rules and effects standards do not apply to noise generated by "...forestry planting and forestry harvesting in the Rural Production, Horticulture and Horticulture processing zones". However, the chapter does not recognise that noise and vibration associated with all plantation forestry activities is a permitted activity subject to the provisions of regulation 98 of the NES-PF. There is no direction for plantation forestry to follow the NES-PF rather than the rules in the plan.	Insert a "note #2" in the rules section of the noise section that directs plantation forestry activities to the NES-PF (regulation 98).
Ballance Agri-Nutrients Limited (S143)	S143.009	Noise	Rules	Not Stated	Ballance seeks to have a specific Permitted Activity rule for agricultural aviation to ensure these activities are adequately provided for in the District Plan. Agricultural aircraft landing and taking off from	Insert a new rule: NOISE-RX Agricultural aviation activitiesRural production zoneHorticulture ZoneOpen

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					rural airstrips is a vital activity for support of agricultural production as well as conservation. Agricultural aircraft movements of fixed-wing aircraft spreading fertiliser for example, are governed by: the volume of product that can be safely held in the aircraft's hopper; weather conditions; and seasonal requirements (for fertiliser as well as pesticide spraying etc). It is important for the district's agricultural production that agricultural aviation is appropriately provided for within the District Plan.	Space and Recreation Zone Natural Open Space Zone Agricultural aviation activities for the purpose of farming, forestry or conservation on a seasonal, temporary or intermittent basis meets the relevant requirements of standard NOISE-S1.
Summit Forests New Zealand Limited (S148)	S148.040	Noise	Rules	Not Stated	While the chapter on noise states that the noise rules and effects standards do not apply to noise generated by "...forestry planting and forestry harvesting in the Rural Production, Horticulture and Horticulture processing zones" (point 5), the chapter fails to reference that noise and vibration associated with all plantation forestry activities is a permitted activity subject to the provisions of regulation 98 of the NES-PF.	Amend the chapter to make it clear that noise and vibration associated with all plantation forestry activities is a permitted activity subject to the provisions of regulation 98 of the NES-PF.
NZ Agricultural Aviation Association (S182)	S182.022	Noise	Rules	Not Stated	Seek a new rule for agricultural aviation activities to ensure they are adequately provided for in the Plan	Insert new rule NOISE-RXX Agricultural aviation activities Rural production zone Horticulture zone Open Space and Recreation zone Natural Open Space zone Agricultural aviation activities for the purpose of farming, forestry or conservation on a seasonal, temporary or intermittent basis for a period up to 30 days in any 12 month period or 315 aircraft hours (whichever is greater).
Northern Rescue	S281.001	Noise	Rules	Support in part	The rules are confusing and should be reviewed.	Insert rule to allow emergency rescue helicopters to be

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Helicopter Limited (S281)						unconstrained and exempt from any noise rules.
Waipapa Pine Limited and Adrian Broughton Trust (S342)	S342.012	Noise	Rules	Oppose	<p>The submitters believe that the provisions associated with the Heavy Industrial Zone requires careful consideration and attention. The underlying zone intent describes quite clearly that the zone will create some objectionable effects in this respect.</p> <p>A balance needs to be struck between enabling heavy industrial activities to be able to operate effectively and efficiently within the Zone, whilst ensuring that the potential effects do not go over and beyond limits set under the PDP and within the s16 RMA 1991 requirements.</p> <p>To add further, the site is already managed by way of resource consent noise provisions and these consent conditions have been appropriately managed between the submitter and adjoining sites, and beyond.</p> <p>To this end, the submitter opposes the noise provisions until their own expert can consider the rules in context of their operations and underlying resource consenting requirements, and potential for growth.</p>	Not stated
Northland Fish and Game Council (S436)	S436.026	Noise	Rules	Not Stated	Existing game bird hunting activities are often constrained by surrounding land use, and generally becomes untenable when this land use changes; for example, when urban and lifestyle encroachment occurs near traditionally hunted sites.	Insert provisions for the associated discharge of noise of firearms for all informal and legitimate proposes such as recreational hunting, pest control and sight adjustment, as permitted

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>Recreational game bird hunting is a very popular activity in the rural environment. The game bird season involves the discharge of shotgun noise. This is not like other constant noises rather it is very brief in duration. Game bird hunting begins at 6:30am in the morning and concludes at 6:30pm at night for the length of the season.</p> <p>Introducing new dwelling areas near areas of recreational significance to hunters can have implications on the future of hunting in these areas. For example, complaints can be made under the Arms Act 1983 which makes clear that anyone discharging a firearm in a public place so as to deliberately endanger, frighten or annoy any other person is guilty of an offence. Shotgun noise may also be a particular issue for public places such as any equestrian arena in the vicinity of maimai used during the game bird hunting season.</p>	activities
Horticulture New Zealand (S159)	S159.087	Noise	Notes	Support	<p>The Plan provides an exemption of horticulture activities of a limited duration, but the exemption is not included in the rules or standards. Therefore, the status is questioned. It would be more appropriate to provide a permitted activity rule for the matters to which exemptions apply</p>	Amend exemptions 1-14 under the Note to a new permitted rule with no condition
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S416)	S416.039	Noise	Notes	Support	<p>KiwiRail support the clarification provided under point 4 in the introduction that trains on rail lines and crossing bells, including at railway yards, railway sidings or stations are exempt from the noise standards within this chapter.</p>	Retain point 4 of the NOTES.
Northland Fish and Game Council (S436)	S436.041	Noise	Notes	Not Stated	<p>Existing game bird hunting activities are often constrained by surrounding land use, and generally becomes untenable when this land use changes; for example, when urban and lifestyle encroachment occurs near traditionally hunted sites.</p> <p>Recreational game bird hunting is a very popular activity in the rural environment. The game bird season involves the discharge of shotgun noise. This is not like other constant noises rather it is very brief in duration. Game bird hunting begins at</p>	Insert a further point within the notes in the Noise Chapter stating that the noise rules and effects standards do not apply to noise generated by hunting

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					6:30am in the morning and concludes at 6:30pm at night for the length of the season. Introducing new dwelling areas near areas of recreational significance to hunters can have implications on the future of hunting in these areas. For example, complaints can be made under the Arms Act 1983 which makes clear that anyone discharging a firearm in a public place so as to deliberately endanger, frighten or annoy any other person is guilty of an offence. Shotgun noise may also be a particular issue for public places such as any equestrian arena in the vicinity of maimai used during the game bird hunting season. Noise generated by recreational hunting should be made a permitted activity.	
Top Energy Limited (S483)	S483.183	Noise	Notes	Not Stated	Top Energy seeks to ensure that an exemption from the noise rules is provided in all zones for emergency use of generators required to ensure continued supply of electricity and that the exemption for use of generators for this purpose is not limited to operation by emergency services or lifeline utilities. Note 8 provides an exemption, but the 48 hour restriction is arbitrary and unnecessary. There is no guarantee that the requirement to utilise generators in an emergency will be less than 48 hours, and having to apply the rules of the Noise Chapter and potentially apply for consents in emergency is impractical and inefficient	Amend Note 8 as follows: 8. the use of generators and mobile equipment (including vehicles) for emergency purposes, including testing and maintenance not exceeding 48 hours in duration , where they are operated by emergency services or lifeline utilities
Fire and Emergency New Zealand (S512)	S512.037	Noise	Notes	Support	Emergency sirens play a crucial role in facilitating a prompt emergency response and provide a critical backup to the pager system used by Fire and Emergency. A siren can also be the most effective means of communication in alerting volunteers as well as providing assurance to the people who have made the call that help is on the way. Fire and Emergency support FNDC's approach of noise standards not applying to emergency response activities.	retain note
Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health	S516.066	Noise	Notes	Oppose	Noise limits associated with plantation forestry are set in the National Environmental Standards for	Amend point 5 of the exclusions (third paragraph) to delete the

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Northland (S516)					Plantation Forestry (this appears to have been omitted from consideration in 3.2.3 of the s32 report). If reference is made to forestry, it should be clarified that noise limits do apply.	words ', forestry planting and forestry harvesting' as follows: 5. agriculture, horticulture and pastoral farming activities undertaken for a limited duration, including using agricultural vehicles, machinery or equipment used on a seasonal or intermittent basis, forestry planting and forestry harvesting in the Rural Production, Horticulture and Horticulture Processing zones;
Puketona Business Park Limited (S45)	S45.017	Noise	NOISE-R1	Support	The Noise chapter of the PDP as notified is generally acceptable.	Retain the rules in the Noise chapter.
NZ Agricultural Aviation Association (S182)	S182.020	Noise	NOISE-R1	Oppose	Seek a separate rule for agricultural aviation activities	Insert new rule: NOISE-RXX Agricultural aviation activities
Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga (S331)	S331.052	Noise	NOISE-R1	Support	The submitter supports rule NOISE-R1 Emission of noise (not otherwise provided for in this chapter), subject to compliance with NOISE-S1 Maximum noise levels.	Retain rule NOISE-R1 Emission of noise (not otherwise provided for in this chapter), as proposed.
Puketona Business Park Limited (S45)	S45.040	Noise	NOISE-R2	Support	The Noise chapter of the PDP as notified is generally acceptable.	Retain the rules in the Noise chapter.
Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga (S331)	S331.053	Noise	NOISE-R2	Support	The submitter supports rule NOISE-R2 New buildings, alterations and/or additions to an existing building for a noise sensitive activity, subject to compliance of all habitable rooms with the noise insulation for noise sensitive activities effect standards which are relevant to the underlying zone or specific area identified - NOISE-S5 Noise insulation.	Retain rule NOISE-R2 New buildings, alterations and/or additions to an existing building for a noise sensitive activity.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Paihia Properties Holdings Corporate Trustee Limited and UP Management Ltd (S344)	S344.025	Noise	NOISE-R2	Oppose	The requirement to attenuate 40m from the State Highway is onerous, given the nature of the use of the road. PPHCTL are concerned that the MUZ and State Highway setback noise attenuation rules have different standards.	Not stated (Amend NOISE-R2 inferred)
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (S356)	S356.108	Noise	NOISE-R2	Support in part	It is considered that this rule needs to be amended to apply to all spaces containing noise sensitive activities, not solely habitable spaces (i.e. healthcare, places of worship etc).	Amend as follows: All spaces containing noise sensitive activities and habitable rooms comply with the noise insulation for noise sensitive activities effect standards which are relevant to the underlying zone or specific area identified: NOISE-S5 Noise insulation.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S416)	S416.040	Noise	NOISE-R2	Support	KiwiRail support that where mitigation is provided new buildings, alterations and/or additions to an existing building for a noise sensitive activity is a permitted activity. The rule refers to Noise-S5 Noise insulation to which KiwiRail seeks to add a new railway standard.	Retain Rule NOISE-R2
Puketona Business Park Limited (S45)	S45.041	Noise	NOISE-R3	Support	The Noise chapter of the PDP as notified is generally acceptable.	Retain the rules in the Noise chapter.
Puketona Business Park Limited (S45)	S45.042	Noise	NOISE-R4	Support	The Noise chapter of the PDP as notified is generally acceptable.	Retain the rules in the Noise chapter.
Puketona Business Park Limited (S45)	S45.043	Noise	NOISE-R5	Support	The Noise chapter of the PDP as notified is generally acceptable.	Retain the rules in the Noise chapter.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
New Zealand Defence Force (S217)	S217.010	Noise	NOISE-R5	Support	NZDF supports a specific permitted activity rule for TMTA noise in the District Plan.	Retain rule with amendments as listed in points 11 to 13
New Zealand Defence Force (S217)	S217.011	Noise	NOISE-R5	Support in part	TMTA may at times include the use of helicopters, which is not recognised under Rule NOISE-R7 as drafted. NZDF requests that provision for helicopter landing areas associated with TMTA are included in NOISE-R5.	Insert a new Standard PER-3 to provide for helicopter landings areas associated with TMTA, in accordance with the NZDF noise limits request in Attachment 3 to this feedback, and shown below for completeness: NOISE-R3 PER-3:Helicopter landing areas shall comply with NZS6807:1994 Noise Management and Land Use Planning for Helicopter Landing Areas.Noise levels shall be measured in accordance with NZS6801:2008 Acoustics - Measurement of Sound.
New Zealand Defence Force (S217)	S217.012	Noise	NOISE-R5	Oppose	NZDF requests a Controlled Activity status for noise from TMTA that does not meet the Permitted Activity noise standards. NZDF considers that this activity status is appropriate where the effects are known, as is the case with noise effects.	Amend to Controlled Activity status for TMTA where the activity does not comply with the permitted activity standards.
New Zealand Defence Force (S217)	S217.013	Noise	NOISE-R5	Support in part	The matters of discretion listed under Rule Noise-R5 for PER-2 are considered appropriate in relation to the potential noise effects from TMTA, however as noted above NZDF requests that the activity status is amended to Controlled. The matters currently listed are also appropriate for matters of control.	Amend the matters of discretion listed under Rule NOISE-R5 to become matters of control for a Controlled Activity status.
Puketona Business Park Limited (S45)	S45.044	Noise	NOISE-R6	Support	The Noise chapter of the PDP as notified is generally acceptable.	Retain the rules in the Noise chapter.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
New Zealand Defence Force (S217)	S217.014	Noise	NOISE-R6	Support in part	Providing for TMTA involving weapons firing and/or the use of explosives in the Rural Production zone only is overly restrictive and not reflective of the varied real-world situations which NZDF must train across. In order for NZDF to maintain its ability to deploy, it needs to be able to undertake training in both urban and rural environments. It is therefore vital that activities can be undertaken in all zones within the District.	Amend Rule NOISE-R6 so that it applies to All zones.
New Zealand Defence Force (S217)	S217.015	Noise	NOISE-R6	Support	NZDF has developed bespoke noise standards with respect to TMTA, including those that involve weapons firing and/or the use explosives, that NZDF is seeking to be included in every district plan throughout the country. The standards have been specifically developed to manage the particular noise characteristics of TMTA and include a separation distances or peak sound pressure where the activity does not meet the separation distances. The advantage of this approach is that separation distances are easy to comply with and monitor. This approach has been recognised in PER-1 and PER-2 of NOISE-R6 and NZDF supports the inclusion of PER-1 and PER-2.	Retain PER-1 and PER-2 as notified.
New Zealand Defence Force (S217)	S217.016	Noise	NOISE-R6	Oppose	PER-3 requires that the activity comply with standard NOISE-S6 Explosives. However, this relates to quarrying activities and is not applicable to explosive use by NZDF. Having regard to PER-1 and PER-2, PER-3 should be deleted.	Delete NOISE-R6 PER-3
New Zealand Defence Force (S217)	S217.017	Noise	NOISE-R6	Oppose	NZDF requests a Controlled Activity status for noise from a TMTA that involves weapons firing and/or the use of explosives that does not meet the Permitted Activity noise standards. NZDF considers that this activity status is appropriate where the effects are known, as is the case with noise effects.	Amend to Controlled Activity status where the activity does not comply with the permitted activity standards.
New Zealand Defence Force (S217)	S217.018	Noise	NOISE-R6	Support in part	Include matters for control for Rule NOISE-R6, in keeping with those listed under Rule Noise-R5 for PER-2.	Include matters for control for Rule NOISE-R6 as follows: 1. the level, hours of operation, duration and nature of the noise;2. proximity and nature

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>of nearby activities and the adverse effects they may experience from the noise;3. the existing noise environment;4. effects on character and amenity values on the surrounding environment;5. effects on the health and wellbeing of people; and6. any noise reduction measures.</p>
<p>Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland (S516)</p>	<p>S516.067</p>	<p>Noise</p>	<p>NOISE-R6</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>The three permitted activity conditions should all apply in conjunction and not as alternatives. In accordance with the Noise and Vibration Metrics National Planning Standard and in turn NZS 6801, the peak sound levels should be expressed in "dB LCpeak"</p>	<p>Amend Rule NOISE-R6 as follows: Where: PER-1 1. At least 5 working days prior to the commencement of the activity, notify the Council of the activity, including details of the nature, duration and scale of activity, and any consultation that has been undertaken; andPER-2 2. The activity complies with the following: i. 1. occurs between the hours of 7.00am to 7.00pm, and achieves either a 500m minimum separation distance to, or peak sound pressure level of 95 dBC LCpeak when measured within the notional boundary of any noise sensitive activity; and/or ii. 2. occurs between 7.00pm</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						to 7.00am, an achieves either a 1250m minimum separation distance to, or peak sound pressure level of 85 dBC LCpeak when measured within, the notional boundary of any noise sensitive activity; and PER-3 3.The activity complies with standard:NOISE-S6 Explosives.
Puketona Business Park Limited (S45)	S45.045	Noise	NOISE-R7	Support	The Noise chapter of the PDP as notified is generally acceptable.	Retain the rules in the Noise chapter.
Horticulture New Zealand (S159)	S159.088	Noise	NOISE-R7	Oppose	The rules exempt some activities from PER-2 of Rule NOISE-R7 and Standard NOISE-S4. However, these should be included as a permitted activity within the rule.	Amend Rule PER-2 of NOISE-R7 as follows: PER-2 The helicopter landing site complies with standard: NOISE-S4 Helicopter landing areas. This standard does not apply to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Emergency or rescue helicopter operation occurring to or from Bay of Islands, Rawene or Kaitaia Hospital (excludes established helicopter bases on hospital land). 2. Emergency or rescue helicopter landings, departures, overflights or activity during operations

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>that occur away from the permanently established helicopter base.</p> <p>3. Cropping, top dressing, and spraying for the purpose of farming or conservation carried out in the Rural Production, Horticulture zones, or within Significant Natural Area on a seasonal, temporary, or intermittent basis for a period up to 30 days in any 12 month period.</p> <p>Insert: PER-3 Cropping, top dressing and spraying and the use of drones for the purpose of farming or conservation carried out in the Rural Production, Horticulture zones or within Significant Natural areas on a seasonal, temporary or intermittent basis for a period up to 30 days in any 12-month period.</p> <p>Activity status where compliance does not achieve with PER-3: Restricted</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						discretionary
Bentzen Farm Limited (S167)	S167.087	Noise	NOISE-R7	Oppose	<p>It would serve a better resource management purpose, if flight movements for emergency purposes such as medical emergencies, search and rescue or firefighting purposes are exempt from the standard NOISE-S4. That would also be consistent with note 10 in this section that the noise rules and standards do not apply to helicopters used for an emergency and as an air ambulance.</p> <p>As drafted there would appear there is no provision for helicopters other than flight movements for emergency purposes. The intent of the rule might be better served by allowing helicopter landing site complying with standard: NOISE-S4 Helicopter landing areas, irrespective of the use of the helicopter.</p> <p>The rule lacks specificity as to what comprises a helicopter landing area.</p>	<p>Amend Rule Noise-R7 as follows (adding "Or"): Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 Flight movements are for emergency purposes such as medical emergencies, search and rescue or firefighting purposes;Or PER-2 The helicopter landing site complies with standard: NOISE-S4 Helicopter landing areas. This standard does not apply to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Emergency or rescue helicopter operation occurring to or from Bay of Islands, Rawene or Kaitaia Hospital (excludes established helicopter bases on hospital land). ii. Emergency or rescue helicopter landings, departures, overflights or activity during operations that occur away from the permanently established helicopter base. iii. Cropping, top dressing, and spraying for the purpose of

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						farming or conservation carried out in the Rural Production, Horticulture zones, or within Significant Natural Area on a seasonal, temporary, or intermittent basis for a period up to 30 days in any 12 month period.
Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)	S168.085	Noise	NOISE-R7	Oppose	<p>Rule Noise-R7 only permits Helicopter landing areas where flight movements are for emergency purposes such as medical emergencies, search and rescue or firefighting purposes and the helicopter landing site complies with standard: NOISES4 Helicopter landing areas. In other words, both PER-1 and PER-2 need to be met in order to comply with the rule (consistent with the structure of other rules in the Plan). Given the nature of the activity, it would serve a better resource management purpose, if flight movements for emergency purposes such as medical emergencies, search and rescue or firefighting purposes are exempt from the standard NOISE-S4 Helicopter landing areas. That would also be consistent with note 10 in this section that the noise rules and standards do not apply to helicopters used for an emergency and as an air ambulance. As drafted there would appear to be no provision for helicopters other than flight movements for emergency purposes such as medical emergencies, search and rescue or firefighting purposes. The intent of the rule might be better served by allowing helicopter landing site complying with standard: NOISE-S4 Helicopter landing areas, irrespective of the use of the helicopter. Redrafting of the rule to make PER-1 and PER-2 separately applicable would meet the above issues (ie the addition of an 'or')</p>	<p>Amend Rule NOISE-R7 as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 ...Or PER-2 ...</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					In addition, the rule lacks specificity as to what comprises a helicopter landing area, although there is a disconnect between the title of the rule which applies to helicopter landing areas" (presumably dedicated areas for this purpose) and the content of the rule which applies to the movements and landing of helicopters. If the intent is to apply to dedicated helicopter landing areas, then a definition of that land use is warranted to give the rule specificity.	
NZ Agricultural Aviation Association (S182)	S182.021	Noise	NOISE-R7	Oppose	Seek a separate permitted activity rule for agricultural aviation therefore the exemption in NOISE-R7 is not needed	Delete NOISE-R7 PER-2 iii Cropping, top dressing, and spraying for the purpose of farming or conservation carried out in the Rural Production, Horticulture zones, or within Significant natural Area on a seasonal, temporary, or intermittent basis for a period up to 30 days in any 12 month period.
The Shooting Box Limited (S187)	S187.076	Noise	NOISE-R7	Oppose	Refer to submission for detailed reasons for decision(s) requested relating, but not limited to, to the following: it would serve a better resource management purpose, if flight movements for emergency purposes such as medical emergencies, search and rescue are exempt from the standard NOISE-S4 Helicopter Landing Areas; there would appear to be no provision for helicopters other than flight movements for emergency purposes - the intent of the rule might be better serve by allowing helicopter landing site complying with standard NOISE-S4 Helicopter landing areas, irrespective of the use of the helicopter; redrafting of the rule to make PER-1 and PER2 separately applicable would meet the above issues; and the rule lacks specificity as to what comprises a helicopter landing area - include the following definition:	Amend Rule Noise-R7 as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 Flight movements are for emergency purposes such as medical emergencies, search and rescue or firefighting purposes; Or PER-2 The helicopter landing site complies with standard: NOISE-S4 Helicopter landing areas. This standard does not apply to: i. Emergency or rescue helicopter operation occurring to or from Bay of Islands, Rawene or Kaitaia

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					"Helicopter landing areas means an identified landing area for helicopter loading and take-off but does not include refueling, servicing, a hanger, or a freight handling facility".	Hospital (excludes established helicopter bases on hospital land). ii. Emergency or rescue helicopter landings, departures, overflights or activity during operations that occur away from the permanently established helicopter base. iii. Cropping, top dressing, and spraying for the purpose of farming or conservation carried out in the Rural Production, Horticulture zones, or within Significant Natural Area on a seasonal, temporary, or intermittent basis for a period up to 30 days in any 12 month period.
New Zealand Defence Force (S217)	S217.019	Noise	NOISE-R7	Support in part	TMTA may at times include the use of helicopters, which is not recognised under Rule NOISE-R7 as drafted. NZDF requests that helicopter landings associated with TMTA are excluded from NOISE-R7 and instead addressed under NOISE-R5.	Amend NOISE-R7 as follows: This standard does not apply to: iv. helicopter operation or landings associated with temporary military training activities which are addressed in NOISE-R5.
Wendover Two Limited (S222)	S222.079	Noise	NOISE-R7	Support in part	As drafted, Rule Noise-R7 only permits Helicopter landing areas where flight movements are for emergency purposes such as medical emergencies, search and rescue or firefighting purposes and the helicopter landing site complies with standard: NOISES4 Helicopter landing areas. In other words, both PER- 1 and PER-2 need to be met in order to comply with the rule (consistent with the structure of other rules in the Plan). Given the nature of the activity, it would serve a better resource management purpose, if flight movements for emergency purposes such as medical emergencies, search and rescue or firefighting purposes are exempt from the standard	Amend Rule Noise-R7 as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 Flight movements are for emergency purposes such as medical emergencies, search and rescue or firefighting purposes; Or PER-2 The helicopter landing site complies with standard: NOISE-S4 Helicopter landing areas.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>NOISE-S4 Helicopter landing areas. That would also be consistent with note 10 in this section that the noise rules and standards do not apply to helicopters used for an emergency and as an air ambulance. As drafted there would appear to be no provision for helicopters other than flight movements for emergency purposes such as medical emergencies, search and rescue or firefighting purposes. The intent of the rule might be better served by allowing helicopter landing site complying with standard: NOISE-S4 Helicopter landing areas, irrespective of the use of the helicopter. Redrafting of the rule to make PER-1 and PER-2 separately applicable would meet the above issues (ie the addition of an 'or') In addition, the rule lacks specificity as to what comprises a helicopter landing area, although there is a disconnect between the title of the rule which applies to "helicopter landing areas" (presumably dedicated areas for this purpose) and the content of the rule which applies to the movements and landing of helicopters.</p>	<p>This standard does not apply to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Emergency or rescue helicopter operation occurring to or from Bay of Islands, Rawene or Kaitaia Hospital (excludes established helicopter bases on hospital land). ii. Emergency or rescue helicopter landings, departures, overflights or activity during operations that occur away from the permanently established helicopter base. iii. Cropping, top dressing, and spraying for the purpose of farming or conservation carried out in the Rural Production, Horticulture zones, or within Significant Natural Area on a seasonal, temporary, or intermittent basis for a period up to 30 days in any 12 month period.
Matauri Trustee Limited (S243)	S243.105	Noise	NOISE-R7	Oppose	As drafted, Rule Noise-R7 only permits Helicopter landing areas where flight movements are for emergency purposes such as medical emergencies, search and rescue or firefighting purposes and the helicopter landing site complies with standard: NOISE-S4 Helicopter landing areas. In other words, both PER- 1 and PER-2	Amend Rule Noise-R7 as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 Flight movements are for emergency purposes such as medical emergencies, search and

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>need to be met in order to comply with the rule (consistent with the structure of other rules in the Plan).</p> <p>Given the nature of the activity, it would serve a better resource management purpose, if flight movements for emergency purposes such as medical emergencies, search and rescue or firefighting purposes are exempt from the standard NOISE-S4 Helicopter landing areas. That would also be consistent with note 10 in this section that the noise rules and standards do not apply to helicopters used for an emergency and as an air ambulance. As drafted there would appear to be no provision for helicopters other than flight movements for emergency purposes such as medical emergencies, search and rescue or firefighting purposes. The intent of the rule might be better served by allowing helicopter landing site complying with standard: NOISE-S4 Helicopter landing areas, irrespective of the use of the helicopter.</p> <p>Redrafting of the rule to make PER-1 and PER-2 separately applicable would meet the above issues (i.e. the addition of an 'or') In addition, the rule lacks specificity as to what comprises a helicopter landing area, although there is a disconnect between the title of the rule which applies to "helicopter landing areas" (presumably dedicated areas for this purpose) and the content of the rule which applies to the movements and landing of helicopters. If the intent is to apply to dedicated helicopter landing areas, then a definition of that land use is warranted to give the rule specificity.</p>	<p>rescue or firefighting purposes;Or PER-2</p> <p>The helicopter landing site complies with standard: NOISE-S4 Helicopter landing areas.</p> <p>This standard does not apply to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Emergency or rescue helicopter operation occurring to or from Bay of Islands, Rawene or Kaitaia Hospital (excludes established helicopter bases on hospital land). ii. Emergency or rescue helicopter landings, departures, overflights or activity during operations that occur away from the permanently established helicopter base. iii. Cropping, top dressing, and spraying for the purpose of farming or conservation carried out in the Rural Production, Horticulture zones, or within Significant Natural Area on a seasonal, temporary, or intermittent basis for a period up to 30 days in any 12 month period.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
<p>P S Yates Family Trust (S333)</p>	<p>S333.077</p>	<p>Noise</p>	<p>NOISE-R7</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>As drafted, Rule Noise-R7 only permits Helicopter landing areas where flight movements are for emergency purposes such as medical emergencies, search and rescue or firefighting purposes and the helicopter landing site complies with standard: NOISE-S4 Helicopter landing areas. In other words, both PER- 1 and PER-2 need to be met in order to comply with the rule (consistent with the structure of other rules in the Plan). Given the nature of the activity, it would serve a better resource management purpose, if flight movements for emergency purposes such as medical emergencies, search and rescue or firefighting purposes are exempt from the standard NOISE-S4 Helicopter landing areas. That would also be consistent with note 10 in this section that the noise rules and standards do not apply to helicopters used for an emergency and as an air ambulance. As drafted there would appear to be no provision for helicopters other than flight movements for emergency purposes such as medical emergencies, search and rescue or firefighting purposes. The intent of the rule might be better served by allowing helicopter landing site complying with standard: NOISE-S4 Helicopter landing areas, irrespective of the use of the helicopter. Redrafting of the rule to make PER-1 and PER-2 separately applicable would meet the above issues (ie the addition of an 'or') In addition, the rule lacks specificity as to what comprises a helicopter landing area, although there is a disconnect between the title of the rule which applies to "helicopter landing areas" (presumably dedicated areas for this purpose) and the content of the rule which applies to the movements and landing of helicopters. If the intent is to apply to dedicated helicopter landing areas, then a definition of that land use is warranted to give the rule specificity. The following definition is</p>	<p>Amend Rule Noise-R7 as follows:<i>Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 Flight movements are foremergency purposes such as medical emergencies, search and rescue orfirefighting purposes; Or PER-2 The helicopter landing sitecomplies with standard: NOISE-S4 Helicopter landingareas. This standard does not applyto: i. Emergency or rescuehelicopter operation occurring to or from Bay of Islands, Rawene or KaitaiaHospital (excludes established helicopter bases on hospital land). ii. Emergency or rescuehelicopter landings, departures, overflights or activity during operations thatoccur away from the permanently established helicopter base. iii. Cropping, top dressing,and spraying for the purpose of farming or conservation carried out in theRural Production, Horticulture zones, or within Significant Natural Area on aseasonal, temporary, or intermittent basis for a period up to 30 days in any</i></p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					proposed to be included by this submission: "Helicopter landing areas means an identified landing area for helicopter landing, loading and take-off but does not include refuelling, servicing, a hangar, or a freight handling facility".	<i>12month period.</i>
Ironwood Trust Limited (S337)	S337.001	Noise	NOISE-R7	Support in part	Supports in principle the inclusion of provisions for helicopter landing areas set out in the proposal but considers that these need to be amended to remove potential ambiguity and provide greater clarity.	Amend Rule NOISE-R7 to provide for landing areas that do not meet the standard referred to in PER-2 to be identified as restricted discretionary activities instead of discretionary.
Ironwood Trust Limited (S337)	S337.003	Noise	NOISE-R7	Support in part	Supports in principle the inclusion of provisions for helicopter landing areas set out in the proposal but considers that these need to be amended to remove potential ambiguity and provide greater clarity.	Amend the exclusion provisions in Rule NOISE-R7 to clarify that the exclusions relate to PER-2, and delete sub-clauses i and ii of the exclusions
Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand (S421)	S421.198	Noise	NOISE-R7	Support in part	Federated Farmers supports the intent of rule Noise - R7. However, we seek clarification on the exceptions listed in performance standard PER-2. PER-2 states that the rule does not apply to cropping, top dressing, and spraying for the purpose of farming or conservation carried out in the Rural Production, Horticulture zones, or within Significant Natural Area on a seasonal, temporary, or intermittent basis for a period up to 30 days in any 12-month period. The exception is broad in its application in that it does not say what state what scale is applicable. Is the exception to be applied on a site-by-site basis so that it is intended to cover the land of a farm owned by one person. Alternatively, is it meant to apply on a larger scale so that if a person owned land in more than one title, the 30 days apply to all of that land regardless of it being in different certificates of title. The district plan needs to provide for the continuance of existing, lawfully established activities such as farming. The rule as currently drafted is confusing, particularly when regard is had to the text under the heading 'Rules' and	Amend PER-2 of Rule NOISE-R7 to clarify the third exception and how Council intends to apply and enforce exception

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					before the rules themselves. The text states that the noise rules and standards do not apply for agriculture, horticulture and pastoral farming activities undertaken for a limited duration, including using agricultural vehicles, machinery or equipment used on a seasonal or intermittent basis, forestry planting and forestry harvesting in the Rural Production, Horticulture and Horticulture Processing zones.	
Waiaua Bay Farm Limited (S463)	S463.082	Noise	NOISE-R7	Support	WBF supports the enablement of general helicopter flights as a permitted activity under sub-clause PER-2 of this rule. It suggests a minor amendment to reflect that helicopter movements are the source of the effect, not the helicopter landing site.	Amend PER-2 of Rule NOISE-R7 as follows: PER-2 Helicopter movements and landings at t The helicopter landing areas ite complies with standard: NOISE-S4 Helicopter landing areas.
Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland (S516)	S516.068	Noise	NOISE-R7	Oppose	The drafting of the rule is not clear. There is a list under "This standard does not apply to:..." which might have been with the intention of making the listed activities permitted, but actually is excluding them from being permitted. Regardless, these activities have adverse effects on public health so should have controls. To avoid ambiguity the activities should be deleted.	Delete the following text from Rule NOISE-R7: This standard does not apply to: i. Emergency or rescue helicopter operation occurring to or from Bay of Islands, Rawene or Kaitia Hospital (excludes established helicopter bases on hospital land). ii. Emergency or rescue helicopter landings, departures, overflights or activity during operations that occur away from the permanently established helicopter base. iii. Cropping, top dressing, and spraying for

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						the purpose of farming or conservation carried out in the Rural Production, Horticulture zones, or within Significant Natural Area on a seasonal, temporary, or intermittent basis for a period up to 30 days in any 12 month period.
Puketona Business Park Limited (S45)	S45.046	Noise	NOISE-R8	Support	The Noise chapter of the PDP as notified is generally acceptable.	Retain the rules in the Noise chapter.
Horticulture New Zealand (S159)	S159.089	Noise	NOISE-R8	Oppose	A limitation of 7am - 7pm is not appropriate for audible bird scaring devices as the main activity is prior to sunrise and after sunset	Amend PER-1 of Rule NOISE-R8: Audible bird scaring devices must only be used between 7.00am and 7.00pm on any calendar year ½ before sunrise and ½ hour after sunset
Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland (S516)	S516.069	Noise	NOISE-R8	Support	The three permitted activity conditions should all apply in conjunction and not as alternatives. The term "maximum noise level frequency" is erroneous and could lead to incorrect interpretation.	Amend Rule NOISE-R8 as follows: PER-11.....; and (inferred) PER-22. ... ii. A maximum noise level frequency of sound levels not exceeding 65 dB LAE within the notional boundary of any noise sensitive activity not owned by the operator of the device; and PER-33
Puketona Business	S45.047	Noise	NOISE-R9	Support	The Noise chapter of the PDP as notified is generally acceptable.	Retain the rules in the Noise chapter.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Park Limited (S45)						
Horticulture New Zealand (S159)	S159.090	Noise	NOISE-R9	Oppose	The inclusion of multiple frost fans should apply to fans located on the same site. A grower cannot control the noise from fans on other sites	Amend PER-3 of Rule NOISE-R9 as follows: The maximum noise generated by a single or multiple frost fans shall not exceed 55 dB LAeq(15min) at any time when assessed within the notional boundary of any noise sensitive activity on another site.
Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga (S331)	S331.054	Noise	NOISE-R9	Support	The submitter supports rule NOISE-R9 Noise from frost fans and horticultural wind machines, as the proposed permitted activity standards of noise limits to manage the noise effects from frost fans and horticultural wind machines on noise sensitive activities.	Retain rule NOISE-R9 Noise from frost fans and horticultural wind machines, as proposed.
Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland (S516)	S516.070	Noise	NOISE-R9	Support	The three permitted activity conditions should all apply in conjunction and not as alternatives. The term "maximum noise" should be avoided as maximum noise level is a specific acoustics metric. The note regarding special audible characteristics could be misinterpreted and should be rephrased and included in the main clause.	Amend Rule NOISE-R9 as follows: PER-11....; and PER-2 2....; and PER-33. The maximum noise generated by a single or multiple frost fans shall not exceed 55 dB LAeq(15min) at any time when assessed within the notional boundary of any noise sensitive activity on another site, with no adjustment applied for any special audible characteristics. Note: The noise limit includes a correction for the special audible characteristics of frost

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						fans.
Puketona Business Park Limited (S45)	S45.048	Noise	NOISE-R10	Support	The Noise chapter of the PDP as notified is generally acceptable.	Retain the rules in the Noise chapter.
Puketona Business Park Limited (S45)	S45.049	Noise	NOISE-R11	Support	The Noise chapter of the PDP as notified is generally acceptable.	Retain the rules in the Noise chapter.
Waipapa Pine Limited and Adrian Broughton Trust (S342)	S342.013	Noise	Standards	Oppose	<p>The submitters believe that the provisions associated with the Heavy Industrial Zone requires careful consideration and attention. The underlying zone intent describes quite clearly that the zone will create some objectionable effects in this respect.</p> <p>A balance needs to be struck between enabling heavy industrial activities to be able to operate effectively and efficiently within the Zone, whilst ensuring that the potential effects do not go over and beyond limits set under the PDP and within the s16 RMA 1991 requirements.</p> <p>To add further, the site is already managed by way of resource consent noise provisions and these consent conditions have been appropriately managed between the submitter and adjoining sites, and beyond.</p> <p>To this end, the submitter opposes the noise provisions until their own expert can consider the rules in context of their operations and underlying resource consenting</p>	Not stated

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					requirements, and potential for growth.	
Te Whatu Ora - Health New Zealand, Te Tai Tokerau (S42)	S42.015	Noise	NOISE-S1	Support in part	The Hospital is an existing use, located on the current sites for a number of years. Therefore, the Hospital is not new to the surrounding environment and its status as Regionally Significant Infrastructure, along with its long tenure in this environment, must be recognised. As such it must be ensured that any new development and/or redevelopment of the Hospital is not treated as though it is entirely new, rather recognising the Hospital and the adjacent landuses including residential land uses in the immediate environment have successfully coexisted for a significant period of time and the Hospital must be enabled to operate, expand and redevelop over time.	Amend the noise provisions in the chapter to ensure that the zone provisions don't constrain hospital activities nor the design and future expansion of the facilities
Puketona Business Park Limited (S45)	S45.018	Noise	NOISE-S1	Support	The Noise chapter of the PDP as notified is generally acceptable	Retain the standards in the Noise chapter.
Puketona Business Park Limited (S45)	S45.050	Noise	NOISE-S1	Support	The Noise chapter of the PDP as notified is generally acceptable.	Retain the standards in the Noise chapter.
Jeff and Robby Kemp (S51)	S51.009	Noise	NOISE-S1	Support	The rule as it applies to the Rural Production Zone is supported.	Retain NOISE-S1
Horticulture New Zealand (S159)	S159.091	Noise	NOISE-S1	Support	The levels for the Rural Production and Horticulture zones are supported.	Retain Standard NOISE-S1 as relates to the Rural Production and Horticulture zones
Timothy and Dion Spicer (S213)	S213.024	Noise	NOISE-S1	Support in part	In Dion and Timothy Spicer's opinion, there is no logical reason to reduce noise limits between the hours of 7am to 10pm.	amend Rule NOISE-S1 Maximum Noise Levels (RRZ) to be consistent with current noise limits under the ODP.
FNR Properties Limited (S316)	S316.003	Noise	NOISE-S1	Support in part	It is noted that the maximum noise limits in the Rural Production zone and Mineral Extraction overlay, specifically those that apply to the period of 10pm to 7am, are conflicting. Given the Mineral Extraction overlay largely applies to sites with an underlying zone of Rural	Amend Rule NOISE-S1 so that noise limits in the Rural Production zone are consistent with those in the Mineral Extraction overlay.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					Production, specifying different noise limits essentially defeats the purpose of having such limits in the Mineral Extraction overlay. This could lead to confusion and interpretation issues.	
Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga (S331)	S331.056	Noise	NOISE-S1	Support	The submitter supports standard NOISE-S1 Maximum noise levels - zone specific, as educational facilities are noise sensitive activities and often established in residential zones. The Ministry therefore supports the matters of discretion, specifically to consider the location of the noise generation activity in relation to any noise sensitive activities (b).	Retain standard NOISE-S1 Maximum noise levels - zone specific, as proposed.
Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga (S331)	S331.057	Noise	NOISE-S1	Support	The submitter supports standard NOISE-S1 Maximum noise levels - zone specific, in the Rural Production zone, Rural Lifestyle zone, Māori Purpose zone, Horticulture zone, Moturoa Island zone, Kauri Cliffs zone, Ngawha Innovation and Enterprise Park zone, as educational facilities are noise sensitive activities and often established in rural zones. The Ministry therefore support the matters of discretion, specifically to consider the location of the noise generation activity in relation to any noise sensitive activities (b).	Retain standard NOISE-S1 Maximum noise levels - zone specific, in the Rural Production zone, Rural Lifestyle zone, Māori Purpose zone, Horticulture zone, Moturoa Island zone, Kauri Cliffs zone, Ngawha Innovation and Enterprise Park zone.
Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga (S331)	S331.058	Noise	NOISE-S1	Support	The submitter supports standard NOISE-S1 Maximum noise levels - zone specific, in the Settlement zone, Carrington Estate zone, as educational facilities are noise sensitive activities and often established in rural zones. The Ministry therefore support the matters of discretion, specifically to consider the location of the noise generation activity in relation to any noise sensitive activities (b).	Retain standard NOISE-S1 Maximum noise levels - zone specific, in the Settlement zone, Carrington Estate zone, as proposed.
Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga (S331)	S331.059	Noise	NOISE-S1	Support	The submitter supports standard NOISE-S1 Maximum noise levels - zone specific, in the Mixed Use zone, as educational facilities are noise sensitive activities and often established in mixed use zones. The Ministry therefore support the matters of discretion, specifically to consider the ability to design and construct buildings accommodating noise sensitive activities with sound insulation and/or other mitigation measures	Retain standard NOISE-S1 Maximum noise levels - zone specific, in the Mixed Use zone, as proposed.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					to ensure the level of noise received within the building is minimised (d).	
Transpower New Zealand Ltd (S454)	S454.104	Noise	NOISE-S1	Not Stated	Night time noise limits in these zones are set at 40dBA LAeq between 10pm and 7am. The night time noise limit in many of the equivalent zones in the Operative Far North District Plan is 45dBA LAeq. It is unclear that a reduction in the night time noise limit is necessary to address adverse effects or maintain amenity in these zones. A night time noise limits of 45dBA LAeq is consistent with similar environments in other districts. The National Grid traverses the entire country and to have these types of limits applied inconsistently to the same type of infrastructure is problematic. Transpower therefore considers that the night time noise limits in these zones should be retained at 45dBA LAeq.	Amend the PDP where the night time noise limit is set at 40dBA LAeq (15 min) in any of the zones in the Far North District, change the limit to 45dBA LAeq
Waiaua Bay Farm Limited (S463)	S463.083	Noise	NOISE-S1	Support	With specific regard to Kauri Cliffs, WBF considers the permitted noise limited to be compatible with the general range of activities undertaken in the KCZ.	Retain Standard NOISE-S1
Waiaua Bay Farm Limited (S463)	S463.084	Noise	NOISE-S1	Support	Applying the noise rules for the NOSZ to the Natural Heritage subzone at Kauri Cliffs is inappropriate, given the NOSZ in this location is contained entirely in a private landholding.	Amend Standard NPOISE-S1 as follows: Noise generated by any activity shall not exceed the following noise limits at any point within any other site in the Natural Open Space (excluding the Kauri Cliffs Natural Heritage subzone), Open Space, and Sport and Active Recreation zone...
Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland (S516)	S516.071	Noise	NOISE-S1	Oppose	The term "maximum noise levels" has a defined meaning in acoustics standards relating to one specific noise metric. An alternative term should be used for referring to noise limits in general.	Amend the title of Standard NOISE-S1 (and all references to it in other provisions) to read: Maximum noise levels

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						Noise limits - zone specific"
Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland (S516)	S516.072	Noise	NOISE-S1	Oppose	<p>The s32 appendix report recommended a comprehensive set of zone noise limits including limits within zones and between zones. It recommended an overarching provision that, unless otherwise specified, emissions from any zone have to comply with the "within zone" noise limits for the receiving zone. In the notified proposed plan, those recommendations from the s32 report appendix have not been implemented. It appears an attempt has been made to simplify and combine the "within" and "between" zone noise limits, but in this process it has created numerous gaps where noise emissions between zones are not controlled. As such, the notified provisions are inadequate to protect public health. With the current structure of NOISE-S1 there is not a simple remedy and therefore specific wording has not been proposed here as comprehensive redrafting is required to address this issue.</p> <p>For airport noise, inclusion of both outer control boundaries and air noise boundaries is often appropriate for land use planning purposes. However, as a "noise limit", only one control line should apply to each airport. By default, this should be the air noise boundary, unless for a small airport this line does not extend far enough to be practical.</p> <p>In accordance with the Noise and Vibration Metrics National Planning Standard and in turn NZS 6802, engine testing noise (that is not otherwise included in aircraft operations noise), should be subject to noise limits using the metric LAeq(15 min) and not with a 9 hour average.</p>	Delete Standard NOISE-S1 and insert a table containing noise limits for each zone, applying to noise received in sites in each zone, regardless of whether the noise originated from other sites in that zone or sites in another zone. Only set airport noise limits at one boundary (outer control or air noise) for each airport. If separate noise limits are maintained for aircraft engine testing, amend the metric to read: "...dB LAeq(15 min) (9 hour) ..."
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S561)	S561.054	Noise	NOISE-S1	Support	Providing for an increased noise level during daytime activities within the Māori Purpose zones is enabling for the economic growth and development of Māori within the District.	Retain Noise-S1 as notified.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Puketona Business Park Limited (S45)	S45.051	Noise	NOISE-S2	Support	The Noise chapter of the PDP as notified is generally acceptable.	Retain the standards in the Noise chapter
Transpower New Zealand Ltd (S454)	S454.105	Noise	NOISE-S2	Not Stated	These noise limits apply to temporary activities such as the use of generators to provide power for lifeline utilities. This type of activity may not always be able to comply with the noise limits specified and the emergency nature of the activity means that it is unlikely that a resource consent could be applied for to authorise the exceedance in a timely way to ensure that the lifeline utilities can be provided when required. Transpower therefore considers that temporary activities providing lifeline utilities should be excluded from the standard.	Amend the first sentence of NOISE-S2 as follows: 1. The noise generated from any temporary activities (excluding temporary military training activities and temporary activities providing lifeline utilities) and emergency management training activities, shall not exceed the following limits at any point:
Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland (S516)	S516.073	Noise	NOISE-S2	Support	There is a typographical error for two noise metrics.	Amend Standard NOISE-S2 as required to correct the reference as follows: dB LAeq(1 min)
Puketona Business Park Limited (S45)	S45.052	Noise	NOISE-S3	Support	The Noise chapter of the PDP as notified is generally acceptable.	Retain the standards in the Noise chapter.
New Zealand Defence Force (S217)	S217.020	Noise	NOISE-S3	Support in part	NZDF has developed a bespoke set of noise standards that are realistic and appropriate for the type of noise generated. These standards are based on professional acoustic advice and NZDF seeks their inclusion in proposed plans nationwide. NZDF seeks that the noise levels specified in NOISE-S3 are amended to reflect the NZDF standards.	Amend NOISE - S3 as follows: 1. 7am to 7pm - 550 dB LAeq(15min) 2. 7pm to 10pm - 5045 dB LAeq(15min) 3. 10pm to 7am - 450 dB LAeq(15min) 4. 10pm to 7am - 750 dB LAmax
Te Whatu Ora - Health New Zealand, Te	S42.016	Noise	NOISE-S4	Support in part	The Hospital is an existing use, located on the current sites for a number of years. Therefore, the Hospital is not new to the surrounding	Amend the noise provisions in the chapter to ensure that the zone provisions don't constrain hospital

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Tai Tokerau (S42)					environment and its status as Regionally Significant Infrastructure, along with its long tenure in this environment, must be recognised. As such it must be ensured that any new development and/or redevelopment of the Hospital is not treated as though it is entirely new, rather recognising the Hospital and the adjacent landuses including residential land uses in the immediate environment have successfully coexisted for a significant period of time and the Hospital must be enabled to operate, expand and redevelop over time.	activities nor the design and future expansion of the facilities; protect the rights of helicopters to operate on the hospital sites.
Puketona Business Park Limited (S45)	S45.053	Noise	NOISE-S4	Support	The Noise chapter of the PDP as notified is generally acceptable.	Retain the standards in the Noise chapter.
Horticulture New Zealand (S159)	S159.092	Noise	NOISE-S4	Support in part	It should be clear that there are exemptions in the rules so Standard NOISE-S4 does not apply. In particular NZS6807:1994 is not appropriate for the intermittent use for horticultural activities.	Amend Standard NOISE-S4 to clarify that it does not apply to activities exempted in Rule NOISE-R7
Bentzen Farm Limited (S167)	S167.088	Noise	NOISE-S4	Oppose	<p>The rule NOISE-S4 rule does not specify the noise standard to be complied with: referring to 'the following noise limits', without specifying what that is (with only reference to being 'assessed' in accordance with NZS 6807:1994: Noise Management and Land Use Planning for Helicopter Landing Areas, rather than any noise limit contained therein or otherwise expressing a noise limit). That lacks measurability as a rule.</p> <p>In addition, the rule ostensibly applies to 'helicopter landing areas' which presumably is the land use as proposed to be defined by this submission (ie dedicated landing areas), rather than simply the landing and take off of helicopter areas per se. If this is the case, then this would appropriately link with NZS6807:1994: Noise Management and Land Use Planning for Helicopter Landing Areas.</p>	<p>Delete NOISE-S4 Helicopter landing areas and replace with a rule that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Applies the rule to helicopter landing areas only as sought to be defined by this submission. 2. References an appropriate noise limit to be complied with (for example 50 dB Ldn at the notional boundary of a vulnerable activity).

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)	S168.086	Noise	NOISE-S4	Oppose	Standard NOISE-S4 does not specify the noise standard to be complied with: referring to 'the following noise limits', without specifying what that is (with only reference to being 'assessed' in accordance with NZS 6807:1994: Noise Management and Land Use Planning for Helicopter Landing Areas, rather than any noise limit contained therein or otherwise expressing a noise limit). That lacks measurability as a rule. In addition, the rule ostensibly applies to 'helicopter landing areas' which presumably is the land use as proposed to be defined by this submission (ie dedicated landing areas), rather than simply the landing and take off of helicopter areas per se. If this is the case, then this would appropriately link with NZS 6807:1994: Noise Management and Land Use Planning for Helicopter Landing Areas.	Delete standard NOISE-S4 Helicopter landing areas and replace with a rule that: 1. Applies the rule to helicopter landing areas only as sought to be defined by this submission. 2. References an appropriate noise limit to be complied with (for example 50 dB Ldn at the notional boundary of a vulnerable activity).
NZ Agricultural Aviation Association (S182)	S182.023	Noise	NOISE-S4	Support	NZS6807:2994 (NZS6807:1994 inferred) is not an appropriate standard for temporary and intermittent use of helicopters for agricultural aviation activities	Amend NOISE-S4 Note by adding NZS6807:1994 does not apply to agricultural aviation activities
The Shooting Box Limited (S187)	S187.077	Noise	NOISE-S4	Oppose	The rule NOISE-S4 rule does not specify the noise standard to be complied with: referring to 'the following noise limits', without specifying what that is (with only reference to being 'assessed' in accordance with NZS 6807:1994: Noise Management and Land Use Planning for Helicopter Landing Areas, rather than any noise limit contained therein or otherwise expressing a noise limit). That lacks measurability as a rule. In addition, the rule ostensibly applies to 'helicopter landing areas' which presumably is the land use as proposed to be defined by this submission (ie dedicated landing areas), rather than simply the landing and take off of helicopter areas per se. If this is the case, then this would appropriately link with NZS 6807:1994: Noise Management and Land Use Planning for Helicopter Landing Areas.	Delete NOISE-S4 Helicopter landing areas and replace with a rule that: 1. Applies the rule to helicopter landing areas only as sought to be defined by this submission. 2. References an appropriate noise limit to be complied with (for example 50dB at the notional boundary of a vulnerable activity).

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Wendover Two Limited (S222)	S222.081	Noise	NOISE-S4	Oppose	The rule NOISE-S4 rule does not specify the noise standard to be complied with: referring to 'the following noise limits', without specifying what that is (with only reference to being 'assessed' in accordance with NZS 6807:1994: Noise Management and Land Use Planning for Helicopter Landing Areas, rather than any noise limit contained therein or otherwise expressing a noise limit). That lacks measurability as a rule. In addition, the rule ostensibly applies to 'helicopter landing areas' which presumably is the land use as proposed to be defined by this submission (ie dedicated landing areas), rather than simply the landing and take off of helicopter areas per se. If this is the case, then this would appropriately link with NZS 6807:1994: Noise Management and Land Use Planning for Helicopter Landing Areas.	Delete NOISE-S4 Helicopter landing areas and insert a rule that: 1. Applies the rule to helicopter landing areas only as sought to be defined by this submission. 2. References an appropriate noise limit to be complied with (for example 50 dB Ldn at the notional boundary of a vulnerable activity).
Matauri Trustee Limited (S243)	S243.106	Noise	NOISE-S4	Oppose	The rule NOISE-S4 rule does not specify the noise standard to be complied with: referring to 'the following noise limits', without specifying what that is (with only reference to being 'assessed' in accordance with NZS 6807:1994: Noise Management and Land Use Planning for Helicopter Landing Areas, rather than any noise limit contained therein or otherwise expressing a noise limit). That lacks measurability as a rule. In addition, the rule ostensibly applies to 'helicopter landing areas' which presumably is the land use as proposed to be defined by this submission (i.e. dedicated landing areas), rather than simply the landing and take-off of helicopter areas per se. If this is the case, then this would appropriately link with NZS 6807:1994: Noise Management and Land Use Planning for Helicopter Landing Areas.	Delete NOISE-S4 Helicopter landing areas and replace with a rule that: 1. Applies the rule to helicopter landing areas only as sought to be defined by this submission. 2. References an appropriate noise limit to be complied with (for example 50 dB Ldn at the notional boundary of a vulnerable activity).
P S Yates Family Trust (S333)	S333.078	Noise	NOISE-S4	Oppose	The rule NOISE-S4 rule does not specify the noise standard to be complied with: referring to 'the following noise limits', without specifying what that is (with only reference to being 'assessed' in accordance with NZS 6807:1994: Noise	Delete NOISE-S4 Helicopter landing areas and replace with a rule that: 1. Applies the rule to helicopter landing areas only as sought to be

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					Management and Land Use Planning for Helicopter Landing Areas, rather than any noise limit contained therein or otherwise expressing a noise limit). That lacks measurability as a rule. In addition, the rule ostensibly applies to 'helicopter landing areas' which presumably is the land use as proposed to be defined by this submission (ie dedicated landing areas), rather than simply the landing and take off of helicopter areas per se. If this is the case, then this would appropriately link with NZS 6807:1994: Noise Management and Land Use Planning for Helicopter Landing Areas.	defined by this submission. 2. References an appropriate noise limit to be complied with (for example 50 dB Ldn at the notional boundary of a vulnerable activity).
Ironwood Trust Limited (S337)	S337.002	Noise	NOISE-S4	Support in part	Supports in principle the inclusion of provisions for helicopter landing areas set out in the proposal but considers that these need to be amended to remove potential ambiguity and provide greater clarity.	Amend Standard NOISE-S4 to clarify that noise generated from helicopter movements complies with the limits set out standard NZS 6807:1994 when measured at any point within the boundary of the General Residential and Rural Residential zones, or within the notional boundary of any noise sensitive activity in the Rural Production, Rural Lifestyle, Settlement, Horticulture or Maori Purposes zones
Waiaua Bay Farm Limited (S463)	S463.085	Noise	NOISE-S4	Support in part	WBF supports the provision for helicopter movements to/from Kauri Cliffs. It suggests a minor amendment to this rule to clarify where noise measurements are to be taken.	Amend Standard NOISE-S4 as follows: Noise generated from the movements and landing of helicopters shall comply with the following noise limits when measured at any point within a site in separate ownership in any General Residential and Rural Residential zones, or within the notional boundary of any noise sensitive activity on a site in separate

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						ownership in the Rural Production, Rural Lifestyle, Settlement, Horticulture or Māori Purpose zones when assessed in accordance with NZS 6807:1994: Noise Management and Land Use Planning for Helicopter Landing Areas.
Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland (S516)	S516.074	Noise	NOISE-S4	Support	The text explicitly refers to "the following noise limits" but none are given.	Amend Standard NOISE-S4 to add noise limits from Table 1 of NZS 6807.
Puketona Business Park Limited (S45)	S45.054	Noise	NOISE-S5	Support	The Noise chapter of the PDP as notified is generally acceptable.	Retain the standards in the Noise chapter.
Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga (S331)	S331.060	Noise	NOISE-S5	Support	The submitter supports standard NOISE-S5 Noise insulation standards for all noise sensitive activities, for all zones within 40m of a State Highway that exceed an average of 15,000 daily one-way vehicle movements, as educational facilities are noise sensitive activities, however, they may already be established or have an operational need to be established 40m of a State Highway that exceed an average of 15,000 daily one-way vehicle movements. The Ministry support in part the matters of discretion, specifically to consider the ability to design and construct buildings accommodating noise sensitive activities with sound insulation and/or other mitigation measures to ensure the level of noise received within the building is minimised (h).	Retain standard NOISE-S5 Noise insulation standards for all noise sensitive activities, for all zones within 40m of a State Highway that exceed an average of 15,000 daily one-way vehicle movements, as proposed.
Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga (S331)	S331.061	Noise	NOISE-S5	Support	The submitter supports standard NOISE-S5 Noise insulation standards for all noise sensitive activities, for Mixed Use zone, Light Industrial zone, Orongo Bay zone.	Retain standard NOISE-S5 Noise insulation standards for all noise sensitive activities, for Mixed Use zone, Light Industrial zone,

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						Orongo Bay zone, as proposed.
Paihia Properties Holdings Corporate Trustee Limited and UP Management Ltd (S344)	S344.026	Noise	NOISE-S5	Oppose	The requirement to attenuate 40m from the State Highway is onerous, given the nature of the use of the road. PPHCTL are concerned that the MUZ and State Highway setback noise attenuation rules have different standards.	Delete Standard NOISE-S5
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (S356)	S356.109	Noise	NOISE-S5	Oppose	There are no State Highways in the district that exceed 15,000vpd. It is recommended the rule is reworded to apply to all areas within 100m of state highways, this distance may be reduced according to a mapped area that Waka Kotahi will provide to the Council in due course.	Delete reference to vpd and reword to apply to all areas within 100m of state highways.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (S356)	S356.110	Noise	NOISE-S5	Support in part	Part 1 - Amend to include criteria for other noise sensitive activities as per the default provision in the attached s32 report. Part 2 - Amend the 2dB to 3dB and to change the explanation "allowing for future traffic increase" to "allowing for uncertainty and routine changes" Part 3 - It is considered that ventilation should be addressed separately so last sentence should be deleted. Part 4 - It is considered that this partly duplicates Part 3 it is also considered this Part does not make sense. Waka Kotahi also seeks for a new clause to be added that states if windows need to be closed to achieve 1, then mechanical ventilation is to be provided.	Amend as follows: 1. Add criteria for other noise sensitive activities. 2. Amend wording as follows: "Compliance with (1) above shall be achieved based on an existing noise level with a 2 3 decibel addition allowing for future traffic increase uncertainty and routine changes; " 3. Amend wording as follows: "Compliance with (1) above shall be achieved if, prior to the construction of any building containing a habitable room, an acoustic design certificate from a suitably qualified acoustic engineer is provided to the Council stating the design will achieve

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>compliance with this standard. The building shall be designed, constructed, and maintained in accordance with the design certificate. The design certificate shall also state the required HVAC design noise levels that are to be included in the ventilation design as well as any relevant assumptions;"</p> <p>4) Clarification is sought by Waka Kotahi as it is unclear what it sets to achieve.</p> <p>5) Add new clause to require mechanical ventilation to be required if windows need to be closed to achieve (1.)</p>
<p>Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (S356)</p>	<p>S356.111</p>	<p>Noise</p>	<p>NOISE-S5</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>Waka Kotahi suggests all matters b. through to h. be deleted. The 40dB standard is a bottom line for protection of health and it is not appropriate to add factors to open this up for litigation. It is considered that if there is appropriate mitigation, then it would result in meeting the standard.</p>	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</p> <p>a. effects in the ability of existing or permitted activities to operate or establish without undue constraint;b. any legal instruments proposed; c. mitigation of noise achieved through other means; d. any topographical or other site constraints; e. any alternative solutions proposed by a suitably qualified acoustic</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>engineer to achieve appropriate amenity for present and future residents of the site;f. any existing noise generating activities and the level of noise that will be received within any noise sensitive building;g. the primary purpose and the frequency of use of the activity; andh. the ability to design and construct buildings accommodating noise sensitive activities with sound insulation and/or other mitigation measures to ensure the level of noise received within the building is minimised particularly at night.</p>
<p>KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S416)</p>	<p>S416.041</p>	<p>Noise</p>	<p>NOISE-S5</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>KiwiRail seeks the inclusion of noise and vibration controls requiring acoustic insulation and ventilation to be installed in new (or altered) sensitive uses within 100m of the railway corridor. Noise and Vibration from rail corridors can potentially give rise to adverse health and amenity effects on noise sensitive activities located nearby if not properly addressed and provided for. The proposed standard provides options for developers in achieving an appropriate level of amenity for residents who live within 100m of the rail corridor. The rail network is a 24 hour a day, seven day a week operation, and the frequency, length and weight of trains can change without community</p>	<p>Insert a standard (as outlined in the submission) to apply in all zones to built development at any point within 100 metres from the legal boundary of any railway network</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>consultation. Noise and vibration can have an impact on the internal amenity of a building. Appropriate mitigation, installed to ensure that the health and wellbeing of those living and working near to the rail network are not adversely affected, is pivotal to ensure that undue restrictions are not placed on the operation of the rail network. Rail activities not only generate noise, but also vibration effects. KiwiRail seek amendment to require acoustic and vibration treatment for sensitive activities within identified corridors adjacent to the railway networks to ensure an appropriate level of internal amenity is achieved in buildings adjacent to the rail corridor. The proposed standard includes the requirement for feedback from KiwiRail. As the railway and network utility operator, KiwiRail's feedback about any effects of non-compliance is required to ensure that any proposed mitigation is appropriate.</p> <p>KiwiRail also seeks controls within 60m of the railway corridor, for buildings containing new (or altered) sensitive uses to be constructed to manage the impacts of vibration. These controls are important to ensure new development is undertaken in a way that achieves a healthy living environment for people locating within proximity to the railway corridor, minimising the potential for complaints about the effects of the railway network.</p>	
<p>Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland (S516)</p>	<p>S516.075</p>	<p>Noise</p>	<p>NOISE-S5</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>For all parts of this provision, if residents need to close windows to maintain reasonable indoor noise levels then adequate alternative ventilation and cooling need to be provided. Clause G4 of the New Zealand Building Code only requires minimal ventilation and no cooling.</p>	<p>Amend Standard NOISE-S5 to replace existing ventilation requirements in all three rows with the following:If windows are required to be closed to achieve the internal noise limit the building must be designed, constructed and maintained with a mechanical ventilation system that for</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>habitable rooms:i. provides mechanical ventilation to satisfy clause G4 of the New Zealand Building Code; andii. is adjustable by the occupant to control the ventilation rate in increments up to a high air flow setting that provides at least 6 air changes per hour; andiii. provides relief for equivalent volumes of spill air; andiv. provides cooling and heating that is controllable by the occupant and can maintain the inside temperature between 18°C and 25°C; andv. does not generate more than 35 dBLAeq (30s) when measured 1m away from any grille or diffuser.</p>
<p>Puketona Business Park Limited (S45)</p>	<p>S45.055</p>	<p>Noise</p>	<p>NOISE-S6</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>The Noise chapter of the PDP as notified is generally acceptable.</p>	<p>Retain the standards in the Noise chapter.</p>
<p>Waipapa Pine Limited and Adrian Broughton Trust (S342)</p>	<p>S342.024</p>	<p>Noise</p>	<p>NOISE-Table 1</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>The submitters believe that the provisions associated with the Heavy Industrial Zone requires careful consideration and attention. The underlying zone intent describes quite clearly that the zone will create some objectionable effects in this</p>	<p>Not stated</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>respect. A balance needs to be struck between enabling heavy industrial activities to be able to operate effectively and efficiently within the Zone, whilst ensuring that the potential effects do not go over and beyond limits set under the PDP and within the s16 RMA 1991 requirements.</p> <p>To add further, the site is already managed by way of resource consent noise provisions and these consent conditions have been appropriately managed between the submitter and adjoining sites, and beyond. To this end, the submitter opposes the noise provisions until their own expert can consider the rules in context of their operations and underlying resource consenting requirements, and potential for growth.</p>	
Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland (S516)	S516.076	Noise	NOISE-Table 1	Oppose	There are no design noise levels specified for the Orongo Bay zone, as required by NOISE-S5.	Insert design noise levels within NOISE-Table 1 for the Orongo Bay zone
Waipapa Pine Limited and Adrian Broughton Trust (S342)	S342.025	Noise	NOISE-Table 2	Oppose	<p>The submitters believe that the provisions associated with the Heavy Industrial Zone requires careful consideration and attention. The underlying zone intent describes quite clearly that the zone will create some objectionable effects in this respect. A balance needs to be struck between enabling heavy industrial activities to be able to operate effectively and</p>	Not stated

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>efficiently within the Zone, whilst ensuring that the potential effects do not go over and beyond limits set under the PDP and within the s16 RMA 1991 requirements.</p> <p>To add further, the site is already managed by way of resource consent noise provisions and these consent conditions have been appropriately managed between the submitter and adjoining sites, and beyond.</p> <p>To this end, the submitter opposes the noise provisions until their own expert can consider the rules in context of their operations and underlying resource consenting requirements, and potential for growth.</p>	
Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland (S516)	S516.077	Noise	NOISE-Table 2	Support	<p>There are two typographical errors in the vibration limits. All limits should be with units of mm/s. The number of blasts per year is erroneously stated as "all hours" and value of peak airblast sound limit is stated as "all" in two rows.</p>	<p>Amend NOISE-Table 2 as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend two instances so that all vibration limits are in units of mm/s • Amend the number of blasts and peak airblast sound limit to delete and replace entries of "all hours" and "all" respectively.
Far North District Council (S368)	S368.012	Signs	SIGN-O1	Support in part	<p>Minor redrafting is required as it is appropriate to include the defined term 'historic heritage'</p>	<p>Amend SIGN- O1 Signs are consistent with the natural character, amenity, and cultural and heritage values of the zone, historic heritage and the receiving environment.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (S356)	S356.112	Signs	SIGN-O2	Support	not stated	Retain SIGN-O2 as notified
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S416)	S416.042	Signs	SIGN-O2	Support in part	The objective requires amendment to make it clear that some signs are broadly acceptable where designed to avoid impacts on the safe operation of transport networks.	Amend Objective Sign -02 as follows: Enable s Signs that promote health and safety and do not adversely affect infrastructure, particularly the transport network.
Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust (S273)	S273.001	Signs	SIGN-P1	Support in part	The proliferation of signs can generate visual clutter, adverse effects on visual amenity and adverse effects on the character of both urban and rural areas. Signs may also cause distraction for drivers or other safety issues. Support, in principle, firm PDP controls relating to sign area, height, design, setbacks and number of signs permitted, and rules to restrict third party advertising signs. Aspects of the signage provisions need to be strengthened.	Amend and replace the term 'across a range of zones' to 'in appropriate locations only'.
Far North District Council (S368)	S368.013	Signs	SIGN-P1	Support in part	Minor redrafting is required as it is appropriate to include the defined term 'historic heritage'. Consequential change is required to a. to retain cultural values.	Amend SIGN-P1 Allow the use of signs of a scale, size and intensity across a range of zones while avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse effects on: a. character, and amenity and cultural values; b. cultural and heritage values historic heritage ; c. the legibility and function of a place; and d. the safety and efficiency of the transport network.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S416)	S416.043	Signs	SIGN-P1	Support	KiwiRail supports this policy which addresses adverse effects on the operation of transport networks.	Retain Policy SIGN-P1
Kapiro Conservation Trust (S447)	S447.001	Signs	SIGN-P1	Support in part	The phrase 'across a range of zones' is too broad.	Amend SIGN-P1 as follows: 'Allow the use of signs of a scale, size and intensity across a range of zones in appropriate locations only while avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse effects on...'
Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK) (S525)	S525.001	Signs	SIGN-P1	Support in part	The proliferation of signs can generate visual clutter, adverse effects on visual amenity and adverse effects on the character of both urban and rural areas. Signs may also cause distraction for drivers or other safety issues. Support, in principle, firm PDP controls relating to sign area, height, design, setbacks and number of signs permitted, and rules to restrict third party advertising signs. Aspects of the signage provisions need to be strengthened.	Amend and replace the term 'across a range of zones' to 'in appropriate locations only'
Carbon Neutral NZ Trust (S529)	S529.104	Signs	SIGN-P1	Support in part	The proliferation of signs can generate visual clutter, adverse effects on visual amenity and adverse effects on the character of both urban and rural areas. Signs may also cause distraction for drivers or other safety issues. Support, in principle, firm PDP controls relating to sign area, height, design, setbacks and number of signs permitted, and rules to restrict third party advertising signs. Aspects of the signage provisions need to be strengthened.	Amend and replace the term 'across a range of zones' to 'in appropriate locations only'.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport	S356.113	Signs	SIGN-P3	Support	not stated	Retain SIGN-P3 as notified

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Agency (S356)						
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S416)	S416.044	Signs	SIGN-P3	Support in part	KiwiRail seeks that signage within level crossing sightlines is appropriately and carefully managed to avoid safety issues arising at level crossings.	Amend point c. of Policy SIGN-P3 as follows: c. any obstruction caused by signs projecting over the road boundary or within level crossing sightlines
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S416)	S416.045	Signs	SIGN-P4	Support	KiwiRail support the recognition of the need for appropriate wayfaring and safety signs.	Retain Policy SIGN-P4
Northland Fish and Game Council (S436)	S436.029	Signs	Rules	Not Stated	Fish and Game has a statutory role to maintain and enhance access to sports fisheries and game bird hunting areas. Accordingly, Fish and Game erects interpretative signage at access points to sports fisheries and game bird hunting areas. The construction, maintenance, use and removal of these signs is a fundamental aspect of managing game bird shooting and sports fish angling activities in New Zealand and are important functions of NFGC. Such signs are accepted around much of New Zealand as a permitted activity. Fish and Game signs would in some instances be covered by the definition of 'official sign' and therefore subject to the conditions set out in several rules throughout the plan. However, there are some instances in which NFGC may need to breach these rules, for example in the case of in the Rural Zone, by erecting more the one sign on a site, or on a road frontage.	Insert a rule/s to allow for all signs erected by the Northland Fish and Game Council to be a permitted activity, notwithstanding that they may not be located on the site where the angling/hunting activity to which the sign relates is occurring
Bunnings Limited (S371)	S371.010	Signs	Note	Oppose	It is unclear how the Signs chapter interacts with Part 3 - Area Specific Matters. Note 1: indicates that this part of the plan applies but doesn't provide direction in terms of what section takes precedence. This is critical given that signs are captured as structures, and the zones and the	Amend Note 1 to clarify which performance standards take precedent when there is overlap between those in the signs chapter and the zones

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					Signs chapter include performance standards for structure height.	
McDonalds Restaurants NZ Limited (S385)	S385.010	Signs	Note	Oppose	It is unclear how this chapter interacts with Part 3 - Area Specific Matters. Note 1: indicates that this part of the plan applies but doesn't provide direction in terms of what section takes precedence. This is critical given that signs are captured as structures, and the zones and the Signs chapter include performance standards for structure height.	Amend Note 1 to clarify which performance standards take precedent when there is overlap between those in the signs chapter and the zones.
John Andrew Riddell (S431)	S431.116	Signs	SIGN-R2	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.
Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust (S273)	S273.002	Signs	SIGN-R3	Support in part	Temporary signs should be limited at a given site so that we avoid the adverse effects of the accumulation of signage. Consideration should be had to remove the rules for temporary and community signs from the District Plan and instead have a separate bylaw for them.	Amend SIGN-R3 to reduce the duration of a temporary sign to 8 weeks prior to the event and taken down one week of the event ending. Consider removing the rules for temporary and community signs from the District Plan and instead have a separate bylaw for them.
John Andrew Riddell (S431)	S431.117	Signs	SIGN-R3	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.
Kapiro Conservation Trust (S447)	S447.002	Signs	SIGN-R3	Oppose	The use of a separate bylaw for temporary signage would allow for a booking system for people to book a spot for their sign at sites approved by Council or a Community Group. This would ensure that community events could still be marketed but in a controlled way that meets amenity value.	Delete rules for temporary and community signs from the PDP and instead control the activity through a separate bylaw.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Kapiro Conservation Trust (S447)	S447.003	Signs	SIGN-R3	Support in part	Temporary signs should be limited at a given site so that we avoid the adverse effects of the accumulation of signage. We see the proliferation of signs for events on main arterial roads, accumulating near virtually all roundabouts and every main corner. These may cause distraction for drivers or other safety issues. The proposed amendment will ensure adequate control of the proliferation of signs is mitigated.	Amend PER-4 to reduce the duration of a temporary sign being erected to 8 weeks prior to the event and to one week after the event ending.
Waitangi Limited (S503)	S503.046	Signs	SIGN-R3	Not Stated	Relief is being sought to allow an exception for the Waitangi Estate due to the nature of activities which occur on the property. Under this rule, it is highly likely that any temporary event will require consent due to the maximum area of signs being exceeded. It is considered that due to the nature of these events and the fact that they are temporary, any signs will not have an adverse effect on the surrounding environment.	Amend point 2 of PER-2 of Rule SIGN-R3 as follows: SIGN-S1 Maximum area with the exception of the Waitangi Estate We are also happy if this exemption is included within Sign-S1.
Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK) (S525)	S525.002	Signs	SIGN-R3	Support in part	Temporary signs should be limited at a given site so that we avoid the adverse effects of the accumulation of signage. Consideration should be had to remove the rules for temporary and community signs from the District Plan and instead have a separate bylaw for them.	Amend SIGN-R3 to reduce the duration of a temporary sign to 8 weeks prior to the event and taken down one week of the event ending. Consider removing the rules for temporary and community signs from the District Plan and instead have a separate bylaw for them.
Carbon Neutral NZ Trust (S529)	S529.105	Signs	SIGN-R3	Support in part	Temporary signs should be limited at a given site so that we avoid the adverse effects of the accumulation of signage. Consideration should be had to remove the rules for temporary and community signs from the District Plan and instead have a separate bylaw for them.	Amend SIGN-R3 to reduce the duration of a temporary sign to 8 weeks prior to the event and taken down one week of the event ending. Consider removing the rules for temporary and community signs from the District Plan and instead have a separate bylaw for them.
John Andrew Riddell (S431)	S431.118	Signs	SIGN-R4	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

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						from the coastal marine area, or from rivers and banks is a non-complying activity.
Foodstuffs North Island Limited (S363)	S363.015	Signs	SIGN-R5	Not Stated	The submitter considers that rule SIGN-R5 Freestanding signs, could potentially fall into multiple rules in the absence of clear definitions.	Amend rule SIGN-R5 Freestanding signs, to manage signs, utilising standards to clearly articulate types of signs with specified limits. Or Insert definition for free standing signs.
Bunnings Limited (S371)	S371.011	Signs	SIGN-R5	Support in part	Rule SIGN-R5 refers to free standing, double sided and V-shaped signs. There are no definitions to clarify what these signs are. Bunnings consider that signs could potentially fall into multiple rules in the absence of clear definitions	Amend Rule SIGN-R5 to manage signs, utilising standards to clearly articulate types of signs with specified limits OR alternatively insert definitions for free standing, double sided and V-shaped signs.
McDonalds Restaurants NZ Limited (S385)	S385.011	Signs	SIGN-R5	Support in part	Rules SIGN-R5 and SIGN-R6 refer to free standing, double sided and V-shaped signs. There are no definitions to clarify what these signs are. McDonald's consider that signs could potentially fall into multiple rules in the absence of clear definitions	Amend SIGN-R5 to manage signs, utilising standards to clearly articulate types of signs with specified limits. Or alternatively insert definitions for free standing, double sided and V-shaped signs
Foodstuffs North Island Limited (S363)	S363.016	Signs	SIGN-R6	Not Stated	The submitter considers that rule SIGN-R6 Double-sided and V-shaped signs, that double-sided and V-shaped signs could potentially fall into multiple rules in the absence of clear definitions.	Amend rule SIGN-R6 Double-sided and V-shaped signs, to manage signs, utilising standards to clearly articulate types of signs with specified limits. Or Insert definition for Double-sided and V-shaped signs.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Far North District Council (S368)	S368.043	Signs	SIGN-R6	Support in part	Incorrect numbering of permitted rules	Amend SIGN-R6 PER-3 PER-1 The sign complies with standards: SIGN-S1 Maximum area; SIGN-S2 Maximum height; SIGN-S3 Maximum number; SIGN-S4 Traffic safety; and SIGN-S5 Sign design and content.
Bunnings Limited (S371)	S371.012	Signs	SIGN-R6	Support in part	Rule SIGN-R6 refers to free standing, double sided and V-shaped signs. There are no definitions to clarify what these signs are. Bunnings consider that signs could potentially fall into multiple rules in the absence of clear definitions	Amend Rule SIGN-R6 to manage signs, utilising standards to clearly articulate types of signs with specified limits OR alternatively insert definitions for free standing, double sided and V-shaped signs.
McDonalds Restaurants NZ Limited (S385)	S385.012	Signs	SIGN-R6	Support in part	Rules SIGN-R5 and SIGN-R6 refer to free standing, double sided and V-shaped signs. There are no definitions to clarify what these signs are. McDonald's consider that signs could potentially fall into multiple rules in the absence of clear definitions.	Amend SIGN-R6 to manage signs, utilising standards to clearly articulate types of signs with specified limits. Or alternatively insert definitions for free standing, double sided and V-shaped signs
Foodstuffs North Island Limited (S363)	S363.017	Signs	SIGN-R7	Not Stated	The submitter considers that rule SIGN-R7 Signs on or attached to a building, window, fence or wall (excluding a scheduled heritage resource), where signage is directly related to the use of that building or comprises branding it should be exempt from the maximum area (SIGN-S) and maximum number (SIGN - S1) standards. Foodstuffs also notes that PER-1 and PER-3 SIGN - S2 are a double up and considers it unnecessary to specify 'window' or 'wall' which are	Amend rule SIGN - R7 Signs on or attached to a building, window, fence or wall (excluding a scheduled heritage resource), as follows (or to similar effect): Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The sign does not protrude above the highest

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>parts of buildings. Accordingly Foodstuffs seeks the following amendments to SIGN-R7 and suggest that a separate rule be include to address signage on fences.</p>	<p>point of the building or structure.</p> <p>PER-2</p> <p>The sign complies with standards: SIGN-S1 Maximum area; SIGN-S2 Maximum height; SIGN-S3 Maximum number; SIGN-S4 Traffic safety; and SIGN-S5 Sign design and content.</p> <p>PER-3</p> <p>The sign is not for third party advertising, and is directly related to a permitted activity undertaken within the building or Include additional rule for fences R7</p>
<p>Bunnings Limited (S371)</p>	<p>S371.014</p>	<p>Signs</p>	<p>SIGN-R7</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>Bunnings considers that where signage is attached to a building, and the signage is directly related to the use of that building/comprises branding it should be exempt from the maximum area (SIGN-S) and maximum number (SIGN - S1) standards. Bunnings also notes that PER-1 and PER-3 SIGN</p>	<p>Amend Rule SIGN-R7 as follows: Signs on or attached to a building, window, fence or wall (excluding a scheduled heritage resource Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The sign does not protrude above the highest</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>- S2 are a double up and considers it unnecessary to specify 'window' or 'wall' which are parts of buildings. Accordingly Bunnings seeks the following amendments to Rule SIGN-R7 and suggest that a separate rule be include to address signage on fences.</p>	<p>point of the building or structure. PER-2 The sign complies with standards:SIGN-S1 Maximum area; SIGN-S2 Maximum height; SIGN-S3 Maximum number; SIGN-S4 Traffic safety; and SIGN-S5 Sign design and content. PER-3 The sign is not for third party advertising, and is directly related to a permitted activity undertaken within the building Include additional rule for fences - PER-4</p>
<p>McDonalds Restaurants NZ Limited (S385)</p>	<p>S385.013</p>	<p>Signs</p>	<p>SIGN-R7</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>McDonald's considers that where signage is attached to a building in the Mixed Use Zone, and the signage is directly related to the use of that building/comprises branding it should be exempt from the maximum area (SIGN-S) and maximum number (SIGN - S1) standards. McDonald's also notes that PER-1 and PER-3 SIGN - S2 are a double up and considers it unnecessary to specify 'window' or 'wall' which are parts of buildings. Accordingly, McDonald's seek the following amendments to SIGN-R7 and suggest that a separate rule be include to address signage on fences.</p>	<p>Amend SIGN - R7 as follows (or to same effect): Signs on or attached to a building, window, fence or wall (excluding a scheduled heritage resource Activity status: Permitted Where:PER-1The sign does not protrude above the highest point of the building or structure.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>PER-2 The sign complies with standards:SIGN-S1 Maximum area; SIGN-S2 Maximum height;SIGN-S3 Maximum number; SIGN-S4 Traffic safety; and SIGN-S5 Sign design and content.</p> <p>PER-3 The sign is not for third party advertising,and is directly related to a permitted activity undertaken within the building or Include additional rule for fences R7</p>
<p>Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited (S502)</p>	<p>S502.076</p>	<p>Signs</p>	<p>SIGN-R8</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>The Operative Plan excluded signs which were not visible from a public place within the signage definition. Signage is necessary on some sites to direct visitors, to inform of upcoming events, and for general information purposes about the site. Maximum signage area is quite limited in most zones. In some cases you may not be able to see a sign from any public places such that the effect of placing a sign on a particular site would be negligible on the wider environment. In this particular case the exemptions are considered acceptable.</p>	<p>Amend SIGN-R8 PER-1 PER-1 The sign complies with standards: SIGN-S1 Maximum area with the exception of signs where they are not visible from a public viewing place; SIGN-S2 Maximum height; SIGN-S3 Maximum number with the exception of signs where they are not visible from a public viewing place; SIGN-S4 Traffic safety; and SIGN-S5 Sign design and</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						content. or amend to include the exemption within SIGN-S1 and SIGN-S2 as an alternative
Waitangi Limited (S503)	S503.047	Signs	SIGN-R8	Not Stated	We have assumed that any overlay includes the coastal environment and all other overlays which apply to the Waitangi Treaty Grounds. Signage is necessary on this site to direct visitors, to inform of upcoming events, and for general information purposes about the site, about the buildings, vegetation or animals present. Given all the overlays the maximum sign area is very limited. The current amount of signage on site is high with many various signage needs. Given that in most cases you would be unable to see any signs from any public places the effect of placing a sign would be negligible on the wider environment. As such the above-mentioned exemptions are considered acceptable.	Amend SIGN-S1 and SIGN-S3 reference in PER-1 of Rule SIGN-R8 as follows: The sign complies with standards: SIGN-S1 Maximum area with the exception of the Waitangi Estate where signs are not visible from a public viewing place; SIGN-S3 Maximum number with the exception of the Waitangi Estate where signs are not visible from a public viewing place; We are also happy if this exemption is included within Sign-S1 and Sign-S3
Far North District Council (S368)	S368.014	Signs	SIGN-R10	Support in part	Rule needs to be reworded on the basis of a tiered heritage framework. The intention is not to apply to the rule to the entire area	Amend SIGN-R10 Signs in the Kororareka Russell - Part A-D and Kerikeri Heritage Areas - Part A
Puketona Business Park Limited (S45)	S45.022	Signs	SIGN-R11	Not Stated	Digital signs can be accommodated as permitted, or worst-case, restricted discretionary activities, in the Light Industrial zone.	Amend Rule Sign-R11 to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> provide a definition of digital signs, and

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> provide for digital signs as a permitted, or worst-case, restricted discretionary activity, particularly in the Light Industrial zone.
Waitoto Development Limited (S263)	S263.031	Signs	SIGN-R12	Support	The submitter considers that rule SIGN-R12 reflects the existing operative district plan and original approved development plan.	Retain rule SIGN-R12.
Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust (S273)	S273.003	Signs	SIGN-R15	Oppose	Mixed Use Zones should not be able to have third party signs erected at their premises. If a building has multiple tenants, then those businesses would not be deemed third party and could erect their signs, ensuring compliance with the standards.	Not stated (Delete SIGN-R15 and amend SIGN-R18 to include all zones inferred)
Kapiro Conservation Trust (S447)	S447.004	Signs	SIGN-R15	Oppose	Mixed Use Zones should not be able to have third party signs erected at their premises. If a building has multiple tenants, then those businesses would not be deemed third party and could erect their signs, ensuring compliance with the standards.	Delete SIGN-R15 (inferred).
Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK) (S525)	S525.003	Signs	SIGN-R15	Oppose	Mixed Use Zones should not be able to have third party signs erected at their premises. If a building has multiple tenants, then those businesses would not be deemed third party and could erect their signs, ensuring compliance with the standards.	Not stated (Delete SIGN-R15 and amend SIGN-R18 to include all zones inferred)
Carbon Neutral NZ Trust (S529)	S529.106	Signs	SIGN-R15	Oppose	Mixed Use Zones should not be able to have third party signs erected at their premises. If a building has multiple tenants, then those businesses would not be deemed third party and could erect their signs, ensuring compliance with the standards.	Delete SIGN-R15 and amend SIGN-R18 to include all zones (inferred)
Puketona Business Park Limited (S45)	S45.021	Signs	SIGN-R17	Not Stated	Rule SIGN-R17 suggests digital signs anywhere other than in the Mixed Use zone require non-complying activity consent, noting that digital signs are not defined by the PDP as notified. This might inadvertently capture signs with LED illumination, which are increasingly more common, and wholly acceptable within zones other than the Mixed Use zone	Amend SIGN-R17 to provide a definition of digital signs, i.e. they should not include signs with LED illumination.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust (S273)	S273.004	Signs	SIGN-R18	Support in part	This rule should apply in all zones to ensure that such signage is properly controlled.	Amend SIGN-R18 to include all zones
Kapiro Conservation Trust (S447)	S447.005	Signs	SIGN-R18	Support in part	Mixed Use Zones should not be able to have third party signs erected at their premises. If a building has multiple tenants, then those businesses would not be deemed third party and could erect their signs, ensuring compliance with the standards.	Amend SIGN-R18 to apply to all zones.
Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK) (S525)	S525.004	Signs	SIGN-R18	Support in part	This rule should apply in all zones to ensure that such signage is properly controlled.	Amend SIGN-R18 to include all zones
Carbon Neutral NZ Trust (S529)	S529.107	Signs	SIGN-R18	Support in part	This rule should apply in all zones to ensure that such signage is properly controlled.	Amend SIGN-R18 to include all zones
Horticulture New Zealand (S159)	S159.093	Signs	SIGN-S1	Support	Same or similar to operative plan	Retain Standard SIGN-S1
Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust (S273)	S273.006	Signs	SIGN-S1	Support in part	The proposed sign size/area is too large for signs in the Mixed-Use Zone. The standard for Orongo Bay sets a total maximum sign area (cumulative size/area). This approach should be applied to specific roads, roundabouts and precincts where signage is a problem.	Amend SIGN-S1 to reduce sign size/area in the Mixed Use zone.
McDonalds Restaurants NZ Limited (S385)	S385.014	Signs	SIGN-S1	Support in part	In regards to the Mixed Use Zone, the maximum total sign area is considered overly restrictive for a commercial setting. McDonalds seeks that this be increased for signage that is associated with the activity being undertaken on the site to better accommodate commercial activities.	Amend SIGN - S1 to enable increased areas of signage in the Mixed Use Zone.
Kapiro Conservation Trust (S447)	S447.009	Signs	SIGN-S1	Support in part	We support, in principle, firm PDP controls relating to sign area, height, design, setbacks and number of signs permitted. However, aspects of the signage provisions need to be strengthened.	Amend SIGN-S1 to include any other sign or freestanding sign.
Kapiro Conservation Trust (S447)	S447.013	Signs	SIGN-S1	Support in part	The proposed sign size/area is too large for signs in the Mixed-Use Zone.	Amend SIGN-S1 to reduce the total maximum sign area for the Mixed Use Zone, Light Industrial

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						Zone and Heavy Industrial Zone to align with other districts which restrict signage to between 3m ² and 5m ² for building frontage of less than 25m, then between 7% and 12% of building frontage greater than 25m (inferred).
Kapiro Conservation Trust (S447)	S447.014	Signs	SIGN-S1	Support in part	The proliferation of signs can generate visual clutter, adverse effects on visual amenity and adverse effects on the character of both urban and rural areas. Signs may also cause distraction for drivers or other safety issues.	Amend SIGN-S1 to set a total maximum sign area (cumulative size/area) for signs on specific roads, roundabouts and precincts where signage is a problem to follow the approach taken for the Orongo Bay standard.
Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited (S502)	S502.077	Signs	SIGN-S1	Support in part	Under the Operative Plan, Directional and Health and Safety signs are excluded from the maximum area per site thresholds and an allowance is provided for a maximum area per such signs of 1m ² . We seek to align these with real estate and development signs which are also of a temporary nature. Directional and Health and Safety Signs are necessary to ensure the safety of the public.	Amend SIGN-S1 All Zones 1. Any temporary sign (excluding real estate, and development, Directional and Health and Safety) or community sign must not exceed 2m ² in the area but may be double-sided. w Where a sign is double-sided, the maximum area of the sign is calculated as the area of one side of the sign; and 2. Any real estate, and development, Directional and Health and Safety sign must not exceed 1.5m ² in area.
Waitangi Limited (S503)	S503.048	Signs	SIGN-S1	Not Stated	Under the Operative Plan, Directional and Health and Safety signs are excluded from the maximum area per site thresholds and an allowance is provided for a maximum area per such signs of	Amend the provisions in Standard SIGN-S1 as relates to all zones as follows:

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					1m ² . We seek to align these with real estate and development signs which are also of a temporary nature. Directional and Health and Safety Signs are necessary to ensure the safety of the public.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Any temporary sign (excluding real estate, and development, Directional and Health and Safety) or community sign must not exceed 2m² in the area but may be double-sided. Where a sign is double-sided, the maximum area of the sign is calculated as the area of one side of the sign; and Any real estate, and development, Directional and Health and Safety sign must not exceed 1.5m² in area. <p>In the event this relief is not accepted, we would also be satisfied in having this change apply to the Waitangi Estate specifically.</p>
Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK) (S525)	S525.006	Signs	SIGN-S1	Support in part	The proposed sign size/area is too large for signs in the Mixed-Use Zone. The standard for Orongo Bay sets a total maximum sign area (cumulative size/area). This approach should be applied to specific roads, roundabouts and precincts where signage is a problem.	Amend SIGN-S1 to reduce sign size/area in the Mixed Use zone
Carbon Neutral NZ Trust (S529)	S529.109	Signs	SIGN-S1	Support in part	The proposed sign size/area is too large for signs in the Mixed-Use Zone. The standard for Orongo Bay sets a total	Amend SIGN-S1 to reduce sign size/area in the Mixed Use zone.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					maximum sign area (cumulative size/area). This approach should be applied to specific roads, roundabouts and precincts where signage is a problem.	
Bunnings Limited (S371)	S371.015	Signs	SIGN-S2	Support in part	In regard to the Light Industrial zone, the height limited for free standing signs is not appropriate. In general, free-standing signs, such as pylon signs are intended to be higher than the building to provide wayfinding assistance and be visible from a distance. Accordingly, Bunnings seek the following amendment to provide flexibility noting that in the Light Industrial Zone buildings and structures are permitted up to 12m in height.	Amend Standard SIGN-S2 as follows: 1.Freestanding signs must not exceed the height of the building 12m in height ; 2.Signs attached to a building must not protrude above the highest point of the building
McDonalds Restaurants NZ Limited (S385)	S385.015	Signs	SIGN-S2	Support in part	In regard to the Mixed Use Zone, the height limited for free standing signs is not appropriate. In general, free-standing signs, intended to be higher than the building to provide wayfinding assistance and be visible from a distance. Accordingly, McDonald's seek the following amendment to provide flexibility noting that in the Mixed Use Zone buildings and structures are permitted up to 12m in height.	Amend SIGN - S2 as follows (or to same effect) : 1.Freestanding signs must not exceed the height of the building 12m in height ; 2.Signs attached to a building must not protrude above the highest point of the building
Kapiro Conservation Trust (S447)	S447.010	Signs	SIGN-S2	Support in part	We support, in principle, firm PDP controls relating to sign area, height, design, setbacks and number of signs permitted. However, aspects of the signage provisions need to be strengthened.	Amend SIGN-S2 to include any other sign or freestanding sign.
Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust (S273)	S273.005	Signs	SIGN-S3	Support in part	Five signs per site will lead to visual clutter when multiple sites have up to 5 signs each, especially in the Mixed use zone. On sites that have more than 2 signs, the signs should be consolidated onto one hoarding to reduce visual clutter.	Amend SIGN-S3 to reduce sign clutter
Kapiro Conservation Trust (S447)	S447.006	Signs	SIGN-S3	Support in part	Five signs per site will lead to visual clutter when multiple sites have up to 5 signs each, especially in the Mixed use zone.	Amend SIGN-S3 to reduce the number of signs from 5 in the Mixed Use zone, Light Industrial zone, Heavy Industrial zone, Hospital zone , Ngawha Innovation and Enterprise Park

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						zone and Airport zone (inferred).
Kapiro Conservation Trust (S447)	S447.007	Signs	SIGN-S3	Support in part	Consolidated signs are usually easier for drivers and the public to read/understand. Consolidated signs are commonly used at shopping malls and industrial estates, for example. The proposed amendments will also reduce visual clutter.	Amend SIGN-S3 to require signs to be consolidated onto one hoarding on sites that have more than 2 signs.
Kapiro Conservation Trust (S447)	S447.008	Signs	SIGN-S3	Support in part	We support, in principle, firm PDP controls relating to sign area, height, design, setbacks and number of signs permitted. However, aspects of the signage provisions need to be strengthened.	Amend SIGN-S3 to include any other sign or freestanding sign.
Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited (S502)	S502.078	Signs	SIGN-S3	Support in part	Under the Operative Plan, Directional and Health and Safety signs are excluded from maximum number of signs per site thresholds. These signs are considered necessary to ensure the safety of the public. On larger sites especially, more than one sign is necessary to convey important messages to the wider public.	Amend SIGN-S3 There shall be no more than one temporary sign (excluding real estate, and development, Directional and Health and Safety) per site.
Waitangi Limited (S503)	S503.049	Signs	SIGN-S3	Not Stated	Under the Operative Plan, Directional and Health and Safety signs are excluded from maximum number of signs per site thresholds. These signs are considered necessary to ensure the safety of the public. On larger sites especially, more than one sign is necessary to convey important messages to the wider public.	Amend the provisions in Standard SIGN-S3 as relates to all zones as follows: There shall be no more than one temporary sign (excluding real estate, and development, Directional and Health and Safety) per site. In the event this relief is not accepted, we would also be satisfied in having this change apply to the Waitangi Estate specifically.
Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and	S525.005	Signs	SIGN-S3	Support in part	Five signs per site will lead to visual clutter when multiple sites have up to 5 signs each, especially in the Mixed use zone. On sites that have more than 2 signs, the signs	Amend SIGN-S3 to require consolidation into one hoarding if more than 2 signs to reduce sign clutter

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Environs, VKK) (S525)					should be consolidated onto one hoarding to reduce visual clutter.	
Carbon Neutral NZ Trust (S529)	S529.108	Signs	SIGN-S3	Support in part	Five signs per site will lead to visual clutter when multiple sites have up to 5 signs each, especially in the Mixed use zone. On sites that have more than 2 signs, the signs should be consolidated onto one hoarding to reduce visual clutter.	Amend SIGN-S3 to reduce sign clutter
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (S356)	S356.114	Signs	SIGN-S4	Support in part	Amend to include all signs, not just freestanding as all signs have the potential to cause driver distraction and other safety issues to users of the state highway network, not just free standing signs. Also amend to include signs directed at state highway traffic to obtain written approval from the New Zealand Transport Agency.	Amend as follows: 1. All freestanding signs directed at drivers on the visible from State highways must be: a. erected at a right angle to the road; and b. comply with the New Zealand Transport Agency Planning Policy Manual and Signs on State Highways Bylaw 2010; c. Receive written approval from the New Zealand Transport Agency.
Kapiro Conservation Trust (S447)	S447.011	Signs	SIGN-S5	Support in part	We support, in principle, firm PDP controls relating to sign area, height, design, setbacks and number of signs permitted. However, aspects of the signage provisions need to be strengthened.	Amend SIGN-S5 to include any other sign or freestanding sign.
Kapiro Conservation Trust (S447)	S447.012	Signs	SIGN-S6	Support in part	We support, in principle, firm PDP controls relating to sign area, height, design, setbacks and number of signs permitted. However, aspects of the signage provisions need to be strengthened.	Amend SIGN-S6 to include any other sign or freestanding sign.
Far North District Council (S368)	S368.008	Signs	SIGN-Table 1	Support in part	Recommend a small amendment to SIGN-Table 1 to improve clarity for plan users.	Amend SIGN -Table 1 Regulatory speed limit of adjoining road , Main message Property name

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						Main message, Secondary message, Km/hr, Minimum lettering height (mm), Minimum lettering height (mm), Minimum lettering height (mm), 0-50, 100, 150, 75, 51-70, 150, 500, 100, 71-80, 175, 250, 125, 81-100, 200, 300, 150
Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand (S421)	S421.200	Genetically modified organisms	Overview	Support	Federated Farmers supports the use of the precautionary approach and the use of adaptive responses which has been adopted by the Council in terms of the use of genetically modified organisms.	Retain the precautionary approach and the use of adaptive response
GE Free Tai Tokerau (S433)	S433.001	Genetically modified organisms	Overview	Support	This excellent FNDC GE/GMO policy reflects Far North Districts farmer/primary producer and other ratepayer/residents wishes and aspirations, sets council policy direction, helps protect our existing valuable GE/GMO free status, as well as financial/budgetary requirements.	Retain the precautionary and prohibitive GE/GMO provisions/policies/rules in the operative FNDC District Plan (as a result of successful GE/GMO plan change #18, undertaken in a fiscally responsible collaborative process with Whangarei District Council - WDC PC #131) being placed in the new Far North District Plan.
GE Free Tai Tokerau (S433)	S433.003	Genetically modified organisms	Overview	Oppose	We stress that gene edited organisms (CRISPR controversial technique) are genetically modified organisms under NZ law and as ruled by the highest court in the EU. Gene edited organisms have been shown (various independent reports and peer reviewed scientific papers to have unexpected/unforeseen, off target adverse effects (undesirable traits manifesting in the organism)) and should not be allowed in Far North District or the wider region.	Amend to note that controversial and risky gene edited organism (CRISPR technique) are GMOs.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
GE Free Tai Tokerau (S433)	S433.004	Genetically modified organisms	Overview	Oppose	While we strongly support robust protection of native flora and fauna, use of such risky new genetic technologies on our public conservation lands (or elsewhere) would be counter productive and potentially create far more serious problems than it solves.	Amend to oppose any outdoor use of risky and controversial gene edited organisms (CRISPR) or "gene drive" (a sterility technique that presents grave risks to NZ's biosecurity, indigenous biodiversity, and wider environment).
Rolf Mueller-Glodde (S462)	S462.001	Genetically modified organisms	Overview	Support in part	I fully support the status quo of the chapter on Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs) as the most appropriate way to manage the issue with changes only relating to the structure, layout and minor amendment to rule language, to align with the new format of the other chapters.	Retain the chapter (Genetically Modified Organisms Chapter) as proposed.
Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand (S421)	S421.201	Genetically modified organisms	GMO-O1	Support	Federated Farmers supports the use of the precautionary approach and the use of adaptive responses which has been adopted by the Council in terms of the use of genetically modified organisms.	Retain the precautionary approach outlined in Objective GMO-O1
Ngati Rangī ki Ngāwha Hapu (S304)	S304.001	Genetically modified organisms	GMO-P1	Support in part	As reiterated in Ngati Rangī Policy regarding Genetic Engineering and Genetically Modified Organisms: 3.4.1 The Ngāti Rangī rohe will remain free of G.E. and G.M.O. This includes but is not limited to: a. animal and plant gene manipulation; b. any G.E. field trials, and c. any food containing anything from a G.E and G.M.O origin. Furthermore then reiterated in Ngati Rangī Rules regarding Genetic engineering and Genetically Modified Organisms: 3.4.1.1 Genetic engineering is prohibited within the Ngāti Rangī rohe, including any animal or plant gene manipulation. This will include any introduction of G.E. species.	Amend to ensure consistency with Ngati Rangī Policy regarding Genetic Engineering and Genetically Modified Organisms (3.4.1): The Ngāti Rangī rohe will remain free of G.E. and G.M.O. This includes but is not limited to: a. animal and plant gene manipulation; b. any G.E. field trials, and c. any food containing anything from a G.E and G.M.O origin.
Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand (S421)	S421.202	Genetically modified organisms	GMO-P1	Support	Federated Farmers supports the use of the precautionary approach and the use of adaptive responses which has been adopted by the Council in terms of the use of genetically modified organisms.	Retain the precautionary approach outlined in Policy GMO-P1

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Ngati Rangi ki Ngawha (S515)	S515.006	Genetically modified organisms	GMO-P1	Support in part	<p>As reiterated in Ngati Rangi Policy regarding Genetic Engineering and Genetically Modified Organisms:</p> <p>3.4.1 The Ngāti Rangi rohe will remain free of G.E. and G.M.O. This includes but is not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. animal and plant gene manipulation; b. any G.E. field trials, and c. any food containing anything from a G.E and G.M.O origin. <p>Furthermore then reiterated in Ngati Rangi Rules regarding Genetic engineering and Genetically Modified Organisms:</p> <p>3.4.1.1 Genetic engineering is prohibited within the Ngāti Rangi rohe, including any animal or plant gene manipulation. This will include any introduction of G.E. species.</p>	Amend to ensure consistency with Ngati Rangi Policy regarding Genetic Engineering and Genetically Modified Organisms (3.4.1): The Ngāti Rangi rohe will remain free of G.E. and G.M.O. This includes but is not limited to:
Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand (S421)	S421.203	Genetically modified organisms	Rules	Support	<p>Federated Farmers is not supportive of Councils dealing with genetically modified organisms through a restrictive process. The Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) has been tasked with the control and management of genetically modified organisms. For Councils to then seek to restrict these organisms results in the doubling the consenting process and paperwork for a farmer as well as unnecessary duplication.</p> <p>The EPA controls the consent process which is strictly monitored and restricted to ensure that the trials are successful and do not cause damage to the environment and local communities.</p>	Delete the restrictions on the control and management of genetically modified organisms and replace with reference to the processes and controls imposed by the EPA
New Zealand Defence Force (S217)	S217.003	Temporary activities	TA-O1	Support	It is appropriate to recognise the benefits of temporary activities, including TMTA, which contribute to the wellbeing of the community.	Retain this Objective as drafted.
New Zealand Defence Force (S217)	S217.004	Temporary activities	TA-O2	Support	It is appropriate that temporary activities manage any on-site or off-site adverse effects.	Retain this Objective as drafted.
New Zealand Defence Force (S217)	S217.005	Temporary activities	TA-P1	Support	<p>It is important to recognise the social, economic and cultural benefits of TMTA.</p> <p>Being able to undertake TMTA across a wide range of locations is critical to ensuring that NZDF personnel are ready to respond to a military or civilian emergency or disaster, in New Zealand or overseas.</p>	Retain this Policy as drafted.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
New Zealand Defence Force (S217)	S217.006	Temporary activities	TA-P2	Support	It is appropriate that the actual and potential effects from temporary activities are managed, including that they do not result in permanent adverse effects on the environment.	Retain this Policy as drafted.
New Zealand Defence Force (S217)	S217.007	Temporary activities	Notes	Support	The explanatory note is helpful in ensuring consistent application of the TEMP Rules in relation to other chapters, including clarification that the rules in the temporary activities chapter take precedence over any rules in Part 3, with the exception of Designations.	Retain note as drafted.
Waiaua Bay Farm Limited (S463)	S463.086	Temporary activities	TA-R1	Support	WBF supports the permitted allowance for temporary activity events but suggests refinements to make the performance standards clearer.	Amend Rule TA-R1 as follows: TA-R1 Temporary activity (excluding any activity listed in the rules below as permitted or restricted discretionary) PER-1 The site is not used for more than two temporary activity events per calendar year, and each the event does not exceed two consecutive days. PER-2 The temporary activity does not occurs between outside the hours of 6.30am to 10.00pm on each day. PER-3 A maximum of 500 persons (excluding event staff) are hosted on the site each day. PER-4 Any accessory building or structure is removed within seven days of the temporary activity finishing. PER-5 The temporary activity complies with standards...

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Waitangi Limited (S503)	S503.050	Temporary activities	TA-R1	Not Stated	<p>In regards to PER-1 relief is sought to enable a larger number of events to be held per calendar year, due to the number of events which are held on the site already.</p> <p>For PER-2 the lead up to Waitangi Day can have activities occurring on site before 6am and finishing after 10pm. Waitangi Day celebrations themselves start in the very early morning. We seek to exclude compliance with the temporary events rule to celebrate our national day at the birthplace of our nation.</p> <p>Relief is also sought in regards to PER-3 for the Waitangi Day event held at the Waitangi Treaty Grounds. This is a non-ticketed event and therefore attendance is unknown. Restrictions on the number of persons is not considered relevant in this instance, especially considering there are additional controls within this rule which will ensure adverse effects are less than minor.</p>	<p>Amend Per-1, PER-2 and PER-3 of Rule TA-R1 as follows:</p> <p>PER-1 The site is not used for more than two temporary activity events per calendar year, and the event does not exceed two consecutive days excluding the Waitangi Estate where a maximum of five events are allowed on the Treaty Grounds per calendar year.</p> <p>PER-2 The activity occurs between 6.30am to 10.00pm on each day, with the exception of the Waitangi Estate within a week either side of Waitangi Day.</p> <p>PER-3 A maximum of 500 persons on the site each day excluding the Waitangi Day event held at the Waitangi Treaty Grounds.</p>
New Zealand Defence Force (S217)	S217.008	Temporary activities	TA-R2	Support in part	<p>It is appropriate to provide for TMTA as a permitted activity in the District-wide Matters Chapter, which applies across all zones in the Plan.</p> <p>TMTA are by their nature temporary and can vary in duration depending on the training being undertaken. It is also appropriate to exclude any set up and pack down activities from this duration limit.</p>	<p>Amend this performance standard PER-2 to state: The duration of the activity does not exceed a collective total of 31 calendar consecutive days per year on any site, excluding set-up and pack-down activities.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					NZDF requests a Controlled Activity status for TMTA that do not meet the Permitted Activity standards. NZDF considers that this activity status is appropriate where the effects are known, and should apply when any of the permitted activity standards are not met	Amend to Controlled Activity status for TMTA where the activity is not permitted, with matters of control limited to the matters of any infringed standard.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand (S512)	S512.038	Temporary activities	TA-R2	Support	Fire and Emergency support the permitted status for emergency services training as it enables Fire and Emergency to achieve its statutory function by facilitating firefighting and emergency response. Training may include live fire training (i.e. burning and putting out fires) and equipment training both at Fire and Emergency sites (see Table 1 for existing fire stations) and off site.	retain TA -R2
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S416)	S416.036	Temporary activities	TA-R3	Support in part	KiwiRail is concerned that the Plan appears to limit the establishment of temporary works sites which may be adjacent to transport or other infrastructure, but which may be required to be in place for some months to carry out the work are precluded under Rule TA-R3. For safety reasons it is not always possible to work from within a transport corridor. A discretionary status where a worksite is proposed adjacent to the corridor will not facilitate infrastructure works. Appropriate transport approvals (TA-S1) manage traffic effects.	Amend PER-1 of Rule TA-R3 (inferred) as follows: The temporary building or structure is located on the same or an adjacent site as the associated construction work or demolition.
John Andrew Riddell (S431)	S431.119	Temporary activities	TA-R3	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
Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited (S502)	S502.089	Temporary activities	TA-R3	Support in part	PER-2 wording has been amended to exclude 'or adjoins' the General Residential Zone. In most instances, the General Residential zone is adjoined by a larger Rural Zone. These large rural sites should not be restricted to temporary buildings or structures less than 30m2, due to the	Amend TA-R3 PER-2 PER-2 The maximum combined GFA of any temporary buildings or structure does not exceed 30m2 where the site is located within or

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					large nature of some of the projects as well as the need for temporary structures with a combined area of more than 30m2. PER-2 should provide control within the General Residential zone only.	adjoins the General Residential zone.
Ballance Agri-Nutrients Limited (S143)	S143.010	Temporary activities	TA-R5	Support in part	Ballance seeks to have agricultural aviation activities provided for under a new rule (NOISE-RX). It should be clear that TA-R5 does not apply to agricultural aviation.	Amend to unsure TA-R5 does not apply to agricultural aviation. as per new rule NOISE-RX Agricultural aviation activities
NZ Agricultural Aviation Association (S182)	S182.024	Temporary activities	TA-R5	Support in part	Seek to have agricultural activities for conservation activities provided for under a new rule. It should be clear that TA-R5 does not apply to agricultural aviation.	Insert a new rule NOISE-RXX Agricultural aviation activities
Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation) (S364)	S364.077	Temporary activities	TA-R5	Support	The Director-General supports Rule TA-R5.	Retain Rule TA-R5
Trustees of Jet#2 Trust (S383)	S383.001	Treaty settlement land overlay	Overview	Oppose	Refer to submission for detailed reasons for decision request which includes, but not limited to, the following: provisions and framework for the Treaty Settlement Lands Overlay potentially conflicts with objectives, risks creating sporadic use or development, and undermines a consistent approach; and exemptions for Treaty Settlement Lands require review to achieve a fair and consistent planning framework; preferable to adopt established planning concepts, such as Papakainga zones, settlement zones, special purpose zones, precincts.	Amend the provisions and planning framework in the PDP related to Treaty Settlement Lands Overlay, to address the concerns raised in the submission.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S561)	S561.055	Treaty settlement land overlay	Objectives	Support in part	The objectives set out the outcomes to be achieved for the Treaty Settlement Land overlay. Tikanga Māori (Māori customary practices) and mātauranga Māori (Māori knowledge) are integral to achieving the housing and development	Insert one additional objective that specifically includes providing for mana whenua to use and develop land that is consistent with tikanga Māori and mātauranga Māori, as

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					outcomes for mana whenua on Treaty Settlement Land. Kāinga Ora seek the addition of one objective to explicitly include tikanga Māori and mātauranga Māori.	<p>follows:TSL-O5 Tangata Whenua have maximum flexibility to occupy, develop and use Treaty Settlement Land, exercising their role as kaitiaki by:1. Incorporating mātauranga and tikanga Māori; and2. Ensuring the health, safety and wellbeing of people and communities is maintained.</p> <p>Amend to correct spelling in TSL-O3 Treaty Settlement Land returned as cultural redress provides for the on-going relationship tangata whenua has with their land.</p>
Te Aupōuri Commercial Development Ltd (S339)	S339.034	Treaty settlement land overlay	TSL-O1	Support	TACDL supports the intention of this objective	Retain Objective TSL-O1
Te Aupōuri Commercial Development Ltd (S339)	S339.035	Treaty settlement land overlay	TSL-O2	Support	TACDL supports the intention of this objective	Retain Objective TSL-O2
Te Runanga o Ngai Takoto Trust (S390)	S390.067	Treaty settlement land overlay	TSL-O2	Support	The submitter supports objective TSL-O2 but seeks to include environmental development as part of the objective.	Amend objective TSL-O2 to include and enable environmental development.
Te Rūnanga o Whaingaroa (S486)	S486.081	Treaty settlement land overlay	TSL-O2	Support	Te Rūnanga o Whaingaroa seeks to include environmental development as part of the objective to TSL-O2.	Amend Objective TSL-O2 to include and enable environmental development.
Te Rūnanga Ā Iwi O Ngapuhi (S498)	S498.068	Treaty settlement land overlay	TSL-O2	Support	The submitter supports objective TSL-O2 but seeks to include environmental development as part of the objective.	Amend objective TSL-O2 to include and enable environmental development.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Te Aupōuri Commercial Development Ltd (S339)	S339.036	Treaty settlement land overlay	TSL-O3	Support	TACDL supports the intention of this objective	Retain Objective TSL-O3
Far North District Council (S368)	S368.038	Treaty settlement land overlay	TSL-O3	Support in part	spelling error: Tangata	Amend TSL-O3 Treaty Settlement Land returned as cultural redress provides for the on-going relationship tangata tangata whenua has with their land
Te Aupōuri Commercial Development Ltd (S339)	S339.037	Treaty settlement land overlay	TSL-O4	Support	TACDL supports the intention of this objective	Retain Objective TSL-O4
Te Runanga o Ngai Takoto Trust (S390)	S390.068	Treaty settlement land overlay	TSL-O4	Oppose	The submitter opposes objective TSL-O4 as the term "sustainable carrying capacity" is uncertain and contestable. Interpretation could place additional constraints on development in this overlay. The amendment submitted is to make clear that the objective is to enable maximum development up to the sustainable carrying capacity of the land and surrounding environment. This is consistent with the enabling approach of related objectives. A separate submission seeks a definition for "sustainable carrying capacity." In the absence of a definition, the objective should be further clarified, by adding references to capacity criteria including the usable or developable area of a site, nature of the locality (urban, rural, coastal or overlay), access and infrastructure, and services available.	Amend objective TSL-O4 to read as follows: Use and development on Treaty Settlement Land can fully utilise reflects the sustainable carrying capacity of the land and surrounding environment'. AND Otherwise amend TSL-O4 to provide context and clarity.
Te Rūnanga o Whaingaroa (S486)	S486.082	Treaty settlement land overlay	TSL-O4	Oppose	The term "sustainable carrying capacity" is uncertain and contestable. Interpretation could place additional constraints on development in this overlay. The amendment submitted is to make clear that the objective is to enable maximum development up to the sustainable carrying capacity of the land and surrounding environment. This is consistent with the enabling approach of	Amend Objective TSL-O4 as follows: Use and development on Treaty Settlement Land can fully utilise reflects the sustainable carrying capacity of the land

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					related objectives. A separate submission seeks a definition for "sustainable carrying capacity." In the absence of a definition, the objective should be further clarified, by adding references to capacity criteria including the usable or developable area of a site, nature of the locality (urban, rural, coastal or overlay), access and infrastructure, and services available.	and surrounding environment. Otherwise amend Objective TSL-O4 to provide context and clarity
Te Rūnanga Ā Iwi O Ngāpuhi (S498)	S498.069	Treaty settlement land overlay	TSL-O4	Oppose	The submitter opposes objective TSL-O4 as the term "sustainable carrying capacity" is uncertain and contestable. Interpretation could place additional constraints on development in this overlay. The amendment submitted is to make clear that the objective is to enable maximum development up to the sustainable carrying capacity of the land and surrounding environment. This is consistent with the enabling approach of related objectives. A separate submission seeks a definition for "sustainable carrying capacity." In the absence of a definition, the objective should be further clarified, by adding references to capacity criteria including the usable or developable area of a site, nature of the locality (urban, rural, coastal or overlay), access and infrastructure, and services available.	Amend objective TSL-O4 to read as follows: Use and development on Treaty Settlement Land can fully utilise reflects the sustainable carrying capacity of the land and surrounding environment'. AND Otherwise amend TSL-O4 to provide context and clarity.
Te Runanga o Ngai Takoto Trust (S390)	S390.010	Treaty settlement land overlay	Policies	Support in part	The submitter supports in part the inclusion of the Treaty Settlement Overlay to give effect to the aspirations and provisions within Settlement Acts. Treaty Settlements acknowledge that the Crown did not act in good faith and that they have breached the principles of Te Tiriti o Waitangi. In doing so this has restricted the claimants ability to act as kaitiaki over their taonga, wāhi tapu and whenua, and has undermined their traditional tikanga and rangatiratanga including being marginalised on their ancestral lands, and a loss of tribal authority, social cohesion, traditional knowledge, and ability to develop their well-beings. Even returned assets may have underlying caveats that continue to restrict opportunities for claimants and therefore the	Amend Treaty Settlement Land overlay policies which are not enabling thereby limiting or constraining their development opportunities.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					overlay should be considered on a site by site basis.	
Te Runanga o Ngai Takoto Trust (S390)	S390.066	Treaty settlement land overlay	Policies	Oppose	The submitter opposes policies which are not enabling (inferred) as Treaty Settlements acknowledge the Crown had breached their agreement to the Te Tiriti o Waitangi but some returned assets have underlying caveats that continue to restrict opportunities and should be considered on a site-by-site basis.	Amend policies that are not enabling or that constrain development opportunities for iwi and hapū.
Te Rūnanga o Whaingaroa (S486)	S486.016	Treaty settlement land overlay	Policies	Support in part	Treaty Settlements acknowledge that the Crown did not act in good faith and that they have breached the principles of Te Tiriti o Waitangi. In doing so this has restricted the claimants ability to act as kaitiaki over their taonga, wāhi tapu and whenua, and has undermined their traditional tikanga and rangatiratanga including being marginalised on their ancestral lands, and a loss of tribal authority, social cohesion, traditional knowledge, and ability to develop their well-beings. Even returned assets may have underlying caveats that continue to restrict opportunities for claimants and therefore the overlay should be considered on a site by site basis.	Delete (inferred) policies that are not enabling thereby limiting or constraining their development opportunities.
Te Rūnanga o Whaingaroa (S486)	S486.080	Treaty settlement land overlay	Policies	Oppose	Treaty Settlements acknowledge the Crown had breached their agreement to the Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Some returned assets have underlying caveats that continue to restrict opportunities and should be considered on a site-by-site basis.	Delete policies that are not enabling or that constrain development opportunities for iwi and hapū (inferred)
Te Rūnanga Ā Iwi O Ngapuhi (S498)	S498.011	Treaty settlement land overlay	Policies	Support in part	The submitter supports in part the inclusion of the Treaty Settlement Overlay to give effect to the aspirations and provisions within Settlement Acts. Treaty Settlements acknowledge that the Crown did not act in good faith and that they have breached the principles of Te Tiriti o Waitangi. In doing so this has restricted the claimants ability to act as kaitiaki over their taonga, wāhi tapu and whenua, and has undermined their traditional tikanga and rangatiratanga including being marginalised on their ancestral lands, and a loss of tribal authority, social cohesion, traditional knowledge, and ability to develop their well-	Amend Treaty Settlement Land overlay policies which are not enabling thereby limiting or constraining their development opportunities.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					beings. Even returned assets may have underlying caveats that continue to restrict opportunities for claimants and therefore the overlay should be considered on a site by site basis.	
Te Rūnanga Ā Iwi O Ngāpuhi (S498)	S498.067	Treaty settlement land overlay	Policies	Oppose	The submitter opposes policies which are not enabling (inferred) as Treaty Settlements acknowledge the Crown had breached their agreement to the Te Tiriti o Waitangi but some returned assets have underlying caveats that continue to restrict opportunities and should be considered on a site-by-site basis.	Amend policies that are not enabling or that constrain development opportunities for iwi and hapū.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S561)	S561.058	Treaty settlement land overlay	Policies	Support in part	A new policies should be provided that outline how the objectives are to be achieved.	Insert a new policy TSL-P5 as follows: Enable alternative approaches to site access and infrastructure provision here the occupation, use and development of Treaty Settlement Land is constrained by access or the availability of infrastructure.
Te Aupōuri Commercial Development Ltd (S339)	S339.038	Treaty settlement land overlay	TSL-P1	Support	TACDL supports the intention of this policy, however, considers this can be improved by align with the aspirations of whānau, hapū and iwi as outlined in any plans and strategies that have been prepared. Iwi authorities view the environment through a te ao Māori lens which means plans and strategies are developed looking 20, 50 and 100 years into the future to achieve their overarching aspirations for whenua, whānau and the taiao (land, people, and the environment).	Amend Policy TSL-P1 as follows: Provide for Enable the occupation, use and development of Treaty Settlement Land in accordance with iwi, hapū and whānau aspirations outlined in their environment, economic, cultural and social plans and strategies.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand (S421)	S421.099	Treaty settlement land overlay	TSL-P1	Support in part	Policy HA-P1 applies to all heritage area overlays. The policy as currently worded is inconsistent with section 6(f) of the Resource Management Act 1991 which provides for the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use and development. Again, the Council appears to have elevated on aspect of the environment (heritage) over another which is inappropriate. Federated Farmers supports clause (e) of the policy as it recognises and provides for the removal of non-heritage buildings and structures which is important for viable farming operations.	Amend point a. of Objective HA-P1 as follows: a. identifying and protecting the heritage buildings, objects and sites, and archaeological sites within the Heritage area overlay from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development; Retain point e. of Objective HA-P1 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent
Te Aupōuri Commercial Development Ltd (S339)	S339.039	Treaty settlement land overlay	TSL-P2	Support	TACDL support the intention of this policy, however, do not consider it necessary to restrict the scale of commercial activities that may take place on these sites. The innate nature of the Treaty Settlement process limits the available land and assets that can be returned to iwi to those owned by the Crown. The available landholdings to return to iwi are typically rural farm or forestry holdings, and while these are still commercial assets, they're typically not enabled for commercial activities by district plans. For this reason, TACDL seek greater flexibility for the enablement of commercial activities within the TSL.	Amend Policy TSL-P2 as follows: Enable a range of activities on Treaty Settlement Land including marae, papakāinga, customary use, cultural and small-scale commercial activities where the adverse effects can be avoided, remedied or mitigated.
Te Aupōuri Commercial Development Ltd (S339)	S339.040	Treaty settlement land overlay	TSL-P3	Not Stated	For the same reasons detailed in submission point 25, TACDL seek maximum flexibility to develop TSL land in order to provide for the economic and social wellbeing of its members. Further, the bulk and location standards of either the underlying zone or the TSL provide sufficient separation distance, bulk, scale and size to manage onsite amenity of the surrounding sites.	Amend TSL-P3 as follows: Provide for the occupation, use and development on Treaty Settlement Land where it is demonstrated that: a. it is compatible with surrounding activities; a.it will not compromise the

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>occupation, development and use of Treaty Settlement Land; b.it will not compromise the underlying zone, adjacent land or other zones to be efficiently or effectively used for their intended purpose; c.any values identified through cultural redress are maintained; d.it maintains the character and amenity of surrounding area; e.it provides for community wellbeing,health and safety; f.it can be serviced by on site infrastructure or reticulated infrastructure where this is available; and g.any adverse effects can be avoided, remedied or mitigated.</p>
<p>Te Runanga o Ngai Takoto Trust (S390)</p>	<p>S390.069</p>	<p>Treaty settlement land overlay</p>	<p>TSL-P3</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>The submitter opposes policy TSL-P3 as it places unnecessary constraints on development of Treaty Settlement Land. Paragraphs a), c) and e) deal repetitively with the issue of cross-boundary effects and c) and e) are therefore redundant. Paras b) and f) appear to be somewhat paternalistic, addressing matters that are properly the preserve of the landowners, when they are choosing development options.</p>	<p>Amend policy TSL-P3 by deleting paragraphs a), b), c), & e)</p>
<p>Kapiro Conservation Trust (S442)</p>	<p>S442.126</p>	<p>Treaty settlement land overlay</p>	<p>TSL-P3</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>Need to include more specific recognition of the importance of protecting and enhancing natural values, including protection of SNAs</p>	<p>Amend to include more specific recognition of the importance of protecting and enhancing natural values, including protection of</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						SNAs.
Te Rūnanga o Whaingaroa (S486)	S486.083	Treaty settlement land overlay	TSL-P3	Oppose	Policy TSL-P3 places unnecessary constraints on development of Treaty Settlement Land. Paragraphs a), c) and e) deal repetitively with the issue of cross-boundary effects and c) and e) are therefore redundant. Paras b) and f) appear to be somewhat paternalistic, addressing matters that are properly the preserve of the landowners, when they are choosing development options.	Delete sections a, b, c and e of Policy TSL-P3
Te Rūnanga Ā Iwi O Ngapuhi (S498)	S498.070	Treaty settlement land overlay	TSL-P3	Oppose	The submitter opposes policy TSL-P3 as it places unnecessary constraints on development of Treaty Settlement Land. Paragraphs a), c) and e) deal repetitively with the issue of cross-boundary effects and c) and e) are therefore redundant. Paras b) and f) appear to be somewhat paternalistic, addressing matters that are properly the preserve of the landowners, when they are choosing development options.	Amend policy TSL-P3 by deleting paragraphs a), b), c), & e)
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand (S511)	S511.107	Treaty settlement land overlay	TSL-P3	Oppose	Need to include more specific recognition of the importance of protecting and enhancing natural values, including protection of SNAs	Amend policy TSL-P3 to include more specific recognition of the importance of protecting and enhancing natural values including protection of SNAs.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S561)	S561.056	Treaty settlement land overlay	TSL-P3	Support in part	The amendments proposed to this policy are to ensure the policy remains supportive of use and development to achieve the objectives of this overlay.	Amend TSL-P3 as follows: Provide for development on Māori land where it is demonstrated: a. it is compatible with surrounding activities;b. it will not compromise occupation, development and use of Māori land;c. it will not compromise use of adjacent land or other zones to be efficiently and effectively used for their intended purpose;d. it

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>maintains character and amenity of surrounding area; e. it provides for community wellbeing, health and safety; f. it can be serviced by onsite infrastructure or reticulated infrastructure where this is available; and g. that any adverse effects can be avoided, remedied or mitigated.</p> <p>Recognise and provide for mātauranga Māori, tikanga Māori and kaitiakitanga when determining the scale, intensity and compatibility of activities in the Māori purpose zone, including when considering measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects.</p>
Te Runanga o Ngai Takoto Trust (S390)	S390.070	Treaty settlement land overlay	TSL-P4	Support	The submitter supports TSL-P4 (c) (inferred) as consideration of positive effects of activities is essential to achieve the enabling objectives.	Retain TSL-P4 (c), requiring consideration of positive effects of land use and subdivision.
Te Rūnanga o Whaingaroa (S486)	S486.084	Treaty settlement land overlay	TSL-P4	Support	Consideration of positive effects of activities is essential to achieve the enabling objectives.	Retain section c of Policy TSL-P4, requiring consideration of positive effects of land use and subdivision.
Te Rūnanga Ā Iwi O Ngapuhi (S498)	S498.071	Treaty settlement land overlay	TSL-P4	Support	The submitter supports TSL-P4 (c) (inferred) as consideration of positive effects of activities is essential to achieve the enabling objectives.	Retain TSL-P4 (c), requiring consideration of positive effects of land use and subdivision.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
<p>Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S561)</p>	<p>S561.057</p>	<p>Treaty settlement land overlay</p>	<p>TSL-P4</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>This policy as it is written is more appropriate as matters of discretion required to be complied with for a Restricted Discretionary activity. New policies should be provided that outline how the objectives are to be achieved.</p>	<p>Amend Policy TSL-P4 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, density, design and character of the environment and purpose of the zone;b. the location, scale and design of buildings and structures;c. the positive effects resulting from the economic, social and cultural wellbeing provided by the proposed activity.d. at zone interfaces:i. any setbacks, fencing, screening or landscaping required to address potential conflicts;ii. managing reverse sensitivity effects on adjacent land uses, including the ability of surrounding properties to undertake primary production activities in a rural environment;e. the adequacy and capacity of available or programmed development infrastructure to accommodate the proposed</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>activity; or the capacity of the site to cater for on-site infrastructure associated with the proposed activity;f. the adequacy of roading infrastructure to service the proposed activity;g. managing natural hazards;h. any loss of highly productive land;i. adverse effects on areas with historic heritage and cultural values, natural features and landscapes, natural character or indigenous biodiversity values; andj. any historical, spiritual, or cultural association held by tangata whenua, with regard to the matters set out in Policy TW-P6.Enable the occupation, use and development of Treaty Settlement Land in areas where there are natural and physical resources that have been scheduled in the District Plan in relation to heritage areas, historic heritage, sites and areas of significance to Māori by considering: a. the need to enable development, occupation and use of Treaty Settlement Land in accordance with mātauranga</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						and tikanga to support the social, cultural and economic wellbeing of Mana Whenua; andb. that there may be no or limited alternative locations for whanau, hapū or iwi to occupy, manage and use their ancestral lands.
Horticulture New Zealand (S159)	S159.094	Treaty settlement land overlay	Rules	Not Stated	Rule TSL-R14 states that activities not otherwise listed in this chapter are discretionary activities. Rural production activities are not listed as a specific activity so need to be provided for as a permitted activity. The Overview states that the underlying zone provisions apply to Treaty Settlement Land overlay unless otherwise specific in the overlay provisions, but this is not included in the rules	Insert a new rule - TSL-RX Rural production activitiesPermittedAll zones and Treaty Settlement Land overlays OR Include a rule that provides for underlying zone provisions to apply
Paihia Properties Holdings Corporate Trustee Limited and UP Management Ltd (S344)	S344.041	Treaty settlement land overlay	Rules	Not Stated	The submitter has identified that the overlay chapters are inconsistent with respect to referencing rules for "activities not otherwise listed". The How the Plan Works chapter includes a statement that some overlays will automatically default to a permitted activity. Noting that resource consent may still be required under other Part 2: District-wide Matters chapters and/or Part 3: Area-Specific chapters (including the underlying zone). This lack of consistency will cause confusion for plan users: 1. The overlay chapters do not include notes to this effect. 2. Each overlay chapter has a different approach activity status default rules. 3. Overlays and zone chapters use different terminology. Applying an automatic permitted activity default could lead to unintentional consequences.	Amend all relevant overlay chapters as necessary to insert rules for "Activities not otherwise listed in this chapter" consistent with zone chapters.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Northland Regional Council (S359)	S359.024	Treaty settlement land overlay	Rules	Support in part	Fully support the identification of and specific zoning for Māori land (under Te Ture Whenua Act) and land returned through Treaty Settlement as cultural or commercial redress. However, we recommend that the provisions relating to the use and subdivision of these zones (eg. Policy NFL-P5) be reviewed to ensure that they do not unnecessarily restrict the intent for the use of such land (for example land returned as commercial redress should not be limited to 'ancestral' use where it is in an ONL or ONF) especially as there is no definition of what constitutes 'ancestral' use.	Amend the provisions in the Treaty Settlement Land overlay to ensure they do not unnecessarily restrict the intent for the use of such land (for example land returned as commercial redress should not be limited to 'ancestral' use where it is in an ONL or ONF) especially as there is no definition of what constitutes 'ancestral' use.
Foodstuffs North Island Limited (S363)	S363.033	Treaty settlement land overlay	Rules	Not Stated	The submitter has identified that the overlay chapters are inconsistent with respect to referencing rules for "activities not otherwise listed". The How the Plan Works chapter includes a statement that some overlays will automatically default to a permitted activity. Noting that resource consent may still be required under other Part 2: District-wide Matters chapters and/or Part 3: Area-Specific chapters (including the underlying zone). This lack of consistency will cause confusion for plan users: 1. The overlay chapters do not include notes to this effect. 2. Each overlay chapter has a different approach activity status default rules. 3. Overlays and zone chapters use different terminology. Applying an automatic permitted activity default could lead to unintentional consequences.	Amend all relevant overlay chapters as necessary to insert rules for "Activities not otherwise listed in this chapter" consistent with zone chapters.
Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland (S516)	S516.009	Treaty settlement land overlay	Rules	Not Stated	The submitter has identified that the overlay chapters are inconsistent with respect to referencing rules for "activities not otherwise listed". The How the Plan Works chapter includes a statement that some overlays will automatically default to a permitted activity. Noting that resource consent may still be required under other Part 2: District-wide Matters chapters and/or Part 3: Area-Specific chapters (including the underlying zone). This lack of consistency will cause confusion for	Amend all relevant overlay chapters as necessary to insert rules for "Activities not otherwise listed in this chapter" consistent with zone chapters.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>plan users:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The overlay chapters do not include notes to this effect. 2. Each overlay chapter has a different approach activity status default rules. 3. Overlays and zone chapters use different terminology. <p>Applying an automatic permitted activity default could lead to unintentional consequences.</p>	
Summit Forests New Zealand Limited (S148)	S148.041	Treaty settlement land overlay	Notes	Not Stated	The note 1 to the Rules states "Refer to Note 2 above". There is no "note 2 above" in this section of the Plan. The notes to the rules of this section will be key to the reasonable interpretation of the rules and must be clear and unambiguous.	Amend Note 1 by ensuring the reference to "note 2" either references the relevant section of the plan note 2 can be found or, if "note 2" is with this section, amend the wording to read "Refer to Note 2 below".
Summit Forests New Zealand Limited (S148)	S148.042	Treaty settlement land overlay	Notes	Support	The notes to the rules of this section will be key to the reasonable interpretation of the rules and must be clear and unambiguous.	Retain note 3 as currently worded.
Far North District Council (S368)	S368.039	Treaty settlement land overlay	Notes	Support in part	Typo: Text correction	<p>Amend notes</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There may be rules in other District-Wide Matters that apply to a proposed activity, in addition to the rules in this chapter. These other rules may be more stringent than the rules in this chapter. Ensure that the other relevant District-Wide Matters chapters are also referred to, in addition to this chapter, to determine whether resource consent is required under other rules in the District Plan. Refer to Note 2 above, and the how the plan works chapter to determine the activity status of a proposed activity where resource

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>consent is required under multiple rules.</p> <p>2. The following provisions apply to land identified by the Treaty Settlement land overlay. Applicants may need to provide documentation in the form of final deeds of settlement, associated settlement legislation and confirmation that the land is still held with the post-settlement governance entity.</p> <p>3. The provisions of the underlying zone apply to Treaty Settlement Land unless otherwise specified in this section. The rules provide that where the activity for the relevant zone provides for the same activity, or where there is conflict between a rule or standard in the underlying zone chapter, the less restrictive rule applies.</p>
<p>John Andrew Riddell (S431)</p>	<p>S431.120</p>	<p>Treaty settlement land overlay</p>	<p>TSL-R1</p>	<p>Not Stated</p>	<p>The amendment is necessary in order to achieve the purpose of the Act.</p>	<p>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</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
<p>Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S561)</p>	<p>S561.059</p>	<p>Treaty settlement land overlay</p>	<p>TSL-R1</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>PER-1 determines that a new building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure that will accommodate a permitted activity is a permitted activity, and where compliance is not achieved with PER-1 it becomes a Discretionary activity. PER-2 lists the Standards that must be complied with included (but not limited to) maximum height, height in relation to boundary, and setback. The Rule (activity) intended for new buildings or structures, and extensions or alterations to existing buildings or structures will be assessed under that particular Rule (activity). Therefore, PER-1 is not relevant.</p>	<p>Delete PER-1 from Rule TSL-P1, add proposed new standard MPZ-S7 (inferred) - Impermeable surfaces, and delete activity status related to PER-1, as follows: 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 activity. PER-2 The building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure complies with standards: MPZ-S1 - Maximum height; MPZ-S2 - Height in relation to boundary; MPZ-S3 - Setbacks (excluding from MHWS or wetland, lake and river margins); MPZ-S4 - Setback from MHWS; MPZ-S5 - Building or structure coverage; and MPZ-S6 - On-site services; and MPZ-S7 - Impermeable surfaces. Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-2 PER-1: Restricted Discretionary</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						Matters of discretion are restricted to: a. the matters of discretion of any infringed standardActivity status where compliance not achieved with PER 1: Discretionary
Te Aupōuri Commercial Development Ltd (S339)	S339.041	Treaty settlement land overlay	TSL-R2	Oppose	TACDL considers that stormwater management is adequately managed by TSL-S5 and TSL-S6.	Delete Rule TSL-R2.
Puketotara Lodge Ltd (S481)	S481.001	Treaty settlement land overlay	TSL-R2	Not Stated	<p>The submitter seeks to ensure that the PDP adequately controls effects from stormwater discharge, particularly between sites or adjacent sites.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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,</p>	<p>Amend point c of the matters of discretion as follows:</p> <p>c. the availability of land for disposal of effluent and stormwater on site without adverse effects on adjoining adjacent waterbodies (including groundwater and aquifers) or on adjoining adjacent sites;</p> <p>Insert the following as additional matters of discretion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoiding nuisance or damage to adjacent or downstream properties; • The extent to which the diversion and discharge maintains pre-developmentstormwa

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>ter run-off flows and volumes;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The extent to which the diversion and discharge mimics natural run-off patterns.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S561)	S561.060	Treaty settlement land overlay	TSL-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. Rules which rely on compliance with bulk and location Standards for that Rule should include the Impermeable surfaces Standard.	Delete TSL-R2 Impermeable surfaces in its entirety from the Rules section and create a new Standard for Impermeable surfaces,
Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust (S338)	S338.028	Treaty settlement land overlay	TSL-R3	Not Stated	<p>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.</p> <p>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</p>	<p>Amend the PDP provisions for multi-unit developments to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					of community with Kerikeri and become a real asset.	
Te Aupōuri Commercial Development Ltd (S339)	S339.042	Treaty settlement land overlay	TSL-R3	Support	TACDL has aspirations to develop a range of housing options to meet the diverse needs of Te Aupōuri uri (members). The supply of housing is of great importance to TACDL and ensuring the district plan provides the greatest flexibility is required. Section 6 (e) requires Council's to recognise and provide for the relationship of Māori to lands, water and sites as a matter of national importance. Enablement of residential activities, including residential care, enables uri of Te Aupōuri to live and maintain their relationship to their lands and sites. PER-2 limits the number of residential units to a maximum of six per site irrespective of the carrying capacity of that land. In the case of TACDL, this would limit their significant landholding of over 3,000ha to 18 residential units as a permitted activity due to the record of title configuration. Further, the Section 32 does not provide analysis to justify these thresholds, for this reason, TACDL seek PER-2 to be deleted.	Delete PER-2 of Rule TSL-R3
Kapiro Residents Association (S427)	S427.038	Treaty settlement land overlay	TSL-R3	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	Amend the PDP provisions for multi-unit developments to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					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.	connect, pedestrian walkways and access to community facilities and amenities.
Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK) (S522)	S522.052	Treaty settlement land overlay	TSL-R3	Support in part	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Amend the PDP provisions for multi-unit developments to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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.
Carbon Neutral NZ Trust (S529)	S529.196	Treaty settlement land overlay	TSL-R3	Support in part	<p>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</p>	<p>Amend the PDP provisions for multi-unit developments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> include requirements for outdoor space beyond the area needed to move and park vehicles private, including private

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>and shared outdoor space on the north, east or west side of a building</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S561)	S561.062	Treaty settlement land overlay	TSL-R3	Oppose	Papakāinga includes residential activities. Therefore this activity is captured under TSL-R5 and the Rule TSL-R4 Residential Activity is not required.	Delete Rule TSL-R4 Residential Activity in its entirety, and re-number all the Rules that follow
Te Aupōuri Commercial Development Ltd (S339)	S339.043	Treaty settlement land overlay	TSL-R4	Support	Subject to the amendment of the definition of papakāinga as sought in submission 4 and 5, TACDL generally supports these provisions. However, as no analysis has been provided in the section 32 report, TACDL do not understand or support the thresholds proposed in PER-1. In TACDL's view, these provisions do not acknowledge the carrying capacity of land and arbitrarily limit the number of residential units to 10 irrespective of the land area available. In the case of TACDL, they have three landholdings that range in size between 500ha and 1,500ha which can have sufficient area to easily absorb 10 residential units. Further, it is unclear why PER-1 limits rather than enables the maximum number of residential units that could be achieved via (a) or (b). Finally, as proposed these provisions are even more restrictive than those provided by the ODP, which is considered to better recognise the carrying capacity of land with respect to on-site	<p>Amend Rule TSL-R4 as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delete PER-1; • Amend PER-2 to increase the GBA to align with the permitted impermeable surface coverage provided by Standard TSL-S2.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					servicing requirements. For these reasons, TACDL seek amendments to these provisions. Furthermore, the 250m ² GBA imposed in PER-2 for commercial activities inadequately provides for the development aspirations of TACDL and considers greater flexibility for the size of commercial activities is required. It is considered that this should be managed through the scale of activities which is already provided for by TSL-S2.	
Te Runanga o Ngai Takoto Trust (S390)	S390.071	Treaty settlement land overlay	TSL-R4	Oppose	The submitter opposes rule TSL-R4 as it permits limited numbers of houses, reflecting a cautious approach. Many sites could sustain more houses than these numbers. The option of obtaining resource consent for additional houses is largely impracticable for tāngata whenua in need of social housing. The amendment seeks permitted status for greater numbers of houses. This would better implement Objective MPZ-O3, which calls for use and development to reflect sustainable carrying capacity. The criteria to quantify carrying capacity should include the developable area of a site, nature of the locality (urban, rural, coastal or in an overlay) access and the services provided.	Amend rule TSL-R4 to permit residential units on sites in addition to the numbers permitted in the notified rule. Quantify additional units by reference to the sustainable carrying capacity of the site, referencing the developable site area, nature of the locality (urban, rural, coastal or overlay) access and the available services.
Te Runanga o Ngai Takoto Trust (S390)	S390.072	Treaty settlement land overlay	TSL-R4	Support	The submitter supports TSL-R4 insofar as the permitted activity status of papakāinga is supported however, we believe the predetermined number of residential units and commercial activity allowable is not enabling.	Amend rule TSL-R4 to provide for a more enabling development for papakāinga.
Te Rūnanga o Whaingaroa (S486)	S486.085	Treaty settlement land overlay	TSL-R4	Oppose	The proposed rule permits limited numbers of houses, reflecting a cautious approach. Many sites could sustain more houses than these numbers. The option of obtaining resource consent for additional houses is largely impracticable for tāngata whenua in need of social housing. The amendment seeks permitted status for greater numbers of houses. This would better implement Objective MPZ-O3, which calls for use and development to reflect sustainable carrying capacity. The criteria to quantify carrying capacity should include the developable area of a site, nature of the locality (urban, rural, coastal or in an overlay) access and the services provided.	Amend Rule TSL-R4 to permit residential units on sites in addition to the numbers permitted in the notified rule. Quantify additional units by reference to the sustainable carrying capacity of the site, referencing the developable site area, nature of the locality (urban, rural, coastal or overlay) access and the available services.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Te Rūnanga o Whaingaroa (S486)	S486.086	Treaty settlement land overlay	TSL-R4	Support	Permitted activity of papakāinga is supported however, we believe the predetermined number of residential units and commercial activity allowable is not enabling.	Retain Rule TSL-R4 but implement a more enabling development for papakāinga.
Te Rūnanga Ā Iwi O Ngapuhi (S498)	S498.072	Treaty settlement land overlay	TSL-R4	Oppose	The submitter opposes rule TSL-R4 as it permits limited numbers of houses, reflecting a cautious approach. Many sites could sustain more houses than these numbers. The option of obtaining resource consent for additional houses is largely impracticable for tāngata whenua in need of social housing. The amendment seeks permitted status for greater numbers of houses. This would better implement Objective MPZ-O3, which calls for use and development to reflect sustainable carrying capacity. The criteria to quantify carrying capacity should include the developable area of a site, nature of the locality (urban, rural, coastal or in an overlay) access and the services provided.	Amend rule TSL-R4 to permit residential units on sites in addition to the numbers permitted in the notified rule. Quantify additional units by reference to the sustainable carrying capacity of the site, referencing the developable site area, nature of the locality (urban, rural, coastal or overlay) access and the available services.
Te Rūnanga Ā Iwi O Ngapuhi (S498)	S498.073	Treaty settlement land overlay	TSL-R4	Support	The submitter supports TSL-R4 insofar as the permitted activity status of papakāinga is supported however, we believe the predetermined number of residential units and commercial activity allowable is not enabling.	Amend rule TSL-R4 to provide for a more enabling development for papakāinga.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S561)	S561.063	Treaty settlement land overlay	TSL-R4	Support in part	The matters of discretion have been adopted from the proposed Policy TSL-P4 with amendments.	Amend PER-1 and where compliance with PER-1 or PER-2 is not achieved, this activity becomes Restricted Discretionary with specific matters of discretion as follows: Activity Status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The number of residential units does not exceed the greater of: a. 10 residential units per site; or b. one residential unit per 40ha of site area. Use and development can be adequately serviced in terms of stormwater, wastewater

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>and potable water infrastructure.</p> <p>PER-2</p> <p>Any commercial activity associated with the papakāinga does not exceed a GBA of 250m².</p> <p>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-1 or PER-2: Restricted Discretionary</p> <p>Matters of discretion are restricted to:a. The matters set out in policy TSL-P4.a.</p> <p>consistency with the scale, density, design and character of the planned environment and purpose of the zone;</p> <p>b. the location, scale and design of buildings and structures;</p> <p>c. at zone interfaces:</p> <p>i. any setbacks, fencing, screening or landscaping required to address potential conflicts;</p> <p>ii. managing reverse sensitivity effects on adjacent land uses, including the ability of surrounding properties to undertake primary production activities in a rural environment;</p> <p>d. the adequacy and capacity of available or programmed development</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>infrastructure to accommodate the proposed activity; or the capacity of the site to cater for onsite infrastructure associated with the proposed activity;e. the adequacy of roading infrastructure to service the proposed activity;f. effects on areas with historic heritage and cultural values, natural features and landscapes, natural character or indigenous biodiversity values; andg. any historical, spiritual, or cultural association held by tangata whenua, with regard to the matters set out in Policy TW-P6.</p>
<p>Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S561)</p>	<p>S561.064</p>	<p>Treaty settlement land overlay</p>	<p>TSL-R5</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>The activity status where compliance is not achieved with PER-1 is a Discretionary activity. The proposed Discretionary activity status for noncompliance with PER-1 is not in line with the objectives and policies for the overlay. Kāinga Ora considers that a more appropriate activity status for infringements to PER-1 is a Restricted Discretionary activity.</p>	<p>Amend PER-1 and where compliance with PER-1 is not achieved, this activity becomes Restricted Discretionary with specific matters of discretion as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The occupancy does not exceed six guests per night. Use and development can be adequately serviced in terms of stormwater,</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>wastewater and potable water infrastructure.</p> <p>Note: PER-1 does not apply to marae provided for under TSL-R6 Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-1: Discretionary Restricted DiscretionaryMatters of discretion are restricted to: a. consistency with the scale, density, design and character of the planned environment and purpose of the zone; b. the location, scale and design of buildings and structures; c. at zone interfaces: i. any setbacks, fencing, screening or landscaping required to address potential conflicts; ii. managing reverse sensitivity effects on adjacent land uses, including the ability of surrounding properties to undertake primary production activities in a rural environment; d. the adequacy and capacity of available or programmed development infrastructure to accommodate the proposed activity; or the capacity of the</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>site to cater for onsite infrastructure associated with the proposed activity;e. the adequacy of roading infrastructure to service the proposed activity;f. any loss of highly productive land;g. effects on areas with historic heritage and cultural values, natural features and landscapes, natural character or indigenous biodiversity values; andh. any historical, spiritual, or cultural association held by tangata whenua, with regard to the matters set out in Policy TW-P6.</p>
Te Aupōuri Commercial Development Ltd (S339)	S339.044	Treaty settlement land overlay	TSL-R6	Support	TACDL supports the enablement of Marae activities in the TSL as permitted activities.	Retain Rule TSL-R6
Te Aupōuri Commercial Development Ltd (S339)	S339.045	Treaty settlement land overlay	TSL-R10	Support	TACDL supports the enablement of these activities as permitted activities in the TSL.	Retain Rule TSL-R10
Te Aupōuri Commercial Development Ltd (S339)	S339.046	Treaty settlement land overlay	TSL-R11	Support	TACDL supports the provision of education facilities in the TSL. However, TACDL are concerned that these provisions do not allow for the establishment of kōhanga reo or kura as a permitted activity. While TACDL does not currently have development plans to establish any educational facilities, access to Te Ao Māori education is of the utmost importance to TACDL. As there is no section 32 analysis to support these thresholds, TACDL seek that they are amended to	Amend Rule TSL-R11 to provide for Kōhanga Reo and Kura as a permitted activity.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					provide allow for kōhanga reo or kura as permitted activities. It is noted that these provisions do not apply to kōhanga reo, however, they are not provided for elsewhere in the chapter.	
Te Runanga o Ngai Takoto Trust (S390)	S390.073	Treaty settlement land overlay	TSL-R11	Oppose	The submitter opposes rule TSL-R11 but supports that the standard permits kōhanga reo without restriction. However, the rule requires resource consent for occupational and outdoor training. Training activities, like wānanga, provide an invaluable contribution to the wellbeing of tāngata whenua. Other training in outdoor occupations such as farming and forestry in rural areas is unlikely to generate adverse effects more than minor.	Amend rule TSL-R11 to add the following: These standards do not apply to: Kōhanga reo, Kura Kaupapa, Whare Wānanga and/or to occupational and outdoor training activities.
Te Rūnanga o Whaingaroa (S486)	S486.087	Treaty settlement land overlay	TSL-R11	Oppose	Rule TSL-R11 permits kōhanga reo without restriction, which is supported. However, the rule requires resource consent for occupational and outdoor training. Training activities, like wānanga, provide an invaluable contribution to the wellbeing of tāngata whenua. Other training in outdoor occupations such as farming and forestry in rural areas is unlikely to generate adverse effects more than minor.	Amend the last sentence of Rule TSL-R11 as follows: These standards do not apply to: Kōhanga reo, Kura Kaupapa, Whare Wānanga and/or to occupational and outdoor training activities.
Te Rūnanga Ā Iwi O Ngapuhi (S498)	S498.074	Treaty settlement land overlay	TSL-R11	Oppose	The submitter opposes rule TSL-R11 but supports that the standard permits kōhanga reo without restriction. However, the rule requires resource consent for occupational and outdoor training. Training activities, like wānanga, provide an invaluable contribution to the wellbeing of tāngata whenua. Other training in outdoor occupations such as farming and forestry in rural areas is unlikely to generate adverse effects more than minor.	Amend rule TSL-R11 to add the following: These standards do not apply to: Kōhanga reo, Kura Kaupapa, Whare Wānanga and/or to occupational and outdoor training activities.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S561)	S561.065	Treaty settlement land overlay	TSL-R11	Support in part	The activity status where compliance is not achieved with PER-1 or PER-2 is a Discretionary activity. The proposed Discretionary activity status for non-compliance with PER-1 is not in line with the objectives and policies for the overlay. In addition, Kāinga Ora seeks that PER-2 restricting the number of persons engaged in this activity residing off-site is deleted.	Delete PER-2. Amend PER-1 and where compliance with PER-1 is not achieved, this activity becomes Restricted Discretionary with specific matters of discretion as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where:

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>PER-1The educational facility is within a residential unit or accessory building.PER-2The number of persons attending at any one time does not exceed four, excluding those who reside on site.Use and development can be adequately serviced in terms of stormwater, wastewater and potable water infrastructure.These standards doThis Rule does not apply to: Kōhanga reo activities.</p> <p>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-1 or PER-2: Discretionary Restricted</p> <p>DiscretionaryMatters of discretion are restricted to:a. consistency with the scale, density, design and character of the planned environment and purpose of the zone;b. the location, scale and design of buildings and structures;c. at zone interfaces:i. any setbacks, fencing, screening or landscaping required to address potential conflicts;ii. managing reverse sensitivity effects on adjacent land uses,</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>including the ability of surrounding properties to undertake primary production activities in a rural environment;d. the adequacy and capacity of available or programmed development infrastructure to accommodate the proposed activity; or the capacity of the site to cater for onsite infrastructure associated with the proposed activity;e. the adequacy of roading infrastructure to service the proposed activity;f. any loss of highly productive land;g. effects on areas with historic heritage and cultural values, natural features and landscapes, natural character or indigenous biodiversity values; andh. any historical, spiritual, or cultural association held by tangata whenua, with regard to the matters set out in Policy TW-P6.</p>
<p>Te Aupōuri Commercial Development Ltd (S339)</p>	<p>S339.047</p>	<p>Treaty settlement land overlay</p>	<p>TSL-R12</p>	<p>Not Stated</p>	<p>For the same reasons as outlined in submission point 24 and 26, TACDL seek increased commercial activity thresholds to align with their development aspirations to ensure that the PDP</p>	<p>Amend Rule TSL-R12 to increase the GBA to align with the permitted impermeable surface coverage provided by Rule TSL-</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					provides for the economic and social wellbeing of Te Aupōuri uri.	R2.
Te Aupōuri Commercial Development Ltd (S339)	S339.048	Treaty settlement land overlay	TSL-R13	Not Stated	TACDL support the provision of rural tourism activities, particularly in light of their substantial landholdings conveniently located within 30 minutes of the east and west coasts of Te Hiku. Rural Tourism activities can include a range of natural experiences that have little or no GFA but take place over large extents of land, i.e., zip lining, where built form is unintrusive or is of small scale. For these reasons, TACDL seek that the GBA thresholds for Rural Tourism activities be deleted.	Delete PER-1 of Rule TSL-R13
Top Energy Limited (S483)	S483.192	Treaty settlement land overlay	TSL-R14	Support	<p>Top Energy considers that there is a lack of clarity throughout the PDP in terms of how the Chapters interact with each other, and some consistency. The Overlay chapters are one example and are inconsistent with respect to referencing rules for "activities not otherwise listed". The How the Plan Works chapter includes a statement that indicates some overlays will automatically default to a permitted activity, however resource consent may still be required under other Part 2: District-wide Matters chapters and/or Part 3: Area-Specific chapters (including the underlying zone). Some Chapters include notes which provide some clarity in this regard (e.g. Heritage Overlay) however this isn't consistently applied through the overlays or the District Wide Chapters generally. Some overlays include a catch all 'activities not otherwise specified' activity status (e.g. Treaty Settlement Land Overlay). Some overlays don't.</p> <p>This lack of consistency (coupled with inconsistent terminology) will cause confusion for Plan users and ultimately, impact the integrity of the plan. This is particularly relevant in the Overlay chapters where each Overlay chapter has a different approach to activity status default rules. With specific regard to the permitted activity default, it is noted that this could lead unintentional consequences.</p>	Amend all relevant overlay chapters as necessary to insert rules for "Activities not otherwise listed in this chapter", consistent with zone chapters.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
<p>Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S561)</p>	<p>S561.061</p>	<p>Treaty settlement land overlay</p>	<p>Standards</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>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. Rules which rely on compliance with bulk and location Standards for that Rule should include the Impermeable surfaces Standard.</p>	<p>Insert a new Standard for Impermeable surfaces, as follows:TSL-S7 Impermeable surfacesThe impermeable surface coverage of any site is no more than 60%.Except that:On sites less than 5000m2 containing marae, the impermeable surface coverage is no more than 50%. Where the standard is not met, matters of discretion are restricted to:a. the extent to which landscaping or vegetation may reduce adverse effects of runoff;b. the effectiveness of the proposed method for controlling stormwater on site;c. the availability of land for disposal of effluent and stormwater on site without adverse effects on adjoining waterbodies (including groundwater and aquifers) or on adjoining sites;d. whether low impact design methods and green spaces can be used;e. any cumulative effects on total catchment impermeability; andf. natural hazard mitigation and site</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						constraints.
John Andrew Riddell (S431)	S431.158	Treaty settlement land overlay	TSL-S2	Not Stated	Not stated	Retain the approach varying the required height to boundary depending on the orientation of the relevant boundary.
Te Aupōuri Commercial Development Ltd (S339)	S339.049	Treaty settlement land overlay	TSL-S6	Not Stated	<p>TACDL have aspirations to establish papakāinga housing to provide much needed housing supply for whānau, pakeke and kaumatua. TACDL seeks provisions that provide adequate design flexibility to meet the needs of Te Aupōuri uri different household structures. While TACDL recognises the need to ensure safe and efficient on-site servicing, they have concerns with the approach for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Requiring a minimum exclusive use area is considered unnecessary, as there are already provisions in place to ensure there is sufficient area for onsite wastewater disposal in accordance with FNDC's Engineering Standards; - Requiring consent where exclusive use cannot be achieved would mean that any papakāinga housing developments that proposed a package treatment plant would require resource consent from both territorial and regional authorities. This is considered to be an unnecessary duplication and result in costly consenting processes; - TSL-S6-1(c)(i-iii) are considered to be an unnecessary duplication of regulation. The Building Act and Proposed Regional Plan for Northland already include provisions that manage the design requirements of wastewater disposal systems that do not need to be repeated here; and - It is unclear why these provisions include minimum requirements for water supply. There are no provisions elsewhere in the PDP that require minimum potable supply. This is considered to be unnecessary and would be designed to respond to the needs of a particular household. 	Delete points 1 and of Standard TSL-S6

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Fire and Emergency New Zealand (S512)	S512.039	Treaty settlement land overlay	TSL-S6	Support in part	Support inclusion of firefighting water supply as well as potable (or drinking) water supply. Fire and Emergency request this framing is copied throughout the District Plan.	Amend TSL-S6 references to potable or drinking water throughout the plan to also make reference to firefighting water supply. Water 2. Where a connection to Council's reticulated water systems is not available, all residential units shall have access to potable (drinkable) water and access to water supplies for firefighting in accordance with the alternative firefighting water source provisions of SNZ PAS 4509:2008. from a community water scheme or private water bore or shall be able to store 45,000 litres of potable water from another source.
Kapiro Conservation Trust (S442)	S442.128	Mineral extraction overlay	ME-O1	Support in part	Support reference to meeting District's needs rather than international / global corporate needs.	Retain ME-O1.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand (S511)	S511.109	Mineral extraction overlay	ME-O1	Support in part	Support reference to meeting District's needs rather than international / global corporate needs	Retain
Manulife Forest Management (NZ) Ltd (S160)	S160.031	Mineral extraction overlay	ME-O3	Support	The submitter supports objective ME-03 as they have many active quarries in its managed estate and if Council believes it is of benefit to map these then they are in support.	Retain objective ME-03 as it is written.
Kapiro Conservation Trust (S442)	S442.129	Mineral extraction overlay	ME-P2	Support in part	Should only apply to the Mineral Extraction Overlay.	Amend to include reference to 'Mineral Extraction Overlay'.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Waiaua Bay Farm Limited (S463)	S463.087	Mineral extraction overlay	ME-P2	Support	It is appropriate to require significant adverse effects to be avoided.	Retain Policy ME-P2
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand (S511)	S511.110	Mineral extraction overlay	ME-P2	Support in part	Should only apply to the Mineral Extraction Overlay	Amend to include reference to 'Mineral Extraction Overlay'
Kapiro Conservation Trust (S442)	S442.130	Mineral extraction overlay	ME-P3	Oppose	Forest & Bird considers that mineral extraction activities should not be provided for outside of the Mineral Extraction overlay Further the conditions are entirely loose to serve as any sort of restraint. For example any level of public benefit seems to loose. (c) is far too ambiguous to serve useful purpose. Also (d) is already provided for in ME-P2 Need to check extent of "Natural Environment Overlays" referred to in (b) and consider need for amendment here.	Delete ME-P3 Or Amend so it is not "Provide". A possible alternative is consider then amend sub-policies to reflect simple, clear and enforceable provisions that may be reflected in standards or conditions.
Waiaua Bay Farm Limited (S463)	S463.088	Mineral extraction overlay	ME-P3	Oppose	While WBF agrees with the express recognition afforded to the special purpose zones in this policy, it considers the requirement in subclause (c) for extraction and processing activities to be "sufficiently away from" the Kauri Cliffs Zone to be unduly vague and difficult to enforce. WBF recommends the development of amended wording to clarify a required minimum setback. WBF has provided a placeholder dimension in the amended text of the adjoining column because it considers that the appropriate minimum setback to be specified will require further discussion between parties to this policy	Ament point c. of Policy ME-P3 as follows: c. the location of the extraction or processing activity is setback a minimum of [xx m] from any land in the sufficiently away from Urban zones, Carrington Estate, Kauri Cliffs, Orongo Bay, Quail Ridge and Māori Purpose Special Purpose zones and Settlement and Rural Residential zones;
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand (S511)	S511.111	Mineral extraction overlay	ME-P3	Oppose	Forest & Bird considers that mineral extraction activities should not be provided for outside of the Mineral Extraction overlay Further the conditions are entirely loose to serve as any sort of restraint. For example any level of public benefit seems to loose. (c) is far too ambiguous to serve useful purpose. Also (d) is already provided for in ME-P2	Delete ME-P3 Or amend so it is not "Provide". A possible alternative is consider then amend sub-policies to reflect simple, clear and enforceable provisions that may be reflected in

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					Need to check extent of "Natural Environment Overlays" referred to in (b) and consider need for amendment here	standards or conditions.
Kapiro Conservation Trust (S442)	S442.131	Mineral extraction overlay	ME-P4	Oppose	It is not entirely clear why a policy that pertains specifically to the rural production zone is found in the Mineral Extraction Overlay chapter.	Amend to move to appropriate chapter.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand (S511)	S511.112	Mineral extraction overlay	ME-P4	Oppose	It is not entirely clear why a policy that pertains specifically to the rural production zone is found in the Mineral Extraction Overlay chapter.	Amend to move to appropriate chapter
Far North District Council (S368)	S368.040	Mineral extraction overlay	ME-P5	Support in part	Outstanding Natural Character only occurs within the coastal environment so is redundant in this policy, needs to be removed	Amend ME-P5 Avoid adverse effects, and avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects from new and the expansion of existing mineral extraction activities on the characteristics and qualities of the following, where located outside of the Coastal Environment Overlay: a. Outstanding Natural Landscapes; b. Outstanding Natural Features; _____ Outstanding Natural Character, d. Significant Natural Area; e. Historic and cultural values; and f. Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori.
Te Hiku Iwi Development Trust (S399)	S399.075	Mineral extraction overlay	ME-P5	Not Stated	A word appears to be omitted from Policy ME-P5, otherwise it doesn't make sense. It appears the word might be significant?	Amend Policy ME-P5 to read as follows: Avoid significant adverse effects, and avoid, remedy or

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						mitigate other adverse effects from new and the expansion of existing mineral extraction activities on the characteristics and qualities of the following, where located outside of the Coastal Environment Overlay...
Kapiro Conservation Trust (S442)	S442.132	Mineral extraction overlay	ME-P5	Support in part	This policy needs to apply specifically to the Mineral Extraction Overlay area. Additionally this policy does not go far enough in terms of protecting indigenous biodiversity in accordance with RPS policy 4.4.1(3).	Amend to include reference to Mineral Extraction Overlay within the policy. Amend to protect indigenous biodiversity in accordance with RPS, policy 4.4.1(3).
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand (S511)	S511.113	Mineral extraction overlay	ME-P5	Support in part	This policy needs to apply specifically to the Mineral Extraction Overlay area. Additionally this policy does not go far enough in terms of protecting indigenous biodiversity in accordance with RPS policy 4.4.1(3)	Amend to include reference to Mineral Extraction Overlay within the policy Amend to protect indigenous biodiversity in accordance with RPS, policy 4.4.1(3)
Te Hiku Iwi Development Trust (S399)	S399.076	Mineral extraction overlay	ME-P6	Not Stated	Policy ME-P6 does not take account of threatened and at risk species of biodiversity as required by Policy 11 of the NZCPS.	Amend Policy ME-P6 as follows: Avoid adverse effects of new, and the expansion of existing, mineral extraction activities, within the characteristics and qualities which makeup the following within the Coastal Environment: a) Outstanding Natural Landscapes; b) Outstanding Natural Features; and c) Outstanding Natural Character; andd) Threatened and at risk indigenous species

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Kapiro Conservation Trust (S442)	S442.133	Mineral extraction overlay	ME-P6	Support in part	This policy needs to also reflect the protections afforded to NZCPS, policy 11(a), RPS policy 4.4.1(1) and s6(c) matters.	Amend so as to avoid adverse effects on NZCPS policy 11(a) and s6(c) matters. Insert SNAs.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand (S511)	S511.114	Mineral extraction overlay	ME-P6	Support in part	This policy needs to also reflect the protections afforded to NZCPS, policy 11(a), RPS policy 4.4.1(1) and s6(c) matters.	Amend so as to avoid adverse effects on NZCPS policy 11(a) and s6(c) matters. Insert SNAs
Te Hiku Iwi Development Trust (S399)	S399.077	Mineral extraction overlay	ME-P7	Not Stated	Policy ME-P7 does not take account of threatened and at risk species of biodiversity as required by Policy 11 of the NZCPS.	Amend Policy ME-P7 as follows: Where ME-P6 does not apply avoid significant and avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects of new, and the expansion of existing mineral extraction activities on natural character, natural features, and natural landscapes and indigenous biodiversity within the Coastal Environment.
Kapiro Conservation Trust (S442)	S442.134	Mineral extraction overlay	ME-P7	Support in part	This policy only works if ME-P6 is amended to ensure the NZCPS, policy 11, RPS 4.4.1 and s6(c) are complied with.	Insert reference to SNAs in ME-P6.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand (S511)	S511.115	Mineral extraction overlay	ME-P7	Support in part	This policy only works if ME-P6 is amended to ensure the NZCPS, policy 11, RPS 4.4.1 and s6(c) are complied with	Insert reference to SNAs in ME-P6
Summit Forests New Zealand Limited (S148)	S148.044	Mineral extraction overlay	Rules	Not Stated	The Plan should provide explicit provision for quarrying within a Plantation Forest for use under the same ownership or management as set out in regulations 50 to 59 of the NES-PF.	Amend the provisions to provide explicit reference to forestry quarrying as permitted under the Plan subject to the provisions of the NES-PF and provide a rule to

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						this effect.
Paihia Properties Holdings Corporate Trustee Limited and UP Management Ltd (S344)	S344.042	Mineral extraction overlay	Rules	Not Stated	<p>The submitter has identified that the overlay chapters are inconsistent with respect to referencing rules for "activities not otherwise listed". The How the Plan Works chapter includes a statement that some overlays will automatically default to a permitted activity. Noting that resource consent may still be required under other Part 2: District-wide Matters chapters and/or Part 3: Area-Specific chapters (including the underlying zone). This lack of consistency will cause confusion for plan users:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The overlay chapters do not include notes to this effect. 2. Each overlay chapter has a different approach activity status default rules. 3. Overlays and zone chapters use different terminology. <p>Applying an automatic permitted activity default could lead to unintentional consequences.</p>	Amend all relevant overlay chapters as necessary to insert rules for "Activities not otherwise listed in this chapter" consistent with zone chapters.
Foodstuffs North Island Limited (S363)	S363.034	Mineral extraction overlay	Rules	Not Stated	<p>The submitter has identified that the overlay chapters are inconsistent with respect to referencing rules for "activities not otherwise listed". The How the Plan Works chapter includes a statement that some overlays will automatically default to a permitted activity. Noting that resource consent may still be required under other Part 2: District-wide Matters chapters and/or Part 3: Area-Specific chapters (including the underlying zone). This lack of consistency will cause confusion for plan users:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The overlay chapters do not include notes to this effect. 2. Each overlay chapter has a different approach activity status default rules. 3. Overlays and zone chapters use different terminology. <p>Applying an automatic permitted activity default could lead to unintentional consequences.</p>	Amend all relevant overlay chapters as necessary to insert rules for "Activities not otherwise listed in this chapter" consistent with zone chapters.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Ventia Ltd (S424)	S424.002	Mineral extraction overlay	Rules	Support in part	Ventia considers that further clarity is required in the PDP in terms of what provisions and overlays take precedence over another, particularly when multiple apply. In terms of Attachment 1, it is clear that multiple overlays and features exist. These features are both within and across the Mineral Extraction Overlay. Where a multitude of features exist, the generally enabling provisions of the MEO become diminished, and the overall mineral potential reduced. For example, it is not clear whether the Outstanding Natural Landscape and Natural Feature provisions trump the MEO (or vice versa) should a mining / quarrying activity be extended. Further it is unclear how this would work in terms of the proposed scoria cones on the site. As the Puketona Quarry is quite unique in that it is being actively quarried, has current and proposed Mineral zoning / overlays, but also has a series of protective mechanisms across the landholdings. Perhaps the intrinsic values and worth of all of these features will continue to interact positively however, when there is a time for further quarrying development, an appropriate pathway and process should be established where the values can be considered, offsets made available (if required), and effects appropriately avoided, remedied, and mitigated.	Insert further clarity in terms of what overlays takes precedence when multiple apply.
Ventia Ltd (S424)	S424.011	Mineral extraction overlay	Rules	Support	Sufficient protection is required for new and existing quarrying and mining activities from new sensitive activities.	Retain the existing rule found in many underlying zones (refer RPROZ-S7) Sensitive activities setback from boundaries of a Mineral Extraction Overlay to apply to all underlying zones.
Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland (S516)	S516.082	Mineral extraction overlay	Rules	Not Stated	The submitter has identified that the overlay chapters are inconsistent with respect to referencing rules for "activities not otherwise listed". The How the Plan Works chapter includes a statement that some overlays will automatically default to a permitted activity. Noting that resource consent may still be required under other Part 2:	Amend all relevant overlay chapters as necessary to insert rules for "Activities not otherwise listed in this chapter" consistent with zone chapters.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					District-wide Matters chapters and/or Part 3: Area-Specific chapters (including the underlying zone). This lack of consistency will cause confusion for plan users: 1. The overlay chapters do not include notes to this effect. 2. Each overlay chapter has a different approach activity status default rules. 3. Overlays and zone chapters use different terminology. Applying an automatic permitted activity default could lead to unintentional consequences.	
Imerys Performance Minerals Asia Pacific (S65)	S65.007	Mineral extraction overlay	Notes	Support in part	The note is supported to avoid any necessary confusion, particularly when considered against the definition of Earthworks.	retain the rule but place this within a Minerals zone
Summit Forests New Zealand Limited (S148)	S148.043	Mineral extraction overlay	Notes	Not Stated	The Plan should provide explicit provision for quarrying within a Plantation Forest for use under the same ownership or management as set out in regulations 50 to 59 of the NES-PF. While note 2 to the rules refers to the NES-PF, it does not explicitly state that forestry quarrying in accordance with the regulations is permitted and it incorrectly references regulations 93 and 94 of the NES-PF.	Amend to correctly reference the relevant quarrying sections of the NES-PF.
Ventia Ltd (S424)	S424.004	Mineral extraction overlay	Notes	Support	The note is supported to avoid any necessary confusion, particularly when considered against the definition of Earthworks.	Retain the rule.
Kapiro Conservation Trust (S442)	S442.135	Mineral extraction overlay	Notes	Support in part	Need to make it abundantly clear that the IB rules will apply.	Amend to include reference IB Chapter.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand (S511)	S511.116	Mineral extraction overlay	Notes	Support in part	Need to make it abundantly clear that the IB rules will apply	Amend to include reference IB Chapter
Imerys Performance Minerals Asia Pacific (S65)	S65.008	Mineral extraction overlay	ME-R1	Oppose	Exploration and prospecting includes various methods and to limit this to hand tool investigations only promotes unnecessary limitations to mining operations. Where the site is existing and already has a long standing history of	delete ME-R1 or exemptions for land already zoned for minerals to be provided within a new Minerals

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					quarrying it is not clear what the rules are trying to achieve. If appropriately zoned for mining (as are the Landholdings), then the rules should be deleted or not apply.	Zone (removal of MEO and underlying zone). Removal of PER-1 which requires any prospecting / exploration to be undertaken using handtools.
Imerys Performance Minerals Asia Pacific (S65)	S65.009	Mineral extraction overlay	ME-R2	Oppose	The rule contains arbitrary numbers i.e 10% increase in volumes (CON-3), to necessitate a consent. The rules highlight a lack of understanding of mining, particularly Imerys operation. Business varies according to market demand with annual production sales varying year to year. In 2022 Imerys will forecast 10,000 dry tonne sales, whereas in 2020 this was 40% less. You can also expand an operation without impacting volumes. The 10% figure is considered arbitrary with no defined rationale. With respect to CON-4, which requires a 30m setback from the existing MEO boundary, this is considered to make the entire zoning exercise redundant. If the landholding has been appropriately zoned for mining, the full extent should be able to be quarried / mined. To add further, in many instances, the matters to which Council seek are appropriately managed by the Northland Regional Council through their consenting regime, particularly with respect to existing quarrying arrangements. The PDP in this respect seeks to duplicate requirements.	delete ME-R2
Ventia Ltd (S424)	S424.005	Mineral extraction overlay	ME-R2	Oppose	Exploration and prospecting includes various methods and to limit this to hand tool investigations only promotes unnecessary limitations to mining operations. Where the site is existing and already has a long standing history of quarrying it is not clear what the rules are trying to achieve. If appropriately zoned for mining (as are the Landholdings), then the rules should be deleted or not apply.	Delete the rule in its entirety or exemptions for land already zoned MEO. If not deleted in its entirety delete PER-1 which requires any prospecting / exploration to be undertaken using handtools.
Ventia Ltd (S424)	S424.006	Mineral extraction overlay	ME-R2	Oppose	The rule contains arbitrary numbers i.e 10% increase in volumes (CON-3), to necessitate a consent. The rules highlight a lack of understanding of mining, particularly Imerys	Delete the rule in its entirety.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					operation. Business varies according to market demand with annual production sales varying year to year. It should be noted that a quarry operation can also be expanded without increasing volumes. With respect to CON-4, which requires a 30m setback from the existing MEO boundary, this is considered to make the entire zoning exercise redundant. If the landholding has been appropriately zoned for mining, the full extent should be able to be quarried / mined. To add further, in many instances, the matters to which Council seek are appropriately managed by the Northland Regional Council through their consenting regime, particularly with respect to existing quarrying arrangements. The PDP in this respect seeks to duplicate requirements.	
Kapiro Conservation Trust (S442)	S442.136	Mineral extraction overlay	ME-R2	Oppose	The Council should retain an ability to refuse consent for the expansion of mineral extraction activities. At the time of assessment of the overlay the knowledge of the site may not have been comprehensive enough to identify all important values.	Amend activity status to restricted discretionary.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand (S511)	S511.117	Mineral extraction overlay	ME-R2	Oppose	The Council should retain an ability to refuse consent for the expansion of mineral extraction activities. At the time of assessment of the overlay the knowledge of the site may not have been comprehensive enough to identify all important values	Amend activity status to restricted discretionary
Imerys Performance Minerals Asia Pacific (S65)	S65.010	Mineral extraction overlay	ME-R3	Oppose	Where appropriately zoned as containing a mineral resource, the resource consent process (if any) should be balanced against the requirements of the Northland Regional Council, and specify what the local authorities requirements are in terms of management. A controlled activity status can achieve the matters to which Council typically have concerns with. In many instances the PDP rules seek to manage matters, in addition to what the Northland Regional Council has appropriate scope and experience to manage. This approach is preferred for larger quarrying operations such as that which Imerys undertakes.	delete ME -R3 or amendment of rule to a Controlled Activity status within a new Minerals Zone (removal of MEO and underlying zone).

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Ventia Ltd (S424)	S424.007	Mineral extraction overlay	ME-R3	Oppose	Where appropriately zoned as containing a mineral resource, the resource consent process (if any) should be balanced against the requirements of the Northland Regional Council, and specify what the local authorities requirements are in terms of management. A controlled activity status can achieve the matters to which Council typically have concerns with. In many instances the PDP rules seek to manage matters, in addition to what the Northland Regional Council has appropriate scope and experience to manage. This approach is preferred for larger quarrying operations such as Puketona.	Delete the rule or amendment of rule to a Controlled Activity status within the Mineral Extraction Overlay.
Imerys Performance Minerals Asia Pacific (S65)	S65.011	Mineral extraction overlay	ME-R4	Oppose	Should a quarrying activity wish to include a noise sensitive activity on their site i.e workers accommodations then this should be provided for.	delete ME -R4
Ventia Ltd (S424)	S424.008	Mineral extraction overlay	ME-R4	Oppose	Should a quarrying activity wish to include a noise sensitive activity on their site i.e workers accommodations then this should be provided for.	Delete the rule.
Imerys Performance Minerals Asia Pacific (S65)	S65.012	Mineral extraction overlay	ME-R5	Oppose	Linking the MEO to the underlying zone causes unnecessary confusion and frustration. The rule would also consider any activity associated with rehabilitation of the site as a non-complying activity or any associated passive / active recreation that the site may offer following rehabilitation	delete ME -R5
Ventia Ltd (S424)	S424.009	Mineral extraction overlay	ME-R5	Oppose	The rule would also consider any activity associated with rehabilitation of the landholdings as a non-complying activity or any associated passive / active recreation that the site may offer following rehabilitation.	Delete the rule.
Top Energy Limited (S483)	S483.193	Mineral extraction overlay	ME-R5	Support	Top Energy considers that there is a lack of clarity throughout the PDP in terms of how the Chapters interact with each other, and some consistency. The Overlay chapters are one example and are inconsistent with respect to referencing rules for "activities not otherwise listed". The How the Plan Works chapter includes a statement that indicates some overlays will automatically default to a	Amend all relevant overlay chapters as necessary to insert rules for "Activities not otherwise listed in this chapter", consistent with zone chapters.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>permitted activity, however resource consent may still be required under other Part 2: District-wide Matters chapters and/or Part 3: Area-Specific chapters (including the underlying zone). Some Chapters include notes which provide some clarity in this regard (e.g. Heritage Overlay) however this isn't consistently applied through the overlays or the District Wide Chapters generally. Some overlays include a catch all 'activities not otherwise specified' activity status (e.g. Treaty Settlement Land Overlay). Some overlays don't.</p> <p>This lack of consistency (coupled with inconsistent terminology) will cause confusion for Plan users and ultimately, impact the integrity of the plan. This is particularly relevant in the Overlay chapters where each Overlay chapter has a different approach to activity status default rules. With specific regard to the permitted activity default, it is noted that this could lead unintentional consequences.</p>	
Imerys Performance Minerals Asia Pacific (S65)	S65.013	Mineral extraction overlay	ME-S1	Support in part	<p>The MEAP is supported as this is quite similar to the requirements of a Development Plan as is currently required for an activity associated with quarrying / mining in the existing Minerals Zone. The Management Plan for new activities should be linked to a Controlled Activity status in a revised but overarching Minerals Zone.</p>	Retain the rule within a new Minerals Zone (removal of MEO and underlying zone) linking this to ME-R3 as a Controlled Activity.
Te Hiku Iwi Development Trust (S399)	S399.078	Mineral extraction overlay	ME-S1	Not Stated	<p>Item 5 is insufficient to ensure use of rehabilitation resources such as topsoil, logs, boulders and wilding plants are maximised and rehabilitation outcomes are maximised, particularly with respect to indigenous biodiversity and the potential for prolonged adverse effects in the absence of effective rehabilitation.</p> <p>We recommend that the rehabilitation plan be consistent with Centre for Mining and Environmental Research Guidelines, specifically those available in Section 5.7 of the guidance document available at: https://www.cmer.nz/publications/2018/MELG_Meso_Gold_NAFA.pdf</p>	Amend point 5. of Standard ME-S1 as follows: 5. Integrated traffic assessment. A detailed rehabilitation plan for the site which is consistent with Centre for Mining and Environmental Research guidelines for rehabilitation of mine sites.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Ventia Ltd (S424)	S424.010	Mineral extraction overlay	ME-S1	Support	The Mineral extraction area management plan is supported as this is quite similar to the requirements of a Development Plan in the Operative District Plan. The Management Plan for new activities should be linked to a Controlled Activity status without any further restriction from the underlying zone.	Retain the rule within the Mineral Extraction Overlay linking this to ME-R3 as a Controlled Activity.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S561)	S561.112	General residential	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.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (S356)	S356.128	General residential	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.
Kapiro Residents Association (S428)	S428.019	General residential	Objectives	Support in part	<p>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.</p> <p>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</p>	<p>Amend PDP to include objectives, policies and rules/standards that require best practice environmentally sustainable techniques for new developments, including -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>public water supply, additional water storage for buildings that rely solely on roof water (to cope with drought), and other measures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.
Transpower New Zealand Ltd (S454)	S454.106	General residential	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-07 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.
Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK) (S521)	S521.022	General residential	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,	Amend PDP to include objectives, policies and rules/standards that require best practice environmentally sustainable techniques for new developments,

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>paths.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>including -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S561)	S561.113	General residential	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.
Kairos Connection Trust and Habitat for Humanity Northern Region Ltd (S138)	S138.011	General residential	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
Summerset Group Holdings Limited (S218)	S218.002	General residential	GRZ-O1	Support	expresses support for the submission of the Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand (submission 520) in its entirety.	Retain GRZ-O1
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (S520)	S520.002	General residential	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
Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited (S554)	S554.012	General residential	GRZ-O1	Support	KFO supports the objective as it appropriately recognises the need for housing supply to meet demand.	Retain the objective as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S561)	S561.066	General residential	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.
Kairos Connection Trust and	S138.012	General residential	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	Retain Objective GRZ-O2

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Habitat for Humanity Northern Region Ltd (S138)					establish a variety of residential housing densities and typologies within functional and high amenity living environments is supported.	
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (S356)	S356.115	General residential	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
Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited (S554)	S554.013	General residential	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 locations where the outcomes will achieve a quality well functioning urban environment. "
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S561)	S561.067	General residential	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 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-O2 as notified in relation to General Residentially zoned sites. New provisions are sought to apply to Medium Density Residentially zoned sites around Kerikeri Town Centre. Refer to Appendix 4 and Appendix 5 in the submission.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga (S331)	S331.062	General residential	GRZ-03	Support	The submitter supports objective GRZ-03 and consider educational facilities to contribute to the well-being of the community while complementing the scale, character and amenity of the General Residential zone.	Retain objective GRZ-03, as proposed.
Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited (S554)	S554.014	General residential	GRZ-03	Support	KFO support Objective GRZ-03 as it appropriately recognises the need to co-locate compatible activities.	Retain the objective as notified.
Kairos Connection Trust and Habitat for Humanity Northern Region Ltd (S138)	S138.013	General residential	GRZ-04	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
Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited (S554)	S554.015	General residential	GRZ-04	Support in part	Objective GRZ-04 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-04 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.
Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited (S554)	S554.016	General residential	GRZ-05	Support	KFO supports Objective GRZ-05 and its recognition of the importance of functional, high amenity environments.	Retain the objective as notified.
Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited (S554)	S554.017	General residential	GRZ-06	Support	KFO supports Objective GRZ-06 as it recognises the importance of resilient communities.	Retain the objective as notified.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S561)	S561.068	General residential	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 as notified in relation to General Residentially zoned sites. New provisions are sought to apply to Medium Density Residentially zoned sites around Kerikeri Town Centre. Refer to Appendix 4 and Appendix 5 in the submission.
Summerset Group Holdings Limited (S218)	S218.004	General residential	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.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (S356)	S356.129	General residential	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.
Kapiro Residents Association (S428)	S428.020	General residential	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	Amend PDP to include objectives, policies and rules/standards that require best practice environmentally sustainable techniques for new developments, including - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths etc. • Best practice for lowest environmental impact and water sensitive designs, requiring greywater recycling

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>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</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.
<p>Transpower New Zealand Ltd (S454)</p>	<p>S454.107</p>	<p>General residential</p>	<p>Policies</p>	<p>Not Stated</p>	<p>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 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</p>	<p>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.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					infrastructure such as the National Grid is enabled in the General Residential zone.	
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (S520)	S520.004	General residential	Policies	Not Stated	Not explicitly stated	Insert new policies in the GRZGRZ-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.
Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK) (S521)	S521.023	General residential	Policies	Support in part	<p>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.</p> <p>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</p>	<p>Amend PDP to include objectives, policies and rules/standards that require best practice environmentally sustainable techniques for new developments, including -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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,

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>additional water storage for buildings that rely solely on roof water (to cope with drought), and other measures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.
<p>Carbon Neutral NZ Trust (S529)</p>	<p>S529.227</p>	<p>General residential</p>	<p>Policies</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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</p>	<p>Amend PDP to include objectives, policies and rules/standards that require best practice environmentally sustainable techniques for new developments, including -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>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</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S561)	S561.114	General residential	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 support the introduction of the proposed Medium density residential zone.
Kairos Connection Trust and Habitat for Humanity Northern	S138.014	General residential	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)

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Region Ltd (S138)						
Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited (S554)	S554.018	General residential	GRZ-P1	Support in part	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>
Lynley Newport (S124)	S124.001	General residential	GRZ-P2	Oppose	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>
Brad Hedger (S268)	S268.002	General residential	GRZ-P2	Support	Services where available should be connected.	Retain GRZ-P2.
Traverse Ltd (S328)	S328.001	General residential	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.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Far North District Council (S368)	S368.021	General residential	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.
BR and R Davies (S400)	S400.002	General residential	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
Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited (S554)	S554.019	General residential	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

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						d) potable water and stormwater where it is available.
Kairos Connection Trust and Habitat for Humanity Northern Region Ltd (S138)	S138.015	General residential	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
Arvida Group Limited (S165)	S165.010	General residential	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 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.	Retain Policy GRZ-P3
Te Hiku Community Board (S257)	S257.018	General residential	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
Sean Frieling (S357)	S357.018	General residential	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 should be a	Retain policy GRZ-P3, enabling multi-unit development

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					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.	
Leah Frieling (S358)	S358.018	General residential	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
LJ King Ltd (S464)	S464.024	General residential	GRZ-P3	Support in part	We support a higher density of housing in the new multi-unit development rules.	Retain GRZ-P3.
Michael Foy (S472)	S472.018	General residential	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
Elbury Holdings (S485)	S485.023	General residential	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.
Elbury Holdings (S519)	S519.023	General residential	GRZ-P3	Support	We support a higher density of housing in the new multi-unit development rules.	Retain GRZ-P3.
Elbury Holdings (S541)	S541.021	General residential	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.
LJ King Limited (S543)	S543.022	General residential	GRZ-P3	Support in part	We support a higher density of housing in the new multi-unit development rules	Retain GRZ-P3
LJ King Limited (S547)	S547.022	General residential	GRZ-P3	Support in part	We support a higher density of housing in the new multi-unit development rules	Retain GRZ-P3
Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited (S554)	S554.020	General residential	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	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

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					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.	solution.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S561)	S561.069	General residential	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.
Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga (S331)	S331.063	General residential	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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Arvida Group Limited (S165)	S165.011	General residential	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
Summerset Group Holdings Limited (S218)	S218.003	General residential	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.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	S520.003	General residential	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

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Incorporated (S520)						<p>needs and characteristics of older persons in the General Residential Zone, such as retirement villages, where they:</p> <p>(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;</p> <p>(c) do not adversely affect road safety or the efficiency of the transport network; and</p> <p>(d) can be serviced by adequate development infrastructure.</p>
Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited (S554)	S554.021	General residential	GRZ-P5	Support in part	<p>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 General Residential Zone, or Developer Agreements can be entered into.</p> <p>There are options for connections to the</p>	<p>Amend Policy GRZ-P5 as follows: Provide for retirement villages where they:</p> <p>a) compliment the character and amenity values of the surrounding area;</p> <p>b) contribute to the diverse needs of the community;</p> <p>c) do not adversely affect road safety or the efficiency of the</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					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.	transport network; and d) can be serviced by adequate development infrastructure or private infrastructure solutions.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand (S512)	S512.040	General residential	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
Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited (S554)	S554.022	General residential	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.
Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited (S554)	S554.023	General residential	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.
Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust (S271)	S271.038	General residential	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

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>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 association held by tangata whenua, with regard</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						to the matters set out in Policy TW-P6.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S416)	S416.046	General residential	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
Kapiro Conservation Trust (S446)	S446.039	General residential	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:

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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.
Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK) (S524)	S524.038	General residential	GRZ-P8	Support in part	<p>The Residential Zone borders commercial areas, to ensure real integration, connectivity must be ensured in the residential zones as well.</p>	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. consistency with the scale, design, amenity and character of the residential environment;

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>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 association held by</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						tangata whenua, with regard to the matters set out in Policy TW-P6.
Carbon Neutral NZ Trust (S529)	S529.103	General residential	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.	<p>Amend GRZ-P8</p> <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. provision for outdoor living space; ii. privacy for adjoining sites; iii. access to sunlight; f. for non-residential activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						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.
Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited (S554)	S554.024	General residential	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.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S561)	S561.070	General residential	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;
Kairos Connection Trust and	S138.023	General residential	Rules	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	Insert a separate Inclusionary housing chapter, or integrate throughout proposed subdivision

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Habitat for Humanity Northern Region Ltd (S138)					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).	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.
Kapiro Residents Association (S428)	S428.010	General residential	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.
Kapiro Residents Association (S428)	S428.021	General residential	Rules	Support in part	<p>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.</p> <p>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</p>	<p>Amend PDP to include objectives, policies and rules/standards that require best practice environmentally sustainable techniques for new developments, including -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths etc. • Best practice for lowest environmental impact and water sensitive designs, requiring

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>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</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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.
New Zealand Motor Caravan Association (S438)	S438.014	General residential	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.
New Zealand Motor Caravan Association (S438)	S438.015	General residential	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).

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Kapiro Conservation Trust (S449)	S449.033	General residential	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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand (S512)	S512.049	General residential	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	Insert new rule for Emergency service facilities included as a permitted activity Emergency service facilities are exempt from standards relating to setback distances, vehicle crossings

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					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.	
Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK) (S521)	S521.013	General residential	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.
Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK) (S521)	S521.024	General residential	Rules	Support in part	<p>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.</p> <p>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</p>	<p>Amend PDP to include objectives, policies and rules/standards that require best practice environmentally sustainable techniques for new developments, including -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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,

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>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.</p> <p>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</p>	<p>additional water storage for buildings that rely solely on roof water (to cope with drought), and other measures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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.
Carbon Neutral NZ Trust (S529)	S529.217	General residential	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.
Carbon Neutral NZ Trust (S529)	S529.228	General residential	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	Amend PDP to include objectives, policies and rules/standards that require best practice environmentally sustainable techniques for new developments,

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>including -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited (S554)	S554.025	General residential	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-P4 as a non-residential activity that is of a residential scale and supports the social and economic wellbeing of the community.	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.
Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rēhia (S559)	S559.028	General residential	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).
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S561)	S561.115	General residential	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 support the introduction of the proposed Medium density residential zone.
Radio New Zealand (S489)	S489.041	General residential	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

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						such risks are avoided
Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust (S338)	S338.022	General residential	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.
Far North District Council (S368)	S368.066	General residential	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 ... "
John Andrew Riddell (S431)	S431.121	General residential	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
Kapiro Conservation Trust (S449)	S449.030	General residential	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
House Movers Section of New Zealand Heavy Haulage	S482.001	General residential	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".	amend GRZ-R1 to: provide for relocated building as a permitted activity when relocated buildings meet performance standards and criteria (see schedule 1).

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Association Inc (S482)					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 performance standards unless there is any specific overlay or control which applies e.g. historic heritage	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
Fire and Emergency New Zealand (S512)	S512.095	General residential	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.	Insert new standard and/or matter of discretion across zones on infrastructure servicing (including emergency response transport/access and adequate water supply for firefighting)
Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK) (S522)	S522.041	General residential	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
Carbon Neutral NZ Trust (S529)	S529.029	General residential	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
Brad Hedger (S268)	S268.001	General residential	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	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.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>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.</p> <p>I note also the current residential zone controlled activity has a more restrictive requirement than the permitted zone as it has a m2 limit.</p>	
Trent Simpkin (S283)	S283.013	General residential	GRZ-R2	Oppose	<p>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 stormwater management onsite and shouldn't 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.</p>	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)
Traverse Ltd (S328)	S328.002	General residential	GRZ-R2	Not Stated	<p>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%.</p>	Amend Rule GRZ-R2 to increase the threshold to at least 60%.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Far North District Council (S368)	S368.101	General residential	GRZ-R2	Support in part	The Far North District Engineering Standards April 2022 apply to all land development, including impermeable surfaces that comply with the permitted standards for impermeable surface coverage. The proposed new standard seeks to ensure that the plan users are aware of, and comply with the Far North District Engineering Standards April 2022. Any non-compliance will enable an assessment of the effectiveness of the proposed method for controlling stormwater on site through the resource consent process. The rule will apply in all instances where there is an impermeable surface coverage rule in the PDP.	Amend GRZ-R2 to insert PER 2Stormwater must be disposed of in accordance with Far North District Engineering Standards April 2022.
BR and R Davies (S400)	S400.003	General residential	GRZ-R2	Oppose	Given the 600m ² minimum controlled activity and 300m ² 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%
Kapiro Conservation Trust (S443)	S443.008	General residential	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.
Puketotara Lodge Ltd (S481)	S481.002	General residential	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.	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

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>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,</p>	<p>discretion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoiding nuisance or damage to adjacent or downstream properties; • The extent to which the diversion and discharge maintains pre-development stormwater run-off flows and volumes; • The extent to which the diversion and discharge mimics natural run-off patterns.
<p>Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S561)</p>	<p>S561.071</p>	<p>General residential</p>	<p>GRZ-R2</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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 must be calculated</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						over the gross site area of all affected sites.
Kairos Connection Trust and Habitat for Humanity Northern Region Ltd (S138)	S138.016	General residential	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 600m ² of site area or 1 unit per 300m ² as a Discretionary Activity.	Amend Rule GRZ-R3 'Residential activity (standalone residential units) as follows: <i>Activity status: Permitted</i> Where: <i>PER-1</i> The number of standalone residential units on a site does not exceed one unit per 600m ² of site area; and The site does not contain a multi-unit development. Activity status: <i>Restricted discretionary</i> Where: <i>RD-1</i> The number of standalone residential units on a site does not exceed one unit per 300m ² of site area; and The site does not contain a multi-unit development.
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections (S158)	S158.010	General residential	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.
Nicole Wooster (S259)	S259.017	General residential	GRZ-R3	Support in part	The family has interests in a property located in the General Residential zone (Kerikeri). The property is 2,000m ² as it was created before Council expanded the wastewater network last year, which it is now connected to. Due to the private covenants registered against the title and	Amend rule to consider allowing for the same level of density provided in the subdivision allotment standards for this rule as a permitted activity.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					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.	
Traverse Ltd (S328)	S328.003	General residential	GRZ-R3	Not Stated	GRZ-R3 limits the number of permitted residential units to one per title. Given the 600m ² minimum lot size for controlled activity subdivision, this rule should be amended to allow residential units at a density of 600m ² per residential unit.	Amend Rule GRZ-R3 to allow residential units at a density of 600m ² per residential unit.
BR and R Davies (S400)	S400.004	General residential	GRZ-R3	Oppose	Rule GRZ-R3 limits the number of permitted residential units to one per title. Given the 600m ² minimum lot size for controlled activity subdivision, this rule should be amended to allow residential units at a density of 600m ² per residential unit	Amend Rule GRZ-R3 to allow residential units at a density of 600m ² per residential unit
Roman Catholic Bishop of the Diocese of Auckland (S413)	S413.003	General residential	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 this rule as follows: GRZ-R3 Residential activity Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The number of standalone residential units on a site does not 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.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>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</p>
<p>LMD Planning Consultancy (S419)</p>	<p>S419.003</p>	<p>General residential</p>	<p>GRZ-R3</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>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-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</p>
<p>Northland Fish and Game</p>	<p>S436.007</p>	<p>General residential</p>	<p>GRZ-R3</p>	<p>Not Stated</p>	<p>Existing game bird hunting activities are often constrained by surrounding land use, and generally becomes untenable when this land use</p>	<p>Insert provisions that constrain housing and industrial developments near areas with</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Council (S436)					changes; for example, when urban and lifestyle encroachment occurs near traditionally hunted sites. Recreational game bird hunting is a very popular activity in the rural environment. The game bird season involves the discharge of shotgun noise. This is not like other constant noises rather it is very brief in duration. Game bird hunting begins at 6:30am in the morning and concludes at 6:30pm at night for the length of the season. Introducing new dwelling areas near areas of recreational significance to hunters can have implications on the future of hunting in these areas. For example, complaints can be made under the Arms Act 1983 which makes clear that anyone discharging a firearm in a public place so as to deliberately endanger, frighten or annoy any other person is guilty of an offence. Shotgun noise may also be a particular issue for public places such as any equestrian arena in the vicinity of maimai used during the game bird hunting season.	recreational hunting values.
Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rēhia (S559)	S559.030	General residential	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).
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S561)	S561.072	General residential	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

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						PER-1: Restricted Discretionary
Airbnb (S214)	S214.001	General residential	GRZ-R4	Support in part	<p>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 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.</p> <p>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).</p>	Amend rules to standardise the guest limit cap for visitor accommodation to 10 across all zones and make the default non-permitted status restricted discretionary (as opposed to Discretionary) across all zones.
Rosemary Archibald (S296)	S296.001	General residential	GRZ-R4	Oppose	<p>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</p>	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.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					Driftwood, 333 State Highway 10, Cable Bay 0420.	
Traverse Ltd (S328)	S328.004	General residential	GRZ-R5	Not Stated	<p>This rule sets out the permitted activity requirements for a "home business". A "home business" is defined as a commercial activity that is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>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</p>	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
BR and R Davies (S400)	S400.005	General residential	GRZ-R5	Oppose	<p>This rule sets out the permitted activity requirements for a "home business". A "home business" is defined as a commercial activity that is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>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</p>	Amend Rule GRZ-R5 to clarify if it includes industrial activities otherwise addressed as a non-complying activity under Rule GRZ-R16
Pou Herenga Tai Twin	S425.056	General residential	GRZ-R5	Support	PHTTCCT support the provision for home business in zones. It is considered that providing	retain as notified

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (S425)					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 in terms of social and economic impact can be realised (noting the comments made in the Transport Chapter in regards to parking).	
John Andrew Riddell (S431)	S431.139	General residential	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
Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga (S331)	S331.064	General residential	GRZ-R6	Support in part	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 discretionary activity status where compliance with the permitted standards cannot be achieved, and the following matters of discretion.</p>	<p>Delete rule GRZ-R6 Educational facility as per submission S331.017</p> <p>or</p> <p>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 30four, excluding those who reside onsite. Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-1 or PER-2: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion are restricted to: a. Design and layout. b. Transport safety and efficiency. c. Scale of activity and hours of operation.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						d. Infrastructure servicing.
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections (S158)	S158.013	General residential	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).
Martin John Yuretich (S40)	S40.002	General residential	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.
Joel Vieviorka (S41)	S41.002	General residential	GRZ-R9	Oppose	Rule GRZ-R9 does not take into consideration the capacity of existing infrastructure, namely water supply, stormwater and wastewater, as required	Amend Rule GRZ-R9 to only allow multi-unit development in areas where all infrastructure has been

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					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.	upgraded and maintained to allow for the maximum development potential under this rule and subdivision rules.
Robyn Josephine Baker (S69)	S69.004	General residential	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. 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?	Delete rule GRZ-R9
Trevor John Ashford (S146)	S146.002	General residential	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.
Julianne Sally Bainbridge (S163)	S163.005	General residential	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.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Te Hiku Community Board (S257)	S257.019	General residential	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.
Traverse Ltd (S328)	S328.006	General residential	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
Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust (S338)	S338.026	General residential	GRZ-R9	Not Stated	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Amend the PDP provisions for multi-unit developments to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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.
Sapphire Surveyors Limited (S348)	S348.004	General residential	GRZ-R9	Support in part	<p>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.</p> <p>This rule could result in extra loadings on already</p>	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

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					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.	potential under this rule and subdivision rules.
Sean Frieling (S357)	S357.019	General residential	GRZ-R9	Support in part	<p>We support a higher density of housing in the new multi-unit development rules.</p> <p>We support a higher density of housing in the residential zones</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	Retain rule GRZ-R9, enabling multi-unit development up to three residential units per site.
Leah Frieling (S358)	S358.019	General residential	GRZ-R9	Support in part	<p>We support a higher density of housing in the new multi-unit development rules.</p> <p>We support a higher density of housing in the residential zones</p>	Retain rule GRZ-R9
Rua Hatu Trust (S377)	S377.002	General residential	GRZ-R9	Support in part	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	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.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Sean Jozef Vercammen (S395)	S395.002	General residential	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.
BR and R Davies (S400)	S400.007	General residential	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
Kerry-Anne Smith (S410)	S410.002	General residential	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.
Roger Myles Smith (S411)	S411.002	General residential	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.
Roman Catholic Bishop of the Diocese of Auckland (S413)	S413.005	General residential	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

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>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</p> <p>The minimum net internal floor area, excluding outdoor living space, of a residential unit within a multi unit development shall be</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1 bedroom = 45m² 2. 2 bedroom = 62m² 3. 3 bedroom = 82m² <p>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The effects on the neighbourhood character, residential amenity and the surrounding residential area from all of the following. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
LMD Planning Consultancy (S419)	S419.005	General residential	GRZ-R9	Oppose	Currently there are many 600m ² 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.	<p>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 = 45m² 2 bedroom = 62m² 3 bedroom = 82m² Matters 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</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						design of parking and access.location of outdoor living space in relation to neighbouring sites.
Kapiro Residents Association (S427)	S427.021	General residential	GRZ-R9	Support in part	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Amend the PDP provisions for multi-unit developments to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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.
Northland Fish and Game Council (S436)	S436.011	General residential	GRZ-R9	Not Stated	<p>Existing game bird hunting activities are often constrained by surrounding land use, and generally becomes untenable when this land use changes; for example, when urban and lifestyle encroachment occurs near traditionally hunted sites.</p> <p>Recreational game bird hunting is a very popular activity in the rural environment. The game bird season involves the discharge of shotgun noise. This is not like other constant noises rather it is very brief in duration. Game bird hunting begins at</p>	Insert provisions that constrain housing and industrial developments near areas with recreational hunting values.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					6:30am in the morning and concludes at 6:30pm at night for the length of the season. Introducing new dwelling areas near areas of recreational significance to hunters can have implications on the future of hunting in these areas. For example, complaints can be made under the Arms Act 1983 which makes clear that anyone discharging a firearm in a public place so as to deliberately endanger, frighten or annoy any other person is guilty of an offence. Shotgun noise may also be a particular issue for public places such as any equestrian arena in the vicinity of maimai used during the game bird hunting season.	
John Joseph and Jacqueline Elizabeth Matthews (S439)	S439.002	General residential	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.
LJ King Ltd (S464)	S464.002	General residential	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.
LJ King Ltd (S464)	S464.025	General residential	GRZ-R9	Support in part	We support a higher density of housing in the residential zones.	Retain GRZ-R9.
Helmut Friedrich Paul Letz and Angelika	S470.002	General residential	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	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

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Eveline Letz (S470)					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.	potential under this rule and subdivision rules.
Michael Foy (S472)	S472.019	General residential	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.
Elbury Holdings (S485)	S485.004	General residential	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.
Elbury Holdings (S485)	S485.024	General residential	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.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand (S512)	S512.041	General residential	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 have posed more significant fire risks and/or inadequate emergency response access.	amend GRZ-R9 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 (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

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						4509:2008 New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice.
Elbury Holdings (S519)	S519.004	General residential	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.
Elbury Holdings (S519)	S519.024	General residential	GRZ-R9	Support	We support a higher density of housing in the residential zones.	Retain GRZ-R9.
Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK) (S522)	S522.020	General residential	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 each	Amend the PDP provisions for multi-unit developments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					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.	connect, pedestrian walkways and access to community facilities and amenities.
Carbon Neutral NZ Trust (S529)	S529.032	General residential	GRZ-R9	Support in part	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Amend the PDP provisions for multi-unit developments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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.
Elbury Holdings (S541)	S541.002	General residential	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	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.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					sewage to waterways or the sea, reductions in quality or shortages of drinking water, or exacerbated damage during stormwater events.	
Elbury Holdings (S541)	S541.022	General residential	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.
LJ King Limited (S543)	S543.002	General residential	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
LJ King Limited (S543)	S543.023	General residential	GRZ-R9	Support in part	We support a higher density of housing in the residential zones	Retain GRZ-R9
Kelvin Richard Horsford (S544)	S544.002	General residential	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
LJ King Limited (S547)	S547.002	General residential	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

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
LJ King Limited (S547)	S547.023	General residential	GRZ-R9	Support in part	We support a higher density of housing in the residential zones	Retain GRZ-R9
Ngā Kaingamaha o Ngāti Hine Charitable Trust (S555)	S555.002	General residential	GRZ-R9	Support in part	<p>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.</p> <p>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</p> <p>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 surrounding area which may be traditionally low density</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Delete 'building intensity' from the matters of discretion outlined in subpoint a.i. of Rule GRZ-9.</p>
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S561)	S561.073	General residential	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.	<p>Amend GRZ-R9 as follows:</p> <p>Activity status: Controlled Restricted Discretionary</p> <p>Where: CONRD-11. The site area per multi-unit development is at least 600m²; and</p> <p>2. The number of residential units in a multi-unit development on a site does not exceed two three; and 3.</p> <p>There is no standalone residential unit on the site. CONRD-2</p> <p>The minimum net internal floor area, excluding outdoor</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>living space, of a residential unit within a multi-unit development shall be:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 1 bedroom = 45m² 2. 2 bedroom = 62m² 3. 3 bedroom = 82m² <p>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. the effects on the neighbourhood character, residential amenity and the surrounding residential area from all of the following. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>Activity status for more than three two units: Restricted Discretionary</p>
<p>Rodney S Gates and Cherie R Gates (S569)</p>	<p>S569.002</p>	<p>General residential</p>	<p>GRZ-R9</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>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.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Arvida Group Limited (S165)	S165.012	General residential	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
Summerset Group Holdings Limited (S218)	S218.005	General residential	GRZ-R10	Support in part	expresses support for the submission of the Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand (submission 520) in its entirety.	<p>Insert new Rule GRZ-RXX Retirement Village Activity status: Permitted</p> <p>Amend GRZ-R10 Construction of Retirement village buildings Activity status: Restricted discretionary Where 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 Façade length GRZ-S6 Outdoor living space GRZ-S7 Outdoor storage</p> <p>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</p> <p>ai. the effects of any breach of GRZ-S1, GRZ-S2, GRZ-S3, GRZ-</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>S4, GRZ-S5, and GRZ-S7.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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, 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

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						operational needs of retirement villages. Activity status where compliance not achieved with RD-1: Discretionary
Summerset Group Holdings Limited (S218)	S218.006	General residential	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.
Per Lugnet (S324)	S324.001	General residential	GRZ-R10	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.
Traverse Ltd (S328)	S328.007	General residential	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 buildings or structures or extensions to an existing buildings or structures which comply with the following standards...
Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust (S338)	S338.025	General residential	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.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Far North District Council (S368)	S368.024	General residential	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 Façade length GRZ-S6 Outdoor living space GRZ-S7 Outdoor storage
BR and R Davies (S400)	S400.008	General residential	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 buildings or structures or extensions to an existing buildings or structures which comply with the following standards...
John Andrew Riddell (S431)	S431.122	General residential	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

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Kapiro Conservation Trust (S449)	S449.031	General residential	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
Fire and Emergency New Zealand (S512)	S512.096	General residential	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	Insert new standard and/or matter of discretion across zones on infrastructure servicing (including emergency response transport/access and adequate water supply for firefighting)
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (S520)	S520.005	General residential	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.	<p>Insert new Rule GRZ-RXX Retirement Village Activity status: Permitted</p> <p>Amend GRZ-R10 Construction of Retirement village buildings Activity status: Restricted discretionary Where 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 Façade length GRZ-S6 Outdoor living space GRZ-S7 Outdoor storage</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>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.</p> <p>a. safe integration of vehicle and pedestrian access with the adjoining road network.</p> <p>b. provision of landscaping and bunding, on-site amenity for residents, recreational facilities and stormwater systems. c. design and layout of pedestrian circulation.</p> <p>d. residential amenity for surrounding sites in respect of outlook and privacy.</p> <p>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, including buildings, fencing, location and scale of utility areas and external storage areas.</p> <p>f. the benefits associated with the construction, development, use and provision of accommodation to meet the needs of the</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						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
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (S520)	S520.006	General residential	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.
Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK) (S522)	S522.042	General residential	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
Carbon Neutral NZ Trust (S529)	S529.030	General residential	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

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Lynley Newport (S125)	S125.001	General residential	GRZ-R11	Support	Support inclusion of Minor Residential Unit provision in other zones.	Retain GRZ-R11
Roman Catholic Bishop of the Diocese of Auckland (S413)	S413.004	General residential	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
LMD Planning Consultancy (S419)	S419.004	General residential	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 their property either to accommodate a family member or a tenant.	Amend to include within Rule GRZ R3 to include a minor residential unit as a permitted activity (refer to submission point S419.003)
Kapiro Residents Association (S428)	S428.022	General residential	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	Amend PDP to include objectives, policies and rules/standards that require best practice environmentally sustainable techniques for new developments, including - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths etc. • Best practice for lowest environmental impact and water sensitive designs, requiring greywater recycling

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>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</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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.
<p>Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK) (S521)</p>	<p>S521.025</p>	<p>General residential</p>	<p>Standards</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>The PDP should require all new buildings to store/use roof water wherever possible, to avoid the need for expensive reticulation systems and</p>	<p>Amend PDP to include objectives, policies and rules/standards that require best practice environmentally sustainable techniques for new developments, including -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths etc.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.
<p>Carbon Neutral NZ Trust (S529)</p>	<p>S529.229</p>	<p>General residential</p>	<p>Standards</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>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,</p>	<p>Amend PDP to include objectives, policies and rules/standards that require best practice environmentally sustainable techniques for new developments,</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>paths.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>including -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S561)	S561.116	General residential	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 support the introduction of the proposed Medium density residential zone.
Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust (S338)	S338.021	General residential	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 multi-unit developments or other purpose.	Retain Standard GRZ-S1
Kapiro Residents Association (S427)	S427.019	General residential	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].
Kapiro Conservation Trust (S449)	S449.028	General residential	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
Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK) (S522)	S522.018	General residential	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
Carbon Neutral NZ Trust (S529)	S529.027	General residential	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
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S561)	S561.074	General residential	GRZ-S1	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports a maximum height of 8m in the GRZ only if the Medium Density Residential Zone is 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	Retain maximum height as 8m for General Residential Zone, if Medium Density Residential Zone is accepted with an 11m building height. Otherwise, amend maximum

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					apartments, across the District. Further, amend the matters of discretion to read "planned" character and amenity.	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;
Trent Simpkin (S283)	S283.039	General residential	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.
John Andrew Riddell (S431)	S431.181	General residential	GRZ-S2	Not Stated	Not stated	Retain the approach varying the required height to boundary depending on the orientation of the relevant boundary.
Trent Simpkin (S283)	S283.006	General residential	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.
Tristan Simpkin (S287)	S287.006	General residential	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.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Per Lugnet (S324)	S324.002	General residential	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
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S416)	S416.057	General residential	GRZ-S3	Support in part	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 access to roofs from of buildings even further and results in an effective yard setback of 400mm.</p> <p>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</p>	<p>Insert a railway setback (refer to submission for examples)</p> <p>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</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	
<p>Fire and Emergency New Zealand (S512)</p>	<p>S512.072</p>	<p>General residential</p>	<p>GRZ-S3</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>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).</p>	<p>Insert advice note to setback standard Building setback 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 building consent</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						stage. Issuance of a resource consent does not imply that waivers of Building Code requirements will be considered/granted
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S561)	S561.075	General residential	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
Far North District Council (S368)	S368.047	General residential	GRZ-S4	Support in part	Typo: There is a typo within the Standard for 'Setback from MHWS' across all zones within the PDP, in matter of discretion d. should be 'constraints' nor 'constricts'	Amend GRZ-S4 Replace the word 'constricts' with 'constraints' in the standard for 'Setback from MHWS in all zones in the PDP. d. Natural hazard mitigation and site constricts constraints ;
Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited (S502)	S502.062	General residential	GRZ-S4	Support in part	Some consistency is sought with NATC-R1 which covers activities within proximity to a wetland, lake or a river margin. As such the layout of the rule has been changed to reflect this, while at the same time allowing for certain structures to be exempt.	Amend GRZ-S4 Where: PER-1 The building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure must be set back at least 26m from MHWSPER- 2 The building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure within the 26m setback from MHWS is required for: 1. restoration and enhancement purposes; or 2. natural

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>hazard mitigation undertaken by, or on behalf of, the local authority; or3. a post and wirefence for the purpose of protection from farm stock; or4. Lighting poles by, or on behalf of, the local authority; or5. Footpaths and or paving no greater than 2m in width; or6. Boundary fences or walls no more than 2m in height above ground level;</p>
Lynley Newport (S126)	S126.001	General residential	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.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S561)	S561.076	General residential	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.
Traverse Ltd (S328)	S328.008	General residential	GRZ-S6	Not Stated	GRZ-S6 requires 50m ² 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 20m ² .	Delete Standard GRZ-S6 or reduce the threshold for ground floor units to something not exceeding 20m ² .
BR and R Davies (S400)	S400.009	General residential	GRZ-S6	Oppose	GRZ-S6 requires 50m ² 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 20m ² .	Delete Standard GRZ-S6 or reduce the threshold for ground floor units to something not exceeding 20m ² .

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited (S502)	S502.027	General residential	GRZ-S6	Support in part	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Amend GRZ-S6</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Each residential unit must have an exclusive outdoor living space: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. be directly accessible 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, east or west side (or a combination) of the residential unit. <p>Note: Outdoor Living Space includes decks which are open on at least two sides and covered/partially covered with a roof.</p>
Fire and Emergency New Zealand (S512)	S512.093	General residential	GRZ-S6	Support in part	<p>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 brought 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</p>	<p>add advice note to GRZ-S6</p> <p>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</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					design. The 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.	should refer to the applicable controls within the Building Code to ensure compliance can be achieved at the building consent stage. Issuance of a resource consent does not imply that waivers of Building Code requirements will be considered/granted
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S561)	S561.077	General residential	GRZ-S6	Support in part	Kāinga Ora considers that the requirement of 50m ² of outdoor living space per dwelling is excessive as a minimum and request that it be amended to 30m ² . 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 8m ² (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....
Lynley Newport (S126)	S126.002	General residential	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.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S561)	S561.078	General residential	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....
New Zealand Pork Industry Board (S55)	S55.024	Rural production	Overview	Support in part	Support the description of the RPZ, but this should include a description of the character and amenity of the zone that is to be maintained.	Amend overview to include a description of the character and amenity of the zone, to link to objective RPROZ-O4.
Horticulture New Zealand (S159)	S159.095	Rural production	Overview	Support	Supports the intent for the Rural Production zone	Retain the Overview
Bentzen Farm Limited (S167)	S167.090	Rural production	Overview	Oppose	The zoned is inappropriately named "Rural Production". Large parts of the district that is zoned this is not suitable for rural production and certainly is not retained for rural production purposes. The zone should be renamed to "General Rural" which more accurately reflects the wider range of activities that occur in the rural environments of the Far North.	Insert the following to the Overview: "The purpose of the zone is also to contribute to the social, economic and cultural well-being of the district by providing for a range of other land use activities".
Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)	S168.088	Rural production	Overview	Oppose	For the reasons set out throughout the submission	Insert the following to the Overview: "The purpose of the zone is also to contribute to the social, economic and cultural well-being of the district by providing for a range of other land use activities" .
MLP LLC (S183)	S183.010	Rural production	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Landing Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Landing Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Landing Scheme as well

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						as the continuation of farming activities.
The Shooting Box Limited (S187)	S187.079	Rural production	Overview	Oppose	Refer to submission for detailed reasons for decision(s) requested relating, but not limited to, to the following: large parts of the district that is zoned Rural Production is not suitable for rural production and certainly is not retained for rural production purposes; these activities are provided for in the zone as drafted (at least by the rules, but not recognised in the zone name; the zone name should recognise the broader range of land uses which occur in rural parts of the district; sustain the productive capacity of the soil and the rural character and amenity values that are key elements; the National Planning Standards "Zone Framework Standard" refers to the "General Rural Zone" which is a better fit; and discussion concerning the primary objective of the zone.	Insert the following to the Overview: " The purpose of the zone is also to contribute to the social, economic and cultural well-being of the district by providing for a range of other land use activities ".
Wendover Two Limited (S222)	S222.083	Rural production	Overview	Oppose	Large parts of the district that is zoned this is not suitable for rural production and certainly is not retained for rural production purposes. The zone should be renamed to "General Rural" which more accurately reflects the wider range of activities that occur in the rural environments of the Far North. These activities are provided for in the zone as drafted (at least by the rules), but not recognised in the zone name. This is not to diminish the importance of rural production activities and these should be enabled and protected by the objectives and policies of the zone. The zone name however should recognise the broader range of land uses which occur in rural parts of the district; including bush blocks, smaller titles, residential activity and land holding which are unsuitable for rural production uses. It is important to strengthen the District's economy by providing for a range of land use activities in the rural area; however, accepting the priority is to sustain the productive capacity of the soil and the	Insert the following to the Overview: " The purpose of the zone is also to contribute to the social, economic and cultural well-being of the district by providing for a range of other land use activities ".

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					rural character and amenity values that are key elements. The National Planning Standards "Zone Framework Standard" refers to the "General rural zone" which is a better fit. There is more to it than the name, with the stated primary objective of the zone being that it "is used for primary production activities, ancillary activities that support primary production and other compatible activities that have a functional need to be in a rural environment". That puts undue emphasis on farming activities and does not recognise the broad applicability of the zone in many unproductive areas. This point is taken up further in this submission.	
Tryphena Trustees Limited, David Haythornwait e (S226)	S226.010	Rural production	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Rural Production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.
Isles Casey Trustee Services Limited, WWC Trustee Company Limited (S227)	S227.010	Rural production	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Rural Production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.
Jayesh Govind and Others (S228)	S228.010	Rural production	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most	Amend the Overview of the Rural Production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.
Laurie Pearson (S229)	S229.010	Rural production	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Rural Production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.
Mataka Residents' Association Inc (S230)	S230.010	Rural production	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Rural Production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.
Ovisnegra Limited (S231)	S231.010	Rural production	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Rural Production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.
Tobias Groser (S232)	S232.010	Rural production	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most	Amend the Overview of the Rural Production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.
Whale Bay Limited (S233)	S233.010	Rural production	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Rural Production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.
Whale Bay Limited (S234)	S234.010	Rural production	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Rural Production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.
WW Trustee Services 2016 Limited, Eloise Caroline Caswell, Donald Gordon Chandler (S235)	S235.010	Rural production	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Rural Production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.
Connemara Black Limited (S236)	S236.010	Rural production	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Rural Production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						as the continuation of farming activities.
Evan Williams and Katherine Williams (S237)	S237.010	Rural production	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Rural Production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.
John Gowing and Miriam Van Lith (S238)	S238.010	Rural production	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Rural Production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.
John Gowing, Miriam Van Lith, Ellis Gowing, James Gowing, Byron Gowing (S239)	S239.010	Rural production	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Rural Production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.
Matthew Watson, Kaylene Watson, D R Thomas Limited (S240)	S240.010	Rural production	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Rural Production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Matthew Draper and Michaela Jannard (S241)	S241.010	Rural production	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Rural Production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.
Matauri Trustee Limited (S243)	S243.108	Rural production	Overview	Oppose	<p>The zoned is inappropriately named "Rural Production". Large parts of the district that is zoned Rural Production is not suitable for rural production and certainly is not retained for rural production purposes. The zone should be renamed to "General Rural" which more accurately reflects the wider range of activities that occur in the rural environments of the Far North. These activities are provided for in the zone as drafted (at least by the rules), but not recognised in the zone name.</p> <p>This is not to diminish the importance of rural production activities and these should be enabled and protected by the objectives and policies of the zone.</p> <p>The zone name however should recognise the broader range of land uses which occur in rural parts of the district; including bush blocks, smaller titles, residential activity and land holding which are unsuitable for rural production uses.</p> <p>It is important to strengthen the District's economy by providing for a range of land use activities in the rural area; however, accepting the priority is to sustain the productive capacity of the soil and the rural character and amenity values that are key elements.</p> <p>The National Planning Standards "Zone Framework Standard" refers to the "General rural zone" which is a better fit.</p> <p>There is more to it than the name, with the stated primary objective of the zone being that it "is used for primary production activities, ancillary activities</p>	Insert the following to the Overview: The purpose of the zone is also to contribute to the social, economic and cultural well-being of the district by providing for a range of other land use activities.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					that support primary production and other compatible activities that have a functional need to be in a rural environment". That puts undue emphasis on farming activities and does not recognise the broad applicability of the zone in many unproductive areas.	
P S Yates Family Trust (S333)	S333.080	Rural production	Overview	Oppose	<p>The zoned is inappropriately named "Rural Production". Large parts of the district that is zoned this is not suitable for rural production and certainly is not retained for rural production purposes. The zone should be renamed to "General Rural" which more accurately reflects the wider range of activities that occur in the rural environments of the Far North.</p> <p>These activities are provided for in the zone as drafted (at least by the rules), but not recognised in the zone name.</p> <p>This is not to diminish the importance of rural production activities and these should be enabled and protected by the objectives and policies of the zone. The zone name however should recognise the broader range of land uses which occur in rural parts of the district; including bush blocks, smaller titles, residential activity and land holding which are unsuitable for rural production uses.</p> <p>It is important to strengthen the District's economy by providing for a range of land use activities in the rural area; however, accepting the priority is to sustain the productive capacity of the soil and the rural character and amenity values that are key elements.</p> <p>The National Planning Standards "Zone Framework Standard" refers to the "General rural zone" which is a better fit.</p> <p>There is more to it than the name, with the stated primary objective of the zone being that it "is used for primary production activities, ancillary activities that support primary production and other compatible activities that have a functional need to be in a rural environment". That puts undue emphasis on farming activities and does not recognise the broad applicability of the zone in</p>	Insert the following to the overview: "The purpose of the zone is also to contribute to the social, economic and cultural well-being of the district by providing for a range of other land use activities" .

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					many unproductive areas. This point is taken up further in this submission.	
Philibert Jean-G Frick (S352)	S352.010	Rural production	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Rural Production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.
Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand (S421)	S421.204	Rural production	Overview	Support in part	<p>Federated Farmers supports the recognition in the overview of the fact it is important to differentiate the rural production zone from the rural lifestyle and rural residential zones. We also support the strong recognition that has been given to rural land as an important resource.</p> <p>The concern Federated Farmers has is that the overview is focused on the absolute protection of highly productive from any activities other than primary production. The approach taken by the Council to prevent the fragmentation of rural production land is support but acknowledgement is also needed that all highly productive may not be profitable for the landowner. It would be unequitable for the Council to prohibit a rural landowner who has cared for the land for many years from achieving the real potential value of that land.</p> <p>The proposed district plan has strayed into private property rights through dictating what can and cannot be done on rural production land. Returns from farming are variable due to a variety of factors including weather conditions, economic conditions, individual property circumstances and market demands. Like any business, diversification, flexibility, responsiveness, and cash flow are critically important to retaining their viability.</p> <p>Farmers undertake low impact subdivision for a variety of reasons. These vary from diversifying</p>	Amend the Overview to recognise and provide for private property rights and allow landowners to subdivide land in the rural production zone for specific purposes such as creating lifestyle lots and lots for family members (amongst other matters)

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					their business into tourism operations (luxury lodges and or associated tourism development and infrastructure), providing for disposing of a surplus dwelling on the property where a neighbouring farm is purchased, providing for a family member or staff member to live on the farm or to implement a succession plan for multiple siblings through small lot subdivision. The proposed chapter has taken away any flexibility for farmers to subdivide their land for specific purposes without undermining the primary production or life-style value of the remaining land. The chapter as drafted, adds another layer complexity on top of the regulations and provisions that exist in regional council planning documents and in National Policy Statements. The Council seems intent of duplicating provisions which may have already been dealt with at regional and national levels.	
Maurice Dabbah (S422)	S422.010	Rural production	Overview	Oppose	The Proposed Plan, if approved, will directly affect members of the [Mataka Residents'] Association by imposing undue restrictions on the construction of residential dwellings on the Site through the application of specified overlays and rules.	Amend the Overview of the Rural Production Chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.
Bernard Sabrier (S423)	S423.010	Rural production	Overview	Oppose	The Proposed Plan, if approved, will directly affect members of the [Mataka Residents'] Association by imposing undue restrictions on the construction of residential dwellings on the Site through the application of specified overlays and rules.	Amend the Overview of the Rural Production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.
Francois Dotta (S434)	S434.010	Rural production	Overview	Oppose	The Proposed Plan, if approved, will directly affect members of the [Mataka Residents'] Association	Amend the Overview of the Rural Production chapter to recognise

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					by imposing undue restrictions on the construction of residential dwellings on the Site through the application of specified overlays and rules.	the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.
Elka Gouzer (S435)	S435.010	Rural production	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Rural Production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.
MLP LLC (S183)	S183.011	Rural production	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Landing Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Landing Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Landing Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.
Tryphena Trustees Limited, David Haythornwaite (S226)	S226.011	Rural production	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.
Isles Casey Trustee	S227.011	Rural production	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka	Amend the Objectives of the Rural production chapter to recognise

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Services Limited, WWC Trustee Company Limited (S227)					Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.
Jayesh Govind and Others (S228)	S228.011	Rural production	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.
Laurie Pearson (S229)	S229.011	Rural production	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.
Mataka Residents' Association Inc (S230)	S230.011	Rural production	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.
Ovisnagra Limited (S231)	S231.011	Rural production	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate	Amend the Objectives of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.
Tobias Groser (S232)	S232.011	Rural production	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.
Whale Bay Limited (S233)	S233.011	Rural production	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.
Whale Bay Limited (S234)	S234.011	Rural production	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.
WW Trustee Services 2016 Limited, Eloise Caroline	S235.011	Rural production	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural	Amend the Objectives of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Caswell, Donald Gordon Chandler (S235)					and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.
Connemara Black Limited (S236)	S236.011	Rural production	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.
Evan Williams and Katherine Williams (S237)	S237.011	Rural production	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.
John Gowing and Miriam Van Lith (S238)	S238.011	Rural production	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.
John Gowing, Miriam Van Lith, Ellis Gowing, James Gowing, Byron	S239.011	Rural production	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most	Amend the Objectives of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Gowing (S239)					appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.
Matthew Watson, Kaylene Watson, D R Thomas Limited (S240)	S240.011	Rural production	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.
Matthew Draper and Michaela Jannard (S241)	S241.011	Rural production	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.
Te Hiku Community Board (S257)	S257.025	Rural production	Objectives	Oppose	The Planning Maps show the Rural Production Zone in some areas e.g. Awanui that are serviced by sewerage, footpaths, refuse collection etc. If this zoning continues, it will severely constrain future urban development, and this should be corrected by amending RPROZ objectives, policies and rules zones to accommodate things other than rural production.	Amend the Rural Production Zone objectives so that productive land is defined based on its ability to produce food but can accommodate things other than rural production; OR amend Planning Maps to remove RPROZ from urban areas as separately submitted.
Rosemorn Industries Limited (S340)	S340.002	Rural production	Objectives	Support in part	The objectives in the Rural Production Zone chapter do not provide any clear direction on when, or under what circumstances it is appropriate for existing commercial and industrial activities to be extended. Clear direction is required given the level of investment associated with purchasing properties and establishing the existing activities, and the implications that the	Amend objectives of the Rural Production Zone to include more specific direction on when it is appropriate to extend existing commercial and/or industrial activities.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					PFNDP could have with respect to any future plans for those sites and activities.	
Nicole Way and Christopher Huljich as Trustees of the Trssh Birnie Settlement Trust (S345)	S345.001	Rural production	Objectives	Oppose	<p>The Resource Consents at Mataka Station enable development, and completion of the Mataka Station development, notwithstanding the provisions of the Proposed District Plan. The Proposed District Plan fails to recognise, have regard to, or provide for the development and subdivision enabled by the Resource Consents. The Proposed District Plan provisions will restrict development of the Property, and Mataka Station more generally, in a manner that is inconsistent with the Resource Consents and the integrated and comprehensive development authorised by those. The Council's s32 analysis does not mention, or consider approved but unimplemented developments within the Property and Mataka Station more generally, nor elsewhere. The "low intensity" development controls and height limits proposed within the Coastal Environment are given very little analysis. The proposed provisions are inconsistent with the Act and relevant planning instruments.</p>	<p>Amend to explicitly, and specifically provide for, and preserve the activities and land uses authorised under the Resource Consents at Mataka Station.</p> <p>and/or</p> <p>Insert a new special purpose zone and/or structure plan together with appropriate provisions (objectives, policies and rules) enabling the residential activity and development as is authorised by the Resource Consents as a permitted activity (where they are in general accordance with the Resource Consents) as well as appropriate activities within the Rural Production Zone, regardless of the provisions of the CE, ONL or HNC.</p> <p>and/or</p> <p>Amend the provisions of the Proposed District Plan to preserve the activities and buildings authorised by the Resource Consents on the Property.</p>
Philibert Jean-G Frick (S352)	S352.011	Rural production	Objectives	Oppose	<p>The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).</p>	<p>Amend the Objectives of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Leah Frieling (S358)	S358.029	Rural production	Objectives	Oppose	The Plan redefines the Rural Production zone so that it is based on its ability to produce food but can accommodate things other than rural production i.e.. Rural Production zoning on poor soils is wrong. That is the right place to put smaller areas for housing i.e. 2,000 m ² .	Amend the Rural Production zone objectives so that productive land is defined based on its ability to produce food but can accommodate things other than rural production; OR amend planning maps to remove the Rural Production zone from urban areas (as separately submitted).
Waste Management NZ Limited (S360)	S360.004	Rural production	Objectives	Oppose	It is critical that the Proposed Plan provide for 'waste management facilities' in a broader range of zones to reflect the functional and operational requirements of such activities, and to provide a framework within which the effects of such activities can be appropriately managed. In this respect, it is appropriate that the Proposed Plan provides for waste management facilities at the 'strategic direction' level, as well as specifically within the Light Industrial, Heavy Industrial and Rural Production zones.	Amend the objectives to provide for waste management facilities
Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand (S421)	S421.205	Rural production	Objectives	Support in part	Federated Farmers supports the recognition in the overview of the fact it is important to differentiate the rural production zone from the rural lifestyle and rural residential zones. We also support the strong recognition that has been given to rural land as an important resource. The concern Federated Farmers has is that the overview is focused on the absolute protection of highly productive from any activities other than primary production. The approach taken by the Council to prevent the fragmentation of rural production land is support but acknowledgement is also needed that all highly productive may not be profitable for the landowner. It would be unequitable for the Council to prohibit a rural landowner who has cared for the land for many years from achieving the real potential value of that land. The proposed district plan has strayed into private property rights through dictating what can and	Amend the Objectives to recognise and provide for private property rights and allow landowners to subdivide land in the rural production zone for specific purposes such as creating lifestyle lots and lots for family members (amongst other matters)

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>cannot be done on rural production land. Returns from farming are variable due to a variety of factors including weather conditions, economic conditions, individual property circumstances and market demands. Like any business, diversification, flexibility, responsiveness, and cash flow are critically important to retaining their viability.</p> <p>Farmers undertake low impact subdivision for a variety of reasons. These vary from diversifying their business into tourism operations (luxury lodges and or associated tourism development and infrastructure), providing for disposing of a surplus dwelling on the property where a neighbouring farm is purchased, providing for a family member or staff member to live on the farm or to implement a succession plan for multiple siblings through small lot subdivision. The proposed chapter has taken away any flexibility for farmers to subdivide their land for specific purposes without undermining the primary production or life-style value of the remaining land. The chapter as drafted, adds another layer complexity on top of the regulations and provisions that exist in regional council planning documents and in National Policy Statements. The Council seems intent of duplicating provisions which may have already been dealt with at regional and national levels.</p>	
<p>Maurice Dabbah (S422)</p>	<p>S422.011</p>	<p>Rural production</p>	<p>Objectives</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>The Proposed Plan, if approved, will directly affect members of the [Mataka Residents'] Association by imposing undue restrictions on the construction of residential dwellings on the Site through the application of specified overlays and rules.</p>	<p>Amend the Objectives of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Bernard Sabrier (S423)	S423.011	Rural production	Objectives	Oppose	The Proposed Plan, if approved, will directly affect members of the [Mataka Residents'] Association by imposing undue restrictions on the construction of residential dwellings on the Site through the application of specified overlays and rules.	Amend the Objectives of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.
Francois Dotta (S434)	S434.011	Rural production	Objectives	Oppose	The Proposed Plan, if approved, will directly affect members of the [Mataka Residents'] Association by imposing undue restrictions on the construction of residential dwellings on the Site through the application of specified overlays and rules.	Amend the Objectives of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.
Elka Gouzer (S435)	S435.011	Rural production	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.
Kapiro Conservation Trust (S442)	S442.137	Rural production	Objectives	Support in part	This chapter covers mineral extraction activities and farm quarries. However, there is no policy direction in the Chapter to reflect the rules to mineral extraction	Insert objectives to reflect the rule status of mineral extraction activities in accordance with the relief set out below.
Michael Foy (S472)	S472.030	Rural production	Objectives	Support in part	A separate alternative submission is to ask that the Plan redefines the RPROZ so that productive land is defined based on its ability to produce food but can accommodate things other than rural production. ie. Rural production zoning on poor soils is wrong. That is the right place to put smaller	Amend the Rural Production Zone objectives so that productive land is defined based on its ability to produce food but can accommodate things other than rural production; OR amend

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					areas for housing ie.2000sq mtrs. The Planning Maps show the Rural Production Zone in some areas e.g. Awanui/wireless road kaitaia that are serviced by sewerage, footpaths, etc, and it is submitted that these areas are re-zoned to reflect the existing infrastructure available, and be re-zoned to allow for intensification. This should be corrected by amending RPROZ objectives, policies and rules zones to accommodate things other than rural production.	Planning Maps to remove RPROZ from urban areas as separately submitted.
Dr Lynn Kincla (S505)	S505.001	Rural production	Objectives	Support in part	The properties bordering Henderson Bay Road are only 4 hectare blocks - and rural production requires a minimum of 40 hectares. I have concerns that some permissible rural production activities would possibly have a negative impact on the local environment and the small sizes of the blocks would also compound these effects. For example intensive cropping of avocados or raising of some types of animals like pigs or chickens would impact on neighbouring properties and would put added pressures in the Roading infrastructure. I think certain intensive farming activities should be excluded from the proposed Rural production zoning at Henderson Bay to protect this coastal environment.	Amend to exclude certain intensive farming activities from the proposed Rural production zone at Henderson Bay.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand (S511)	S511.118	Rural production	Objectives	Support in part	This chapter covers mineral extraction activities and farm quarries. However, there is no policy direction in the Chapter to reflect the rules to mineral extraction	Insert objectives to reflect the rule status of mineral extraction activities in accordance with the relief set out below.
Ballance Agri-Nutrients Limited (S143)	S143.011	Rural production	RPROZ-O1	Support	Ballance supports recognising the importance of primary production and its long-term protection.	Retain the objective RPROZ -O1
Horticulture New Zealand (S159)	S159.096	Rural production	RPROZ-O1	Support	Managing the Rural Production Zone for primary production is supported	Retain Objective RPROZ-O1
Manulife Forest Management	S160.032	Rural production	RPROZ-O1	Support	The submitter supports objective RPROZ-01.	Retain objective RPROZ-01 as it is written.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
(NZ) Ltd (S160)						
NZ Agricultural Aviation Association (S182)	S182.025	Rural production	RPROZ-O1	Support	Support recognizing the importance of primary production and its long term protection	Retain RPROZ-O1
Timothy and Dion Spicer (S213)	S213.002	Rural production	RPROZ-O1	Support		Retain objectives
Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand (S421)	S421.209	Rural production	RPROZ-O1	Oppose	<p>Federated Farmers opposes objectives RPZOZ-O1 and RPZOZ-O3 as they are drafted in the proposed district plan. The objectives promote the absolute protection of the rural production zone and highly productive land.</p> <p>The National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land sets out the requirements for the management of highly productive land. Policy 8 requires the protection of highly productive land from inappropriate use and development. Clause 3.8 provides for the subdivision of highly productive land provided certain matters are met. Clause 3.11 state that territorial authorities must include objectives, policies, and rules in their district plans to enable the maintenance, operation, or upgrade of any existing activities on highly productive land; and ensure that any loss of highly productive land from those activities is minimised.</p> <p>The proposed district plan needs to be consistent with the requirements of the National Policy Statement. In our opinion, Objectives RPZOZ-O1 and RPZOZ-O3 do not meet the requirements of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land as they do not provide for the ongoing operation of existing activities.</p>	Amend Objective RPZOZ-O1 to achieve consistency with the requirements of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land
Waiaua Bay Farm Limited (S463)	S463.089	Rural production	RPROZ-O1	Oppose	The drafting of this objective is vague. Presumably it seeks to ensure the ongoing availability of RPROZ land for primary production, however this is unclear from the text.	Amend Policy RPROZ-O1 to clarify the outcome that this objective seeks.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Lynley Newport (S102)	S102.001	Rural production	RPROZ-O2	Support in part	<p>The intent of the objectives is not debated. RPROZ-O2 reads as though there is no other land uses other than those listed that are considered appropriate zone. This in itself is not correct and is also contrary to the proposed rule regime to apply to the zone.</p> <p>The zone is already full of uses other than primary production activities, ancillary activities that support primary production, and other activities that would not be considered 'compatible' . Council is setting up a situation where an existing site supports existing land uses contrary to the objectives applying to it.</p> <p>Broaden/soften the wording of the objective.</p>	Amend RPROZ-O2 to read : The Rural Production Zone is primarily used for
Ballance Agri-Nutrients Limited (S143)	S143.012	Rural production	RPROZ-O2	Support	Ballance supports recognising the importance of ancillary activities (such as agricultural aviation) that support primary production.	Retain the objective RPROZ-O2
Horticulture New Zealand (S159)	S159.097	Rural production	RPROZ-O2	Support	Inclusion of ancillary activities that support primary production is important	Retain Objective RPROZ-O2
Manulife Forest Management (NZ) Ltd (S160)	S160.033	Rural production	RPROZ-O2	Support	The submitter supports objective RPROZ-O2.	Retain RPROZ-O2 as it is written.
Bentzen Farm Limited (S167)	S167.091	Rural production	RPROZ-O2	Support in part	<p>Reference to "functional need" in this objective potentially negates the ability for other activities to establish which may be a sustainable use of land and also contribute to the economic and social development of the district.</p> <p>There is a disconnect here with the subdivision opportunities provided for in the Rural Production Zone (eg environmental enhancement and management plan opportunities). Also with the range of uses permitted in the zone that perhaps also have no 'functional need' to locate.</p>	Amend Objective RPROZ-O2 "The Rural Production zone is used for primary production activities, ancillary activities that support primary production and other compatible activities that have a functional need to be in a rural environment ".
Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)	S168.089	Rural production	RPROZ-O2	Support in part	Reference to "functional need" in this objective potentially negates the ability for other activities to establish which may be a sustainable use of land and also contribute to the economic and social	Amend Objective RPROZ-O2 as follows: "The Rural Production zone is used for primary production

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>development of the district. Functional need is tightly defined in the Proposed Plan as "the need for a proposal or activity to traverse, locate or operate in a particular environment because the activity can only occur in that environment".</p> <p>There is a disconnect here with the subdivision opportunities provided for in the Rural Production Zone (eg environmental enhancement and management plan opportunities). Also with the range of uses permitted in the zone that perhaps also have no 'functional need' to locate within the tight constraint of the definition ie the activity can only occur in that environment (such as Residential activities, Visitor accommodation, Educational facilities, Conservation activities, Recreational activities, Cemeteries/Urupā and Minor residential units). These subdivision opportunities where they result in environmental benefit are recognised by policy RPROZ-P6.</p>	activities, ancillary activities that support primary production and other compatible activities that have a functional need to be in a rural environment ".
NZ Agricultural Aviation Association (S182)	S182.026	Rural production	RPROZ-O2	Support	support recognising compatible activities that support primary production	Retain RPROZ-O2
The Shooting Box Limited (S187)	S187.080	Rural production	RPROZ-O2	Support in part	Refer to submission for detailed reasons for decision(s) requested relating, but not limited to, to the following: the reference to "functional need" in this objective potentially negates the ability for other activities to establish which may be a sustainable use of land and also contribute to the economic social development of the district; and there is a disconnect here with the subdivision opportunities provided for in the Rural Production Zone - these subdivision opportunities where they result in environmental benefit are recognised by RPRIZ-P6.	Amend Objective RPROZ-O2 "The Rural Production zone is used for primary production activities, ancillary activities that support primary production and other compatible activities that have a functional need to be in a rural environment ".
Thomson Survey Ltd (S197)	S197.001	Rural production	RPROZ-O2	Support in part	The intent of the objectives is not debated. However, RPROZ-O2 is overly restrictive in that intent. It reads as though there is no other land uses other than those listed that are considered appropriate zone. This in itself is not correct and is	Amend Objective RPROZ-O2 as follows: The Rural Production zone is primarily used for primary production activities, ancillary

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					also contrary to the proposed rule regime to apply to the zone. In addition, the zone is already full of uses other than primary production activities, ancillary activities that support primary production, and other activities that would not be considered 'compatible'..... so the Council is setting up a situation where an existing site supports existing land uses contrary to the objectives applying to it. Broaden/soften the wording of the objective.	activities that support primary production and other compatible activities that have a functional need to be in a rural environment.
Wendover Two Limited (S222)	S222.084	Rural production	RPROZ-O2	Oppose	Reference to "functional need" in this objective potentially negates the ability for other activities to establish which may be a sustainable use of land and also contribute to the economic and social development of the district. Functional need is tightly defined in the Proposed Plan as "the need for a proposal or activity to traverse, locate or operate in a particular environment because the activity can only occur in that environment". There is a disconnect here with the subdivision opportunities provided for in the Rural Production Zone (eg environmental enhancement and management plan opportunities). Also with the range of uses permitted in the zone that perhaps also have no 'functional need' to locate within the tight constraint of the definition ie the activity can only occur in that environment (such as Residential activities, Visitor accommodation, Educational facilities, Conservation activities, Recreational activities, Cemeteries / Urupā and Minor residential units). These subdivision opportunities where they result in environmental benefit are recognised by policy RPROZ-P6.	Amend Objective RPROZ-O2 "The Rural Production zone is used for primary production activities, ancillary activities that support primary production and other compatible activities that have a functional need to be in a rural environment ".
Matauri Trustee Limited (S243)	S243.109	Rural production	RPROZ-O2	Support in part	Reference to "functional need" in this objective potentially negates the ability for other activities to establish which may be a sustainable use of land and also contribute to the economic and social development of the district. Functional need is tightly defined in the Proposed Plan as "the need for a proposal or activity to	Amend Objective RPROZ-O2 The Rural Production zone is used for primary production activities, ancillary activities that support primary production and other compatible activities that have a functional need to be

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>traverse, locate or operate in a particular environment because the activity can only occur in that environment".</p> <p>There is a disconnect here with the subdivision opportunities provided for in the Rural Production Zone (e.g. environmental enhancement and management plan opportunities). Also with the range of uses permitted in the zone that perhaps also have no 'functional need' to locate within the tight constraint of the definition i.e. the activity can only occur in that environment (such as Residential activities, Visitor accommodation, Educational facilities, Conservation activities, Recreational activities, Cemeteries / Urupā and Minor residential units). These subdivision opportunities where they result in environmental benefit are recognised by policy RPROZ-P6.</p>	in a rural environment.
Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga (S331)	S331.065	Rural production	RPROZ-O2	Support in part	<p>The submitter supports in part objective RPROZ-O2 as it considers educational facilities to be compatible with the activities in this zone however, they also have an operational need to be in the rural environment.</p>	<p>Amend objective RPROZ-O2 as follows: The Rural Production zone is used for primary production activities, ancillary activities that support primary production and other compatible activities that have a functional or operational need to be in a rural environment.</p>
P S Yates Family Trust (S333)	S333.081	Rural production	RPROZ-O2	Support in part	<p>Reference to "functional need" in this objective potentially negates the ability for other activities to establish which may be a sustainable use of land and also contribute to the economic and social development of the district.</p> <p>Functional need is tightly defined in the Proposed Plan as "the need for a proposal or activity to traverse, locate or operate in a particular environment because the activity can only occur in that environment".</p> <p>There is a disconnect here with the subdivision opportunities provided for in the Rural Production</p>	<p>Amend Objective RPROZ-O2 "The Rural Production zone is used for primary production activities, ancillary activities that support primary production and other compatible activities that have a functional need to be in a rural environment".</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					Zone (eg environmental enhancement and management plan opportunities). Also with the range of uses permitted in the zone that perhaps also have no 'functional need' to locate within the tight constraint of the definition ie the activity can only occur in that environment (such as Residential activities, Visitor accommodation, Educational facilities, Conservation activities, Recreational activities, Cemeteries / Urupā and Minor residential units). These subdivision opportunities where they result in environmental benefit are recognised by policy RPROZ-P6.	
Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand (S421)	S421.211	Rural production	RPROZ-O2	Support	Federated Farmers supports objectives RPZOZ-O2 and RPZOZ-O4 as they are currently drafted in the proposed district plan.	Retain Policy RPZOZ-O2 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent
Transpower New Zealand Ltd (S454)	S454.108	Rural production	RPROZ-O2	Not Stated	Objective RPROZ-O2 identifies the activities that the Rural Production Zone will be used for. Transpower supports the intent of this objective to identify the activities that are likely to occur within the Rural Production zone, however critical infrastructure, such as the National Grid, is not addressed. Due to their 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. The objective could be made more explicit to ensure that it is clear that infrastructure such as the National Grid is contemplated in this zone, not just compatible activities.	Amend RPROZ-O2 (inferred) as follows: The Rural Production zone is used for primary production activities, ancillary activities that support primary production, other compatible activities and infrastructure (including the National Grid) that have a functional or operational need to be in a rural environment.
Waiaua Bay Farm Limited (S463)	S463.090	Rural production	RPROZ-O2	Support	WBF agrees with the primacy accorded to primary production by this objective (inferred).	Retain Objective (inferred) RPROZ-O2
Radio New Zealand (S489)	S489.025	Rural production	RPROZ-O2	Support	RNZ support the direction to primarily use land in the rural production zone for primary production, and also activities with a functional need to be in this environment. The maintenance of a rural environment will reduce the potential for activities to be established that conflict with rural activities,	Retain Objective RPROZ-O2

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					and infrastructure such as RNZ's Facilities that are located in the rural production	
New Zealand Pork Industry Board (S55)	S55.025	Rural production	RPROZ-O3	Not Stated	Point a. of this objective enables the use of highly productive land for more productive forms of primary production. This intent of this objective is vague and requires clarification. What is defined as 'more productive forms of primary production' and how will it be measured/assessed?	amend to Define "more productive forms of primary production"
PF Olsen Limited (S91)	S91.020	Rural production	RPROZ-O3	Support in part	PF Olsen supports clauses a. and b. Clause c. is an unacceptable form of grandparenting existing land use, favouring one form of primary production over others.	Retain clauses a. and b. Amend clause c. to apply to all primary production activities.
Ballance Agri-Nutrients Limited (S143)	S143.013	Rural production	RPROZ-O3	Support	Ballance supports the protection of highly productive land and the protection of primary production activities from reverse sensitivity effects	Retain the objective RPROZ -O3
Summit Forests New Zealand Limited (S148)	S148.045	Rural production	RPROZ-O3	Support in part	In general, SFNZ supports the objectives and policies of this zone except where they seek to grandparent existing land use in favour of one form of primary production over others. Land use in the rural production zone needs to be able to adapt to changing economic and climatic conditions to ensure long term sustainability.	Amend any reference to "farming activities" in the Rural Production objectives to "primary production activities" and any reference to "farming" to "primary production" and any other changes to like effect.
Horticulture New Zealand (S159)	S159.098	Rural production	RPROZ-O3	Support	The rural working environment is what provides the rural character and amenity to the Rural Production zone	Retain Objective RPROZ-O3
Bentzen Farm Limited (S167)	S167.092	Rural production	RPROZ-O3	Support	The support for this objective is conditional on the amendments to the definition of highly productive land also sought by this submission. Reference to "other compatible activities" is supported because it recognises the broader range of land uses which occur in rural parts of the district.	Retain Objective RPROZ-O3
NZ Agricultural Aviation Association (S182)	S182.027	Rural production	RPROZ-O3	Support	support the protection for primary production activities from reverse sensitivity effects	Retain RPROZ-O3

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Wendover Two Limited (S222)	S222.085	Rural production	RPROZ-03	Support	The support for this objective is conditional on the amendments to the definition of highly productive land also sought by this submission. Reference to "other compatible activities" is supported because it recognises the broader range of land uses which occur in rural parts of the district.	Retain Objective RPROZ-03
Matauri Trustee Limited (S243)	S243.110	Rural production	RPROZ-03	Support	The support for this objective is conditional on the amendments to the definition of highly productive land also sought by this submission. Reference to "other compatible activities" is supported because it recognises the broader range of land uses which occur in rural parts of the district.	Retain Objective RPROZ-03
Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand (S421)	S421.210	Rural production	RPROZ-03	Oppose	Federated Farmers opposes objectives RPZOZ-O1 and RPZOZ-O3 as they are drafted in the proposed district plan. The objectives promote the absolute protection of the rural production zone and highly productive land. The National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land sets out the requirements for the management of highly productive land. Policy 8 requires the protection of highly productive land from inappropriate use and development. Clause 3.8 provides for the subdivision of highly productive land provided certain matters are met. Clause 3.11 state that territorial authorities must include objectives, policies, and rules in their district plans to enable the maintenance, operation, or upgrade of any existing activities on highly productive land; and ensure that any loss of highly productive land from those activities is minimised. The proposed district plan needs to be consistent with the requirements of the National Policy Statement. In our opinion, Objectives RPZOZ-O1 and RPZOZ-O3 do not meet the requirements of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land as they do not provide for the ongoing operation of existing activities.	Amend Objective RPZOZ-O3 to achieve consistency with the requirements of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land
Manulife Forest Management	S160.034	Rural production	RPROZ-04	Support	The submitter supports objective RPROZ-04.	Retain objective RPROZ-04 as it is written.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
(NZ) Ltd (S160)						
Bentzen Farm Limited (S167)	S167.093	Rural production	RPROZ-O4	Oppose	<p>The proposed objective that "the rural character and amenity associated with a rural working environment is maintained", fails to recognise that character and amenity of the zone is not only defined by a working rural environment for the reasons discussed above in this submission, and that such character and amenity can be very location specific.</p> <p>The proposed alternative objective allows a more nuanced assessment of character and amenity. In contrast, this diverse range of rural environments, rural character and amenity values throughout the District is recognised by policy RPROZ-P4.</p>	Delete Objective RPROZ-O4 and replace with the following: Subdivision, use and development in the Rural Area maintain the rural character and amenity of the zone.
Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)	S168.090	Rural production	RPROZ-O4	Oppose	<p>The proposed objective that "the rural character and amenity associated with a rural working environment is maintained", fails to recognise that character and amenity of the zone is not only defined by a working rural environment for the reasons discussed above in this submission, and that such character and amenity can be very location specific. The proposed alternative objective allows a more nuanced assessment of character and amenity.</p> <p>In contrast, this diverse range of rural environments, rural character and amenity values throughout the District is recognised by policy RPROZ-P4.</p>	Delete Objective RPROZ-O4 and replace with the following: Subdivision, use and development in the Rural Area maintain the rural character and amenity of the zone.
The Shooting Box Limited (S187)	S187.081	Rural production	RPROZ-O4	Oppose	<p>The proposed objective that "the rural character and amenity associated with a rural working environment is maintained", fails to recognise that character and amenity of the zone is not only defined by a working rural environment for the reasons discussed above in this submission, and that such character and amenity can be very location specific. The proposed alternative objective allows a more nuanced assessment of character and amenity.</p> <p>In contrast, this diverse range of rural environments, rural character and amenity values</p>	Delete Objective RPROZ-O4 and replace with the following: Subdivision, use and development in the Rural Area maintain the rural character and amenity of the zone.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					throughout the District is recognised by policy RPROZ-P4.	
Wendover Two Limited (S222)	S222.086	Rural production	RPROZ-O4	Oppose	The proposed objective that "the rural character and amenity associated with a rural working environment is maintained", fails to recognise that character and amenity of the zone is not only defined by a working rural environment for the reasons discussed above in this submission, and that such character and amenity can be very location specific. The proposed alternative objective allows a more nuanced assessment of character and amenity. In contrast, this diverse range of rural environments, rural character and amenity values throughout the District is recognised by policy RPROZ-P4.	Delete Objective RPROZ-O4 and insert the following: Subdivision, use and development in the Rural Area maintain the rural character and amenity of the zone.
Matauri Trustee Limited (S243)	S243.111	Rural production	RPROZ-O4	Oppose	The proposed objective that "the rural character and amenity associated with a rural working environment is maintained", fails to recognise that character and amenity of the zone is not only defined by a working rural environment for the reasons discussed above in this submission, and that such character and amenity can be very location specific. The proposed alternative objective allows a more nuanced assessment of character and amenity. In contrast, this diverse range of rural environments, rural character and amenity values throughout the District is recognised by policy RPROZ-P4	Delete Objective RPROZ-O4 and replace with the following: Subdivision, use and development in the rural area maintain the rural character and amenity of the zone.
P S Yates Family Trust (S333)	S333.082	Rural production	RPROZ-O4	Oppose	The proposed objective that "the rural character and amenity associated with a rural working environment is maintained", fails to recognise that character and amenity of the zone is not only defined by a working rural environment for the reasons discussed above in this submission, and that such character and amenity can be very location specific. The proposed alternative objective allows a more nuanced assessment of character and amenity. In contrast, this diverse range of rural environments, rural character and amenity values	Delete Objective RPROZ-O4 and replace with the following: Subdivision, use and development in the Rural Area maintain the rural character and amenity of the zone.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					throughout the District is recognised by policy RPROZ-P4.	
Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand (S421)	S421.212	Rural production	RPROZ-O4	Support	Federated Farmers supports objectives RPZOZ-O2 and RPZOZ-O4 as they are currently drafted in the proposed district plan.	Retain Policy RPZOZ-O4 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent
Radio New Zealand (S489)	S489.026	Rural production	RPROZ-O4	Support	RNZ supports the maintenance of rural character and amenity.	Retain Objective RPROZ-O4
MLP LLC (S183)	S183.012	Rural production	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Landing Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Landing Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Landing Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.
Tryphena Trustees Limited, David Haythornwaite (S226)	S226.012	Rural production	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.
Isles Casey Trustee Services Limited, WWC Trustee Company Limited (S227)	S227.012	Rural production	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Jayesh Govind and Others (S228)	S228.012	Rural production	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.
Laurie Pearson (S229)	S229.012	Rural production	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.
Mataka Residents' Association Inc (S230)	S230.012	Rural production	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.
Tobias Groser (S232)	S232.012	Rural production	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Whale Bay Limited (S233)	S233.012	Rural production	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.
Whale Bay Limited (S234)	S234.012	Rural production	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.
WW Trustee Services 2016 Limited, Eloise Caroline Caswell, Donald Gordon Chandler (S235)	S235.012	Rural production	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.
Connemara Black Limited (S236)	S236.012	Rural production	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.
Evan Williams and	S237.012	Rural production	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka	Amend the Policies of the Rural production chapter to recognise

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Katherine Williams (S237)					Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.
John Gowing and Miriam Van Lith (S238)	S238.012	Rural production	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.
John Gowing, Miriam Van Lith, Ellis Gowing, James Gowing, Byron Gowing (S239)	S239.012	Rural production	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.
Matthew Watson, Kaylene Watson, D R Thomas Limited (S240)	S240.012	Rural production	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.
Matthew Draper and Michaela	S241.012	Rural production	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not	Amend the Policies of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Jannard (S241)					promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.
Te Hiku Community Board (S257)	S257.026	Rural production	Policies	Oppose	The Planning Maps show the Rural Production Zone in some areas e.g. Awanui that are serviced by sewerage, footpaths, refuse collection etc. If this zoning continues, it will severely constrain future urban development, and this should be corrected by amending RPROZ objectives, policies and rules zones to accommodate things other than rural production.	Amend the Rural Production Zone policies so that productive land is defined based on its ability to produce food but can accommodate things other than rural production; OR amend Planning Maps to remove RPROZ from urban areas as separately submitted.
Rosemorn Industries Limited (S340)	S340.003	Rural production	Policies	Support in part	The policies in the Rural Production Zone chapter do not provide any clear direction on when, or under what circumstances it is appropriate for existing commercial and industrial activities to be extended. Clear direction is required given the level of investment associated with purchasing properties and establishing the existing activities, and the implications that the PFNDP could have with respect to any future plans for those sites and activities.	Amend policies of the Rural Production Zone to include more specific direction on when it is appropriate to extend existing commercial and/or industrial activities.
Nicole Way and Christopher Huljich as Trustees of the Trssh Birnie Settlement Trust (S345)	S345.002	Rural production	Policies	Oppose	The Resource Consents at Mataka Station enable development, and completion of the Mataka Station development, notwithstanding the provisions of the Proposed District Plan. The Proposed District Plan fails to recognise, have regard to, or provide for the development and subdivision enabled by the Resource Consents. The Proposed District Plan provisions will restrict development of the Property, and Mataka Station more generally, in a manner that is inconsistent with the Resource Consents and the integrated and comprehensive development authorised by those. The Council's s32 analysis does not mention, or consider approved but unimplemented developments within the Property and Mataka Station more generally, nor elsewhere. The "low	Amend to explicitly, and specifically provide for, and preserve the activities and land uses authorised under the Resource Consents at Mataka Station. and/or Insert a new special purpose zone and/or structure plan together with appropriate provisions (objectives, policies and rules) enabling the residential activity and development as is authorised by the Resource Consents as a permitted activity (where they are in general accordance with the

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					intensity" development controls and height limits proposed within the Coastal Environment are given very little analysis. The proposed provisions are inconsistent with the Act and relevant planning instruments.	ResourceConsents) as well as appropriate activities within the Rural Production Zone, regardless of the provisions of the CE, ONL or HNC. and/or Amend the provisions of the Proposed District Plan to preserve the activities and buildings authorised by the Resource Consents on the Property.
Philibert Jean-G Frick (S352)	S352.012	Rural production	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.
Leah Frieling (S358)	S358.030	Rural production	Policies	Oppose	The Plan redefines the Rural Production zone so that it is based on its ability to produce food but can accommodate things other than rural production i.e. Rural Production zoning on poor soils is wrong. That is the right place to put smaller areas for housing i.e. 2,000 m ² .	Amend the Rural Production zone policies so that productive land is defined based on its ability to produce food but can accommodate things other than rural production; OR amend planning maps to remove the Rural Production zone from urban areas (as separately submitted).
Waste Management NZ Limited (S360)	S360.007	Rural production	Policies	Oppose	It is critical that the Proposed Plan provide for 'waste management facilities' in a broader range of zones to reflect the functional and operational requirements of such activities, and to provide a framework within which the effects of such activities can be appropriately managed. In this respect, it is appropriate that the Proposed Plan	Amend the policies to provide for waste management facilities

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					provides for waste management facilities at the 'strategic direction' level, as well as specifically within the Light Industrial, Heavy Industrial and Rural Production zones.	
<p>Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand (S421)</p>	S421.206	Rural production	Policies	Support in part	<p>Federated Farmers supports the recognition in the overview of the fact it is important to differentiate the rural production zone from the rural lifestyle and rural residential zones. We also support the strong recognition that has been given to rural land as an important resource.</p> <p>The concern Federated Farmers has is that the overview is focused on the absolute protection of highly productive from any activities other than primary production. The approach taken by the Council to prevent the fragmentation of rural production land is support but acknowledgement is also needed that all highly productive may not be profitable for the landowner. It would be unequitable for the Council to prohibit a rural landowner who has cared for the land for many years from achieving the real potential value of that land.</p> <p>The proposed district plan has strayed into private property rights through dictating what can and cannot be done on rural production land.</p> <p>Returns from farming are variable due to a variety of factors including weather conditions, economic conditions, individual property circumstances and market demands. Like any business, diversification, flexibility, responsiveness, and cash flow are critically important to retaining their viability.</p> <p>Farmers undertake low impact subdivision for a variety of reasons. These vary from diversifying their business into tourism operations (luxury lodges and or associated tourism development and infrastructure), providing for disposing of a surplus dwelling on the property where a neighbouring farm is purchased, providing for a family member or staff member to live on the farm or to implement a succession plan for multiple siblings through small lot subdivision. The</p>	<p>Amend the Policies to recognise and provide for private property rights and allow landowners to subdivide land in the rural production zone for specific purposes such as creating lifestyle lots and lots for family members (amongst other matters)</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					proposed chapter has taken away any flexibility for farmers to subdivide their land for specific purposes without undermining the primary production or life-style value of the remaining land. The chapter as drafted, adds another layer complexity on top of the regulations and provisions that exist in regional council planning documents and in National Policy Statements. The Council seems intent of duplicating provisions which may have already been dealt with at regional and national levels.	
Maurice Dabbah (S422)	S422.012	Rural production	Policies	Oppose	The Proposed Plan, if approved, will directly affect members of the [Mataka Residents'] Association by imposing undue restrictions on the construction of residential dwellings on the Site through the application of specified overlays and rules.	Amend the Policies of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.
Bernard Sabrier (S423)	S423.012	Rural production	Policies	Oppose	The Proposed Plan, if approved, will directly affect members of the [Mataka Residents'] Association by imposing undue restrictions on the construction of residential dwellings on the Site through the application of specified overlays and rules.	Amend the Policies of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.
Kapiro Residents Association (S427)	S427.032	Rural production	Policies	Support in part	Land that is regarded as highly productive (LUC Classes 1,2 and 3) is a strictly finite resource, essential for future food production for a growing population here and worldwide, and important for jobs and economic development. The recently issued National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land requires councils to protect LUC Class 1-3 land from fragmentation and loss (outside of identified urban zones) and allows councils to protect other types of productive land in similar manner.	Amend to include specific policies/rules to prevent fragmentation and loss of land in rural and horticulture zones [inferred].

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Francois Dotta (S434)	S434.012	Rural production	Policies	Oppose	The Proposed Plan, if approved, will directly affect members of the [Mataka Residents'] Association by imposing undue restrictions on the construction of residential dwellings on the Site through the application of specified overlays and rules.	Amend the Policies of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.
Elka Gouzer (S435)	S435.012	Rural production	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.
Kapiro Conservation Trust (S442)	S442.138	Rural production	Policies	Support in part	This chapter covers mineral extraction activities and farm quarries. However, there is no policy direction in the Chapter to reflect the rules to mineral extraction.	Insert policies to reflect the rule status of mineral extraction activities in accordance with the relief set out below.
Kapiro Conservation Trust (S449)	S449.065	Rural production	Policies	Support in part	Land that is regarded as highly productive (LUC Classes 1,2 and 3) is a strictly finite resource, essential for future food production for a growing population here and worldwide, and important for jobs and economic development. The recently issued National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land requires councils to protect LUC Class 1-3 land from fragmentation and loss (outside of identified urban zones) and allows councils to protect other types of productive land in similar manner.	Amend to include specify policies/rules to prevent fragmentation and loss of land in rural and horticulture zones [inferred].
Transpower New Zealand Ltd (S454)	S454.109	Rural production	Policies	Not Stated	RPROZ-P1 sets out the activities that are to be enabled in the Rural Production 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 Grid,	Insert new policy RPROZ-Px as follows: Enable compatible activities and infrastructure, that have a functional or operational need to locate in

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					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 Rural Production zone.	the Rural Production zone.
Michael Foy (S472)	S472.031	Rural production	Policies	Support in part	A separate alternative submission is to ask that the Plan redefines the RPROZ so that productive land is defined based on its ability to produce food but can accommodate things other than rural production. ie. Rural production zoning on poor soils is wrong. That is the right place to put smaller areas for housing ie.2000sq mtrs. The Planning Maps show the Rural Production Zone in some areas e.g. Awanui/wireless road kaitaia that are serviced by sewerage, footpaths, etc, and it is submitted that these areas are re-zoned to reflect the existing infrastructure available, and be re-zoned to allow for intensification. This should be corrected by amending RPROZ objectives, policies and rules zones to accommodate things other than rural production.	Amend the Rural Production Zone policies so that productive land is defined based on its ability to produce food but can accommodate things other than rural production; OR amend Planning Maps to remove RPROZ from urban areas as separately submitted
Dr Lynn Kincla (S505)	S505.002	Rural production	Policies	Support in part	The properties bordering Henderson Bay Road are only 4 hectare blocks - and rural production requires a minimum of 40 hectares. I have concerns that some permissible rural production activities would possibly have a negative impact on the local environment and the small sizes of the blocks would also compound these effects. For example intensive cropping of avocados or raising of some types of animals like pigs or chickens would impact on neighbouring properties and would put added pressures in the Roding infrastructure. I think certain intensive farming activities should be excluded from the proposed Rural production zoning at Henderson Bay to protect this coastal environment.	Amend to exclude certainintensive farming activities from the proposed Rural production zone at Henderson Bay.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of	S511.119	Rural production	Policies	Support in part	This chapter covers mineral extraction activities and farm quarries. However, there is no policy direction in the Chapter to reflect the rules to mineral extraction	Include objectives and policies to reflect the rule status of mineral extraction activities in accordance with the relief set out below.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
New Zealand (S511)						
Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK) (S522)	S522.047	Rural production	Policies	Support in part	Land that is regarded as highly productive (LUC Classes 1,2 and 3) is a strictly finite resource, essential for future food production for a growing population here and worldwide, and important for jobs and economic development. The recently issued National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land requires councils to protect LUC Class 1-3 land from fragmentation and loss (outside of identified urban zones) and allows councils to protect other types of productive land in similar manner.	Amend to include specific policies/rules to prevent fragmentation and loss of land in rural and horticulture zones [inferred].
Carbon Neutral NZ Trust (S529)	S529.155	Rural production	Policies	Not Stated	We consider that all zones, except urban zones, need to be covered by firm PDP policies and rules to protect a key natural resource - productive land - now and for future generations. This means preventing fragmentation and loss of productive land from productive use, especially LUC Class 1-3 land and productive types of soil/land suitable for horticulture. It is not necessary to wait until the regional council has implemented the NPS-HPL.	Amend policies to have firm policy around protecting a key natural resource - productive land - now and for future generations.
New Zealand Pork Industry Board (S55)	S55.026	Rural production	RPROZ-P1	Support	Support policy to enable primary production activities and recognition that typical adverse effects associated with such activities should be anticipated and accepted within the rural zo	Retain as proposed
Ballance Agri-Nutrients Limited (S143)	S143.014	Rural production	RPROZ-P1	Support	Ballance supports the enabling of primary production and recognition that typical adverse effects should be anticipated and expected within the Rural production Zone	retain the polciicy RPROZ-P1
Manulife Forest Management (NZ) Ltd (S160)	S160.035	Rural production	RPROZ-P1	Support	The submitter supports policy RPROZ-P1	Retain policy RPROZ-P1 as it is written.
NZ Agricultural Aviation Association (S182)	S182.028	Rural production	RPROZ-P1	Support	support the enabling of primary production and recognition that typical adverse effects should be anticipated and expected	Retain RPROZ-P1

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Timothy and Dion Spicer (S213)	S213.003	Rural production	RPROZ-P1	Support		retain policies
Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand (S421)	S421.218	Rural production	RPROZ-P1	Support	Federated Farmers supports policies RPZOZ-P1 and RPZOZ-P7 as they are currently drafted in the proposed district plan.	Retain Policy RPZOZ-P1 (inferred) or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent
Waiaua Bay Farm Limited (S463)	S463.091	Rural production	RPROZ-P1	Support	WBF supports recognition of the typical effects of primary production, which cannot necessarily be internalised.	Retain Policy RPROZ-P1
New Zealand Pork Industry Board (S55)	S55.027	Rural production	RPROZ-P2	Support	Support enabling primary production activities as the predominant land use, on the understanding that this includes intensive primary production activities.	Retain as proposed
Lynley Newport (S103)	S103.001	Rural production	RPROZ-P2	Oppose	<p>The intent of the policies is made abundantly clear by their wording. I disagree with that intent and oppose strongly the punitive and restrictive wording of the policies.</p> <p>There will be existing property and land use in the Rural Production Zone already contrary to the policies. There are permitted activities listed in the zone rules that will be contrary to some of the policies - which is illogical and not consistent with the Resource Management Act.</p> <p>The problem with some of the policies as written is that they attempt to stop almost any activity in the zone except farming. This is not effects based, is an inconsistent approach when compared with other zones, is overly stifling of the rural community's ability to remain vibrant and viable; and not consistent with the zone's own rule suite. RPROZ-P2 should also provide for/enable a range of compatible activities that may not support primary production but which might establish without adversely affecting the ability to continue with primary production. This would be more consistent with the rule framework.</p>	Amend the Rural Production Zone policy RPROZ-P2 by adding a part (c): Enabling activities that do not support primary production activities but where they do not adversely affect the ability of the site to continue with primary production use.
Ballance Agri-Nutrients	S143.015	Rural production	RPROZ-P2	Support	Ballance supports the enabling and recognition of primary production as the predominant land use in the Rural Production Zone as well as the	retain the Policy RPROZ- P2

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Limited (S143)					importance of enabling ancillary activities (such as agricultural aviation).	
Horticulture New Zealand (S159)	S159.099	Rural production	RPROZ-P2	Support	Enabling primary production and ancillary activities and those with a functional need to support primary production is supported.	Retain Policy RPROZ-P2
Manulife Forest Management (NZ) Ltd (S160)	S160.036	Rural production	RPROZ-P2	Support	The submitter supports RPROZ-P2.	Retain RPROZ-P2 as it is written.
NZ Agricultural Aviation Association (S182)	S182.029	Rural production	RPROZ-P2	Support in part	support enabling and recognising primary production as the predominant land use. Seek to have agricultural aviation acknowledged as part of the rural character	Retain RPROZ-P2 and amend to add: b. enabling a range of compatible activities that support primary production activities, including ancillary activities, agricultural aviation , rural produce manufacturing, rural produce retail, visitor accommodation and home businesses.
Thomson Survey Ltd (S199)	S199.001	Rural production	RPROZ-P2	Oppose	The submitter opposes the intent and restrictive wording of RPROZ-P2 and contends that there are permitted activities listed in the zone rules that will be contrary to the policies.	Amend RPROZ-2 as follows: Add (c): Enabling activities that do not support primary production activities but where they do not adversely affect the anility of the site to continue with priary production use.
Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga (S331)	S331.066	Rural production	RPROZ-P2	Support in part	The submitter supports in part policy RPROZ-P2 as it provides for a range of compactible activities that require a rural location such as educational facilities.	Amend policy RPROZ-P2 as follows: Ensure the Rural Production zone provides for activities that require a rural location by: a. enabling primary production activities as the

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>predominant land use; b. enabling a range of compatible activities that support primary production activities, including ancillary activities, rural produce manufacturing, rural produce retail, visitor accommodation, educational facilities, and home businesses.</p>
<p>Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand (S421)</p>	<p>S421.213</p>	<p>Rural production</p>	<p>RPROZ-P2</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>Federated Farmers opposes policies RPZOZ-P2 RPZOZ-P3, RPROZ-4, RPRPZ-P5 and RPROZ-P6 as they are drafted in the proposed district plan. The policies have no regard for the private property rights of landowners and are promoting the absolute protection of the rural production zone and highly productive land through removing the ability of landowners to control the use of their land.</p> <p>The National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land sets out the requirements for the management of highly productive land. Policy 8 requires the protection of highly productive land from inappropriate use and development. Clause 3.8 provides for the subdivision of highly productive land provided certain matters are met. Clause 3.11 states that territorial authorities must include objectives, policies, and rules in their district plans to enable the maintenance, operation, or upgrade of any existing activities on highly productive land; and ensure that any loss of highly productive land from those activities is minimised.</p> <p>The proposed district plan needs to be consistent with the requirements of the National Policy</p>	<p>Amend Policy RPZOZ-P2 to achieve consistency with the requirements of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land and to recognise and provide for the rights of private landowners</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					Statement as well as acknowledging the rights of landowners.	
Waiaua Bay Farm Limited (S463)	S463.092	Rural production	RPROZ-P2	Oppose	WBF seeks the inclusion of reference to 'staff accommodation' in this policy to clarify that this activity is ancillary to farming.	Amend point b. of Policy RPROZ-P2 as follows: b. enabling a range of compatible activities that support primary production activities, including ancillary activities (including staff accommodation) , rural produce manufacturing, rural produce retail, visitor accommodation and home businesses.
Radio New Zealand (S489)	S489.027	Rural production	RPROZ-P2	Support	RNZ support the direction to primarily use land in the rural production zone for primary production	Retain Policy RPROZ-P2
New Zealand Pork Industry Board (S55)	S55.028	Rural production	RPROZ-P3	Support	Support requirement to avoid or mitigate reverse sensitivity effects on primary production activities.	Retain as proposed
Ballance Agri-Nutrients Limited (S143)	S143.016	Rural production	RPROZ-P3	Support	Ballance supports ensuring that reverse sensitivities and non-productive activities do not impact on primary production and associated ancillary activities	Retain the Policy RPROZ -P3
Horticulture New Zealand (S159)	S159.100	Rural production	RPROZ-P3	Oppose	Policy RPROZ-P5 seeks to avoid land uses for a number of reasons. It is considered that Policy RPROZ-P3 could be combined with Policy RPROZ-P5 by an additional clause	Delete Policy RPROZ-P3
Manulife Forest Management (NZ) Ltd (S160)	S160.037	Rural production	RPROZ-P3	Support	The submitter supports policy RPROZ-P3.	Retain policy RPROZ-P3 as it is written.
NZ Agricultural Aviation Association (S182)	S182.030	Rural production	RPROZ-P3	Support	support ensuring that reverse sensitivities and non-productive activities do not impact on primary production	Retain RPROZ-P3

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga (S331)	S331.067	Rural production	RPROZ-P3	Support	The submitter supports policy RPROZ-P3 to manage the establishment, design and location of new sensitive activities such as educational facilities in the Rural Production zone to avoid where possible, or otherwise mitigate reverse sensitivity effects on primary production activities.	Retain policy RPROZ-P3, as proposed.
Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand (S421)	S421.214	Rural production	RPROZ-P3	Oppose	Federated Farmers opposes policies RPZ-2, RPZ-3, RPROZ-4, RPRPZ-P5 and RPROZ-P6 as they are drafted in the proposed district plan. The policies have no regard for the private property rights of landowners and are promoting the absolute protection of the rural production zone and highly productive land through removing the ability of landowners to control the use of their land. The National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land sets out the requirements for the management of highly productive land. Policy 8 requires the protection of highly productive land from inappropriate use and development. Clause 3.8 provides for the subdivision of highly productive land provided certain matters are met. Clause 3.11 states that territorial authorities must include objectives, policies, and rules in their district plans to enable the maintenance, operation, or upgrade of any existing activities on highly productive land; and ensure that any loss of highly productive land from those activities is minimised. The proposed district plan needs to be consistent with the requirements of the National Policy Statement as well as acknowledging the rights of landowners.	Amend Policy RPZ-3 to achieve consistency with the requirements of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land and to recognise and provide for the rights of private landowners
Radio New Zealand (S489)	S489.028	Rural production	RPROZ-P3	Support	RNZ supports policy direction limiting the potential for new sensitive activities to have reverse sensitivity effects on established activities in the rural production zone	Retain Policy RPROZ-P3 (inferred)
New Zealand Pork Industry Board (S55)	S55.029	Rural production	RPROZ-P4	Support	Support land use and subdivision being undertaken in a manner that reflects character and amenity of the RPZ.	Retain as proposed
Ballance Agri-	S143.017	Rural production	RPROZ-P4	Support	Ballance supports ensuring that subdivision maintains or enhances the rural character of the	retain the Policy RPROZ -P4

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Nutrients Limited (S143)					Rural production Zone including noise and dust associated with the rural environment	
Horticulture New Zealand (S159)	S159.102	Rural production	RPROZ-P4	Support	The description of rural character reflects the nature of the rural environment although there may be site coverage for orchard structures	Retain Policy RPROZ-P4
Manulife Forest Management (NZ) Ltd (S160)	S160.038	Rural production	RPROZ-P4	Support	The submitter supports policy RPROZ-P4.	Retain policy RPROZ-P4 as it is written.
Bentzen Farm Limited (S167)	S167.094	Rural production	RPROZ-P4	Support	The policy is supported because it recognises that the rural character and amenity of the zone includes "a diverse range of rural environments, rural character and amenity values throughout the District".	Retain Policy RPROZ-P4
Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)	S168.091	Rural production	RPROZ-P4	Support	The policy is supported because it recognises that the rural character and amenity of the zone includes "a diverse range of rural environments, rural character and amenity values throughout the District".	Retain Policy RPROZ-P4
NZ Agricultural Aviation Association (S182)	S182.031	Rural production	RPROZ-P4	Support	support ensuring that subdivision maintains or enhances the rural character of the RPROZ including noise and dust associated with the rural environment	Retain RPROZ-P4
The Shooting Box Limited (S187)	S187.082	Rural production	RPROZ-P4	Support	The policy is supported because it recognises that the rural character and amenity of the zone includes "a diverse range of rural environments, rural character and amenity values throughout the District".	Retain Policy RPROZ-P4.
Wendover Two Limited (S222)	S222.087	Rural production	RPROZ-P4	Support	The policy is supported because it recognises that the rural character and amenity of the zone includes "a diverse range of rural environments, rural character and amenity values throughout the District".	Retain Policy RPROZ-P4
Matauri Trustee Limited (S243)	S243.112	Rural production	RPROZ-P4	Support	The policy is supported because it recognises that the rural character and amenity of the zone includes "a diverse range of rural environments, rural character and amenity values throughout the District".	Retain Policy RPROZ-P4

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
P S Yates Family Trust (S333)	S333.083	Rural production	RPROZ-P4	Support	The policy is supported because it recognises that the rural character and amenity of the zone includes "a diverse range of rural environments, rural character and amenity values throughout the District	Retain Policy RPROZ-P4
Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand (S421)	S421.215	Rural production	RPROZ-P4	Oppose	<p>Federated Farmers opposes policies RPZOZ-P2 RPZOZ-P3, RPROZ-4, RPRPZ-P5 and RPROZ-P6 as they are drafted in the proposed district plan. The policies have no regard for the private property rights of landowners and are promoting the absolute protection of the rural production zone and highly productive land through removing the ability of landowners to control the use of their land.</p> <p>The National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land sets out the requirements for the management of highly productive land. Policy 8 requires the protection of highly productive land from inappropriate use and development. Clause 3.8 provides for the subdivision of highly productive land provided certain matters are met. Clause 3.11 states that territorial authorities must include objectives, policies, and rules in their district plans to enable the maintenance, operation, or upgrade of any existing activities on highly productive land; and ensure that any loss of highly productive land from those activities is minimised.</p> <p>The proposed district plan needs to be consistent with the requirements of the National Policy Statement as well as acknowledging the rights of landowners.</p>	Amend Policy RPZOZ-P4 to achieve consistency with the requirements of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land and to recognise and provide for the rights of private landowners
Radio New Zealand (S489)	S489.029	Rural production	RPROZ-P4	Support	RNZ support this policy, particularly the direction to maintain low density development.	Retain Policy RPROZ-P4
New Zealand Pork Industry Board (S55)	S55.030	Rural production	RPROZ-P5	Support	Support policy to avoid land use that is incompatible with the purpose, character and amenity of the RPZ and does not have a functional need to locate there. Intensive primary production, while not directly dependent on the soil resource, has a functional and locational need	Retain as proposed

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					to operate in the rural production zone. Indoor pig farms are often part of a larger farming enterprise incorporating either an arable or pastoral operation. Effluent from the piggery is applied to the land as a natural fertiliser. The land can, in turn, grow feed or bedding for the pigs. For this reason, pig farms are often situated by necessity on highly productive land, as they are integrated with operations that do rely on the productive capacity of the soil.	
Lynley Newport (S103)	S103.002	Rural production	RPROZ-P5	Oppose	<p>The intent of the policies is made abundantly clear by their wording. I disagree with that intent and oppose strongly the punitive and restrictive wording of the policies.</p> <p>There will be existing property and land use in the Rural Production Zone already contrary to the policies. There are permitted activities listed in the zone rules that will be contrary to some of the policies - which is illogical and not consistent with the Resource Management Act.</p> <p>The problem with some of the policies as written is that they attempt to stop almost any activity in the zone except farming. This is not effects based, is an inconsistent approach when compared with other zones, is overly stifling of the rural community's ability to remain vibrant and viable; and not consistent with the zone's own rule suite.</p>	Amended Policy RPROZ-P5 to read: Manage land use so that: a. It is compatible with the purpose, character and amenity of the Rural Production Zone;b. It enables activities with a functional need to locate in the Rural Production Zone;c. Does not result in a more than minor loss of productive capacity of highly productive land;d. Does not exacerbate natural hazards; ande. Can provide appropriate on-site infrastructure.
Horticulture New Zealand (S159)	S159.101	Rural production	RPROZ-P5	Oppose	Policy RPROZ-P5 seeks to avoid land uses for a number of reasons. It is considered that Policy RPROZ-P3 could be combined with RPROZ-P5 by an additional clause	Amend Policy RPROZ-P5 to incorporate reverse sensitivity effects, add: f) could result in reverse sensitivity effects
Horticulture New Zealand (S159)	S159.103	Rural production	RPROZ-P5	Support in part	The approach of Policy RPROZ-P5 is supported but an additional clause is supported for reverse sensitivity effects.	Amend Policy RPROZ-P5 by adding: f) could result in reverse sensitivity effects

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Manulife Forest Management (NZ) Ltd (S160)	S160.039	Rural production	RPROZ-P5	Support	The submitter supports policy RPROZ-P5.	Retain policy RPROZ-P5 as it is written.
Bentzen Farm Limited (S167)	S167.095	Rural production	RPROZ-P5	Oppose	Reference to "functional need" in this policy potentially negates the ability for other activities to establish which may be a sustainable use of land and also contribute to the economic and social development of the district, or bring environmental benefit such as residential activities, Visitor accommodation, Educational facilities, Conservation activities, Recreational activities, Cemeteries / Urupā and Minor residential units.	Delete Policy RPROZ-P5 Or alternatively Amend Policy RPROZ-P5 as follows: Avoid land use that: a. is incompatible with the purpose, character and amenity of the Rural Production zone; b. does not have a functional need to locate in the Rural Production zone and is more appropriately located in another zone; c. would result in the loss of productive capacity of highly productive land; d. would exacerbate natural hazards; and e. cannot provide appropriate on-site infrastructure.
Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)	S168.092	Rural production	RPROZ-P5	Oppose	Reference to "functional need" in this policy potentially negates the ability for other activities to establish which may be a sustainable use of land and also contribute to the economic and social development of the district, or bring environmental benefit such as residential activities, Visitor accommodation, Educational facilities, Conservation activities, Recreational activities, Cemeteries/Urupā and Minor residential units.	Delete Policy RPROZ-P5 Or alternatively Amend Policy RPROZ-P5 as follows: Avoid land use that: a. is incompatible with the purpose, character and amenity of the Rural Production zone;

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>The zone purpose presumably is from the overview. Sub clause a. is only supported with the amendment to that overview sought in this submission.</p> <p>Similarly, reference to Highly Productive Land in subclause c. is only supported with the amendments to the definition of Highly Productive Land also sought in this submission.</p>	<p>b. does not have a functional need to locate in the Rural Production zone and is more appropriately located in another zone; ...</p>
The Shooting Box Limited (S187)	S187.083	Rural production	RPROZ-P5	Oppose	<p>Refer to submission for detailed reasons for decision(s) requested relating, but not limited to, to the following: reference to "functional need" in this policy potentially negates the ability for other activities to establish which may be a sustainable use of land; sub clause (a) is only supported with the amendment to that overview sought in this submission; and subclause (c) is only supported with the amendments to the definition of Highly Productive Land also sought in this submission.</p>	<p>Delete Policy RPROZ-P5 Or alternatively Amend Policy RPROZ-P5 as follows: Avoid land use that: a. is incompatible with the purpose, character and amenity of the Rural Production zone; b. does not have a functional need to locate in the Rural Production zone and is more appropriately located in another zone; c. would result in the loss of productive capacity of highly productive land; d. would exacerbate natural hazards; and e. cannot provide appropriate on-site infrastructure</p>
Thomson Survey Ltd (S199)	S199.002	Rural production	RPROZ-P5	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the intent and restrictive wording of RPROZ-P5 and contends that there are permitted activities listed in the zone rules that will be contrary to the policies.</p>	<p>Amend RPROZ-P5 to read as follows: Manage land use so that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. it is compatible with the purpose, character and amenity of the Rural Production zone;

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. it enables activities with a functional need to locate in the Rural Production zone and is more appropriately located in another zone; 3. does not result in a more than minor loss of productive capacity of highly productive land; 4. does not exacerbate natural hazards; and 5. can provide appropriate on-site infrastructure.
Errol McIntyre (S216)	S216.001	Rural production	RPROZ-P5	Oppose	Any regulations infringe on a property owners right. Existing use has not been accounted for and future development and maintenance of any use has now become subject to restriction. Council must consider the property owners right to own and use their land. A disproportionate amount of rates are paid for the services we get.	Amend policy to consider existing uses and property owners rights to use their land (inferred)
Wendover Two Limited (S222)	S222.088	Rural production	RPROZ-P5	Oppose	Reference to "functional need" in this policy potentially negates the ability for other activities to establish which may be a sustainable use of land and also contribute to the economic and social development of the district, or bring environmental benefit such as residential activities, Visitor accommodation, Educational facilities, Conservation activities, Recreational activities, Cemeteries / Urupā and Minor residential units. The zone purpose presumably is from the overview. Sub clause a. is only supported with the amendment to that overview sought in this submission. Similarly, reference to Highly Productive Land in subclause c. is only supported with the amendments	Delete Policy RPROZ-P5 Or alternatively Amend Policy RPROZ-P5 as follows: Avoid land use that: a. is incompatible with the purpose, character and amenity of the Rural Production zone; b. does not have a functional need to locate in the Rural Production zone and is more appropriately located in another zone; c. would result in the loss of productive capacity of highly productive

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					to the definition of Highly Productive Land also sought in this submission.	land; c. would exacerbate natural hazards; and d. cannot provide appropriate on-site infrastructure.
Matauri Trustee Limited (S243)	S243.113	Rural production	RPROZ-P5	Oppose	Reference to "functional need" in this policy potentially negates the ability for other activities to establish which may be a sustainable use of land and also contribute to the economic and social development of the district, or bring environmental benefit such as residential activities, Visitor accommodation, Educational facilities, Conservation activities, Recreational activities, Cemeteries/Urupā and Minor residential units.	Delete Policy RPROZ-P5 Or alternatively amend Policy RPROZ-P5 as follows: Avoid land use that: a. is incompatible with the purpose, character and amenity of the Rural Production zone; b. does not have a functional need to locate in the Rural Production zone and is more appropriately located in another zone; c. would result in the loss of productive capacity of highly productive land; d. would exacerbate natural hazards; and e. cannot provide appropriate on-site infrastructure.
P S Yates Family Trust (S333)	S333.084	Rural production	RPROZ-P5	Oppose	Reference to "functional need" in this policy potentially negates the ability for other activities to establish which may be a sustainable use of land and also contribute to the economic and social development of the district, or bring environmental benefit such as residential activities, Visitor accommodation, Educational facilities, Conservation activities, Recreational activities, Cemeteries / Urupā and Minor residential units.	Delete Policy RPROZ-P5 Or alternatively Amend Policy RPROZ-P5 as follows: Avoid land use that: a. is incompatible with the purpose, character and amenity of the Rural Production zone; b. does not have a functional

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>The zone purpose presumably is from the overview. Sub clause a. is only supported with the amendment to that overview sought in this submission.</p> <p>Similarly, reference to Highly Productive Land in subclause c. is only supported with the amendments to the definition of Highly Productive Land also sought in this submission.</p>	<p>need to locate in the Rural Production zone and is more appropriately located in another zone;</p> <p>c. would result in the loss of productive capacity of highly productive land;</p> <p>d. would exacerbate natural hazards; and</p> <p>e. cannot provide appropriate on-site infrastructure</p>
<p>Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand (S421)</p>	<p>S421.216</p>	<p>Rural production</p>	<p>RPROZ-P5</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>Federated Farmers opposes policies RPZOZ-P2 RPZOZ-P3, RPROZ-4, RPRPZ-P5 and RPROZ-P6 as they are drafted in the proposed district plan. The policies have no regard for the private property rights of landowners and are promoting the absolute protection of the rural production zone and highly productive land through removing the ability of landowners to control the use of their land.</p> <p>The National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land sets out the requirements for the management of highly productive land. Policy 8 requires the protection of highly productive land from inappropriate use and development. Clause 3.8 provides for the subdivision of highly productive land provided certain matters are met. Clause 3.11 states that territorial authorities must include objectives, policies, and rules in their district plans to enable the maintenance, operation, or upgrade of any existing activities on highly productive land; and ensure that any loss of highly productive land from those activities is minimised.</p> <p>The proposed district plan needs to be consistent with the requirements of the National Policy Statement as well as acknowledging the rights of landowners.</p>	<p>Amend Policy RPZOZ-P5 to achieve consistency with the requirements of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land and to recognise and provide for the rights of private landowners</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Lynley Newport (S103)	S103.003	Rural production	RPROZ-P6	Oppose	<p>The intent of the policies is made abundantly clear by their wording. I disagree with that intent and oppose strongly the punitive and restrictive wording of the policies.</p> <p>There will be existing property and land use in the Rural Production Zone already contrary to the policies. There are permitted activities listed in the zone rules that will be contrary to some of the policies - which is illogical and not consistent with the Resource Management Act.</p> <p>The problem with some of the policies as written is that they attempt to stop almost any activity in the zone except farming. This is not effects based, is an inconsistent approach when compared with other zones, is overly stifling of the rural community's ability to remain vibrant and viable; and not consistent with the zone's own rule suite. RPROZ-P6 relates to subdivision only and probably has no place in the Zone policies.</p>	<p>Deleted RPROZ-P6 from the zone policies.</p> <p>If it is to remain, Amend as follows (removing the concept of "avoid" and associated negative, restrictive connotations):Manage subdivision so that:a. the loss of highly productive land [or use by [arming activities is avoided, where possible, and were avoidance is not possible, the loss has only minor impact on the availability of highly productive land for productive purposes. b. the land is not fragmented into parcel sizes that are no longer able to support farming activities, taking into account....{remainder unchanged});c. smaller lot sizes and rural lifestyle living is encouraged where there is an environmental benefit.</p>
Summit Forests New Zealand Limited (S148)	S148.046	Rural production	RPROZ-P6	Support in part	<p>In general, SFNZ supports the objectives and policies of this zone except where they seek to grandparent existing land use in favour of one form of primary production over others. Land use in the rural production zone needs to be able to adapt to changing economic and climatic conditions to ensure long term sustainability.</p>	<p>Amend any reference to "farming activities" in the Rural Production policies to "primary production activities" and any reference to "farming" to "primary production" and any other changes to like effect.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Horticulture New Zealand (S159)	S159.104	Rural production	RPROZ-P6	Support	Fragmentation of rural land is a concern, so the policy approach is supported.	Retain Policy RPROZ-P6
Bentzen Farm Limited (S167)	S167.096	Rural production	RPROZ-P6	Oppose	Policy RPROZ-P6 fails to recognise the forms and subdivision otherwise enabled by the Proposed Plan in rural environment (Management Plan and Environmental benefit subdivisions).	Delete Policy RPROZ-P6 and replace with the following: Provide limited opportunities for subdivision in the general rural zone while ensuring that: a. there will be significant environmental protection of indigenous vegetation including restoration, or wetlands;b. subdivision avoids the inappropriate proliferation and dispersal of development by limiting the number of sites created;c. subdivision avoids inappropriate development within areas of the Outstanding Natural Landscape Overlay, Outstanding Natural Character Overlay, High Natural Character Overlay and the coastal environment;d. adverse effects on rural and coastal character are avoided, remedied or mitigated; e. sites are of sufficient size to absorb and manage adverse effects within the site; andf.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>reverse sensitivity effects are managed in a way that does not compromise the viability of rural sites for continued production.g. The fragmentation of highly productive land is avoided.</p>
<p>Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)</p>	<p>S168.093</p>	<p>Rural production</p>	<p>RPROZ-P6</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>Policy RPROZ-P6 seeks to avoid subdivision except in the limited circumstances specified. This fails to recognise the forms and subdivision otherwise enabled by the Proposed Plan in rural environment (Management Plan and Environmental benefit subdivisions). The zone should recognise and provide for these opportunities on the basis that they may represent the only viable pathway to achieve sustainable land use change on a rural block and that they actively promote the biodiversity/natural character enhancement policies of the Proposed Plan, the RPS and the NZCPS. Other features of the rural environment can be appropriately managed in the manner sought in the relief.</p>	<p>Delete Policy RPROZ-P6 and replace with the following:Provide limited opportunities for subdivision in the general rural zone while ensuring that:a. there will be significant environmental protection of indigenous vegetation including restoration, or wetlands;b. subdivision avoids the inappropriate proliferation and dispersal of development by limiting the number of sites created;c. subdivision avoids inappropriate development within areas of the Outstanding Natural Landscape Overlay, Outstanding Natural Character Overlay, High Natural Character Overlay and the coastal environment;d. adverse</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>effects on rural and coastal character are avoided, remedied or mitigated;e. sites are of sufficient size to absorb and manage adverse effects within the site; andf. reverse sensitivity effects are managed in a way that does not compromise the viability of rural sites for continued production.g. The fragmentation of highly productive land is avoided.</p>
<p>The Shooting Box Limited (S187)</p>	<p>S187.084</p>	<p>Rural production</p>	<p>RPROZ-P6</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>Policy RPROZ-P6 seeks to avoid subdivision except in the limited circumstances specified. This fails to recognise the forms and subdivision otherwise enabled by the Proposed Plan in rural environment (Management Plan and Environmental benefit subdivisions). The zone should recognise and provide for these opportunities on the basis that they may represent the only viable pathway to achieve sustainable land use change on a rural block and that they actively promote the biodiversity/natural character enhancement policies of the Proposed Plan, the RPS and the NZCPS. Other features of the rural environment can be appropriately managed in the manner sought in the relief.</p>	<p>Delete Policy RPROZ-P6 and replace with the following: Provide limited opportunities for subdivision in the general rural zone while ensuring that: a. there will be significant environmental protection of indigenous vegetation including restoration, or wetlands; b. subdivision avoids the inappropriate proliferation and dispersal of development by limiting the number of sites created; c. subdivision avoids inappropriate development within areas of the Outstanding Natural Landscape Overlay, Outstanding Natural Character Overlay, High Natural Character Overlay and the coastal environment; d. adverse effects on rural and coastal character are avoided,</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>remedied or mitigated; e. sites are of sufficient size to absorb and manage adverse effects within the site; and f. reverse sensitivity effects are managed in a way that does not compromise the viability of rural sites for continued production. g. The fragmentation of highly productive land is avoided.</p>
<p>Thomson Survey Ltd (S199)</p>	<p>S199.003</p>	<p>Rural production</p>	<p>RPROZ-P6</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>The submitter opposes the intent and restrictive wording of RPROZ-P6 and contends that there are permitted activities listed in the zone rules that will be contrary to the policies.</p>	<p>Amend RPROZ-P6 to read as follows: Manage subdivision so that: a. the loss of highly productive land for use by farming activities is avoided, where possible, and where avoidance is not possible, the loss has minor impact on the availability of highly productive land for productive purposes; b. the land is not fragmented into parcel sizes that are no longer able to support farming activities, taking into account: 1. the type of farming proposed; and 2. whether smaller land parcels can support more productive forms of farming due to the presence of highly productive land. c. smaller lot sizes and rural lifestyle living is encouraged where there is an environmental benefit.</p>
<p>Wendover Two Limited (S222)</p>	<p>S222.089</p>	<p>Rural production</p>	<p>RPROZ-P6</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>Policy RPROZ-P6 seeks to avoid subdivision except in the limited circumstances specified. This fails to recognise the forms and subdivision otherwise enabled by the Proposed Plan in rural environment (Management Plan and</p>	<p>Delete Policy RPROZ-P6 and insert with the following: Provide limited opportunities for subdivision in the general</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>Environmental benefit subdivisions). The zone should recognise and provide for these opportunities on the basis that they may represent the only viable pathway to achieve sustainable land use change on a rural block and that they actively promote the biodiversity/natural character enhancement policies of the Proposed Plan, the RPS and the NZCPS. Other features of the rural environment can be appropriately managed in the manner sought in the relief.</p>	<p>rural zone while ensuring that:a. there will be significant environmental protection of indigenous vegetation including restoration, or wetlands;b. subdivision avoids the inappropriate proliferation and dispersal of development by limiting the number of sites created;c. subdivision avoids inappropriate development within areas of the Outstanding Natural Landscape Overlay, Outstanding Natural Character Overlay, High Natural Character Overlay and the coastal environment;d. adverse effects on rural and coastal character are avoided, remedied or mitigated;e. sites are of sufficient size to absorb and manage adverse effects within the site; andf. reverse sensitivity effects are managed in a way that does not compromise the viability of rural sites for continued production.g. The fragmentation of highly</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						productive land is avoided.
Matauri Trustee Limited (S243)	S243.114	Rural production	RPROZ-P6	Oppose	Policy RPROZ-P6 seeks to avoid subdivision except in the limited circumstances specified. This fails to recognise the forms and subdivision otherwise enabled by the Proposed Plan in rural environment (Management Plan and Environmental benefit subdivisions). The zone should recognise and provide for these opportunities on the basis that they may represent the only viable pathway to achieve sustainable land use change on a rural block and that they actively promote the biodiversity/natural character enhancement policies of the Proposed Plan, the RPS and the NZCPS. Other features of the rural environment can be appropriately managed in the manner sought in the relief.	Delete Policy RPROZ-P6 and replace with the following: Provide limited opportunities for subdivision in the general rural zone while ensuring that: a. there will be significant environmental protection of indigenous vegetation including restoration, or wetlands; b. subdivision avoids the inappropriate proliferation and dispersal of development by limiting the number of sites created; c. subdivision avoids inappropriate development within areas of the Outstanding Natural Landscape Overlay, Outstanding Natural Character Overlay, High Natural Character Overlay and the coastal environment; d. adverse effects on rural and coastal character are avoided, remedied or mitigated; e. sites are of sufficient size to absorb and manage adverse effects within the site; and f. reverse

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>sensitivity effects are managed in a way that does not compromise the viability of rural sites for continued production.g. The fragmentation of highly productive land is avoided.</p>
<p>Willowridge Development s Limited (S250)</p>	<p>S250.019</p>	<p>Rural production</p>	<p>RPROZ-P6</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>This policy to be too narrow, focussing too heavily on farming activities, rather than the productive capability of the zone. This policy should be broadened to encompass all primary production activities.</p>	<p>Amend RPROZ-P6 Avoid subdivision that: a. results in the loss of highly productive land for use primary production by farming activities; b. fragments land into parcel sizes that are no longer able to support farming activities productive capacity of the rural environment, taking into account: 1. the productive capability of soils type of farming proposed; and 2. whether smaller land parcels can support more productive activities forms of farming due to the presence of highly productive land. c. provides for rural lifestyle living unless there is an environmental benefit.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
<p>P S Yates Family Trust (S333)</p>	<p>S333.085</p>	<p>Rural production</p>	<p>RPROZ-P6</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>Policy RPROZ-P6 seeks to avoid subdivision except in the limited circumstances specified. This fails to recognise the forms and subdivision otherwise enabled by the Proposed Plan in rural environment (Management Plan and Environmental benefit subdivisions). The zone should recognise and provide for these opportunities on the basis that they may represent the only viable pathway to achieve sustainable land use change on a rural block and that they actively promote the biodiversity/natural character enhancement policies of the Proposed Plan, the RPS and the NZCPS. Other features of the rural environment can be appropriately managed in the manner sought in the relief.</p>	<p>Delete Policy RPROZ-P6 and replace with the following:Provide limited opportunities for subdivision in the general rural zone while ensuring that:a. there will be significant environmental protection of indigenous vegetation including restoration, or wetlands;b. subdivision avoids the inappropriate proliferation and dispersal of development by limiting the number of sites created;c. subdivision avoids inappropriate development within areas of the Outstanding Natural Landscape Overlay, Outstanding Natural Character Overlay, High Natural Character Overlay and the coastal environment;d. adverse effects on rural and coastal character are avoided, remedied or mitigated;e. sites are of sufficient size to absorb and manage adverse effects within the site; andf. reverse sensitivity effects are managed in a way that does</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>not compromise the viability of rural sites for continued production.g. The fragmentation of highly productive land is avoided.</p>
<p>Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew (S386)</p>	<p>S386.019</p>	<p>Rural production</p>	<p>RPROZ-P6</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>Ballantyne & Agnew consider this policy to be too narrow, focussing too heavily on farming activities, rather than the productive capability of the zone. It is considered that this policy should be broadened to encompass all primary production activities.</p>	<p>Amend RPROZ-P6 as follows: "Avoid subdivision that: a. results in the loss of highly productive land for use primary production by farming activities; b. fragments land into parcel sizes that are no longer able to support farming activities productive capacity of the rural environment, taking into account: 1. the productive capability of soils type of farming proposed; and 2. whether smaller land parcels can support more productive activities forms of farming due to the presence of highly productive land. c. provides for rural lifestyle living unless there is an environmental benefit."</p>
<p>Northland Federated Farmers of</p>	<p>S421.217</p>	<p>Rural production</p>	<p>RPROZ-P6</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>Federated Farmers opposes policies RPZOZ-P2 RPZOZ-P3, RPROZ-4, RPRPZ-P5 and RPROZ-P6 as they are drafted in the proposed district plan. The policies have no regard for the private</p>	<p>Amend Policy RPZOZ-P6 to achieve consistency with the requirements of the National Policy Statement for Highly</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
New Zealand (S421)					<p>property rights of landowners and are promoting the absolute protection of the rural production zone and highly productive land through removing the ability of landowners to control the use of their land.</p> <p>The National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land sets out the requirements for the management of highly productive land. Policy 8 requires the protection of highly productive land from inappropriate use and development. Clause 3.8 provides for the subdivision of highly productive land provided certain matters are met. Clause 3.11 states that territorial authorities must include objectives, policies, and rules in their district plans to enable the maintenance, operation, or upgrade of any existing activities on highly productive land; and ensure that any loss of highly productive land from those activities is minimised.</p> <p>The proposed district plan needs to be consistent with the requirements of the National Policy Statement as well as acknowledging the rights of landowners.</p>	Productive Land and to recognise and provide for the rights of private landowners
Horticulture New Zealand (S159)	S159.105	Rural production	RPROZ-P7	Support	The matters for consideration are relevant and appropriate	Retain Policy RPROZ-P7
Bentzen Farm Limited (S167)	S167.097	Rural production	RPROZ-P7	Oppose	RPROZ-P7 is not a policy but a method of assessment, and therefore more appropriately an assessment criterion. Noncomplying and discretionary activity applications should be assessed against objectives and policies which should be a clear expression of a desired outcome - not a way to achieve an unspecified outcome as is this policy.	Delete Policy RPROZ-P7
Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)	S168.094	Rural production	RPROZ-P7	Oppose	<p>Policy RPROZ-P7 seeks to manage land use and subdivision to address the effects of the activity requiring resource consent, including (but not limited to) consideration of matters listed.</p> <p>This is not a policy but a method of assessment, and therefore more appropriately an assessment criterion.</p> <p>Noncomplying and discretionary activity</p>	Delete Policy RPROZ-P7

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					applications should be assessed against objectives and policies which should be a clear expression of a desired outcome - not a way to achieve an unspecified outcome as is this policy.	
The Shooting Box Limited (S187)	S187.085	Rural production	RPROZ-P7	Oppose	<p>This is not a policy but a method of assessment, and therefore more appropriately an assessment criterion.</p> <p>Non-complying and discretionary activity applications should be assessed against objectives and policies which should be a clear expression of a desired outcome - not a way to achieve an unspecified outcome as is this policy.</p>	Delete Policy RPROZ-P7.
Wendover Two Limited (S222)	S222.090	Rural production	RPROZ-P7	Oppose	<p>Policy RPROZ-P7 seeks to manage land use and subdivision to address the effects of the activity requiring resource consent, including (but not limited to) consideration of matters listed. This is not a policy but a method of assessment, and therefore more appropriately an assessment criterion. Noncomplying and discretionary activity applications should be assessed against objectives and policies which should be a clear expression of a desired outcome - not a way to achieve an unspecified outcome as is this policy.</p>	Delete Policy RPROZ-P7
Matauri Trustee Limited (S243)	S243.115	Rural production	RPROZ-P7	Oppose	<p>Policy RPROZ-P7 seeks to manage land use and subdivision to address the effects of the activity requiring resource consent, including (but not limited to) consideration of matters listed. This is not a policy but a method of assessment, and therefore more appropriately an assessment criterion.</p> <p>Non-complying and discretionary activity applications should be assessed against objectives and policies which should be a clear expression of a desired outcome - not a way to achieve an unspecified outcome as is this policy.</p>	Delete Policy RPROZ-P7
P S Yates Family Trust (S333)	S333.086	Rural production	RPROZ-P7	Oppose	<p>Policy RPROZ-P7 seeks to manage land use and subdivision to address the effects of the activity requiring resource consent, including (but not limited to) consideration of matters listed. This is not a policy but a method of assessment, and therefore more appropriately an assessment</p>	Delete Policy RPROZ-P7

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>criterion.</p> <p>Non-complying and discretionary activity applications should be assessed against objectives and policies which should be a clear expression of a desired outcome - not a way to achieve an unspecified outcome as is this policy.</p>	
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S416)	S416.047	Rural production	RPROZ-P7	Support in part	<p>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</p>	<p>Insert additional matter as follows:the location and design of buildings adjacent to the railway corridor</p>
Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand (S421)	S421.219	Rural production	RPROZ-P7	Support	<p>Federated Farmers supports policies RPZOZ-P1 and RPZOZ-P7 as they are currently drafted in the proposed district plan.</p>	<p>Retain Policy RPZOZ-P7 (inferred) or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent</p>
Waiaua Bay Farm Limited (S463)	S463.093	Rural production	RPROZ-P7	Oppose	<p>Sub-clauses (a) to (j) are a list of assessment matters that are inappropriate to be included in a policy. They do not provide direction about how to achieve the overarching objectives of the zone. WBF recommends deletion of the policy and reliance on the remaining policies instead. If necessary, the assessment criteria can be relocated to rules and standards later in this chapter.</p>	<p>Delete Policy RPROZ-P7</p>
Radio New Zealand (S489)	S489.030	Rural production	RPROZ-P7	Support	<p>RNZ supports recognition that a proposed land use ought to consider potentially reverse sensitivity effects on existing infrastructure.</p>	<p>Retain Policy PROZ-P7</p>
Puketona Business Park Limited (S45)	S45.005	Rural production	Rules	Not Stated	<p>The PDP proposes that industrial activities within the Rural Production zone become non-complying, whereas the ODP allows such activities as permitted within the zone where they comply with relevant bulk and location standards. Should the Rural Production zone be retained for 759 State Highway 10, Oromahoe, PBPL suggests the zone provisions should account for</p>	<p>Amend the Rural Production zone provisions to provide for industrial activities as restricted discretionary or discretionary activities where they meet certain criteria. Any such bespoke provisions regarding activity status should be accompanied by</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>industrial activities as restricted discretionary or discretionary activities where they meet certain criteria - for example, existing site size, soil classification and proximity to other non-productive uses. Failing that, PBPL suggests a site-specific rule enabling industrial activities on the site would suffice, for the reasons set out earlier in their submission.</p>	<p>associated reconsideration of relevant permitted activity standards within the Rural Production zone of the PDP as notified. Namely, the limited impervious area and building coverage permitted thresholds.</p>
<p>Horticulture New Zealand (S159)</p>	<p>S159.108</p>	<p>Rural production</p>	<p>Rules</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>Include specific rule for artificial crop protection structure</p>	<p>Insert a new rule:RPROZ-RX Artificial Crop Protection Structures and Crop Protection Structures Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The establishment of a new, or expansion of an existing artificial crop protection structure or crop support structure, where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The height of the structure does not exceed 6m; 2. green or black cloth is used on any vertical faces within 30m of a property boundary, including a road boundary, except that a different colour may be used if written approval of the owner(s) of the immediately adjoining property or the road controlling

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>authority (in the case of a road) is obtained and provided to the Council; or the structure is setback 1m from the boundary</p> <p>3. The activity complies with standards:</p> <p>RPROZ-S1 Maximum height</p> <p>RPROZ-S4 Setbacks from MHWSActivity status when compliance not achieved:Restricted Discretionary</p> <p>Matters of discretion are restricted to:Assessment of the potential glare on neighbouring properties (or road users) from the colour of the clothWhere compliance with any rule requirement is not achieved: Refer to relevant Rule RequirementNote: Elsewhere in their submission, the submitter has sought a definition for crop support structure</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
<p>Horticulture New Zealand (S159)</p>	<p>S159.129</p>	<p>Rural production</p>	<p>Rules</p>	<p>Not Stated</p>	<p>The provision of seasonal worker accommodation is becoming a necessary supporting activity to horticultural operations. Seek a suite of provisions to provide for this activity. Seeks that where seasonal worker accommodation does not meet the permitted activity standards, that this default to a Restricted Discretionary rule</p>	<p>Include a permitted activity rule for Seasonal Worker Accommodation as follows:RPROZ-RX - Seasonal Worker Accommodation Activity Status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The establishment of a new, or expansion of existing seasonal worker accommodation where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The seasonal worker accommodation is associated with horticultural activity 2. The accommodation comprises of a combination of communal kitchen and eating areas and sleeping and ablution facilities 3. The accommodation provides for no more than 12 workers 4. It complies with Code of Practice for Able Bodied Seasonal Workers, published by Dept of Building and Housing 2008. <p>PER-2The activity complies with standards:RPROZ-S1</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>Maximum heightRPROZ-S2 Height in relation to boundaryRPROZ-S3 SetbacksActivity status where compliance not achieved with PER-1 or PER-2: Restricted DiscretionaryMatters of discretion are restricted to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Methods to avoid, remedy or mitigate the effects on existing activities, including the provision of screening, landscaping and methods for noise control. <li>2. The extent to which the application complies with the Code of Practice for Able Bodied Seasonal Workers, published by Dept of Building and Housing 2008 <p>Where compliance with any rule requirement is not achieved: Refer to relevant Rule requirement.Note: Elsewhere in their submission, the submitter has sought a definition for</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						Seasonal Worker Accommodation.
MLP LLC (S183)	S183.013	Rural production	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Landing Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.
Timothy and Dion Spicer (S213)	S213.004	Rural production	Rules	Support		retain rules
Tryphena Trustees Limited, David Haythornwait e (S226)	S226.013	Rural production	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.
Isles Casey Trustee Services Limited, WWC Trustee Company Limited (S227)	S227.013	Rural production	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.
Jayesh Govind and Others (S228)	S228.013	Rural production	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.
Laurie Pearson (S229)	S229.013	Rural production	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.
Mataka Residents' Association Inc (S230)	S230.013	Rural production	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.
Ovisnegra Limited (S231)	S231.012	Rural production	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.
Tobias Groser (S232)	S232.013	Rural production	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.
Whale Bay Limited (S233)	S233.013	Rural production	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.
Whale Bay Limited (S234)	S234.013	Rural production	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.
WW Trustee Services 2016 Limited, Eloise Caroline Caswell, Donald Gordon Chandler (S235)	S235.013	Rural production	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.
Connemara Black Limited (S236)	S236.013	Rural production	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.
Evan Williams and Katherine Williams (S237)	S237.013	Rural production	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.
John Gowing and Miriam Van Lith (S238)	S238.013	Rural production	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.