



Proposed Far North District Plan

Volume 7 - Summary of Decisions Requested

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
John Gowing, Miriam Van Lith, Ellis Gowing, James Gowing, Byron Gowing (S239)	S239.013	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.
Matthew Watson, Kaylene Watson, D R Thomas Limited (S240)	S240.013	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.
Matthew Draper and Michaela Jannard (S241)	S241.013	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.
Te Hiku Community Board (S257)	S257.027	Rural production	Rules	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 rules 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.
Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust (S338)	S338.051	Rural production	Rules	Not Stated	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are	Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries,

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	<p>and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour. • Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish.
Nicole Way and Christopher Hujich as Trustees of the Trssh	S345.003	Rural production	Rules	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,	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

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Birnie Settlement Trust (S345)					<p>have regard to, or provide for the development and subdivision enabled by the Resource Consents.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The proposed provisions are inconsistent with the Act and relevant planning instruments.</p>	<p>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 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)	S352.013	Rural production	Rules	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 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.</p>
Sean Frieling (S357)	S357.026	Rural production	Rules	Oppose	<p>The PDP needs to redefine 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. This should be corrected by amending RPROZ objectives, policies and rules zones to accommodate things other than rural production.</p> <p>Support the development bonus provisions for allow for smaller lot sizes in the rural</p>	<p>Amend Rural Production Zone objectives, policies and rules as separately submitted and allow smaller blocks of land ie. 2000 sq mtrs</p> <p>Amend the Rural Production Zone objectives, policies and rules zones so that productive land is defined based on its ability to produce food but can accommodate things other than rural production;</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					production zone for any subdivision that provides protection of indigenous vegetation.	
Leah Frieling (S358)	S358.031	Rural production	Rules	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 rules 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)	S360.010	Rural production	Rules	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 rules to provide for waste management facilities
Mark Spaans (S402)	S402.002	Rural production	Rules	Oppose	Henderson Bay has now been assigned to the Rural Production Zone. I believe the uncontrolled permissible activities of the Rural Production Zone will have adverse effects on the natural character of Henderson Bay. What occurs on the land at Henderson Bay has an effect on the coastline due to the contour of the land and streams that run off onto the beach. I would like to see Henderson Bay have exclusions that restrict and limit any primary production to what doesn't have adverse effects on those living in the Bay and the natural character of the Bay.	Amend, for Henderson Bay to remain in Rural Production Zone, to have tighter restrictions on any primary production that will have adverse effects on the natural character of the coastline and those living in it.
Northland Federated Farmers of	S421.207	Rural production	Rules	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	Amend the Rules to recognise and provide for private property rights and allow landowners to subdivide land in the rural production zone for specific

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
New Zealand (S421)					<p>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. 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</p>	<p>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
					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)	S422.013	Rural production	Rules	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 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.
Bernard Sabrier (S423)	S423.013	Rural production	Rules	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 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.
Kapiro Residents Association (S427)	S427.033	Rural production	Rules	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].
Kapiro Residents Association (S427)	S427.063	Rural production	Rules	Support in part	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further	Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	specific rules/standards, as follows - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour. • Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish.
Francois Dotta (S434)	S434.013	Rural production	Rules	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 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.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Elka Gouzer (S435)	S435.013	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.
Northland Fish and Game Council (S436)	S436.027	Rural production	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. 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.	Insert provisions for recreational hunting as a permitted activity in the Rural Production zone (inferred)
New Zealand Motor Caravan Association (S438)	S438.009	Rural production	Rules	Support in part	The NZMCA operates a number of campgrounds and park over properties that are present in a variety of zones. Allowing for more permissive rules around the establishment of campgrounds will make it easier to establish sites for self-contained vehicle-based camping in the Far North	Amend Rural Production Zone rules to provide for camping sites of 20 vehicles and under as a permitted activity and require a resource consent for camping sites over 20 vehicles (inferred).

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					District. This will also create positive social and economic benefits for the community. The scale of camping sites proposed is also unlikely to compromise rural production activities.	
Kapiro Conservation Trust (S449)	S449.047	Rural production	Rules	Support	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	<p>Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour. • Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Kapiro Conservation Trust (S449)	S449.060	Rural production	Rules	Support	<p>The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.</p>	<p>Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour. • Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Kapiro Conservation Trust (S449)	S449.066	Rural production	Rules	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].
Michael Foy (S472)	S472.032	Rural production	Rules	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 rules zones 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)	S505.003	Rural production	Rules	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	Amend to exclude certainintensive farming activities from the proposed Rural production zone at Henderson Bay.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					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.	
Fire and Emergency New Zealand (S512)	S512.050	Rural production	Rules	Not Stated	Fire and Emergency support an activity for emergency service facilities being listed as an activity in zones. Please see Table 1 of the submission for the location of existing fire stations. Note that these are found in a range of zones. New fire stations may be necessary in order to continue to achieve emergency response time commitments in situations where development occurs, and populations change. In this regard it is noted that Fire and Emergency is not a requiring authority under section 166 of the RMA, and therefore does not have the ability to designate land for the purposes of fire stations. Provisions within the rules of the district plan are therefore, the best way to facilitate the development of any new fire stations within the district as urban development progresses. Fire and Emergency request that emergency service facilities are included as a permitted activity in all zones. The draft Plan currently only includes emergency services facilities as an activity in some zones and with varying activity status. In addition, fire stations have specific requirements with relation to setback distances and vehicle crossings. Fire and Emergency request that emergency service facilities are exempt from these standards	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
New Zealand Kiwifruit Growers Incorporated (S518)	S518.005	Rural production	Rules	Support in part		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

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>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 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"> 1. Methods to avoid, remedy or mitigate the

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>effects on existing activities, including the provision of screening, landscaping and methods for noise control.</p> <p>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> <p>Where compliance with any rule requirement is not achieved: Refer to relevant Rule requirement.</p> <p>(inferred).</p>
<p>Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK) (S522)</p>	<p>S522.048</p>	<p>Rural production</p>	<p>Rules</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>Amend to include specific policies/rules to prevent fragmentation and loss of land in rural and horticulture zones [inferred].</p>
<p>Carbon Neutral NZ Trust (S529)</p>	<p>S529.161</p>	<p>Rural production</p>	<p>Rules</p>	<p>Not Stated</p>	<p>We consider that all zones, except urban zones, need to be covered by firm PDP policies and rules to protect a key natural</p>	<p>Amend rules to protect a key natural resource - productive land - now and</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					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.	for future generations.
Carbon Neutral NZ Trust (S529)	S529.211	Rural production	Rules	Support in part	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	<p>Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour. • Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish.
Sean Jozef Vercammen (S395)	S395.012	Rural production	Notes	Support in part	The final sentence reads "The Natural Character chapter should ...". Something has been omitted from this rule and needs to be completed.	amend to complete the note wording.... The Natural Character chapter should ...".
John Joseph and Jacqueline Elizabeth Matthews (S439)	S439.015	Rural production	Notes	Not Stated	The final sentence of 'Note 2' reads "The Natural Character chapter should ...". Something has been omitted and needs to be completed.	Amend the final sentence of 'Note 2' in the Rural Production Chapter, as it appears incomplete.
Puketona Business Park Limited (S45)	S45.006	Rural production	RPROZ-R1	Support	Supports the requirement for a restricted discretionary activity where zone standards are infringed.	Retain restricted discretionary activity status where zone standards are infringed.
Horticulture New Zealand (S159)	S159.106	Rural production	RPROZ-R1	Support in part	There is not a specific rule for artificial crop protection structures so Rule RPROZ-R1 would apply. Seeks changes to some of the Standards to ensure that such structures are adequately provided for.	Seeks changes to some of the Standards to ensure that structures such as artificial crop protection structures are adequately provided for
Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust (S338)	S338.052	Rural production	RPROZ-R1	Not Stated	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish.
Far North District Council (S368)	S368.067	Rural production	RPROZ-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 RPROZ -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 ... "
Kapiro Residents Association (S427)	S427.060	Rural production	RPROZ-R1	Support in part	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further	Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	specific rules/standards, as follows - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour. • Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish.
John Andrew Riddell (S431)	S431.123	Rural production	RPROZ-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)	S449.035	Rural production	RPROZ-R1	Support	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures	Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.</p>	<p>at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour. • Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish.
<p>Waiaua Bay Farm Limited (S463)</p>	<p>S463.094</p>	<p>Rural production</p>	<p>RPROZ-R1</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>WBF supports the permitted activity performance standards for development in the RPROZ, which, in its view, adequately provide for the type of buildings common to rural areas.</p>	<p>Retain Rule RPROZ-R1</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
House Movers Section of New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc (S482)	S482.002	Rural production	RPROZ-R1	Support in part	The Proposed Plan definition of "building" does not clearly include relocated buildings, and the existence of a separate definition of relocate buildings in the Proposed Plan appears to create a distinction between "buildings" and "relocated buildings". It is not clear that the permitted activity status applied in most zones to "new buildings and structures" also applies to the relocation of buildings. It is submitted that relocated buildings should have the same status as new buildings, and subject to the same performance standards unless there is any specific overlay or control which applies e.g. historic heritage	amend RPROZ-R1 to: provide for relocated building as a permitted activity whenrelocated buildings meet performance standards and criteria (see schedule 1). insert a performance standard for use of a pre inspection report(schedule 2) restricted discretionary activity status for relocated buildings that do not meet the permitted activity status standards
Radio New Zealand (S489)	S489.031	Rural production	RPROZ-R1	Support	RNZ support a permitted activity status for structures that comply with standards and a restricted discretionary status for activities that do not. As RNZ has the technical expertise and operational ability to assist applicants in ensuring the risk of EMR coupling is addressed, RNZ seeks the following note is added (similar to the note applying to subdivision applications noting the importance of considering effects on the airport operator). Notification to RNZ of any applications for tall structures within 1,000m will ensure safety risks to the applicant, and reverse sensitivity effects on RNZ can be considered collaboratively.	Insert the following note to Rule RPROZ-R1: NOTE:If a resource consent application is made under this rule on land that is within 1,000m of Radio New Zealand's Facilities at Waipapakauri or Ōhaeawai, and the proposed building does not comply with RPROZ-S1, Radio New Zealand will be considered an affected person for the activity.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand (S512)	S512.097	Rural production	RPROZ-R1	Support in part	Many zones hold objectives and policies related to servicing developments with appropriate infrastructure. Noting that NH-R5 requires adequate firefighting water supply for vulnerable activities (including residential), Fire and Emergency consider that inclusion of an additional standard on infrastructure servicing within individual zone chapters may be beneficial.	Insertnew standard and/or matter of discretion across zones on infrastructureservicing (including emergency response transport/access and adequate watersupply for firefighting)

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Carbon Neutral NZ Trust (S529)	S529.208	Rural production	RPROZ-R1	Support in part	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	<p>Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour. • Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish.
Michael John Winch (S67)	S67.010	Rural production	RPROZ-R2	Oppose	I oppose the permitted activity threshold of 15% impermeable surface coverage in the Rural Production zone. The impermeable surfaces permitted activity	Amend the permitted activity threshold for impermeable surfaces coverage in the Rural Production

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>threshold of 15% for Rural Production is excessive and would result in significant adverse effects on stormwater runoff if development were to occur at these levels. A site developed with 15% impermeable surfaces will typically have 20% to 30% higher peak stormwater runoff compared with an undeveloped site, and will result in increased flooding and erosion downstream. As this zone comprises a large proportion of the District, cumulative adverse effects are also likely to be significant.</p> <p>The 15% permitted activity threshold for the Rural Production zone is inconsistent with the objectives and policies of the zone, for example Rural Production Objective RPROZ-O3 and Policies RPROZ-P2 and P5. The maximum impermeable surfaces permitted activity thresholds in the Rural Production zone should be reduced to 5%. On a typical 200 ha farm or forestry block, this would allow 10 ha of impermeable surfaces, permitting normal rural buildings, yards, races and roads while minimising cumulative adverse effects.</p> <p>The matters of discretion do not include assessing adverse effects of impermeable surface coverage on the life-supporting capacity of the soil, even highly productive soils, as required by Policies RPROZ-P5 and P7. There are no other rules in the District Plan that protect the life-supporting capacity of the soil and highly productive soils from inappropriate use unless the land is being subdivided</p>	<p>zone to 5%.</p>
<p>Michael John Winch (S67)</p>	<p>S67.011</p>	<p>Rural production</p>	<p>RPROZ-R2</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>The matters of discretion do not include assessing adverse effects of impermeable surface coverage on the life-supporting capacity of the soil, even highly productive soils, as required by Policies RPROZ-P5 and P7. There are no other rules in the District Plan that protect the life-supporting capacity</p>	<p>Insert a further matter of discretion: the adverse effects on the life-supporting capacity of soil and the protection of highly productive land.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					of the soil and highly productive soils from inappropriate use unless the land is being subdivided.	
Haigh Workman Limited (S215)	S215.054	Rural production	RPROZ-R2	Support in part	<p>The impermeable surfaces permitted activity thresholds of 15% for Rural Production and Horticulture zones are excessive and would result in significant adverse effects if development were to occur at these levels. A site developed with 15% impermeable surfaces will typically have 20% to 30% higher peak stormwater runoff compared with an undeveloped site, and will result in increased flooding and erosion downstream. As these zones comprise most of the District, cumulative adverse effects are also likely to be significant.</p> <p>Northland Regional Council flood hazard maps have been developed on the basis of impermeable coverage as permitted under District Plan rules for urban areas, whilst existing impermeable coverage has been adopted for rural areas. Development to the permitted activity coverage in rural areas has not been anticipated in the flood hazard mapping. The 15% permitted activity threshold for Rural Production and Horticulture zones is inconsistent with the objectives and policies of the zonings, for example Rural Production Objective RPROZ-O3 and Policies RPROZ-P2 and P5. We recommend that the maximum impermeable surfaces permitted activity thresholds in the Rural Production and Horticulture zones be reduced to 5% (500m² per hectare). This would permit normal rural buildings, yards, races and roads while minimising cumulative adverse effects.</p>	Amend RPROZ-R2 impermeable surfaces permitted activity thresholds from 15% to 5% of the site area
Brad Hedger (S267)	S267.001	Rural production	RPROZ-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	Amend PER-1 of RPROZ-R2 to: The impermeable surface coverage of any site is no more than 15% or

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>an additional 20% to intensities for climate change, this will increase stormwater run off from entire catchments and the effects will increase especially in regards to ground water recharge and overland flow paths. This is also supported from the work that NRC has done on river/stream catchments which show the effects from flooding increasing due to development and effects from climate change. The NRC assessment is limited to stream flows and flooding, the effects from development and overland flow paths to streams and rivers does not seem to be considered. In my opinion properties downstream of development will be receiving between 5-10% more stormwater flows over the next 10 years and 20% over the next 30 years.</p> <p>Currently impermeable surfaces coverage is linked to % of area, these areas can be quite large in rural areas i.e., 100ha farm can have 15ha of impermeable surfaces before triggering a consent or using mitigation measures that may be located right on a boundary discharging to a downstream property or stream, it would be assumed that this may be spread out over there would be a buffer with permeable areas, but my observation is that commercial activity in these zones occurs at the boundary due to access obviously the runoff volume from the 15ha property will have a much larger effect on downstream properties.</p>	<p>3000m2, which ever is the lesser.</p>
<p>Trent Simpkin (S283)</p>	<p>S283.014</p>	<p>Rural production</p>	<p>RPROZ-R2</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<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</p>	<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)</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					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.	
Far North District Council (S368)	S368.102	Rural production	RPROZ-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 RPROZ -R2 to insert PER-2Stormwater must be disposed of in accordance with Far North District Engineering Standards April 2022.
Waiaua Bay Farm Limited (S463)	S463.095	Rural production	RPROZ-R2	Support	WBF considers the allotted 15% site coverage performance standard and fallback restricted discretionary consenting pathway for proposals that exceed this standard, to be an adequate allowance for the RPROZ.	Retain Rule RPROZ-R2
Puketotara Lodge Ltd (S481)	S481.003	Rural production	RPROZ-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	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

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>management" rule in the Rural Production zone in the PDP, however there is a rule relating to impermeable surface coverage. It is submitted that additional matters should be added to the list of relevant matters for discretion in the impermeable coverage rule in all zones, in order to better control effects between sites or adjacent sites,</p>	<p>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-development stormwater run-off flows and volumes; • The extent to which the diversion and discharge mimics natural run-off patterns.
<p>Martin John Yuretich (S40)</p>	<p>S40.015</p>	<p>Rural production</p>	<p>RPROZ-R3</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>The new subdivision rules, requiring a minimum lot size of 8ha (without a Management Plan) will severely restrict the ability to create small rural lots in the rural production zone.</p> <p>The reason given for this rule is to protect the productive potential of the rural area, in particular, highly productive land. However, the majority of land in the Far North District does not come under this category, and the PDP does not distinguish between highly productive land and less productive land when it comes to subdivision.</p> <p>With Council struggling to provide urban amenities (sewerage, water supply and stormwater) and people wanting to live independent of these services in the rural areas without too much land to care for, it makes sense to allow small rural blocks. It is correct to protect rural productive potential, but this can be achieved without</p>	<p>Amend allotment sizes, perhaps with a limited number of allotments of a minimum of 8000m² or 1ha, then 4ha generally after that. Smaller lot sizes should apply for properties (or parts thereof) that do not consist of highly productive land.</p> <p>Perhaps there should be more focus on the size of the balance parcel - subdividing off 4ha to leave a 10ha balance parcel does not protect productivity, while subdividing 1ha off a 200ha block has next to no effect, especially if the smaller block consists of bush.</p> <p>Consequential amendments to RPROZ-R3 Residential activity and SUB-R7 Management plan subdivision.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					imposing a total restriction on rural lifestyle properties.	
Joel Vieviorka (S41)	S41.015	Rural production	RPROZ-R3	Oppose	<p>The new subdivision rules, requiring a minimum lot size of 8ha (without a Management Plan) will severely restrict the ability to create small rural lots in the rural production zone.</p> <p>The reason given for this rule is to protect the productive potential of the rural area, in particular, highly productive land. However, the majority of land in the Far North District does not come under this category, and the PDP does not distinguish between highly productive land and less productive land when it comes to subdivision.</p> <p>With Council struggling to provide urban amenities (sewerage, water supply and stormwater) and people wanting to live independent of these services in the rural areas without too much land to care for, it makes sense to allow small rural blocks. It is correct to protect rural productive potential, but this can be achieved without imposing a total restriction on rural lifestyle properties.</p>	<p>Amend allotment sizes in the Rural Production zone, perhaps with a limited number of allotments with minimum areas of 8000m² or 1ha, then 4ha generally after that. Smaller lot sizes should apply for properties (or parts thereof) that do not consist of highly productive land.</p> <p>Perhaps there should be more focus on the size of the balance parcel - subdividing off 4ha to leave a 10ha balance parcel does not protect productivity, while subdividing 1ha off a 200ha block has next to no effect, especially if the smaller block consists of bush.</p> <p>Consequential amendments to RPROZ-R3 Residential activity and SUB-R7 Management plan subdivision.</p>
New Zealand Pork Industry Board (S55)	S55.032	Rural production	RPROZ-R3	Not Stated	Residential activities are defined as a sensitive activity and therefore have the potential to cause reverse sensitivity effects on established intensive primary production activities	insert new standard for new sensitive activity setback from an existing intensive primary production activity, as per RPROZ-R1
Lynley Newport (S104)	S104.001	Rural production	RPROZ-R3	Oppose	The discretionary activity minimum lot size should remain at four hectares and, as such, the discretionary residential intensity ratio in Rule RPROZ-R3 DIS-1 should similarly be four hectares.	Amend Rule RPROZ-R3 DIS-1 as follows - The site area per residential unit is at least 8ha 4ha.
Horticulture New Zealand (S159)	S159.109	Rural production	RPROZ-R3	Support in part	Rule RPROZ-R3 does not state the Standards that will apply. The Standards	Amend Rule RPROZ-R3 to insert the following: PER-3The new building or structure, or extension or

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					relating to buildings should be included in the rule.	<p>alteration to an existing building or structure complies with standards:RPROZ-S1 Maximum height;RPROZ-S2 Height in relation to boundary;RPROZ-S3 Setback (excluding from MHWS or wetland, lake and river margins)RPROZ-S4 Setback from MHWS RPROZ-S5 Building or structure coverage); RPROZ-S6 Buildings or structures used to house, milk or feed stock (excluding buildings or structures used for an intensive indoor primary production activity)}. RPROZ-S7 Sensitive activities setback from boundaries of a Mineral extraction overlay</p>
<p>Bentzen Farm Limited (S167)</p>	S167.098	Rural production	RPROZ-R3	Oppose	<p>Amend the rule to align with the minimum lot size of 20ha sought in this submission, with a consequent pro-rata amendment to PER-2. The provision that PER-1 does not apply to: a single residential unit located on a site less than 20ha (as sought) is supported because it recognises existing and potential new sites provided for in the zone with smaller lot sizes.</p>	<p>Amend Rule RPROZ-R3 as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The site area per residential unit is at least 40ha 20ha. PER-2 The number of residential units on a site does not exceed six three. PER-1 does not apply to: a single residential unit located on a site less than 40 20ha.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)	S168.095	Rural production	RPROZ-R3	Oppose	Amend the rule to align with the minimum lot size of 20ha sought in this submission, with a consequent pro-rata amendment to PER-2. The provision that PER-1 does not apply to: a single residential unit located on a site less than 20ha (as sought) is supported because it recognises existing and potential new sites provided for in the zone with smaller lot sizes.	Amend Rule RPROZ-R3 as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The site area per residential unit is at least 40ha 20ha . PER-2 The number of residential units on a site does not exceed six three . PER-1 does not apply to: a single residential unit located on a site less than 40ha 20ha .
The Shooting Box Limited (S187)	S187.086	Rural production	RPROZ-R3	Oppose	Amend the rule to align with the minimum lot size of 20ha, with a consequent pro-rata amendment to PER-2. The provision that PER-1 does not apply to: a single residential unit located on a site less than 20ha (as sought) is supported because it recognises existing and potential new sites provided for in the zone with smaller lot sizes.	Amend Rule RPROZ-R3 as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The site area per residential unit is at least 40ha 20ha. PER-2 The number of residential units on a site does not exceed six three . PER-1 does not apply to: a single residential unit located on a site less than 40 20ha .
Thomson Survey Ltd (S200)	S200.001	Rural production	RPROZ-R3	Oppose	The discretionary activity residential activity site area per residential unit should be reduced from at least 8ha to at least 4ha.	Amend RPROZ-3 DIS-1 to read as follows: DIS-1 The site area per residential unit is at least 4ha.
Wendover Two Limited (S222)	S222.091	Rural production	RPROZ-R3	Oppose	Amend the rule to align with the minimum lot size of 20ha sought in this submission, with a consequent pro-rata amendment to PER-2. The provision that PER-1 does not apply to: a single residential unit located on a site less	Amend Rule RPROZ-R3 as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The site area per residential unit is at

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					than 20ha (as sought) is supported because it recognises existing and potential new sites provided for in the zone with smaller lot sizes .	least 40ha 20ha . PER-2 The number of residential units on a site does not exceed six three . PER-1 does not apply to: a single residential unit located on a site less than 40 20ha .
Matauri Trustee Limited (S243)	S243.116	Rural production	RPROZ-R3	Oppose	Amend the rule to align with the minimum lot size of 20ha sought in this submission, with a consequent pro-rata amendment to PER-2. The provision that PER-1 does not apply to: a single residential unit located on a site less than 20ha (as sought) is supported because it recognises existing and potential new sites provided for in the zone with smaller lot sizes .	Amend Rule RPROZ-R3 as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The site area per residential unit is at least 40ha 20ha . PER-2 The number of residential units on a site does not exceed six three . PER-1 does not apply to: a single residential unit located on a site less than 40 20ha .
Willowridge Developments Limited (S250)	S250.020	Rural production	RPROZ-R3	Support in part	Willowridge are generally supportive of the intent of the approach. The section 32 does not provide sufficient assessment regarding the density controls primarily focussing on allotment sizes for subdivision. The approach fails to recognise the functional need to accommodate multiple residential units on a single site for activities such as farming or horticulture where workers may be required to reside on site or where there is a need to provide housing for family.	Amend PROZ-R3-PER-1 to allow for at a minimum, one residential unit per 20ha.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Amber Hookway (S261)	S261.002	Rural production	RPROZ-R3	Oppose	Submitter opposes change from "Residential development shall be limited to one unit per 12ha of land" to "The site area per residential unit is at least 40ha". There is a housing crisis and whanau are coming home to live on the land. 12ha is a huge area to be able to have one dwelling and all that will happen will be the Far North becomes full of unpermitted unsafe dwellings as this rule change will not stop family living on their land. There should be no limit to the number. This should be based on land size so owners of larger blocks are not disadvantaged by only being allowed a maximum of 6 regardless of their land size.	Amend to reinstate the equivalent operative District Plan rule (one residential unit per 12ha of land, with no maximum number per site)
Wilson Hookway (S264)	S264.002	Rural production	RPROZ-R3	Oppose	Submitter opposes change from "Residential development shall be limited to one unit per 12ha of land" to "The site area per residential unit is at least 40ha". There is a housing crisis and whanau are coming home to live on the land. 12ha is a huge area to be able to have one dwelling and all that will happen will be the Far North becomes full of unpermitted unsafe dwellings as this rule change will not stop family living on their land. There should be no limit to the number. This should be based on land size so owners of larger blocks are not disadvantaged by only being allowed a maximum of 6 regardless of their land size.	Amend to reinstate the equivalent operative District Plan rule (one residential unit per 12ha of land, with no maximum number per site).
Danielle Hookway (S309)	S309.002	Rural production	RPROZ-R3	Oppose	There is a housing crisis and whanau are coming home to live on the land. 12ha is a huge area to have one dwelling and all that will happen will be the Far North becomes full of unpermitted and unsafe dwellings as this rule change will not stop family living on their land. There should be no limit to the number. This should be based on land size so owners on larger blocks are not disadvantaged bu only being allowed a maximum of 6 regardless of their land size.	Amend rule RPROZ-R3 to retain the current rule allowing residential development of one unit per 12 ha of land with no maximum number per site.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Lianne Kennedy (S310)	S310.002	Rural production	RPROZ-R3	Oppose	There is a housing crisis and whanau are coming home to live on the land. 12ha is a huge area to have one dwelling and all that will happen will be the Far North becomes full of unpermitted and unsafe dwellings as this rule change will not stop family living on their land. There should be no limit to the number. This should be based on land size so owners on larger blocks are not disadvantaged but only being allowed a maximum of 6 regardless of their land size.	Amend rule RPROZ-R3 to retain the current rule allowing residential development of one unit per 12 ha of land with no maximum number per site.
Allen Hookway (S311)	S311.002	Rural production	RPROZ-R3	Oppose	There is a housing crisis and whanau are coming home to live on the land. 12ha is a huge area to have one dwelling and all that will happen will be the Far North becomes full of unpermitted and unsafe dwellings as this rule change will not stop family living on their land. There should be no limit to the number. This should be based on land size so owners on larger blocks are not disadvantaged but only being allowed a maximum of 6 regardless of their land size.	Amend rule RPROZ-R3 to retain the current rule allowing residential development of one unit per 12 ha of land with no maximum number per site.
FNR Properties Limited (S319)	S319.002	Rural production	RPROZ-R3	Oppose	The submitter considers that as RPROZ-R3 will be reducing the permitted threshold from one residential unit per 12ha to one residential unit per 40ha and limiting the total number of residential units on one site in the Rural Production Zone to six is overall a substantial reduction in the permitted residential intensity threshold in the zone and is heavy handed.	Amend RPZ-R3 to allow for a higher residential intensity and/or provide for more options for residential intensity as a controlled, restricted discretionary and discretionary activity.
P S Yates Family Trust (S333)	S333.087	Rural production	RPROZ-R3	Support in part	Amend the rule to align with the minimum lot size of 20ha, with a consequent pro-rata amendment to PER- 2. The provision that PER-1 does not apply to: a single residential unit located on a site less than 20ha (as sought) is supported because it recognises existing and potential new sites provided for in the zone with smaller lot sizes .	Amend Rule RPROZ-R3 as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The site area per residential unit is at least 40ha 20ha. PER-2 The number of residential units on a site does not exceed six three .

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						PER-1 does not apply to: a single residential unit located on a site less than 40 20ha .
FNR Properties Limited (S334)	S334.001	Rural production	RPROZ-R3	Oppose	<p>The PDP does not provide for any subdivision in the RPZ as a Restricted Discretionary Activity, and that the Discretionary Activity thresholds have been significantly reduced.</p> <p>The substantial reduction in the permitted residential intensity threshold in the RPZ is extremely heavy-handed and will result in significant adverse effects on the socio-economic wellbeing of the Far North District. Imposing such restrictions on residential intensity will only contribute further to the current housing crisis that is being observed both locally and nationwide.</p> <p>Further, the RPZ objectives and policies as notified primarily provide for primary production activities in the RPZ and do not recognise that some properties are no longer suitable for production, or never have been suitable or used for production.</p> <p>Providing more options for residential intensity as a Controlled, Restricted Discretionary, and Discretionary Activity would be more appropriate as this will enable such development to occur in the RPZ while providing for case by case consideration of any proposed residential activity within the context of the subject site and immediate surrounding environment (as opposed to a 'one size fits all' approach).</p>	Amend the RPZ provisions to allow for a higher residential intensity in the RPZ and/or to provide for more options for residential intensity as a Controlled, Restricted Discretionary, and Discretionary Activity.
Te Aupōuri Commercial Development Ltd (S339)	S339.050	Rural production	RPROZ-R3	Not Stated	The RPROZ limits residential development to one unit per 40ha of site area, up to a maximum of 6 per site and requires a discretionary activity resource consent for non-compliance with either of these standards. This is considered to be an overly restrictive rule framework. The section 32	Amend PER-1 of Rule PROZ-R3 to allow for at a minimum, one residential unit per 20ha.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>has some brief commentary regarding the 40ha size limit at it relates to subdivision and considers this to be a response to manage fragmentation effects. TACDL note that this density control has been proposed to align with the controlled activity subdivision threshold (which is discussed separately), however, aside from this there is little evaluation within the section 32 of the appropriateness of threshold. Further, it is noted that the Whangārei District Plan and Kaipara's Exposure Draft Plan each have rule frameworks that would provide for two residential units per 40ha. It is considered that these provisions should be amended to align with adjacent Councils to provide a more consistent region wide approach to the management of RPROZ land.</p>	
<p>Sapphire Surveyors Limited (S348)</p>	<p>S348.002</p>	<p>Rural production</p>	<p>RPROZ-R3</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>The new subdivision rules, requiring a minimum lot size of 8ha (without a Management Plan) will severely restrict the ability to create small rural lots in the Rural Production zone. The reason given for this rule is to protect the productive potential of the rural area, in particular, highly productive land. However, the majority of land in the Far North District does not come under this category, and the PDP does not distinguish between highly productive land and less productive land when it comes to subdivision.</p> <p>With Council struggling to provide urban amenities (sewerage, water supply and stormwater) and people wanting to live independent of these services in the rural areas without too much land to care for, it makes sense to allow small rural blocks. It is correct to protect rural productive potential, but this can be achieved without imposing a total restriction on rural lifestyle properties.</p> <p>Previously blocks down to 4000sqm were</p>	<p>Amend Rule RPROZ-R3 to align with changes sought by submitter to Standard SUB-S1 as it relates to subdivision in the Rural Production zone</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>allowed under the Operative District Plan. Perhaps the new District Plan could reconsider allotment sizes, perhaps with a limited number of allotments of a minimum of 8000sqm or 1ha, then 4ha generally after that. Smaller lot sizes should apply for properties (or parts thereof) that do not consist of highly productive land. This would give effect to Policy SUB-P8.</p> <p>Perhaps there should be more focus on the size of the balance parcel - subdividing off 4ha to leave a 10ha balance parcel does not protect productivity, while subdividing 1ha off a 200ha block has next to no effect, especially if the smaller block consists of bush.</p> <p>This would provide vitality in rural areas, opportunities for farmers to develop their land, relief for urban services, continued local jobs, lifestyle blocks for those that want them, and all while still protecting the productive capacity of the land.</p>	
Wakaiti Dalton (S355)	S355.025	Rural production	RPROZ-R3	Support in part	<p>The RPROZ limits residential development to one unit per 40ha of site area, up to a maximum of 6 per site and requires a discretionary activity resource consent for non-compliance with either of these standards. This is considered to be an overly restrictive rule framework. The section 32 has some brief commentary regarding the 40ha size limit at it relates to subdivision and considers this to be a response to manage fragmentation effects. We note that this density control has been proposed to align with the controlled activity subdivision threshold (which is discussed separately), however, aside from this there is little evaluation within the section 32 of the appropriateness of threshold. Further, it is noted that the Whangārei District Plan and Kaipara's Exposure Draft Plan each have rule frameworks that would provide for two</p>	Amend PROZ-R3-PER-1 to allow for at a minimum, one residential unit per 20ha.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					residential units per 40ha. It is considered that these provisions should be amended to align with adjacent Councils to provide a more consistent region wide approach to the management of RPROZ land.	
Sean Frieling (S357)	S357.041	Rural production	RPROZ-R3	Oppose	We do not support the new permitted residential intensity rule density (multiple dwellings per title), and submit that it be retained at the 1 dwelling per 12ha intensity, as per the existing operative district plan. This is requested as still allows for a relatively low density of housing relative to land area, but still allows for the provision of housing in a rural setting. It is submitted that that the rule is currently effective, and should remain the same, to ensure that housing can still be provided in the general rural zone as a permitted activity as long as the subject site has a minimum of 12 hectares of land, and the minimum area of 3000m ² of exclusive use surrounding the dwelling.	Amend to retain the operative district plan rule to ensure that housing can still be provided in the general rural zone as a permitted activity as long as the subject site has a minimum of 12 hectares of land, and the minimum area of 3000m ² of exclusive use surrounding the dwelling.
Leah Frieling (S358)	S358.044	Rural production	RPROZ-R3	Oppose	We do not support the new permitted residential intensity rule density (multiple dwellings per title), and submit that it be retained at the 1 dwelling per 12ha intensity, as per the existing operative district plan. This is requested as still allows for a relatively low density of housing relative to land area, but still allows for the provision of housing in a rural setting. It is submitted that that the rule is currently effective, and should remain the same, to ensure that housing can still be provided in the General Rural zone as a permitted activity as long as the subject site has a minimum of 12 hectares of land, and the minimum area of 3,000m ² of exclusive use surrounding the dwelling.	Amend Rule RPROZ-R3 to reflect the requirements in the Operative District Plan, i.e. 1 dwelling per 12ha
Far North District Council (S368)	S368.080	Rural production	RPROZ-R3	Support in part	The 'Residential activity' rule in zones that provide for a minor residential unit need to provide an exclusion for a 'minor residential unit'. The intent of the rule is to provide for a minor residential unit in addition to a principal	Amend RPROZ-R3 Make the following amendments (the area2 will be relative to the zone) to the 'Residential activity' rule within the Rural Production zone, Rural Lifestyle

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					residential unit on a site, it is not meant to be captured by PER-1 within the rule	zone, Rural Residential zone and the Settlement zone in the PDP. PER-1 The site area per residential unit is at least xxxm ² . PER-1 does not apply to: i. a single residential unit located on a site less than xxxm ² . ii. A minor residential unit constructed in accordance with rule Rxx-Rxx
Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew (S386)	S386.020	Rural production	RPROZ-R3	Support in part	The RPROZ limits residential development to one unit per 40ha of site area, up to a maximum of 6 per site and requires a discretionary activity resource consent for non-compliance with either of these standards. This is considered to be an overly restrictive rule framework. The section 32 has some brief commentary regarding the 40ha size limit at it relates to subdivision and considers this to be a response to manage fragmentation effects. Ballantyne & Agnew note that this density control has been proposed to align with the controlled activity subdivision threshold (which is discussed separately), however, aside from this there is little evaluation within the section 32 of the appropriateness of threshold. Further, it is noted that the Whangārei District Plan and Kaipara's Exposure Draft Plan each have rule frameworks that would provide for two residential units per 40ha. It is considered that these provisions should be amended to align with adjacent Councils to provide a more consistent region wide approach to the management of RPROZ land.	Amend RPROZ-R3-PER-1 to allow for at a minimum, one residential unit per 20ha.
LMD Planning Consultancy (S415)	S415.002	Rural production	RPROZ-R3	Oppose	Residential density standards proposed for the Rural Production zone are too restrictive, particularly as applicable to Sacred Heart Catholic Church premises at 867 State Highway 10, Waitaruke (Part Waihapa 3A1 Blk).	Amend PER-1 of Rule RPROZ-R3 as follows: PER-1 The site area per residential unit is at least 40ha 20ha .

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>PER-1 does not apply to: a single residential unit located on a site less than 40ha 20ha.</p> <p>Amend DIS-1 of Rule RPROZ-R3 as follows - The site area per residential unit is at least 8ha 4ha.</p>
Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand (S421)	S421.220	Rural production	RPROZ-R3	Support in part	<p>Federated Farmers does not support performance standard PR-1 in the rule. PER-1 requires that the site area per residential unit is a minimum of 40 hectares. It is inappropriate to imply that the impact of a residential activity on the environment will be greater simply because the site is less than 40 hectares in size.</p> <p>We do support the permitted activity classifications status for residential activities in the rural production zone.</p>	Delete the site area requirements from Rule RPROZ-R3
Northland Fish and Game Council (S436)	S436.010	Rural production	RPROZ-R3	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.</p> <p>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</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
					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.	
Waiaua Bay Farm Limited (S463)	S463.096	Rural production	RPROZ-R3	Oppose	Given the large size of lots in the RPROZ WBF proposes an amendment to exempt farm staff accommodation from this rule.	Amend the title of Rule RPROZ-R3 as follows: RPROZ-R3 Residential activity (excluding staff accommodation)
LJ King Ltd (S464)	S464.041	Rural production	RPROZ-R3	Oppose	We do not support the new permitted residential intensity rule density (multiple dwellings per title), and submit that it be retained at the 1 dwelling per 12ha intensity, as per the existing operative district plan. This is requested as still allows for a relatively low density of housing relative to land area, but still allows for the provision of housing in a rural setting. It is submitted that that the rule is currently effective, and should remain the same, to ensure that housing can still be provided in the general rural zone as a permitted activity as long as the subject site has a minimum of 12 hectares of land, and the minimum area of 3000m ² of exclusive use surrounding the dwelling	Amend to ensure that housing can still be provided in the general rural zone as a permitted activity as long as the subject site has a minimum of 12 hectares of land, and the minimum area of 3000m ² of exclusive use surrounding the dwelling.
Te Waka Pupuri Putea Trust (S477)	S477.016	Rural production	RPROZ-R3	Support	As the proprietors of significant holdings within the Rural Production Zone, we are broadly supportive of the proposed changes. We support the preservation of the character of the zone in its restriction on intensification and development and the protection from reverse sensitivity related issues that can arise from activities of this kind. More specifically and for example, we support Rules like RPROZ-R3, RPROZ-R10 and RPROZ-R20 in providing for not only the living environment for our workforce but also	Retain Rule RPROZ-R3

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					the opportunity for rural produce retail and Papakainga housing respectively - the latter being of increasing importance to our whanau, hapu into the future.	
Tracy and Kenneth Dalton (S479)	S479.020	Rural production	RPROZ-R3	Oppose	The RPROZ limits residential development to one unit per 40ha of site area, up to a maximum of 6 per site and requires a discretionary activity resource consent for non-compliance with either of these standards. This is considered to be an overly restrictive rule framework. The section 32 has some brief commentary regarding the 40ha size limit at it relates to subdivision and considers this to be a response to manage fragmentation effects. We note that this density control has been proposed to align with the controlled activity subdivision threshold (which is discussed separately), however, aside from this there is little evaluation within the section 32 of the appropriateness of threshold. Further, it is noted that the Whangārei District Plan and Kaipara's Exposure Draft Plan each have rule frameworks that would provide for two residential units per 40ha. It is considered that these provisions should be amended to align with adjacent Councils to provide a more consistent region wide approach to the management of RPROZ land.	Amend PROZ-R3-PER-1 to allow for at a minimum, one residential unit per 20ha.
Elbury Holdings (S485)	S485.041	Rural production	RPROZ-R3	Oppose	We do not support the new permitted residential intensity rule density (multiple dwellings per title), and submit that it be retained at the 1 dwelling per 12ha intensity, as per the existing operative district plan. This is requested as still allows for a relatively low density of housing relative to land area, but still allows for the provision of housing in a rural setting. It is submitted that that the rule is currently effective, and should remain the same, to ensure that housing can still be provided in the general rural zone as a permitted activity as long as the subject	Amend to ensure that housing can still be provided in the general rural zone as a permitted activity as long as the subject site has a minimum of 12 hectares of land, and the minimum area of 3000m ² of exclusive use surrounding the dwelling.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					site has a minimum of 12 hectares of land, and the minimum area of 3000m ² of exclusive use surrounding the dwelling	
Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited (S502)	S502.046	Rural production	RPROZ-R3	Support in part	In most cases sites generally do not exceed 40ha. However, on larger farming units where the site does exceed 40ha additional housing is required to provide living accommodation for workers. The larger and more diverse the site, the more workers which are required. As PER-1 still restricts residential intensity to 1 dwelling per 40ha this is considered sufficient to ensure that the impact of residential intensity on these larger sites will be no more than minor. As such, we seek relief that PER-2 is deleted in its entirety	Delete RPROZ-R3 PER-2
Waitangi Limited (S503)	S503.030	Rural production	RPROZ-R3	Not Stated	In most cases sites generally do not exceed 40ha. However, on larger farming units where the site does exceed 40ha additional housing is required to provide living accommodation for workers. The larger and more diverse the site, the more workers which are required. In the case of the Waitangi Estate there are a number of dwellings which either house staff working at the treaty grounds or staff working at the Cophorne. In the future if any further activities are established on site where affordable workers accommodation is needed this will likely trigger consent. Further restrictions on housing for workers is not considered to assist with the affordable housing shortages in the country. As such, we seek relief that PER-2 is deleted in its entirety.	Delete PER-2 of Rule RPROZ-R3, as follows: The number of residential units on a site does not exceed six. In the event this is not accepted we seek an exemption be put in place specifically for the Waitangi Estate similar to what has been put in place under Rule MPZ-R5 Maori Purpose Zone - Rural for Matauri X
Elbury Holdings (S519)	S519.040	Rural production	RPROZ-R3	Oppose	We do not support the new permitted residential intensity rule density (multiple dwellings per title), and submit that it be retained at the 1 dwelling per 12ha intensity, as per the existing operative district plan. This is requested as still allows for a relatively low density of housing relative to	Retain Rule 8.6.5.1.1 'Residential Intensity' under the operative district plan.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					land area, but still allows for the provision of housing in a rural setting.	
New Zealand Pork Industry Board (S55)	S55.033	Rural production	RPROZ-R4	Oppose	Visitor accommodation is defined as a sensitive activity and therefore have the potential to cause reverse sensitivity effects on established intensive primary production activities. The potential impact of sensitive activities within the rural production zone should be thoroughly assessed via a consenting process	amend activity status to RD.
New Zealand Pork Industry Board (S55)	S55.034	Rural production	RPROZ-R4	Oppose	Visitor accommodation is defined as a sensitive activity and therefore have the potential to cause reverse sensitivity effects on established intensive primary production activities. The potential impact of sensitive activities within the rural production zone should be thoroughly assessed via a consenting process	insert condition for new sensitive activity setback from an existing intensive primary production activity, as per RPROZ-R1
Horticulture New Zealand (S159)	S159.110	Rural production	RPROZ-R4	Oppose	Ten guests as a permitted activity with a setback of 10m from a boundary is not considered appropriate to manage potential reverse sensitivity effects. The rule does not state the Standards that will apply. The Standards relating to buildings should be included in the rule.	Amend Rule RPROZ-R4 to six guests per night Insert: PER-4 The new building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure complies with standards:RPROZ-S1 Maximum height;RPROZ-S2 Height in relation to boundary;RPROZ-S3 Setback (excluding from MHWS or wetland, lake and river margins)RPROZ-S4 Setback from MHWS RPROZ-S5 Building or structure coverage}; RPROZ-S6 Buildings or structures used to house, milk or feed stock (excluding buildings or structures used for an intensive indoor primary production activity)} .

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						RPROZ-S7 Sensitive activities setback from boundaries of a Mineral extraction overlay
Airbnb (S214)	S214.002	Rural production	RPROZ-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 permitted visitor accommodation to 10 across all zones and make the defauly non-permitted status restricted discretionary (as opposed to Discretionary) across all zones.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Willowridge Developments Limited (S250)	S250.021	Rural production	RPROZ-R4	Support	Support the enablement of visitor accommodation.	Retain as notified.
Wakaiti Dalton (S355)	S355.026	Rural production	RPROZ-R4	Support	We support the intention of this rule.	retain RPROZ-R4
Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew (S386)	S386.021	Rural production	RPROZ-R4	Support	Ballantyne & Agnew support the enablement of visitor accommodation in the PRZ.	Retain as notified.
Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (S425)	S425.052	Rural production	RPROZ-R4	Support in part	PHTTCCT support the provision for visitor accommodation in zones. It is considered that providing for this activity, particularly throughout the Zones that adjoin the Trail as a permitted activity 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). PHTTCCT acknowledged the rationale behind the inclusion of PER-1 in the Rural Production, Rural Residential, Rural Living and Settlement Zone but considers that this is too blunt given the number of shared access ways within the District, and has suggested wording that uses a setback to manage any likely noise or dust effects that could be experienced as a result of sharing an access.	Amend RPROZ-R4 "Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The visitor accommodation is within a residential unit, accessory building or minor residential unit. PER-2 The occupancy does not exceed 10 guests per night. PER-3 The site does not share access with another site. Where the site shares access with a The access to the site is set back more than 20m from any residential unit, or minor residential unit on any site that shares the access."
Tracy and Kenneth Dalton (S479)	S479.021	Rural production	RPROZ-R4	Support	We support the intention of this rule.	Retain as notified.
Waitangi Limited (S503)	S503.031	Rural production	RPROZ-R4	Not Stated	The Waitangi Treaty grounds has a marae on site which at times could accommodate more than 10 guests per night. Accommodation is not currently offered however, if it was to be offered, we seek that	Amend PER-1 and PER-2 of Rule RPROZ-R4 as follows: PER-1 The visitor accommodation is within a residential unit, accessory building, or

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					there be no restrictions be imposed in terms of visitor numbers.	minor residential unit, or marae. PER-2 The occupancy does not exceed 10 guests per night. With the exception of the Waitangi Estate.
Horticulture New Zealand (S159)	S159.112	Rural production	RPROZ-R5	Support in part	Rule RPROZ-R5 does not state the Standards that will apply. The standards relating to buildings should be included in the rule	Amend Rule RPROZ-R5 to insert: PER-5The new building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure complies with standards:RPROZ-S1 Maximum height;RPROZ-S2 Height in relation to boundary;RPROZ-S3 Setback (excluding from MHWS or wetland, lake and river margins)RPROZ-S4 Setback from MHWSRPROZ-S5 Building or structure coverage};RPROZ-S6 Buildings or structures used to house, milk or feed stock (excluding buildings or structures used for an intensive indoor primary production activity)}.RPROZ-S7 Sensitive activities setback from boundaries of a Mineral extraction overlay

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Trent Simpkin (S283)	S283.030	Rural production	RPROZ-R5	Oppose	This submission applies to all Building Coverage rules within all zones. Amend to be larger, considering the size of allotments allowed for in the zone.	Amend the maximum building or structure coverage from 12.5% to 20% or offer an alternative pathway around this rule, by inserting a PER-2 which says if a building is above 20% or 2500m ² , it is permitted if a visual assessment and landscape plan is provided as part of the building consent.
Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (S425)	S425.057	Rural production	RPROZ-R5	Support	PHTTCCT support the provision for home business in zones. It is considered that providing for this activity as a permitted activity, particularly throughout the zones that adjoin the Trail, will help activate the Trail and ensure that that the potential in terms of social and economic impact can be realised (noting the comments made in the Transport Chapter in regards to parking).	retain as notified
John Andrew Riddell (S431)	S431.140	Rural production	RPROZ-R5	Not Stated	The amendment is necessary in order to achieve the purpose of the Act.	Amend PER-4 of Rule RPROZ-R5 so that the hours of operation apply to when the business is open to the public
Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited (S502)	S502.047	Rural production	RPROZ-R5	Support in part	A home business could be utilizing an existing farm shed on site which may be larger than 40m ² . A business may only utilize a portion of that building where the rest is set aside as private space. Utilizing an existing building which exceeds 40m ² should not be a trigger for consent. Moreover, even if a business was utilizing a space greater than 40m ² other standards such as PER-2 & 3 are in place to control the effects such that the effects will be no more than minor on the surrounding environment.	Amend RPROZ-R5 PER-1 The home business is undertaken within: 1. a residential unit; or 2. an accessory building that does not exceed 40m² GFA ; or 3. a minor residential unit.
New Zealand Pork Industry Board (S55)	S55.035	Rural production	RPROZ-R6	Oppose	Educational facilities are defined as a sensitive activity and therefore have the potential to cause reverse sensitivity effects on established intensive primary production activities. The potential impact of sensitive activities within the rural production zone	amend activity status to RD.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					should be thoroughly assessed via a consenting process	
New Zealand Pork Industry Board (S55)	S55.036	Rural production	RPROZ-R6	Oppose	Educational facilities are defined as a sensitive activity and therefore have the potential to cause reverse sensitivity effects on established intensive primary production activities. The potential impact of sensitive activities within the rural production zone should be thoroughly assessed via a consenting process	insert condition for new sensitive activity setback from an existing intensive primary production activity, as per RPROZ-R1
New Zealand Pork Industry Board (S55)	S55.037	Rural production	RPROZ-R6	Oppose	Educational facilities are defined as a sensitive activity and therefore have the potential to cause reverse sensitivity effects on established intensive primary production activities. The potential impact of sensitive activities within the rural production zone should be thoroughly assessed via a consenting process	insert new standard for new sensitive activity setback from an existing intensive primary production activity, as per RPROZ-R1
Horticulture New Zealand (S159)	S159.113	Rural production	RPROZ-R6	Support in part	Educational facilities limited to four students in a residential unit as a permitted activity will ensure that the effects are minor. The rule does not state the Standards that will apply	Amend Rule RPROZ-R6 to insert: PER-4The new building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure complies with standards:RPROZ-S1 Maximum height;RPROZ-S2 Height in relation to boundary;RPROZ-S3 Setback (excluding from MHWS or wetland, lake and river margins)RPROZ-S4 Setback from MHWSRPROZ-S5 Building or structure coverage};RPROZ-S6 Buildings or structures used to house, milk or feed stock (excluding buildings or structures used for an intensive indoor primary production activity)}.RPROZ-S7 Sensitive

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						activities setback from boundaries of a Mineral extraction overlay
Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga (S331)	S331.068	Rural production	RPROZ-R6	Support in part	<p>The submitter supports in part RPROZ-R6 Educational Facility, however, in the first instance recommends the inclusion of a new provision (see submission #S331.017) to provide for educational facilities as a permitted activity in the Rural Production zone in the Infrastructure Chapter. In conjunction with this relief, the Ministry seeks the removal of this rule from the Rural Production zone to limit rule duplication. However, if this relief is not granted, the Ministry supports the permitted activity standards to provide for day care facilities in the Rural Production Zone. However, educational facilities with student attendance higher than four will likely be required to support the rural lifestyle environment and suggest student attendance not exceeding 30 to align with Ministry pre-school licences. The Ministry requests that all educational facilities are enabled in the Rural Production zone to serve the education needs of the rural 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 RPROZ-R6 Educational Facility or Amend RPROZ-R6 Educational Facility, as follows: Educational facility</p> <p>Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The educational facility is within a residential unit, accessory building or minor residential unit. PER-2 Hours of operation are between; 1. 7am-8pm Monday to Friday. 2. 8am-8pm Weekends and public holidays. PER-3 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, PER-2 or PER-3: 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.d.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>Infrastructure servicing.e. Potential reverse sensitivity effects on rural production operations. f. Contribution to community cohesiveness</p>
<p>Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited (S502)</p>	<p>S502.048</p>	<p>Rural production</p>	<p>RPROZ-R6</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>It appears that a museum, marae, town hall, community center or similar would not fall under the definition of an accessory building. Buildings of this nature host educational programs often and should be allowed to continue to do so without triggering consent. We seek relief that provision is made such that museums, maraes and other similar buildings could accommodate an educational facility.</p>	<p>Amend RPROZ-R6 PER-1 The educational facility is within a residential unit, accessory building or, minor residential unit- Museum, marae or other similar facility. PER-2 Hours of operation are between; 3. 7am-8pm Monday to Friday. 4. 8am-8pm Weekends and public holidays. PER-3 The number of students attending at one time does not exceed four within a residential unit, accessory building or minor residential unit, excluding those who reside onsite PER-4 The number of students attending at one time does not exceed the number of people for which a museum, marae or other similar facility has been designed for.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Waitangi Limited (S503)	S503.032	Rural production	RPROZ-R6	Not Stated	It appears that a museum, marae, town hall, or community center may not fall under the definition of an accessory building. Buildings of this nature host educational programs often and should be allowed to continue to do so without triggering consent. We seek relief that provision is made such that museums, maraes and other similar buildings can accommodate an educational facility as a permitted activity.	Amend PER-1 and PER-3 of Rule RPROZ-R6 as follows: PER-1 The educational facility is within a residential unit, accessory building or , minor residential unit, Museum, marae or other similar facility. PER-3 The number of students attending at one time does not exceed four within a residential unit, accessory building or minor residential unit , excluding those who reside onsite. Insert new PER-4 as follows: PER-4 The number of students attending at one time does not exceed the number of people for which a museum, marae or other similar facility has been designed for.
New Zealand Pork Industry Board (S55)	S55.038	Rural production	RPROZ-R7	Oppose	Support extensive farming activities as permitted without restriction in the rural production zone. Support separate rules for intensive primary production.	Amend rule structure as required to account for the definition of farming including intensive primary production (as per previous submission points).
Bentzen Farm Limited (S167)	S167.099	Rural production	RPROZ-R7	Support	Rule RPROZ-R7 is supported because it effectively and efficiently enables farming activities in the zone giving direct effect to the zone's objectives.	Retain Rule RPROZ-R7
NZ Agricultural Aviation	S182.032	Rural production	RPROZ-R7	Support in part	support farming activities as a permitted activity subject to the inclusion of the amendments sought to the definition	Add to the definition of Farming Activity sought by this submission

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Association (S182)						
Wendover Two Limited (S222)	S222.092	Rural production	RPROZ-R7	Support	Rule RPROZ-R7 is supported because it effectively and efficiently enables farming activities in the zone giving direct effect to the zone's objectives.	Retain Rule RPROZ-R7
Matauri Trustee Limited (S243)	S243.117	Rural production	RPROZ-R7	Support	Rule RPROZ-R7 is supported because it effectively and efficiently enables farming activities in the zone giving direct effect to the zone's objectives.	Retain Rule RPROZ-R7
Te Aupōuri Commercial Development Ltd (S339)	S339.051	Rural production	RPROZ-R7	Support	TACDL supports the intention of this rule.	Retain Rule RPROZ-R7
Wakaiti Dalton (S355)	S355.027	Rural production	RPROZ-R7	Support	We support the intention of this rule.	retain RPROZ-R7
Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand (S421)	S421.221	Rural production	RPROZ-R7	Support	Federated Farmers supports farming activity being classified as a permitted activity in the rural production zone.	Retain the permitted activity classification status for farming activities in Rule RPROZ-R7
Tracy and Kenneth Dalton (S479)	S479.022	Rural production	RPROZ-R7	Support	We support the intention of this rule.	Retain as notified.
Bentzen Farm Limited (S167)	S167.100	Rural production	RPROZ-R8	Support	Rule RPROZ-R8 is supported because it enables conservation activities, thereby giving effect to wider District Plan objectives and policies such as "CE-P8 Encourage the restoration and enhancement of the natural character of the coastal environment".	Retain Rule RPROZ-R8
Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)	S168.096	Rural production	RPROZ-R8	Support	Rule RPROZ-R8 is supported because it enables conservation activities, thereby giving effect to wider District Plan objectives and policies such as "CE-P8 Encourage the restoration and enhancement of the natural character of the coastal environment".	Retain Rule RPROZ-R8
NZ Agricultural Aviation Association (S182)	S182.033	Rural production	RPROZ-R8	Support in part	support conservation activities as a permitted activity subject to the inclusion of the amendments sought to the definition	Retain subject to adding to the definition of Conservation Activity as sought by this submission

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
The Shooting Box Limited (S187)	S187.087	Rural production	RPROZ-R8	Support	Rule RPROZ-R8 is supported because it enables conservation activities, thereby giving effect to wider District Plan objectives and policies such as "CE-P8 Encourage the restoration and enhancement of the natural character of the coastal environment".	Retain Rule RPROZ-R8.
Wendover Two Limited (S222)	S222.093	Rural production	RPROZ-R8	Support	Rule RPROZ-R8 is supported because it enables conservation activities, thereby giving effect to wider District Plan objectives and policies such as "CE-P8 Encourage the restoration and enhancement of the natural character of the coastal environment".	Retain Rule RPROZ-R8
Matauri Trustee Limited (S243)	S243.118	Rural production	RPROZ-R8	Support	Rule RPROZ-R8 is supported because it enables conservation activities, thereby giving effect to wider District Plan objectives and policies such as "CE-P8 Encourage the restoration and enhancement of the natural character of the coastal environment".	Retain Rule RPROZ-R8
P S Yates Family Trust (S333)	S333.088	Rural production	RPROZ-R8	Support	Rule RPROZ-R8 is supported because it enables conservation activities, thereby giving effect to wider District Plan objectives and policies such as "CE-P8 Encourage the restoration and enhancement of the natural character of the coastal environment".	Retain Rule RPROZ-R8
Te Aupōuri Commercial Development Ltd (S339)	S339.052	Rural production	RPROZ-R8	Support	TACDL supports the intention of this rule.	Retain Rule RPROZ-R8
Wakaiti Dalton (S355)	S355.028	Rural production	RPROZ-R8	Support	We support the intention of this rule.	retain RPROZ-R8
Tracy and Kenneth Dalton (S479)	S479.023	Rural production	RPROZ-R8	Support	We support the intention of this rule.	Retain as notified.
Willowridge Developments Limited (S250)	S250.022	Rural production	RPROZ-R9	Support in part	The rule title is inconsistent with the defined term 'Recreation Activity' in the Definitions Chapter, should be revised to improve consistency and legibility.	Amend RPROZ-R9 to be consistent with definition.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew (S386)	S386.022	Rural production	RPROZ-R9	Support in part	As outlined above, the rule title is inconsistent with the defined term 'Recreation Activity' in the Definitions Chapter. It is considered that this should be revised to improve consistency and legibility.	Amend to be consistent with definition.
Wakaiti Dalton (S355)	S355.029	Rural production	RPROZ-R10	Support in part	We support the intention of this rule, however, it is unclear why a 30m setback from any 'internal' boundary is required. Particularly as 'internal boundary' is not a defined term and it is unclear what this relates to. Further, there are already appropriate setbacks in place by RPROZ-S3.	amend RPROZ-R10 to delete the 30m setback in RPROZ-R10-PER-1.
Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand (S421)	S421.222	Rural production	RPROZ-R10	Support in part	While Federated Farmers supports the permitted activity classification for rural produce retail, we question the requirement in performance standard PER-1 for this to be set back a minimum of 30m from any internal boundaries. Stands and stalls for farm produce need to be located where they are visible from the road. A 30m setback is onerous and unrealistic.	Amend PER-1 of Rule RPROZ-R10 to delete the 30m setback requirement, or if Council is not inclined to accept the above relief, amend to reduce the setback from 30m to 5m
Te Waka Pupuri Putea Trust (S477)	S477.017	Rural production	RPROZ-R10	Support	As the proprietors of significant holdings within the Rural Production Zone, we are broadly supportive of the proposed changes. We support the preservation of the character of the zone in its restriction on intensification and development and the protection from reverse sensitivity related issues that can arise from activities of this kind. More specifically and for example, we support Rules like RPROZ-R3, RPROZ-R10 and RPROZ-R20 in providing for not only the living environment for our workforce but also the opportunity for rural produce retail and Papakainga housing respectively - the latter being of increasing importance to our whanau, hapu into the future.	Retain Rule RPROZ-R10
Tracy and Kenneth Dalton (S479)	S479.024	Rural production	RPROZ-R10	Support in part	We support the intention of this rule, however, it is unclear why a 30m setback from any 'internal' boundary is required. Particularly as 'internal boundary' is not a defined term and it is unclear what this	Amend RPROZ-R10 to delete the 30m setback in RPROZ-R10-PER-1.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
<p>Horticulture New Zealand (S159)</p>	<p>S159.114</p>	<p>Rural production</p>	<p>RPROZ-R11</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>relates to. Further, there are already appropriate setbacks in place by RPROZ-S3. There should be provision for small scale rural industry as a permitted activity. Rural produce manufacturing is a rural industry so the rule would be better titled rural industry.</p>	<p>Amend the title of Rule RPROZ-R11 to 'Rural industry' and change all reference to 'rural produce manufacturing' in the rule to 'rural industry'. Amend default status to Restricted Discretionary activity and include matters of discretion as follows- Matters of discretion are restricted to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the character and appearance of the building(s) 2. the siting of the building(s) and outdoor areas including parking relative to adjoining sites; 3. whether the building(s) are visually dominant and create a loss of privacy for surrounding residential units and their associated outdoor areas; 4. ability of the supporting roading network to cater for the additional traffic; 5. servicing requirements and any constraints of the site;

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. whether the location of the building(s) and the rural industry is compatible with adjacent and surrounding primary production activities; 7. whether the layout of the development maintains the existing rural character of the surrounding area; 8. any lighting or noise effects; 9. the frequency of the use, hours and days of operation and the number of people employed; 10. any natural hazard affecting the site or surrounding area.
Te Aupōuri Commercial Development Ltd (S339)	S339.053	Rural production	RPROZ-R11	Not Stated	TACDL supports rural produce manufacturing activities as this aligns with TACDL's development aspirations to provide economic and employment opportunities to improve the wellbeing of their people. In the absence of section 32 analysis of these provisions, TACDL seek increased thresholds to enable greater flexibility.	Amend PER-1 of Rule RPROZ-R11 to increase the GFA thresholds.
Wakaiti Dalton (S355)	S355.030	Rural production	RPROZ-R11	Support	We support the intention of this rule.	retain RPROZ-R11

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand (S421)	S421.223	Rural production	RPROZ-R11	Support in part	Federated Farmer supports the intent of rule RPROZ-R11 but does not the proposed building gross floor area of 100m ² . The size is unrealistic for rural production activities and should be increased to a minimum of 250m ² .	Amend Rule RPROZ-R11 to reduce the gross floor area for rural produce manufacturing from 100m ² to 250m
Tracy and Kenneth Dalton (S479)	S479.025	Rural production	RPROZ-R11	Support	We support the intention of this rule.	Retain as notified.
Summit Forests New Zealand Limited (S148)	S148.047	Rural production	RPROZ-R12	Not Stated	Consistent with SFNZ's submission on the definition of "Farm Quarry", the rule needs to provide for quarrying for use within the same management unit and include production forestry subject to the provisions of the NES-PF.	Amend RPROZ-R12 to refer to "Farm/Forestry Quarry" and include a further clause under PER-1 that reads "subject to the provisions of the NES-PF".
Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand (S421)	S421.224	Rural production	RPROZ-R12	Support	Federated Farmers supports farm quarries being classified as a permitted activity in the rural production zone.	Retain the permitted activity classification status for farming activities in Rule RPROZ-R12
PF Olsen Limited (S91)	S91.021	Rural production	RPROZ-R15	Oppose	Regulation 6 of the National Environmental Standards for Plantation Forestry establishes where councils may have more stringent rules than the National Environmental Standard. There is no provision for the plan to contain rule RPROZ-R15. The section 32 analysis is flawed in its legal argument. Just because the NES-PF does not state which natural and physical resources are not regulated under its provisions, this does not mean that they are out of scope. The stated application of the NES-PF is very clear. There is no section 43(5)(b) of the RMA. Plantation forestry is not an irreversible land use and will not compromise the soil for other primary production activities. Perverse outcomes would be expected if certain primary production activities are segmented into Land Use Capability classes (versatile soils).	Amend Rule RPROZ-R15 by deleting PER-1

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					Allowing all primary production activities in the Rural Production Zone enables the land manager to choose the appropriate use of the land.	
Summit Forests New Zealand Limited (S148)	S148.048	Rural production	RPROZ-R15	Oppose	SFNZ opposes the requirement that plantation forestry and plantation forestry activities do not occur on versatile soils. There are no provisions within the NES-PF that would allow Council to apply a more stringent rule in this regard. Specifically, "An NES prevails over district or regional plan rules except where the NES-PF specifically allows more stringent plan rules". The National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land does not support such an approach.	Amend RPROZ-R15 by deleting PER-1 "It is not located on versatile soils" and change "Activity status where compliance not achieved" to "Not Applicable".
Manulife Forest Management (NZ) Ltd (S160)	S160.040	Rural production	RPROZ-R15	Support in part	The submitter supports in part rule RPROZ-R15 and considers that versatile soils should be available to be used by all primary production as production forestry can be planted, harvested, and converted back to horticulture or farming land.	Amend rule RPROZ-R15 to delete PER-1
Willowridge Developments Limited (S250)	S250.023	Rural production	RPROZ-R15	Support in part	There is an error in the rule title.	Amend RPROZ-R15 to delete the repeated 'and'.
Te Aupōuri Commercial Development Ltd (S339)	S339.054	Rural production	RPROZ-R15	Not Stated	There is an error in the rule title. Otherwise, they are supportive of the intention of this rule.	Amend the title of Rule RPROZ-R15 to delete the repeated word 'and'.
Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew (S386)	S386.023	Rural production	RPROZ-R15	Support in part	There is an error in the rule title	Amend to delete the repeated 'and'.
Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited (S502)	S502.049	Rural production	RPROZ-R16	Support in part	This enables existing smaller scale marae outside of the Maori purpose zone to undertake a minor alteration to their buildings without triggering resource consent. This is considered to be a benefit to the local Maori community.	Amend the heading of RPROZ-R16 ROROZ-R16 - Additions or alterations to an existing Community Facility or Marae

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
FNR Properties Limited (S316)	S316.001	Rural production	RPROZ-R18	Support	FNR Properties support this provision as it specifically provides for such activity to occur within the RPZ and largely represents a positive change for existing activities occurring on site.	Retain Rule RPROZ-R18
Kapiro Conservation Trust (S442)	S442.139	Rural production	RPROZ-R18	Oppose	This activity should only be permitted in the Mineral Extraction Overlay. This rule covers the same thing as the ME rule on prospecting and exploration just not in the ME Overlay.	Amend to change activity status to Controlled (inferred reference to RPROZ-R18)
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand (S511)	S511.120	Rural production	RPROZ-R18	Oppose	This activity should only be permitted in the Mineral Extraction Overlay. This rule covers the same thing as the ME rule on prospecting and exploration just not in the ME Overlay.	Amend to change activity status to Controlled (inferred reference to RPROZ-R18)
Glen Nathan (S36)	S36.001	Rural production	RPROZ-R19	Oppose	The proposed gross floor area for minor residential units is 65m ² . Submitter considers that this should be increased to 75m ² for minor residential units which have been modified or built for wheelchair accessibility (wider doorways, accessible bathrooms, ramps, provision of lower benches in kitchens). Submitter also considers that Internal access garages should also be increased from 18m ² to 24m ² to allow for room to transfer from wheelchair to vehicle.	Amend the maximum GFA for minor residential units from 65m ² to 75m ² (specifically for minor residential units which have been modified or built for wheelchair accessibility), and increase maximum GFA for internal access garages from 18m ² to 24m ² , to allow room to transfer from wheelchair to vehicle.
Lynley Newport (S105)	S105.001	Rural production	RPROZ-R19	Support in part	Support the rule but consider the separation distance of 15m too restrictive. It should be 30m in order to provide for adequate space to accommodate shared gardening/ landscaping, and driveway turning and manoeuvring areas.	Amend Rule RPROZ-R19 CON-4 to read: The separation distance between the minor residential unit and the principal residential unit does not exceed 15m 30m .
Lynley Newport (S105)	S105.002	Rural production	RPROZ-R19	Support in part	To have at least 1ha of land is also overly restrictive noting the number of lots already in the zone less than 1ha in area.	Amend Rule RPROZ-R19 CON-2 to read: The site area per minor residential unit is at least one hectare 5000m

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						² .
Lynley Newport (S105)	S105.003	Rural production	RPROZ-R19	Support in part	Non-compliance with Rule RPROZ-R19 CON-4 should not result in non-complying status. In terms of effects, I would consider it similar to access (Rule RPROZ-R19 CON-3).	Amend activity status column of Rule RPROZ-R19 to read: Activity status where compliance not achieved with CON-3 and/or CON-4 : Discretionary; Activity status where compliance not achieved with CON-1, CON-2, CON-4 and/or CON-5: Non complying.
Bentzen Farm Limited (S167)	S167.101	Rural production	RPROZ-R19	Oppose	This rule should be a permitted activity and it is unclear from the drafting whether that was in fact the intent. The matters sought to be managed by the rules (density, access, separation distance and size) are easily controlled by the standards at CON-1 to CON-5. Council is able to ascertain compliance with these matters at building consent stage, with the requirement for a controlled activity resource consent unnecessary. The requirement that the separation distance between the minor residential unit and the principal residential unit does not exceed 15m should be deleted. There are many site-specific characteristics which may necessitate a greater separation distance, including availability of a suitable building platform and the desirability of screening the minor unit. The size limit of 65m ² as proposed effectively controls the risk of the proliferation of minor units as de-facto gull dwellings.	Amend the activity status for Minor residential units RPROZ-R19 from controlled to permitted , where the standards are complied with. Replace CON to PER in the rule. Delete the requirement that the separation distance between the minor residential unit and the principal residential unit does not exceed 15m (CON-4).
Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)	S168.097	Rural production	RPROZ-R19	Oppose	This rule should be a permitted activity and it is unclear from the drafting whether that was in fact the intent. The matters sought to be managed by the	Amend the activity status for Minor residential units RPROZ-R19 from controlled to permitted, where the standards are complied with.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>rules (density, access, separation distance and size) are easily controlled by the standards at CON-1 to CON-5. Council is able to ascertain compliance with these matters at building consent stage, with the requirement for a controlled activity resource consent unnecessary. The requirement that the separation distance between the minor residential unit and the principal residential unit does not exceed 15m should be deleted. There are many site-specific characterises which may necessitate a greater separation distance, including availability of a suitable building platform and the desirability of screening the minor unit. The size limit of 65m² as proposed effectively controls the risk of the proliferation of minor units as de-facto gull dwellings.</p>	<p>Replace CON to PER in the rule. Delete the requirement that the separation distance between the minor residential unit and the principal residential unit does not exceed 15m (CON-4).</p>
The Shooting Box Limited (S187)	S187.088	Rural production	RPROZ-R19	Oppose	<p>Refer to submission for detailed reasons for decision(s) requested relating, but not limited to, to the following: this rule should be a permitted activity and it is unclear from the drafting whether that was in fact that intent; the matters sought to be managed by the rules are easily controlled by the standards at CON-1-CON-5 - Council able to ascertain compliance with these matters at building consent stage, with the requirement for a controlled activity resource consent unnecessary; and the requirement that the separation distance between the minor residential unit and the principal residential unit does not exceed 15m should be deleted.</p>	<p>Amend the activity status for Minor residential units RPROZ-R19 from controlled to permitted, where the standards are complied with. Replace CON to PER in the rule. Delete the requirement that the separation distance between the minor residential unit and the principal residential unit does not exceed 15m (CON-4).</p>
Wendover Two Limited (S222)	S222.094	Rural production	RPROZ-R19	Oppose	<p>This rule should be a permitted activity and it is unclear from the drafting whether that was in fact the intent. The matters sought to be managed by the rules(density, access, separation distance and size) are easily controlled by the standards at CON-1 to CON-5. Council is able to ascertain compliance with these matters at building consent stage, with</p>	<p>Amend the activity status for Minor residential units RPROZ-R19 from controlled to permitted, where the standards are complied with.Activity status: Controlled Delete CON-4 The separation distance between the minor residential unit and the principal</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					the requirement for a controlled activity resource consent unnecessary. The requirement that the separation distance between the minor residential unit and the principal residential unit does not exceed 15m should be deleted. There are many site-specific characterises which may necessitate a greater separation distance, including availability o a suitable building platform and the desirability of screening the minor unit. The size limit of 65m2 as proposed effectively controls the risk of the proliferation of minor units as de-facto gull dwellings.	residential unit does not exceed 15m.
Matauri Trustee Limited (S243)	S243.119	Rural production	RPROZ-R19	Oppose	This rule should be a permitted activity and it is unclear from the drafting whether that was in fact the intent. The matters sought to be managed by the rules (density, access, separation distance and size) are easily controlled by the standards at CON-1 to CON-5. Council is able to ascertain compliance with these matters at building consent stage, with the requirement for a controlled activity resource consent unnecessary. The requirement that the separation distance between the minor residential unit and the principal residential unit does not exceed 15m should be deleted. There are many site-specific characterises which may necessitate a greater separation distance, including availability of a suitable building platform and the desirability of screening the minor unit. The size limit of 65m2 as proposed effectively controls the risk of the proliferation of minor units as de-facto gull dwellings.	Amend the activity status for Minor residential units RPROZ-R19 from controlled to permitted, where the standards are complied with. Replace CON to PER in the rule. Delete the requirement that the separation distance between the minor residential unit and the principal residential unit does not exceed 15m (CON-4).
Willowridge Developments Limited (S250)	S250.024	Rural production	RPROZ-R19	Support in part	Willowridge support the inclusion of a minor residential unit rule in the RPROZ. It can be appropriately managed as a permitted activity with the same clauses applied. The rule does not contain any matters of control making it unclear whether	Amend RPROZ-R19 activity status to make a permitted activity.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					this is supposed to be a permitted or a controlled activity or define the parameters over which Council limits its control.	
Amber Hookway (S261)	S261.003	Rural production	RPROZ-R19	Oppose	Opposes the change from: "the separation distance of the minor residential unit is no greater than 30m from the principal dwelling" to "The separation distance between the minor residential unit and the principal residential unit does not exceed 15m". There needs to be a distance of at least 30m to ensure quiet enjoyment of the minor residential unit. As is seen at multiple properties close together disputes arise where there is not a healthy amount of space between dwellings - noise etc. The issue of sharing a driveway and then a distance between of no more than 15 metres raises safety concerns - how many children are run over in their/shared driveways each year in NZ.	Amend to reinstate the equivalent Operative District Plan rule (the separation distance of the minor residential unit is no greater than 30m from the principal dwelling)
Wilson Hookway (S264)	S264.003	Rural production	RPROZ-R19	Oppose	Opposes the change from: "the separation distance of the minor residential unit is no greater than 30m from the principal dwelling" to "The separation distance between the minor residential unit and the principal residential unit does not exceed 15m". There needs to be a distance of at least 30m to ensure quiet enjoyment of the minor residential unit. As is seen at multiple properties close together disputes arise where there is not a healthy amount of space between dwellings - noise etc. The issue of sharing a driveway and then a distance between of no more than 15 metres raises safety concerns - how many children are run over in their/shared driveways each year in NZ.	Amend to reinstate the equivalent Operative District Plan rule (the separation distance of the minor residential unit is no greater than 30m from the principal dwelling)
Danielle Hookway (S309)	S309.003	Rural production	RPROZ-R19	Oppose	There needs to be a distance of at least 30m to ensure quiet enjoyment of the minor residential unit. As is seen at multiple properties close together, disputes arise where there is not a healthy amount of space	Amend rule RPROZ-R19 to retain at least the existing rule: 'the separation distance of the minor dwelling unit is no greater than 30m from the principal dwelling'. The same should

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>between dwellings. The issue of sharing a driveway and then a distance between of no more than 15m raises safety concerns - how many children are run over in their/shared driveways each year in New Zealand?</p>	<p>also apply: 'In considering an application under this provision, the Council will restrict the exercise of its control to the following matters: (i) the extent of the separation between the principal dwelling and the minor residential unit; (ii) the degree to which design is compatible with the principal dwelling; (iii) the extent that services can be shared; (iv) the ability to mitigate any adverse effects by way of provision of landscaping and screening; (v) the location of the unit.'</p>
<p>Lianne Kennedy (S310)</p>	<p>S310.003</p>	<p>Rural production</p>	<p>RPROZ-R19</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>There needs to be a distance of at least 30m to ensure quiet enjoyment of the minor residential unit. As is seen at multiple properties close together, disputes arise where there is not a healthy amount of space between dwellings. The issue of sharing a driveway and then a distance between of no more than 15m raises safety concerns - how many children are run over in their/shared driveways each year in New Zealand?</p>	<p>Amend rule RPROZ-R19 to retain at least the existing rule: 'the separation distance of the minor dwelling unit is no greater than 30m from the principal dwelling'. The same should also apply: 'In considering an application under this provision, the Council will restrict the exercise of its control to the following matters: (i) the extent of the separation between the principal dwelling and the minor residential unit; (ii) the degree to which design is compatible with the principal dwelling; (iii) the extent that services can be shared; (iv) the ability to mitigate any adverse effects by</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						way of provision of landscaping and screening; (v) the location of the unit.'
Allen Hookway (S311)	S311.003	Rural production	RPROZ-R19	Oppose	There needs to be a distance of at least 30m to ensure quiet enjoyment of the minor residential unit. As is seen at multiple properties close together, disputes arise where there is not a healthy amount of space between dwellings. The issue of sharing a driveway and then a distance between of no more than 15m raises safety concerns - how many children are run over in their/shared driveways each year in New Zealand?	Amend rule RPROZ-R19 to retain at least the existing rule: 'the separation distance of the minor dwelling unit is no greater than 30m from the principal dwelling'. The same should also apply: 'In considering an application under this provision, the Council will restrict the exercise of its control to the following matters: (i) the extent of the separation between the principal dwelling and the minor residential unit; (ii) the degree to which design is compatible with the principal dwelling; (iii) the extent that services can be shared; (iv) the ability to mitigate any adverse effects by way of provision of landscaping and screening; (v) the location of the unit.'
P S Yates Family Trust (S333)	S333.089	Rural production	RPROZ-R19	Support in part	This rule should be a permitted activity and it is unclear from the drafting whether that was in fact the intent. The matters sought to be managed by the rules (density, access, separation distance and size) are easily controlled by the standards at CON-1 to CON-5. Council is able to ascertain compliance with these matters at building consent stage, with the requirement for a controlled activity resource consent unnecessary. The requirement that the separation distance between the minor residential unit and the	Amend the activity status for minor residential units RPROZ-R19 from controlled to permitted, where the standards are complied with Amend CON to PER in the rule. Delete the requirement that the separation distance between the minor residential unit and the principal residential unit does not exceed 15m (CON-4). .

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					principal residential unit does not exceed 15m should be deleted. There are many site-specific characterises which may necessitate a greater separation distance, including availability o a suitable building platform and the desirability of screening the minor unit. The size limit of 65m2 as proposed effectively controls the risk of the proliferation of minor units as de-facto gull dwellings	
Wakaiti Dalton (S355)	S355.031	Rural production	RPROZ-R19	Support in part	We support the inclusion of a minor residential unit rule, however, considers this can be appropriately managed as a permitted activity with the same clauses applied. Further, it is noted that this rule does not contain any matters of control making it unclear which matters/effects require assessment and what the parameters of control are.	Amend activity status to make a permitted activity.
Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew (S386)	S386.024	Rural production	RPROZ-R19	Support in part	Ballantyne & Agnew support the inclusion of a minor residential unit rule, however, considers this can be appropriately managed as a permitted activity with the same clauses applied. Further, it is noted that this rule does not contain any matters of control making it unclear which matters/effects require assessment and what the parameters of control are.	Amend activity status to make a permitted activity.
Tracy and Kenneth Dalton (S479)	S479.026	Rural production	RPROZ-R19	Support in part	We support the inclusion of a minor residential unit rule, however, considers this can be appropriately managed as a permitted activity with the same clauses applied. Further, it is noted that this rule does not contain any matters of control making it unclear which matters/effects require assessment and what the parameters of control are.	Amend activity status to make a permitted activity.
Te Aupōuri Commercial Development Ltd (S339)	S339.055	Rural production	RPROZ-R20	Support	TACDL are supportive of the provision of papakāinga housing in the RPROZ.	Retain Rule RPROZ-R20

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Wakaiti Dalton (S355)	S355.032	Rural production	RPROZ-R20	Support in part	We generally support the intention of these provisions. However, we consider that these would be best managed as a controlled activity, in line with the ODP's activity status.	Amend activity status to make a controlled activity.
Te Waka Pupuri Putea Trust (S477)	S477.018	Rural production	RPROZ-R20	Support	We support the provision for rules relating to accommodation for staff as imagined within the Rural Production Zone. As an employer of a significant number of workers, it is critical that we are enabled to provide for the living of a prospective workforce that provides value into the wider local and regional economies. More specifically and for example, we support Rules like RPROZ-R3, RPROZ-R10 and RPROZ-R20 in providing for not only the living environment for our workforce but also the opportunity for rural produce retail and Papakainga housing respectively - the latter being of increasing importance to our whanau, hapu into the future.	Retain Rule RPROZ-R20
Tracy and Kenneth Dalton (S479)	S479.027	Rural production	RPROZ-R20	Support in part	We generally support the intention of these provisions. However, we consider that these would be best managed as a controlled activity, in line with the ODP's activity status.	Amend activity status to make a controlled activity.
FNR Properties Limited (S316)	S316.002	Rural production	RPROZ-R21	Support in part	Contrary to the ODP, the PDP specifically provides for the expansion of existing mineral extraction activity in the Rural Production zone as a restricted discretionary activity. While this largely represents a positive change for the subject site, it is noted that the same activity is provided for as a controlled activity under Rule ME-R2 which conflicts/contradicts with Rule RPROZ-R21. This could lead to confusion and interpretation issues. It is therefore recommended that Rule RPROZ-R21 is amended to be consistent with Rule ME-R2.	Amend Rule RPROZ-R21 to be consistent with Rule ME-R2
Kapiro Conservation Trust (S442)	S442.140	Rural production	RPROZ-R21	Oppose	This activity should be a discretionary activity outside of the Mineral Extraction Overlay.	Amend activity status to discretionary (inferred reference to RPROZ-R21).

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Willowridge Development s Limited (S250)	S250.025	Rural production	RPROZ-R22	Support	It provides for tourism activities within the rural environment which have a functional need to be located here.	Retain as notified.
Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew (S386)	S386.025	Rural production	RPROZ-R22	Support	Ballantyne & Agnew support this, as it provides for tourism activities within the rural environment which have a functional need to be located here.	Retain as notified.
Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited (S502)	S502.050	Rural production	RPROZ-R22	Support in part	Generally, we support the inclusion of this rule. However, we do seek to add in some minor matters of clarification. Item b we seek to add whether there is a link to that tourism activity being undertaken on that particular site. In Northland we have a number of natural features, landscapes and historic spaces which are located on certain sites. Tourism businesses associated with these features, landscapes and historic spaces are generally located on these subject sites and are not able to be located elsewhere. We have further enabled these particular activities on those specific sites by adding in an additional criteria m.	Amend RPROZ-R22 Matters of discretion are restricted to: a. the character and appearance of the building(s); b. the link between the tourism activity and the rural environment and/or the site ; c. the siting of the building(s), decks and outdoor areas including parking relative to adjoining sites; d. whether the building(s) are visually dominant and create a loss of privacy for surrounding residential units and their associated outdoor areas; e. ability of the supporting roading network to cater for the additional vehicular and if applicable cycling and pedestrian traffic; f. servicing requirements and any constraints of the site; g. whether the location of the building(s) and rural tourism activity could create reverse sensitivity effects on adjacent and

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>surrounding primary production activities;</p> <p>h. whether the development will result in the site being unable to continue to undertake a primary production activity or undertake one in the future due to loss of productive land;</p> <p>i. whether the layout of the development maintains the existing rural character of the surrounding area;</p> <p>j. any lighting or noise effects;</p> <p>k. the frequency of the use, hours and days of operation and the number of people it can cater for;</p> <p>l. any natural hazard affecting the site or surrounding area.m.</p> <p>Whether the tourism activity could be operated on another site.</p>
<p>Waitangi Limited (S503)</p>	<p>S503.033</p>	<p>Rural production</p>	<p>RPROZ-R22</p>	<p>Not Stated</p>	<p>Generally, we support the inclusion of this rule. However, we do seek to add in some minor matters of clarification. Item b we seek to add whether there is a link to that tourism activity being undertaken on that particular site. The Waitangi Treaty Grounds is a site in which both international and domestic travelers come to visit. There is opportunity to provide additional experiences associated with the historic site across the wider estate which could utilize this rule. As Waitangi is a site which cannot be moved or relocated</p>	<p>Amend point b of the matters of discretion as follows: the link between the tourism activity and the rural environment and/or the siteInsert new point m within the matters of discretion as follows:Whether the tourism activity could be operated on another site.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					elsewhere similar to other businesses which utilize the natural features, landscapes and historic spaces located on certain sites, it is fitting to include this as a criteria to further enable businesses of this nature. We have further enabled these particular activities on those specific sites by adding in an additional criteria m.	
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand (S511)	S511.121	Rural production	RPROZ-R22	Oppose	This activity should be a discretionary activity outside of the Mineral Extraction Overlay	Amend activity status to discretionary (inferred reference to R22)
New Zealand Pork Industry Board (S55)	S55.039	Rural production	RPROZ-R23	Oppose	Adverse effects on sensitive activities can arise from intensive farming areas other than buildings housing animals - such as effluent ponds or stock yards. Expanding the definition will encompass more of the farm operation and ensure it is appropriately located away from existing sensitive activities. The rule should apply to the broader definition of intensive primary production, which encompasses both intensive indoor and intensive outdoor operations.	Amend rule as follows: Buildings or structures Any hardstand areas, treatment systems, buildings housing animals and any other structures associated with an intensive primary production activity are set back at least 300m from any sensitive activity on a site under separate ownership.
New Zealand Pork Industry Board (S55)	S55.040	Rural production	RPROZ-R23	Oppose	Intensive farming should not be a non-complying activity anywhere within the rural production zone. If a new operation seeks to locate within 300m of a sensitive activity, the effects of the activity along with appropriate remedying actions can be assessed and put in place via a discretionary consent process.	Amend Activity status where compliance not achieved with RDIS-1: Non-complying Discretionary.
Horticulture New Zealand (S159)	S159.115	Rural production	RPROZ-R24	Oppose	Rural industry supports horticulture production and a discretionary activity status for all rural industry may prevent activities which support horticulture activities	Delete Rule RPROZ-R24
Northland Planning and Development	S502.051	Rural production	RPROZ-R24	Support in part	With subdivision in the Rural Production zone becoming more restrictive, as well as the price of land increasing, it is anticipated	Delete RPROZ-R24 RDIS-2

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
2020 Limited (S502)					that co-ownership of land will become more prevalent in the rural zones especially between families. As a result, a piece of land may contain more than one rural industry to cater for the co-ownership of the land. As a Rural Industry captures all businesses undertaken in a rural environment which are dependent on primary production it can include things such as rural tourism operators, rural contractors, the small scale selling of honey, vegetables or flowers in roadside stalls just to name a few. If these are run as separate businesses, this would technically require consent. We seek relief that RDIS-2 is deleted in its entirety. RDIS-1 provides control over the maximum GBA within a site such that restrictions on the number is not deemed necessary.	
Waitangi Limited (S503)	S503.034	Rural production	RPROZ-R24	Not Stated	On larger sites like the Waitangi Treaty Grounds which are diverse in what they offer there can be multiple rural industries operating on site. As a Rural Industry captures all businesses undertaken in a rural environment which are dependent on primary production it can include things such as the small scale selling of honey, vegetables, flowers or wine just to name a few. If these are run as separate businesses, this would technically require consent. We seek relief that RDIS-2 is deleted in its entirety. If this is not accepted, we seek that RDIS-2 does not apply to the Waitangi Estate.	Delete RDIS-2 of Rule RPROZ-R24, as follows: The number of rural industry activities per site does not exceed one.
Horticulture New Zealand (S159)	S159.116	Rural production	RPROZ-R25	Support	Discretionary activity or non-complying status for activities that are generally not anticipated in the Rural Production zone is supported	Retain activity status for Rule RPROZ-R25
Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail	S425.064	Rural production	RPROZ-R25	Oppose	PHTTCCT oppose campgrounds as a discretionary activity in the Rural Production Zone and considers this zone to be the most appropriate for such an activity. Camping grounds provide a low-cost way for	Amend to provide for camping grounds as a permitted activity in the Rural Production Zone

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Charitable Trust (S425)					tourists and locals to experience the District. PHHTTCCT consider that it is inequitable to provide for other accommodation activities as a permitted activity but not camp ground. PHTTCCT seek that Camping grounds are provided for as a permitted activity subject to compliance with performance standards in this zone, and it highlighted that noise and traffic will be managed through District Wide Chapters.	
New Zealand Motor Caravan Association (S438)	S438.008	Rural production	RPROZ-R25	Oppose	The NZMCA operates a number of campgrounds and park over properties that are present in a variety of zones. Allowing for more permissive rules around the establishment of campgrounds will make it easier to establish sites for self-contained vehicle-based camping in the Far North District. This will also create positive social and economic benefits for the community.	Amend RPROZ-R25 to restricted discretionary activity status and include consent criteria which relates to visual impacts and protection of highly productive soils.
Horticulture New Zealand (S159)	S159.117	Rural production	RPROZ-R26	Support	Discretionary activity or non-complying status for activities that are generally not anticipated in the Rural Production zone is supported	Retain activity status for Rule RPROZ-R26
Horticulture New Zealand (S159)	S159.118	Rural production	RPROZ-R27	Support	Discretionary activity or non-complying status for activities that are generally not anticipated in the Rural Production zone is supported	Retain activity status for Rule RPROZ-R27
Horticulture New Zealand (S159)	S159.119	Rural production	RPROZ-R28	Support	Discretionary activity or non-complying status for activities that are generally not anticipated in the Rural Production zone is supported	Retain activity status for Rule RPROZ-R28
Horticulture New Zealand (S159)	S159.120	Rural production	RPROZ-R29	Support	Discretionary activity or non-complying status for activities that are generally not anticipated in the Rural Production zone is supported	Retain activity status for Rule RPROZ-R29
Horticulture New Zealand (S159)	S159.121	Rural production	RPROZ-R30	Support	Discretionary activity or non-complying status for activities that are generally not anticipated in the Rural Production zone is supported	Retain activity status for Rule RPROZ-R30
Horticulture New Zealand (S159)	S159.122	Rural production	RPROZ-R31	Support	Discretionary activity or non-complying status for activities that are generally not	Retain activity status for Rule RPROZ-R31

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					anticipated in the Rural Production zone is supported	
Horticulture New Zealand (S159)	S159.123	Rural production	RPROZ-R32	Support	Discretionary activity or non-complying status for activities that are generally not anticipated in the Rural Production zone is supported	Retain activity status for Rule RPROZ-R32
Horticulture New Zealand (S159)	S159.124	Rural production	RPROZ-R33	Support	Discretionary activity or non-complying status for activities that are generally not anticipated in the Rural Production zone is supported	Retain activity status for Rule RPROZ-R33
Horticulture New Zealand (S159)	S159.125	Rural production	RPROZ-R34	Support	Discretionary activity or non-complying status for activities that are generally not anticipated in the Rural Production zone is supported	Retain activity status for Rule RPROZ-R34
Horticulture New Zealand (S159)	S159.126	Rural production	RPROZ-R35	Support	Discretionary activity or non-complying status for activities that are generally not anticipated in the Rural Production zone is supported	Retain activity status for Rule RPROZ-R35
Horticulture New Zealand (S159)	S159.127	Rural production	RPROZ-R36	Support	Discretionary activity or non-complying status for activities that are generally not anticipated in the Rural Production zone is supported	Retain activity status for Rule RPROZ-R36
Horticulture New Zealand (S159)	S159.128	Rural production	RPROZ-R37	Support	Discretionary activity or non-complying status for activities that are generally not anticipated in the Rural Production zone is supported	Retain activity status for Rule RPROZ-R37
New Zealand Pork Industry Board (S55)	S55.031	Rural production	Standards	Oppose	<p>There is no provision within the plan to address the impacts of new sensitive activities on existing indoor primary production (both indoor and outdoor) activities.</p> <p>RPRZOZ-P3 specifies a requirement to avoid or mitigate reverse sensitivity effects on primary production activities, but there is no associated rule or standard to give effect to the policy. Reverse sensitivity effects caused by new sensitivity activities establishing in close proximity to indoor pig farming activities are one of the leading causes of constraints on commercial pork</p>	<p>insert new standard for new sensitive activity setback from an existing intensive primary production activity, as follows:</p> <p>RPROZ-S8 Sensitive activities setback from intensive primary production activities:All buildings used for new sensitive activities will be setback 300m from any hardstand areas, treatment systems, buildings housing animals and any other structures associated with an</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					production. To protect the legitimate operation of established primary production activities, standard should be put in place to restrict the location of new sensitive activities.	intensive primary production activity located on a separate site under separate ownership.
Horticulture New Zealand (S159)	S159.107	Rural production	Standards	Support in part	There is not a specific rule for artificial crop protection structures so Rule RPROZ-R1 would apply. Seeks changes to some of the Standards to ensure that such structures are adequately provided for.	Seeks changes to some of the Standards to ensure that structures such as artificial crop protection structures are adequately provided for
Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust (S338)	S338.065	Rural production	Standards	Not Stated	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour. • Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						complying'activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish.
Nicole Way and Christopher Huljich as Trustees of the Trssh Birnie Settlement Trust (S345)	S345.004	Rural production	Standards	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.</p> <p>The Proposed District Plan fails to recognise, have regard to, or provide for the development and subdivision enabled by the Resource Consents.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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>
Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand (S421)	S421.208	Rural production	Standards	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</p>	<p>Amend the Standards 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
					<p>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. 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.</p> <p>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</p>	

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					Statements. The Council seems intent of duplicating provisions which may have already been dealt with at regional and national levels.	
Kapiro Residents Association (S427)	S427.066	Rural production	Standards	Support in part	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	<p>Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour. • Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Kapiro Conservation Trust (S449)	S449.061	Rural production	Standards	Support	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	<p>Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour. • Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish.
LJ King Ltd (S464)	S464.040	Rural production	Standards	Oppose	We do not support the 30m setback from roads and instead submit to having a 20m setback, and only a 5m setback if it is a garage or non-habitable building. This will	Amend the setback from the road boundary in this zone to 20 metres for a dwelling, and 5 metres for a non-

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					provide for open space and rural amenity, while still allowing efficient and effective use of the rural site.	habitable dwelling.
Carbon Neutral NZ Trust (S529)	S529.214	Rural production	Standards	Support in part	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	<p>Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour. • Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Horticulture New Zealand (S159)	S159.130	Rural production	RPROZ-S1	Support	Standard RPROZ-S1 provides for artificial crop protection structures up to 6m	Retain Standard RPROZ-S1
Bentzen Farm Limited (S167)	S167.102	Rural production	RPROZ-S1	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain RPROZ-S1 - RPROZ-S7
Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)	S168.098	Rural production	RPROZ-S1	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain Standard RPROZ-S1.
The Shooting Box Limited (S187)	S187.089	Rural production	RPROZ-S1	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain RPROZ-S1- RPROZ-S7.
Timothy and Dion Spicer (S213)	S213.005	Rural production	RPROZ-S1	Support		Retain standards
Matauri Trustee Limited (S243)	S243.120	Rural production	RPROZ-S1	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain Standard RPROZ-S1
P S Yates Family Trust (S333)	S333.090	Rural production	RPROZ-S1	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain RPROZ-S1
Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust (S338)	S338.029	Rural production	RPROZ-S1	Not Stated	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish.
<p>Kapiro Residents Association (S427)</p>	<p>S427.023</p>	<p>Rural production</p>	<p>RPROZ-S1</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character. We support PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, however. the PDP needs additional specific rules/standard.</p>	<p>Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish.
<p>Kapiro Conservation Trust (S449)</p>	<p>S449.048</p>	<p>Rural production</p>	<p>RPROZ-S1</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.</p>	<p>Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>fabric must be black or very dark colour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish.
Radio New Zealand (S489)	S489.032	Rural production	RPROZ-S1	Support in part	<p>RNZ is concerned that elevated structures near RNZ's facilities could experience EMR coupling which can present a safety risk to people on or near the structures. RNZ notes that the height limit proposed in the proposed district plan has been adopted as a trigger for considering EMR coupling, to allow for simpler administration of the standard. However, RNZ is open to higher trigger heights of 21m (within 1,000m of the Waipapakauri transmitter) and 16m (within 1,000m of the Ōhaeawai transmitter) being imposed in the District Plan if this would lead to better outcomes.</p>	<p>Insert a new matter of discretion within Standard RPROZ-S1 as follows:g. for structures within 1,000m of Radio New Zealand's Facilities at Waipapakauri or Ōhaeawai, whether the safety risks of electromagnetic coupling have been considered and addressed effectively.</p>
Carbon Neutral NZ Trust (S529)	S529.034	Rural production	RPROZ-S1	Support in part	<p>The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.</p>	<p>Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish.
Horticulture New Zealand (S159)	S159.131	Rural production	RPROZ-S2	Oppose	Standard RPROZ-S2 should not apply to artificial crop protection structures as they are open in nature and let light through	Amend the list of activities that Standard RPROZ-S2 does not apply to, to add: v) artificial crop protection structures
Bentzen Farm Limited (S167)	S167.111	Rural production	RPROZ-S2	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain RPROZ-S1 - RPROZ-S7
Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)	S168.099	Rural production	RPROZ-S2	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain Standard RPROZ-S2.
The Shooting Box Limited (S187)	S187.101	Rural production	RPROZ-S2	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain RPROZ-S1 - RPROZ-S7
The Shooting Box Limited (S187)	S187.102	Rural production	RPROZ-S2	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain RPROZ-S1 - RPROZ-S7

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Matauri Trustee Limited (S243)	S243.121	Rural production	RPROZ-S2	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain Standard RPROZ-S2
P S Yates Family Trust (S333)	S333.091	Rural production	RPROZ-S2	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain RPROZ-S2
John Andrew Riddell (S431)	S431.182	Rural production	RPROZ-S2	Not Stated	Not stated	Retain the approach varying the required height to boundary depending on the orientation of the relevant boundary.
Jono Corskie (S37)	S37.001	Rural production	RPROZ-S3	Support in part	The removal of the provision for 3m offset from sections under 5000sqm (from the Operative District Plan (inferred)) creates a large amount of parcels of land that have been created assuming a 3m setback to create a building platform. This affects 26% of parcels in the rural environment based on Section 32 Rural Environment Appendix Table 37. This approach creates additional resource consent requirements for someone who simply wants to add a shed, greenhouse, office or a building consent exempt structure to a parcel that has been created under the previous plan under 5000sqm rules. It also will lead to under utilisation of smaller land parcels, when the plan states it is important to protect this finite resource from inappropriate land use and subdivision to ensure it can be used for its primary purpose. Habitable dwellings adjacent to boundaries have a potential for reverse sensitivity which I assume is the main aim of this rule. With other structures the effect is negligible. Limiting the setback of dwellings to 10m, for sections under 5000sqm the effects of horticultural or rural activities is addressed. All other structures should be able to be built up to 3m setback as per previous plan to avoid unnecessary costs incurred for building and under	Amend standard so that the 10m setback from site boundaries only applies to dwellings, 3m setback applies for all other structures for sections under 5000m2, and consider 3m setback for all other structures for sections over 5000m2.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					utilisation of land. The subdivision rules prevent the creation of any more sections where this rule applies going forward, some transition is necessary or 26% of parcels will have significant under utilisation effects.	
Summit Forests New Zealand Limited (S148)	S148.049	Rural production	RPROZ-S3	Not Stated	The proposed Plan does not appear to provide for set backs for building and structures along a plantation forest boundary. The minimum setback along an existing plantation forest boundary should be at least 30m to account for shading and the risk of wind throw.	Amend RPROZ-S3 to provide for setbacks of at least 30m from existing plantation forest boundaries and make any consequential amendments required at all other applicable standards.
Horticulture New Zealand (S159)	S159.111	Rural production	RPROZ-S3	Oppose	Ten guests as a permitted activity with a setback of 10m from a boundary is not considered appropriate to manage potential reverse sensitivity effects. The rule does not state the Standards that will apply. The standards relating to buildings should be included in the rule.	Increase setbacks in Standard RPROZ-S3 to 20m from boundaries.
Horticulture New Zealand (S159)	S159.132	Rural production	RPROZ-S3	Support in part	The standard provides for artificial crop protection structures with a 3m setback. The setbacks only provide for a 10m setback of habitable buildings from boundaries which is considered insufficient to address potential reverse sensitivity effects.	Amend Policy RPROZ-S3 as follows: The building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure must be setback at least 10m from all site boundaries, except: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. on sites less than 5,000m² accessory buildings can be setback to a minimum of 3m for boundaries that do not adjoin a road; 2. artificial crop protection and support structures must be setback at least 3m 1m from all site boundaries; and 3. habitable buildings must be setback at least 30m from the boundary of an unsealed road and 20m from side and rear boundaries.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Manulife Forest Management (NZ) Ltd (S160)	S160.041	Rural production	RPROZ-S3	Not Stated	The submitter considers that standard RPROZ-S3 should include a 30metre setback for buildings from production forestry land.	Amend standard RPROZ-S3 to include 30 metre setback for buildings from production forestry land.
Bentzen Farm Limited (S167)	S167.112	Rural production	RPROZ-S3	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain RPROZ-S1 - RPROZ-S7
Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)	S168.100	Rural production	RPROZ-S3	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain Standard RPROZ-S3.
The Shooting Box Limited (S187)	S187.103	Rural production	RPROZ-S3	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain RPROZ-S1 - RPROZ-S7
Paul Hayman (S210)	S210.002	Rural production	RPROZ-S3	Oppose	Opposes the inclusion of 'that do not adjoin a road' in proposed rule #1 of this standard, and standard that excludes houses being built with 3m setback on sites less than 5000m2. The reasons are that 3m can afford adequate screening if landscaped and planted to a height of 3m, and submitters property at 277 Wainui road is very narrow, and the current rule could exclude the building of a house on the site.	Amend the standard to read: on sites less than 5000m2, accessory buildings can be setback to a minimum of 3m from boundaries that do not adjoin a road. 100% of the 3m setback is to be landscaped and planted to a minimum height of 3m.
Matauri Trustee Limited (S243)	S243.122	Rural production	RPROZ-S3	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain Standard RPROZ-S3
Nicole Wooster (S259)	S259.019	Rural production	RPROZ-S3	Support in part	Bee hives are not controlled by this rule as they are not a building or structure, however they can create health and safety issues when in close proximity to a road boundary or adjoining site. For example when using the council cycle way a number of bee hives were right up against the road boundary and thousands of bees were swarming over the cycleway, which could not be avoided, this could have resulted in multiple stings or prevented a person with an allergy from using the cycleway. Setbacks should be considered to prevent swarming over a adjoining site or road. Bees fly up to 5km to	Amend standard to consider a setback for bee hives from adjoining sites and road boundaries.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					access food, and do not need to be located right up against a boundary, in many cases this is simply done for the convenience of the bee keeper or an attempt to access adjoining sites resources. Consideration needs to be given to proximity to an adjoining site due to health and safety issues for people with allergies or do not want swarming bees right next to there boundary due to perhaps it adjoining an outdoor area they may use for example or adjoin a public road. In some instances bee keepers will place hives right up against a boundary to get as close as possible to vegetation on an adjoining properties site, or to be located next to a public road for ease of access. This can result in health and safety issues.	
P S Yates Family Trust (S333)	S333.092	Rural production	RPROZ-S3	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain RPROZ-S3
Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust (S338)	S338.056	Rural production	RPROZ-S3	Not Stated	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish.
Sean Frieling (S357)	S357.040	Rural production	RPROZ-S3	Oppose	We do not support the 30m setback from roads and instead submit to having a 20m setback, and only a 5m setback if it is a garage or non-habitable building. This will provide for open space and rural amenity, while still allowing efficient and effective use of the rural site.	Amend the setback from the road boundary in this zone to 20 metres for a dwelling, and 5 metres for a non-habitable dwelling
Leah Frieling (S358)	S358.043	Rural production	RPROZ-S3	Oppose	We do not support the 30m setback from roads and instead submit to having a 20m setback, and only a 5m setback if it is a garage or non-habitable building. This will provide for open space and rural amenity, while still allowing efficient and effective use of the rural site.	Amend the setback from the road boundary to 20 metres for a dwelling, and 5 metres for a non-habitable dwelling
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S416)	S416.058	Rural production	RPROZ-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.</p> <p>Parts of the KiwiRail network adjoin commercial, mixed use, industrial and open space zones. These zone chapters do not currently include provision for boundary</p>	<p>Insert a railway setback (refer to submission for examples)</p> <p>Insert the following matters of discretion into the standard:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the location and design of the building as it relates to the ability to safely use, access and

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>setbacks for buildings and structures. KiwiRail seek a boundary setback of 5m from the rail corridor for all buildings and structures.</p> <p>KiwiRail considers that a matter of discretion directing consideration of impacts on the safety and efficiency of the rail corridor is appropriate in situations where the 5m setback standard is not complied with in all zones adjacent to the railway corridor. Building setbacks are essential to address significant safety hazards associated with the operational rail corridor. The Proposed Plan enables a 1m setback from side and rear boundaries shared with the rail corridor, increasing the risk that poles, ladders, or even ropes for abseiling equipment, could protrude into the rail corridor and increasing the risk of collision with a train or electrified overhead lines. Further, there is a 600mm eave allowance within side and rear yards which restricts potential 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 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</p>	<p>maintain buildings without requiring access on, above or over the rail corridor</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the safe and efficient operation of the rail network

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>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.</p> <p>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>Kapiro Residents Association (S427)</p>	<p>S427.041</p>	<p>Rural production</p>	<p>RPROZ-S3</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.</p>	<p>Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>fabric must be black or very dark colour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish.
<p>Kapiro Conservation Trust (S449)</p>	<p>S449.052</p>	<p>Rural production</p>	<p>RPROZ-S3</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.</p>	<p>Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour. Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish.
Elbury Holdings (S485)	S485.040	Rural production	RPROZ-S3	Oppose	We do not support the 30m setback from roads and instead submit to having a 20m setback, and only a 5m setback if it is a garage or non-habitable building. This will provide for open space and rural amenity, while still allowing efficient and effective use of the rural site.	Amend the setback from the road boundary in this zone to 20 metres for a dwelling, and 5 metres for a non-habitable dwelling.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand (S512)	S512.073	Rural production	RPROZ-S3	Support in part	Setbacks play a role in reducing spread of fire as well as ensuring Fire and Emergency personnel can get to a fire source or other emergency. An advice note is recommended to raise to plan users (e.g. developers) early on in the resource consent process that there is further control of building setbacks and firefighting access through the New Zealand Building Code (NZBC).	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 stage. Issuance of a resource consent does not imply that waivers of Building Code requirements will be considered/granted
Elbury Holdings (S519)	S519.041	Rural production	RPROZ-S3	Oppose	We do not support the 30m setback from roads and instead submit to having a 20m setback, and only a 5m setback if it is a garage or non-habitable building. This will provide for open space and rural amenity,	Amend RPROZ-S3 as follows: '1. on sites less than 5,000m ² accessory buildings can be setback to a minimum of 3m 5m for boundaries that do not adjoin a road;...3.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					while still allowing efficient and effective use of the rural site.	habitable buildings must be setback at least 30m 20m from the boundary of an unsealed road.' (inferred)
Carbon Neutral NZ Trust (S529)	S529.200	Rural production	RPROZ-S3	Support in part	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	<p>Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour. • Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						opportunity to object if they wish.
Bentzen Farm Limited (S167)	S167.113	Rural production	RPROZ-S4	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain RPROZ-S1 - RPROZ-S7
Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)	S168.101	Rural production	RPROZ-S4	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain Standard RPROZ-S4
The Shooting Box Limited (S187)	S187.104	Rural production	RPROZ-S4	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain RPROZ-S1 - RPROZ-S7
Matauri Trustee Limited (S243)	S243.123	Rural production	RPROZ-S4	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain Standard RPROZ-S4
IDF Development s Limited (S253)	S253.004	Rural production	RPROZ-S4	Not Stated	The relief sought draws off an existing exemption from the setback rules in the Operative District Plan where the setback provision does not apply to a legally formed and maintained road between the property and the coastal marine area, lake or river (refer 12.7.6.1.1(vii)). This approach should be extended also to areas promoted (or already existing) as esplanade reserves, crown grants, or similar landholdings as they effectively serve as a buffer in many instances.	Amend Standard RPROZ-S4 to include an exemption where there is a landholding (i.e. crown grant, road, or reserve) that separates a site from MHWS
Nicole Wooster (S259)	S259.018	Rural production	RPROZ-S4	Support in part	In the rural environment it is not uncommon where a farm has coastal water access that wharfs or boat ramps exist for private use, especially in places like the hokianga (e.g our family farm) where prior to roads being constructed access was obtained via the river and harbour network. However, the rule does not appear to provide for a setback exemption for these types of activities.	Amend standard to consider whether wharfs/boat ramps should be exempt from the set back rules in relation to the MHW.
P S Yates Family Trust (S333)	S333.093	Rural production	RPROZ-S4	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain RPROZ-S4

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Far North District Council (S368)	S368.048	Rural production	RPROZ-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 RPROZ-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 ;
Owen Burn (S490)	S490.007	Rural production	RPROZ-S4	Oppose	Not stated	Delete Standard RPROZ-S4
Eric Kloet (S491)	S491.007	Rural production	RPROZ-S4	Oppose	Not stated	Delete Standard RPROZ-S4
Ironwood Trust Limited (S492)	S492.007	Rural production	RPROZ-S4	Oppose	Not stated	Delete Standard RPROZ-S4
William Goodfellow (S493)	S493.014	Rural production	RPROZ-S4	Support in part	The imposition of controls intended to manage development in highly sensitive areas and in the coastal environment are thus considered to be inappropriate in this context and will make the continuation of reasonable use and development of the property unfairly and unnecessarily constrained.	Amend provisions requiring buildings within the Rural Production Zone be setback 30 metres from MHWS be deleted.
Ian Jepson (S494)	S494.014	Rural production	RPROZ-S4	Oppose	The imposition of controls intended to manage development in highly sensitive areas are inappropriate in this context and will make the reasonable use and development of the property unfairly and unnecessarily constrained.	Amend provisions requiring buildings within the Rural Production Zone be setback 30 metres from MHWS be deleted.
Ricky Faesen Kloet (S495)	S495.011	Rural production	RPROZ-S4	Oppose	N/A	Delete RPROZ-S4 (inferred).
Philip Thornton (S496)	S496.012	Rural production	RPROZ-S4	Oppose	The imposition of controls intended to manage development make the reasonable use and development of the property unnecessarily onerous (inferred).	Amend provisions requiring buildings within the Rural Production Zone be setback 30 metres from MHWS be deleted.
Mark John Wyborn (S497)	S497.012	Rural production	RPROZ-S4	Support in part	The imposition of controls intended to manage development make the reasonable	Amend provisions requiring buildings within the Rural Production Zone be setback 30 metres from MHWS be

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					use and development of the property unfairly and unnecessarily constrained (inferred).	deleted.
Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited (S502)	S502.052	Rural production	RPROZ-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 RPROZ-S4 Where: PER-1 The building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure must be set back at least 30m from MHWSPER-2 The building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure within the 30m setback from MHWS is required for: 1. restoration and enhancement purposes; or 2. natural hazard mitigation undertaken by, or on behalf of, the local authority; or 3. a post and wire fence for the purpose of protection from farm stock; or 4. Lighting poles by, or on behalf of, the local authority; or 5. Footpaths and or paving no greater than 2m in width; or 6. Boundary fences or walls no more than 2m in height above ground level;
Waitangi Limited (S503)	S503.035	Rural production	RPROZ-S4	Not Stated	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.	Insert New PER-2 in Standard RPROZ-S4 as follows: PER-2 The building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>The definition for a Structure includes any building, equipment, device, or other facility, made by people and which is fixed to land; and includes any raft.</p> <p>There are many structures fixed to land such as stock fences that have a functional requirement to be located within 26m of the MHWS. Exclusion of this is consistent with NATC-R1.</p> <p>Lighting poles by or on behalf of FNDC have been sought as these are generally within legal road (which assumes the zoning of the neighboring site) or within park areas. In the case of the Waitangi Estate, the site contains a boat ramp and other infrastructure utilized by the general public which may at times require lighting not covered by a designation. Exclusions have been sought for footpaths and paving for both private and public use. In terms of the Waitangi Estate footpaths and paving convey people from Paihia onto the site and through to the Treaty grounds, and the Haruru Falls walking track among other uses. Generally, these are setback more than 30m from the coast but there are instances on the site where existing shell pathways are within the setback which may at some point require an upgrade. A 2m wide footpath has been sought to enable easy passing by two mobility scooters. The impact of sealing pathways is considered minor. Boundary fences and walls are also sought to be excluded so long as they are no more than 2m in height. This is because they are now captured under the definition of structure.</p>	<p>within the 30m setback from MHWS is required for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. restoration and enhancement purposes; or 2. natural hazard mitigation undertaken by, or on behalf of, the local authority; or 3. a post and wire fence for the purpose of protection from farm stock; or 4. Lighting poles by, or on behalf of, the local authority or NZTA; or 5. Footpaths and or paving no greater than 2m in width; or 6. Boundary fences or walls no more than 2m in height above ground level.
<p>New Zealand Pork Industry Board (S55)</p>	<p>S55.041</p>	<p>Rural production</p>	<p>RPROZ-S5</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>Mobile pig shelters a critical part of outdoor pig farming systems, and can come in a variety of forms and sizes (as per Section 2.4) Mobile farrowing huts used in outdoor systems are small - designed to accommodate one sow and her offspring</p>	<p>Amend standard to provide an exclusion for mobile pig shelters.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					every farrowing cycle. After each farrowing cycle, the huts are moved to fresh ground for biosecurity and environmental purposes. Mobile pig shelters should be exempted from this standard, owing to the small nature of the buildings (low amenity and environmental impact) and the necessity of moving them to various locations around the property.	
Horticulture New Zealand (S159)	S159.133	Rural production	RPROZ-S5	Oppose	Standard RPROZ-S5 provides for 12.5% site coverage by buildings or structures. There should be provision for a greater site coverage of artificial crop protection structures	Amend Standard RPROZ-S5 by adding: This Standard does not apply to: i) Artificial crop protection structures ii) Greenhouses
Bentzen Farm Limited (S167)	S167.114	Rural production	RPROZ-S5	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain RPROZ-S1 - RPROZ-S7
Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)	S168.102	Rural production	RPROZ-S5	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain Standard RPROZ-S5
The Shooting Box Limited (S187)	S187.105	Rural production	RPROZ-S5	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain RPROZ-S1 - RPROZ-S7
Matauri Trustee Limited (S243)	S243.124	Rural production	RPROZ-S5	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain Standard RPROZ-S5
IDF Development s Limited (S253)	S253.003	Rural production	RPROZ-S5	Not Stated	There is no clear rationale within Council's analysis that supports a 12.5% building/structure coverage for the Rural Production zone. It is not clear what the difference in effect is from 2.5% between the Operative and PDP provisions. The operative provisions should be retained and this approach would also align with Rule RPROZ-R2 Impermeable surface coverage.	Amend the threshold in Standard RPROZ-S5 to 15%
P S Yates Family Trust (S333)	S333.094	Rural production	RPROZ-S5	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain RPROZ-S5

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Bentzen Farm Limited (S167)	S167.115	Rural production	RPROZ-S6	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain RPROZ-S1 - RPROZ-S7
Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)	S168.103	Rural production	RPROZ-S6	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain Standard RPROZ-S6
The Shooting Box Limited (S187)	S187.106	Rural production	RPROZ-S6	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain RPROZ-S1 - RPROZ-S7
Matauri Trustee Limited (S243)	S243.125	Rural production	RPROZ-S6	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain Standard RPROZ-S6
P S Yates Family Trust (S333)	S333.095	Rural production	RPROZ-S6	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain RPROZ-S6
Bentzen Farm Limited (S167)	S167.116	Rural production	RPROZ-S7	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain RPROZ-S1 - RPROZ-S7
Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)	S168.104	Rural production	RPROZ-S7	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain Standard RPROZ-S7
The Shooting Box Limited (S187)	S187.107	Rural production	RPROZ-S7	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain RPROZ-S1 - RPROZ-S7
Matauri Trustee Limited (S243)	S243.126	Rural production	RPROZ-S7	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain Standard RPROZ-S7
FNR Properties Limited (S316)	S316.004	Rural production	RPROZ-S7	Support in part	FNR Properties acknowledge the importance of avoiding reverse sensitivity issues, particularly where they relate to quarrying activities and residential activities. FNR Properties also acknowledge that a restricted discretionary status may be appropriate where sensitive activities are established within 100m of the Mineral Extraction overlay. However, Rule RPROZ-S7 does not recognise that previous technical reports may have been provided to, and approved by Council, where reverse	Amend Standard RPROZ-S7 to provide for such activity to occur as a controlled activity where the site contains an 'approved building platform' and where reverse sensitivity effects have already been addressed.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					sensitivity effects have already been satisfactorily addressed. Where this is the case, and to reduce unnecessary costs to the applicant/property owner, it is therefore recommended that a controlled activity status is provided for where the site contains an 'approved building platform' and where reverse sensitivity effects have already been addressed.	
P S Yates Family Trust (S333)	S333.096	Rural production	RPROZ-S7	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain RPROZ-S7
Horticulture New Zealand (S159)	S159.178	Rural lifestyle	Overview	Support	The inclusion of a Rural Lifestyle zone is consistent with the National Planning Standards	Retain the Overview
Bentzen Farm Limited (S167)	S167.103	Rural lifestyle	Overview	Support in part	Land zoned Rural lifestyle is not necessarily close to urban areas and settlements as expressed in the overview. There are, for example, pockets of Rural lifestyle zoned land in the eastern Bay of Islands which are not close to urban areas and settlements, including at Parekura Bay.	Amend the Overview as follows: Given the proximity of most of this zone to urban areas and settlements, there is the potential for activities that are more typically associated with urban areas to seek to establish in this zone.
Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)	S168.105	Rural lifestyle	Overview	Support in part	Land zoned Rural lifestyle is not necessarily close to urban areas and settlements as expressed in the overview. There are, for example, pockets of Rural lifestyle zoned land in the eastern Bay of Islands which are not close to urban areas and settlements	Amend the Overview as follows: Given the proximity of most of this zone to urban areas and settlements, there is the potential for activities that are more typically associated with urban areas to seek to establish in this zone.
The Shooting Box Limited (S187)	S187.090	Rural lifestyle	Overview	Support in part	Land zoned Rural lifestyle is not necessarily close to urban areas and settlements as expressed in the overview. There are, for	Amend the Overview as follows: Given the proximity of most of this zone to urban areas and

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					example, pockets of Rural lifestyle zoned land in the eastern Bay of Islands which are not close to urban areas and settlements.	settlements, there is the potential for activities that are more typically associated with urban areas to seek to establish in this zone.
P S Yates Family Trust (S333)	S333.097	Rural lifestyle	Overview	Support in part	Land zoned Rural lifestyle is not necessarily close to urban areas and settlements as expressed in the overview. There are, for example, pockets of Rural lifestyle zoned land in the eastern Bay of Islands which are not close to urban areas and settlements.	Amend the Overview as follows: Given the proximity of most of this zone to urban areas and settlements, there is the potential for activities that are more typically associated with urban areas to seek to establish in this zone.
Neil Construction Limited (S349)	S349.020	Rural lifestyle	Objectives	Oppose	The broader Tubbs Farm land area has already been subject to significant rural residential subdivision and development in accordance with resource consents and the existing planning framework. This has involved substantial infrastructure investment in this land to date, and has created an emerging residential land use pattern that should be continued	delete or amend objectives to provide for rural residential subdivision of 3,000m2 lots and delete references to rural character and amenity.
Transpower New Zealand Ltd (S454)	S454.110	Rural lifestyle	Objectives	Not Stated	Objective RLZ-O1 sets out that the Rural Lifestyle Zone is used predominantly for low density residential activities and compatible small-scale farming activities. 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 need to locate in the Rural Lifestyle Zone and needs to be provided for. A new objective is required to address this.	Insert new objective RLZ-Ox as follows: The Rural Lifestyle zone is used by compatible activities and infrastructure, that have a functional or operational need to locate in the zone.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Bentzen Farm Limited (S167)	S167.104	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-O1	Support	The objectives are the most appropriate to achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991 and give effect to higher order planning documents as required.	Retain Objectives RLZ-O1 - RLZ-O4
Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)	S168.106	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-O1	Support	The objective is the most appropriate to achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991 and give effect to higher order planning documents as required	Retain Objective RLZ-O1
The Shooting Box Limited (S187)	S187.091	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-O1	Support	The objectives are the most appropriate to achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991 and give effect to higher order planning documents as required.	Retain Objectives RLZ-O1 - RLZ-O4.
P S Yates Family Trust (S333)	S333.098	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-O1	Support	The objectives are the most appropriate to achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991 and give effect to higher order planning documents as required.	Retain Objective RLZ-O1
Bentzen Farm Limited (S167)	S167.118	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-O2	Support	The objectives are the most appropriate to achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991 and give effect to higher order planning documents as required.	Retain Objectives RLZ-O1 - RLZ-O4
Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)	S168.107	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-O2	Support	The objective is the most appropriate to achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991 and give effect to higher order planning documents as required	Retain Objective RLZ-O2
The Shooting Box Limited (S187)	S187.108	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-O2	Support	The objectives are the most appropriate to achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991 and give effect to higher order planning documents as required.	Retain Objectives RLZ-O1 - RLZ-O4.
P S Yates Family Trust (S333)	S333.099	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-O2	Support	The objectives are the most appropriate to achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991 and give effect to higher order planning documents as required.	Retain Objective RLZ-O2
Bentzen Farm Limited (S167)	S167.119	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-O3	Support	The objectives are the most appropriate to achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991 and give effect to higher order planning documents as required.	Retain Objectives RLZ-O1 - RLZ-O4
Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)	S168.108	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-O3	Support	The objective is the most appropriate to achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991 and give effect to higher order planning documents as required	Retain Objective RLZ-O3

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
The Shooting Box Limited (S187)	S187.109	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-O3	Support	The objectives are the most appropriate to achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991 and give effect to higher order planning documents as required.	Retain Objectives RLZ-O1 - RLZ-O4.
Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga (S331)	S331.069	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-O3	Support	The submitter supports objective RLZ-O3 as it provides for activities compatible with the role, function, and predominant character and amenity of the Rural Lifestyle Zone, noting that childcare and education are an integral part of a rural lifestyle community and contributes to its overall sense of place.	Retain objective RLZ-O3 as proposed.
P S Yates Family Trust (S333)	S333.100	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-O3	Support	The objectives are the most appropriate to achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991 and give effect to higher order planning documents as required.	Retain Objective RLZ-O3
Horticulture New Zealand (S159)	S159.179	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-O4	Support	It is important that Rural Lifestyle zone activities do not compromise activities in the adjacent Rural Production zone	Retain Objective RLZ-O4
Bentzen Farm Limited (S167)	S167.120	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-O4	Support	The objectives are the most appropriate to achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991 and give effect to higher order planning documents as required.	Retain Objectives RLZ-O1 - RLZ-O4
Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)	S168.109	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-O4	Support	The objective is the most appropriate to achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991 and give effect to higher order planning documents as required.	Retain Objective RLZ-O4
The Shooting Box Limited (S187)	S187.110	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-O4	Support	The objectives are the most appropriate to achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991 and give effect to higher order planning documents as required.	Retain Objectives RLZ-O1 - RLZ-O4.
P S Yates Family Trust (S333)	S333.101	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-O4	Support	The objectives are the most appropriate to achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991 and give effect to higher order planning documents as required.	Retain Objective RLZ-O4
Neil Construction Limited (S349)	S349.021	Rural lifestyle	Policies	Oppose	The broader Tubbs Farm land area has already been subject to significant rural residential subdivision and development in accordance with resource consents and the existing planning framework. This has involved substantial infrastructure investment in this land to date, and has created an	delete or amend policies to provide for rural residential subdivision of 3,000m2 lots and delete references to rural character and amenity.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					emerging residential land use pattern that should be continued	
Transpower New Zealand Ltd (S454)	S454.111	Rural lifestyle	Policies	Not Stated	RLZ-P1 sets out the activities that are to be enabled in the Rural Lifestyle 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 infrastructure such as the National Grid is enabled in the Rural Lifestyle zone.	Insert new policy RLZ-Px as follows: Enable compatible activities and infrastructure, that have a functional or operational need to locate in the Rural Lifestyle zone.
Carbon Neutral NZ Trust (S529)	S529.156	Rural lifestyle	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.
Bentzen Farm Limited (S167)	S167.105	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-P1	Support	The policies RLZ-P1- RLZ-P4 are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives.	Retain Policies RLZ-P1- RLZ-P3 (policy RLZ-P4 also inferred)
Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)	S168.110	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-P1	Support	The policy is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Policy RLZ-P1
The Shooting Box Limited (S187)	S187.092	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-P1	Support	The policies RLZ-P1- RLZ-P4 are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives.	Retain Policies RLZ-P1- RLZ-P3.
Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga (S331)	S331.070	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-P1	Support in part	The submitter supports in part policy RLZ-P1 as it provides for activities compatible with the role, function and predominant character and amenity of the Rural Lifestyle zone. However, educational facilities with student attendance higher than 4 may be required to	Amend policy RLZ-P1 as follows: Enable activities that will not compromise the role, function and predominant character and amenity of the Rural Lifestyle Zone, while ensuring their design, scale and

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					support the rural environment and could be considered compatible with the role, function and predominant character and amenity.	intensity is appropriate to manage adverse effects in the zone, including: a. low density residential activities; b. small scale farming activities; c. home business activities; d. visitor accommodation; and e. small scale educational facilities.
P S Yates Family Trust (S333)	S333.102	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-P1	Support	The objectives are the most appropriate to achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991 and give effect to higher order planning documents as required.	Retain Policy RLZ-P1
Bentzen Farm Limited (S167)	S167.121	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-P2	Support	The policies RLZ-P1- RLZ-P4 are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives.	Retain Policies RLZ-P1- RLZ-P3 (policy RLZ-P4 also inferred)
Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)	S168.111	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-P2	Support	The policy is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Policy RLZ-P2
The Shooting Box Limited (S187)	S187.111	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-P2	Support	The objectives are the most appropriate to achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991 and give effect to higher order planning documents as required.	Retain Policies RLZ-P1 - RLZ-P3
P S Yates Family Trust (S333)	S333.103	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-P2	Support	The policies RLZ-P1- RLZ-P4 are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Policy RLZ-P2
Horticulture New Zealand (S159)	S159.180	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-P3	Support	It is important that Rural Lifestyle zone activities do not compromise activities in the adjacent Rural Production zone.	Retain Policy RLZ-P3
Bentzen Farm Limited (S167)	S167.122	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-P3	Support	The policies RLZ-P1- RLZ-P4 are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives.	Retain Policies RLZ-P1- RLZ-P3 (policy RLZ-P4 also inferred)
Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)	S168.112	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-P3	Support	The policy is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Policy RLZ-P3

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
The Shooting Box Limited (S187)	S187.112	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-P3	Support	The objectives are the most appropriate to achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991 and give effect to higher order planning documents as required.	Retain Policies RLZ-P1 - RLZ-P3
P S Yates Family Trust (S333)	S333.104	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-P3	Support	The policies RLZ-P1- RLZ-P4 are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Policy RLZ-P3
Michael John Winch (S67)	S67.014	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-P4	Oppose	I oppose the lack of protection for the life-supporting capacity of the soil and highly productive soils in the Rural Lifestyle Zone Policies. The Rural Lifestyle zone is a Rural zone with a greater residential intensity than the Rural Production zone, while still enabling people to undertake primary production activities such as growing food and grazing livestock. As such, protection of the productive value of soil is important.	insert to Policy RLZ-P4: managing adverse effects on the life-supporting capacity of soil and the protection of highly productive land.
Horticulture New Zealand (S159)	S159.181	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-P4	Support in part	Visitor accommodation should be set back from the adjacent Rural Production zone.	Not stated
Bentzen Farm Limited (S167)	S167.130	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-P4	Support	The policies RLZ-P1- RLZ-P4 are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives.	Retain Policies RLZ-P1- RLZ-P3 (policy RLZ-P4 also inferred)
Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)	S168.113	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-P4	Support	The policy is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Policy RLZ-P4
The Shooting Box Limited (S187)	S187.118	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-P4	Support	The policies RLZ-P1- RLZ-P4 are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives.	Retain Policies RLZ-P1- RLZ-P3 (policy RLZ-P4 also inferred)
P S Yates Family Trust (S333)	S333.105	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-P4	Support	The policies RLZ-P1- RLZ-P4 are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Policy RLZ-P4
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S416)	S416.049	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-P4	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	Insert additional matter as follows: the location and design of buildings adjacent to the railway corridor

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					transport network, thus supporting safety and the railway setback rule sought	
Robert Adams (S149)	S149.001	Rural lifestyle	Rules	Support in part	The Rural Lifestyle zone applies to rear sites along the length of Long Beach Road at Long Beach. These sites are connected to the sewerage system, are very narrow and very deep with many (but not all) running either to the top of the ridge of half way up. The problem with having the Rural Lifestyle zoning for the developed part of the site at the bottom of the cliffs is that the site coverage and impermeable rules are unnecessarily restrictive at 12.5 % because those limits are designed for sites of 2 hectares plus. At a guess most of the houses already built would be well over the 12.5 limits now. Clearly this is too restrictive and not equitable when front lots onto Long Beach road do not lose impermeability and site coverage allowances to a long driveway.	Amend rules to add an additional clause as follows: For lots under 2 ha and/or with access lots site impermeability is calculated on the net site area and for lots under 2 ha and/or with access lots, building coverage is calculated on the net site area.
Bentzen Farm Limited (S167)	S167.106	Rural lifestyle	Rules	Support	The rules are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Rules RLZ-R1 - RLZ-R28
The Shooting Box Limited (S187)	S187.093	Rural lifestyle	Rules	Support	The rules are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives.	Retain Rules RLZ-R1 - RLZ-R28.
P S Yates Family Trust (S333)	S333.106	Rural lifestyle	Rules	Support	The rules are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Rules RLZ-R1 - RLZ-R28
Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust (S338)	S338.055	Rural lifestyle	Rules	Not Stated	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish.
<p>Kapiro Residents Association (S427)</p>	<p>S427.064</p>	<p>Rural lifestyle</p>	<p>Rules</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.</p>	<p>Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish.
<p>New Zealand Motor Caravan Association (S438)</p>	<p>S438.011</p>	<p>Rural lifestyle</p>	<p>Rules</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>The NZMCA operates a number of campgrounds and park over properties that are present in a variety of zones. Allowing for more permissive rules around the establishment of campgrounds will make it easier to establish sites for self-contained vehicle-based camping in the Far North District. This will also create positive social and economic benefits for the community.</p>	<p>Amend Rural Lifestyle Zone rules to provide for camping sites of 10 guests and under as a permitted activity and require a consent for camping sites over 10 guests and under 20 guests (inferred).</p>
<p>Kapiro Conservation Trust (S449)</p>	<p>S449.051</p>	<p>Rural lifestyle</p>	<p>Rules</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.</p>	<p>Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish.
<p>Fire and Emergency New Zealand (S512)</p>	<p>S512.051</p>	<p>Rural lifestyle</p>	<p>Rules</p>	<p>Not Stated</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>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</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					therefore does not have the ability to designate land for the purposes of fire stations. Provisions within the rules of the district plan are therefore, the best way to facilitate the development of any new fire stations within the district as urban development progresses. Fire and Emergency request that emergency service facilities are included as a permitted activity in all zones. The draft Plan currently only includes emergency services facilities as an activity in some zones and with varying activity status. In addition, fire stations have specific requirements with relation to setback distances and vehicle crossings. Fire and Emergency request that emergency service facilities are exempt from these standards	
Carbon Neutral NZ Trust (S529)	S529.162	Rural lifestyle	Rules	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 rules to protect a key natural resource - productive land - now and for future generations.
Carbon Neutral NZ Trust (S529)	S529.163	Rural lifestyle	Rules	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 rules to protect a key natural resource - productive land - now and for future generations.
Carbon Neutral NZ Trust (S529)	S529.212	Rural lifestyle	Rules	Support in part	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures	Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.</p>	<p>at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour. • Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish.
<p>Far North District Council (S368)</p>	<p>S368.044</p>	<p>Rural lifestyle</p>	<p>Notes</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>Missing the word 'chapter' in NOTE 2</p>	<p>Amend notes 1. There may be other rules in Part 2-District-Wide Matters of the District Plan that apply to a proposed activity, in addition to the rules in this zone chapter. These District-Wide rules may be more stringent than the rules</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>in this chapter. Ensure that 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 the how the plan works chapter to determine the activity status of a proposed activity where resource consent is required under multiple rules</p> <p>2. This zone chapter does not contain rules relating to setback to waterbodies for building and structures or setbacks to waterbodies for earthworks and indigenous vegetation clearance. The Natural Character chapter contains rules for activities within wetland, lake and river margins. The Natural Character chapter should be referred to in addition to this zone chapter.</p>
Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)	S168.114	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-R1	Support	The rule is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Rule RLZ-R1
Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust (S338)	S338.053	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-R1	Not Stated	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	<p>Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish.
<p>Far North District Council (S368)</p>	<p>S368.068</p>	<p>Rural lifestyle</p>	<p>RLZ-R1</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>Amend RLZ-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 ... "</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Kapiro Residents Association (S427)	S427.061	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-R1	Support in part	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	<p>Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour. • Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish.
John Andrew Riddell (S431)	S431.124	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-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

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						20 metres back from the coastal marine area, or from rivers and banks is a non-complying activity
<p>Kapiro Conservation Trust (S449)</p>	S449.049	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-R1	Support	<p>The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.</p>	<p>Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour. • Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
House Movers Section of New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc (S482)	S482.003	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-R1	Support in part	The Proposed Plan definition of "building" does not clearly include relocated buildings, and the existence of a separate definition of relocate buildings in the Proposed Plan appears to create a distinction between "buildings" and "relocated buildings". It is not clear that the permitted activity status applied in most zones to "new buildings and structures" also applies to the relocation of buildings. It is submitted that relocated buildings should have the same status as new buildings, and subject to the same performance standards unless there is any specific overlay or control which applies e.g. historic heritage	amend RLZ-R1 to: provide for relocated building as a permitted activity whenrelocated buildings meet performance standards and criteria (see schedule 1). insert a performance standard for use of a pre inspection report(schedule 2) restricted discretionary activity status for relocated buildings that do not meet the permitted activity status standards
Fire and Emergency New Zealand (S512)	S512.098	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-R1	Not Stated	Many zones hold objectives and policies related to servicing developments with appropriate infrastructure. Noting that NH-R5 requires adequate firefighting water supply for vulnerable activities (including residential), Fire and Emergency consider that inclusion of an additional standard on infrastructure servicing within individual zone chapters may be beneficial.	Insertnew standard and/or matter of discretion across zones on infrastructureservicing (including emergency response transport/access and adequate watersupply for firefighting)
Carbon Neutral NZ Trust (S529)	S529.209	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-R1	Support in part	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish.
Michael John Winch (S67)	S67.015	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-R2	Support	I support the impermeable surfaces permitted activity thresholds of 12.5% / 2500m ² in the Rural Lifestyle zone	retain the impermeable surfaces permitted activity thresholds of 12.5% / 2500m ² in the Rural Lifestyle zone,
Michael John Winch (S67)	S67.016	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-R2	Oppose	<p>oppose the lack of protection for the life-supporting capacity of the soil and highly productive soils.</p> <p>The Rural Lifestyle zone contains smaller lots and covers a relatively small total area of the Far North District. The permitted activity thresholds are appropriate for managing stormwater effects in this zone. As discussed above for the Rural Production and Horticulture zones, there are no other rules in the District Plan that protect the life-supporting capacity of the soil and highly productive soils from inappropriate use unless the land is being subdivided.</p>	insert a further matter of discretion: the adverse effects on the life-supporting capacity of soil and the protection of highly productive land.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)	S168.115	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-R2	Support	The rule is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Rule RLZ-R2
Trent Simpkin (S283)	S283.015	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-R2	Oppose	The impermeable surfaces rule is one of the most common rules breached when designing homes. The low thresholds means therefore means many homes will still require a resource consent for Impermeable surfaces. all RC's breaching impermeable surfaces require a TP10/Stormwater report from an engineer (already). This is a detailed design of the 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.	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)
Neil Construction Limited (S349)	S349.022	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-R2	Oppose	The broader Tubbs Farm land area has already been subject to significant rural residential subdivision and development in accordance with resource consents and the existing planning framework. This has involved substantial infrastructure investment in this land to date, and has created an emerging residential land use pattern that should be continued	amend RLZ-R2 by replacing "lesser" with "greater" to enable reasonable impermeable surface area
Far North District Council (S368)	S368.103	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-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	Amend RLZ-R2 PER-2Stormwater must be disposed of in accordance with Far North District Engineering Standards April 2022.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					process. The rule will apply in all instances where there is an impermeable surface coverage rule in the PDP.	
Puketotara Lodge Ltd (S481)	S481.004	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-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. 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: c. the availability of land for disposal of effluent and stormwater on the site without adverse effects on adjoining adjacent waterbodies (including groundwater and aquifers) or on adjoining adjacent sites; Insert the following as additional matters of discretion:</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.
Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)	S168.116	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-R3	Support	The rule is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Rule RLZ-R3
Willowridge Developments Limited (S250)	S250.026	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-R3	Support in part	Generally supportive of the PDP approach to recognise and provide for rural lifestyle living activities, and the intentions of the density control.	Amend RLZ-R3-PER to provide for residential intensity of one residential unit per 5,000m2 as a permitted

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					It is considered that rural lifestyle living could be easily accommodated on a range of allotment sizes ranging from 5,000m ² to 2ha as provided in the ODP Coastal Living Zone.	activity.
Neil Construction Limited (S349)	S349.023	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-R3	Oppose	The broader Tubbs Farm land area has already been subject to significant rural residential subdivision and development in accordance with resource consents and the existing planning framework. This has involved substantial infrastructure investment in this land to date, and has created an emerging residential land use pattern that should be continued	amend RLZ-R3 to provide for the site area per residential unit to be at least 3,000m ² .
Far North District Council (S368)	S368.081	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-R3	Support in part	The 'Residential activity' rule in zones that provide for a minor residential unit need to provide an exclusion for a 'minor residential unit'. The intent of the rule is to provide for a minor residential unit in addition to a principal residential unit on a site, it is not meant to be captured by PER-1 within the rule	Amend RLZ-R3 Make the following amendments (the area ² will be relative to the zone) to the 'Residential activity' rule within the Rural Production zone, Rural Lifestyle zone, Rural Residential zone and the Settlement zone in the PDP. PER-1 The site area per residential unit is at least xxxm ² . PER-1 does not apply to: i. a single residential unit located on a site less than xxxm ² . ii. A minor residential unit constructed in accordance with rule Rxx-Rxx
Northland Fish and Game Council (S436)	S436.012	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-R3	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. 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	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
					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.	
Robert Adams (S155)	S155.001	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-R4	Oppose	Please clarify share access with another site. Particular if a common concrete drive exists for two separate legal properties who each have their own legal access lot of 3.3m wide each and each have ROW access over the others access lot. The concrete driveway is 3.0 m wide with half on each access lot. Both sites want to have visitor accommodation so want to continue sharing the access over the common driveway. Having two driveways makes no sense from permeability, waste of resources and site coverage on a Rural lifestyle zone. Also decreases the landscaping. The rule is one dimensional, poorly drafted and needs justification to be allowed to continue in the district plan.	Delete standard PER-3 (shared access) from rule, or amend it so that having shared access over common driveways does not prevent permitted visitor accommodation (inferred).
Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)	S168.117	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-R4	Support	The rule is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Rule RLZ-R4
Airbnb (S214)	S214.003	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-R4	Support in part	The proposed district plan allows for visitor accommodation as a permitted activity for less than or equal to 6-10 guests on site. If these conditions are not met, the activity is discretionary except in the settlement zone where it is restricted discretionary. Airbnb supports the overall approach to allow visitor accommodation to occur in all zones and commends the Council's leadership in this space. We would, however, recommend that	Amend rules to standardise the guest limit cap for permitted visitor accommodation to 10 across all zones and make the default non-permitted status restricted discretionary (as opposed to Discretionary) across all zones.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>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, operating 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>	
Willowridge Developments Limited (S250)	S250.027	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-R4	Support	Supportive of the provision of small-scale visitor accommodation in this zone	Retain as notified.
Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew (S386)	S386.026	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-R4	Support	Ballantyne & Agnew are supportive of the provision of small-scale visitor accommodation in this zone.	Retain as notified.
Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (S425)	S425.053	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-R4	Support in part	PHTTCCT support the provision for visitor accommodation in zones. It is considered that providing for this activity, particularly throughout the Zones that adjoin the Trail as a permitted activity will help activate the Trail and ensure that that the potential in terms of social and economic impact can be realised	Amend , RLZ-R4, as follows: "Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The visitor accommodation is within a residential unit, accessory building or minor residential unit.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					(noting the comments made in the Transport Chapter in regards to parking). PHTTCCT acknowledged the rationale behind the inclusion of PER-1 in the Rural Production, Rural Residential, Rural Living and Settlement Zone but considers that this is too blunt given the number of shared access ways within the District, and has suggested wording that uses a setback to manage any likely noise or dust effects that could be experienced as a result of sharing an access.	PER-2 The occupancy does not exceed 10 guests per night. PER-3 The site does not share access with another site. Where the site shares access with a The access to the site is set back more than 20m from any residential unit, or minor residential unit on any site that shares the access."
Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)	S168.118	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-R5	Support	The rule is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Rule RLZ-R5
Trent Simpkin (S283)	S283.031	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-R5	Oppose	This submission applies to all Building Coverage rules within all zones. Amend to be larger, considering the size of allotments allowed for in the zone.	Amend the maximum building or structure coverage from 12.5% to 20% or offer an alternative pathway around this rule, by inserting a PER-2 which says if a building is above 20% or 2500m ² , it is permitted if a visual assessment and landscape plan is provided as part of the building consent.
Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (S425)	S425.058	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-R5	Support	PHTTCCT support the provision for home business in zones. It is considered that providing for this activity as a permitted activity, particularly throughout the zones that adjoin the Trail, will help activate the Trail and ensure that that the potential in terms of social and economic impact can be realised (noting the comments made in the Transport Chapter in regards to parking).	retain as notified
John Andrew Riddell (S431)	S431.141	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-R5	Not Stated	The amendment is necessary in order to achieve the purpose of the Act.	Amend PER-4 of Rule RLZ-R5 so that the hours of operation apply to when the business is open to the public
Northland Planning and	S502.053	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-R5	Support in part	A home business could be utilizing an existing farm shed on site which may be	Amend RLZ-R5 PER-1 The home business is undertaken

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Development 2020 Limited (S502)					larger than 40m2. A business may only utilize a portion of a building where the rest is set aside as private space. Utilizing an existing building which exceeds 40m2 should not be a trigger for consent. Moreover, even if a business was utilizing a space greater than 40m2 other standards such as PER-2 & 3 are in place to control the effects such that the effects will be no more than minor on the surrounding environment.	within: 1. a residential unit; or 2. an accessory building that does not exceed 40m2 GFA ; or 3. a minor residential unit.
Horticulture New Zealand (S159)	S159.183	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-R6	Support in part	Educational facilities should be set back from the adjacent Rural Production zone	Amend Rule PLZ-R6 to include a requirement that: educational facilities buildings must be set back at least 20m from the Rural Production zone boundary
Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)	S168.119	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-R6	Support	The rule is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Rule RLZ-R6
Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga (S331)	S331.071	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-R6	Support in part	The submitter supports in part rule RLZ-R6 Educational facility, however, recommends the inclusion of a new provision (see submission #S331.017) to provide for educational facilities as a permitted activity in the Rural Lifestyle zone in the Infrastructure Chapter. In conjunction with this relief, the Ministry seeks the removal of this rule from the Rural Lifestyle zone to limit rule duplication. However, if this relief is not granted, the submitter supports the permitted activity standards to provide for small scale educational facilities in the Rural Lifestyle Zone. However, educational facilities with student attendance higher than 4 will likely be required to support the rural environment and suggest student attendance not exceeding 30 to align with Ministry pre-school licences. The Ministry requests that all educational facilities are enabled in the Rural Lifestyle	Delete rule RLZ-R6 Educational Facility or Amend rule RLZ-R6 Educational Facility, as follows: Educational facility Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The educational facility is within a residential unit, accessory building or minor residential unit. PER-2 Hours of operation are between; 1. 7am-8pm Monday to Friday. 2. 8am-8pm Weekends and public holidays. PER-3 The number of students attending at one time does not exceed 30 four ,

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					zone to serve the education needs of the rural community and suggest a restricted discretionary activity status where compliance with the permitted standards cannot be achieved, and the following matters of discretion.	excluding those who reside onsite. Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-1, PER-2 or PER-3: 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. d. Infrastructure servicing. e. Potential reverse sensitivity effects.
Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited (S502)	S502.054	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-R6	Support in part	It appears that a museum, marae, town hall, or community center would not fall under the definition of an accessory building. Buildings of this nature host educational programs often and should be allowed to continue to do so without triggering consent. We seek relief that provision is made such that a museums, maraes and other similar buildings to accommodate an educational facility.	Amend RLZ-R6 PER-1 The educational facility is within a residential unit, accessory building or, minor residential unit. Museum, marae or other similar facility. PER-2 Hours of operation are between; 1. 7am-8pm Monday to Friday. 2. 8am-8pm Weekends and public holidays. PER-3 The number of students attending at one time does not exceed four within a residential unit, accessory building or minor residential unit , excluding those who reside onsite PER-4 The

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						number of students attending at one time does not exceed the number of people for which a museum, marae or other similar facility has been designed for.
Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)	S168.120	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-R7	Support	The rule is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Rule RLZ-R7
Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)	S168.121	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-R8	Support	The rule is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Rule RLZ-R8
Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)	S168.122	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-R9	Support	The rule is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Rule RLZ-R9
Far North District Council (S368)	S368.045	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-R9	Support in part	Drafting error: Missing reference to PER-2 in column 3	Amend RLZ-R9 Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-1 or PER-2:
PF Olsen Limited (S91)	S91.022	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-R10	Oppose	Regulation 6 of the National Environmental Standards for Plantation Forestry establishes where councils may have more stringent rules than the National Environmental Standard. There is no provision for the plan to contain rule RLZ-R10. Also refer to reasons in this submission for RPORZ-R15.	Amend rule RLZ-R10 by deleting PER-1.
Summit Forests New Zealand Limited (S148)	S148.050	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-R10	Oppose	SFNZ opposes the requirement that plantation forestry and plantation forestry activities do not occur on versatile soils. There are no provisions within the NES-PF that would allow Council to apply a more stringent rule in this regard. Specifically, "An NES prevails over district or regional plan rules except where the NES-PF specifically allows more stringent plan rules". The National Policy Statement for Highly	Amend RLZ-R10 by deleting PER-1 "It is not located on versatile soils" and change "Activity status where compliance not achieved" to "Not Applicable".

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					Productive Land does not support such an approach	
Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)	S168.123	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-R10	Support	The rule is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Rule RLZ-R10
Lynley Newport (S99)	S99.001	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-R11	Support in part	Whole Heartedly support the introduction of this rule into zones other than the Rural Production zone. However the separation distance is too restrictive and should be extended to 30m. This provides space for shared landscaping and gardening and for shared parking and maneuvering areas. Also the minimum sizes property required by PER-2 is too large when considering the likely size of lots in the zone.	Amend RLZ-R11 PER-4 to read: The separation distance between the minor residential unit and the principal residential unit does not exceed 15m 30m Amend PER-2 to read: The site area per minor residential unit is at least one hectare 5000m²
Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)	S168.124	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-R11	Support	The rule is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Rule RLZ-R11
Willowridge Developments Limited (S250)	S250.028	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-R11	Support in part	Consider that either a controlled or restricted discretionary activity control should be considered where compliance cannot be achieved with clauses PER-1 to 4. The justification for requiring a minimum of 1ha to make use of this provision is unclear.	Amend RLZ-R11 Remove PER-2, alternatively, provide justification as to why this density control is necessary; Amend to introduce a controlled or restricted discretionary activity with targeted matters/limits to manage the effects of clauses PER-1-4.
Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew (S386)	S386.027	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-R11	Support in part	Ballantyne & Agnew are supportive of the intention of this rule, particularly recognising the need and providing for minor residential units as a permitted activity. However, Ballantyne & Agnew considers that either a controlled or restricted discretionary activity control should be considered where compliance cannot be achieved with clauses PER-1 to 4. Particularly, PER-4 where there may be a functional purpose or physical constraints that requires a larger separation distance. Further, the justification for requiring a minimum of 1ha to make use of	Amend RLZ-R11 as follows: - Remove PER-2, alternatively, provide justification as to why this density control is necessary; - Introduce a controlled or restricted discretionary activity with targeted matters/limits to manage the effects of clauses PER-1-3. - Delete PER-4.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					this provision is unclear. In Ballantyne & Agnew's view, this clause should be removed.	
Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)	S168.125	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-R12	Support	The rule is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Rule RLZ-R12
Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)	S168.126	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-R13	Support	The rule is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Rule RLZ-R13
New Zealand Motor Caravan Association (S438)	S438.010	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-R13	Oppose	The NZMCA operates a number of campgrounds and park over properties that are present in a variety of zones. Allowing for more permissive rules around the establishment of campgrounds will make it easier to establish sites for self-contained vehicle-based camping in the Far North District. This will also create positive social and economic benefits for the community.	Amend RLZ-R13 to restricted discretionary activity status and include criteria which subjects applications to conditions around traffic and visual impacts.
Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)	S168.127	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-R14	Support	The rule is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Rule RLZ-R14
Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)	S168.128	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-R15	Support	The rule is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Rule RLZ-R15
Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)	S168.129	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-R16	Support	The rule is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Rule RLZ-R16
Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)	S168.130	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-R17	Support	The rule is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Rule RLZ-R17
Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)	S168.131	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-R18	Support	The rule is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Rule RLZ-R18
Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)	S168.132	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-R19	Support	The rule is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Rule RLZ-R19
Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)	S168.133	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-R20	Support	The rule is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Rule RLZ-R20
Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)	S168.134	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-R21	Support	The rule is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Rule RLZ-R21

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)	S168.135	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-R22	Support	The rule is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Rule RLZ-R22
Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)	S168.136	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-R23	Support	The rule is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Rule RLZ-R23
Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)	S168.137	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-R24	Support	The rule is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Rule RLZ-R24
Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)	S168.138	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-R25	Support	The rule is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Rule RLZ-R25
Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)	S168.139	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-R26	Support	The rule is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Rule RLZ-R26
Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)	S168.140	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-R27	Support	The rule is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Rule RLZ-R27
Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)	S168.141	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-R28	Support	The rule is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Rule RLZ-R28
Imerys Performance Minerals Asia Pacific (S65)	S65.014	Rural lifestyle	Standards	Not Stated	Sufficient protection is required for new and existing quarrying and mining activities from new sensitive activities.	insert new standard refer to (refer RPROZ-S7 Sensitive activities setback from boundaries of a Mineral Extraction Overlay
P S Yates Family Trust (S333)	S333.107	Rural lifestyle	Standards	Support	The standards are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Standards RLZ-S1- RLZ-S6
Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust (S338)	S338.066	Rural lifestyle	Standards	Not Stated	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish.
<p>Kapiro Residents Association (S427)</p>	<p>S427.067</p>	<p>Rural lifestyle</p>	<p>Standards</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.</p>	<p>Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish.
<p>Kapiro Conservation Trust (S449)</p>	<p>S449.062</p>	<p>Rural lifestyle</p>	<p>Standards</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.</p>	<p>Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish.
<p>Carbon Neutral NZ Trust (S529)</p>	<p>S529.215</p>	<p>Rural lifestyle</p>	<p>Standards</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.</p>	<p>Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish.
Bentzen Farm Limited (S167)	S167.107	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-S1	Support	The standards are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Standards RLZ-S1- RLZ-S6
Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)	S168.142	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-S1	Support	The standard is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Standard RLZ-S1
The Shooting Box Limited (S187)	S187.094	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-S1	Support	The standards are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives.	Retain Standards RLZ-S1- RLZ-S6.
Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust (S338)	S338.054	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-S1	Not Stated	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	<p>Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish.
<p>Kapiro Residents Association (S427)</p>	<p>S427.042</p>	<p>Rural lifestyle</p>	<p>RLZ-S1</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.</p>	<p>Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish.
<p>Kapiro Conservation Trust (S449)</p>	<p>S449.050</p>	<p>Rural lifestyle</p>	<p>RLZ-S1</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.</p>	<p>Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish.
<p>Carbon Neutral NZ Trust (S529)</p>	<p>S529.201</p>	<p>Rural lifestyle</p>	<p>RLZ-S1</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.</p>	<p>Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour. Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish.
Bentzen Farm Limited (S167)	S167.125	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-S2	Support	The standards are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Standards RLZ-S1- RLZ-S6.
Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)	S168.143	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-S2	Support	The standard is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Standard RLZ-S2
The Shooting Box Limited (S187)	S187.113	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-S2	Support	The standards are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives.	Retain Standards RLZ-S1- RLZ-S6.
John Andrew Riddell (S431)	S431.183	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-S2	Not Stated	Not stated	Retain the approach varying the required height to boundary depending on the orientation of the relevant boundary.
Horticulture New Zealand (S159)	S159.182	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-S3	Support in part	Visitor accommodation should be set back from the adjacent Rural Production zone	Amend Standard RLZ-S3 to include a requirement that: habitable buildings must be set back at least 20m from the Rural Production zone boundary
Horticulture New Zealand (S159)	S159.184	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-S3	Oppose	To implement Objective RLZ-O4 there should be greater setbacks from the Rural Production zone boundary	Amend part 3 of Standard RLZ-S3 as follows: habitable buildings must be setback at least 30m from the boundary of an unsealed road and 20m from the boundary of the Rural Production zone or the Horticulture zone Amend Standard RLZ-S3 to include: 4) Educational facilities should be setback 20m from the

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						boundary of the Rural Production Zone or the Horticulture Zone.
Horticulture New Zealand (S159)	S159.186	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-S3	Oppose	The setback provides for a 10m setback from the Rural Production zone. This is not considered to be sufficient to mitigate potential reverse sensitivity effects	Amend part 2 of Standard RLZ-S3 as follows: minimum building setback from the boundary of any Rural Production zone is at least 10m 20m , and from any boundary with the mineral extraction overlay the setback is at least 20m.
Bentzen Farm Limited (S167)	S167.126	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-S3	Support	The standards are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives.	Retain Standards RLZ-S1- RLZ-S6.
Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)	S168.144	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-S3	Support	The standard is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Standard RLZ-S3
The Shooting Box Limited (S187)	S187.114	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-S3	Support	The standards are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives.	Retain Standards RLZ-S1- RLZ-S6.
Willowridge Developments Limited (S250)	S250.029	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-S3	Support in part	It is unclear why a tiered setback approach has been taken in this instance for sites that are 5,000m ² or less vs larger sites.	Amend RLZ-S3 to have one setback standard for side boundaries.
Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust (S338)	S338.057	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-S3	Not Stated	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish.
Neil Construction Limited (S349)	S349.024	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-S3	Oppose	The broader Tubbs Farm land area has already been subject to significant rural residential subdivision and development in accordance with resource consents and the existing planning framework. This has involved substantial infrastructure investment in this land to date, and has created an emerging residential land use pattern that should be continued	amend RLZ-S3 to delete 10m yard setback for lots greater than 5,000m2.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S416)	S416.059	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-S3	Support in part	For health and safety reasons, KiwiRail seek a setback for structures from the rail corridor boundary. While KiwiRail do not oppose development on adjacent sites, ensuring the ability to access and maintain structures without requiring access to rail land is	<p>Insert a railway setback (refer to submission for examples)</p> <p>Insert the following matters of discretion into the standard:</p> <p>the location and design of the building as it relates to the</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>important.</p> <p>Parts of the KiwiRail network adjoin commercial, mixed use, industrial and open space zones. These zone chapters do not currently include provision for boundary setbacks for buildings and structures. KiwiRail seek a boundary setback of 5m from the rail corridor for all buildings and structures.</p> <p>KiwiRail considers that a matter of discretion directing consideration of impacts on the safety and efficiency of the rail corridor is appropriate in situations where the 5m setback standard is not complied with in all zones adjacent to the railway corridor. Building setbacks are essential to address significant safety hazards associated with the operational rail corridor. The Proposed Plan enables a 1m setback from side and rear boundaries shared with the rail corridor, increasing the risk that poles, ladders, or even ropes for abseiling equipment, could protrude into the rail corridor and increasing the risk of collision with a train or electrified overhead lines. Further, there is a 600mm eave allowance within side and rear yards which restricts potential 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 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</p>	<p>ability to safely use, access and maintain buildings without requiring access on, above or over the rail corridor the safe and efficient operation of the rail network</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>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.</p> <p>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>Kapiro Residents Association (S427)</p>	<p>S427.043</p>	<p>Rural lifestyle</p>	<p>RLZ-S3</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.</p>	<p>Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish.
<p>Kapiro Conservation Trust (S449)</p>	<p>S449.053</p>	<p>Rural lifestyle</p>	<p>RLZ-S3</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.</p>	<p>Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>fabric must be black or very dark colour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand (S512)	S512.074	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-S3	Support in part	<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.</p> <p>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 stage. Issuance of a resource consent does not imply that waivers of Building Code requirements will be considered/granted</p>
Carbon Neutral NZ Trust (S529)	S529.202	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-S3	Support in part	<p>The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.</p>	<p>Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows -</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour. Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish.
<p>Carbon Neutral NZ Trust (S529)</p>	<p>S529.204</p>	<p>Rural lifestyle</p>	<p>RLZ-S3</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.</p>	<p>Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish.
Bentzen Farm Limited (S167)	S167.127	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-S4	Support	The standards are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives.	Retain Standards RLZ-S1- RLZ-S6.
Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)	S168.145	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-S4	Support	The standard is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Standard RLZ-S4
The Shooting Box Limited (S187)	S187.115	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-S4	Support	The standards are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives.	Retain Standards RLZ-S1- RLZ-S6.
Far North District Council (S368)	S368.049	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-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 RLZ-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

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						constricts constraints;
Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited (S502)	S502.055	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-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 Standard RLZ-S4 as follows: 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 MHWS PER-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 hazard mitigation undertaken by, or on behalf of, the local authority; or 3. a post and wire fence for the purpose of protection from farm stock; or 4. Lighting poles by, or on behalf of, the local authority; or 5. Footpaths and or paving no greater than 2m in width; or 6. Boundary fences or walls no more than 2m in height above ground level
Bentzen Farm Limited (S167)	S167.128	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-S5	Support	The standards are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives.	Retain Standards RLZ-S1- RLZ-S6.
Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)	S168.146	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-S5	Support	The standard is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Standard RLZ-S5

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
The Shooting Box Limited (S187)	S187.116	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-S5	Support	The standards are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives.	Retain Standards RLZ-S1- RLZ-S6.
Bentzen Farm Limited (S167)	S167.129	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-S6	Support	The standards are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives.	Retain Standards RLZ-S1- RLZ-S6.
Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)	S168.147	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-S6	Support	The standard is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Standard RLZ-S6
The Shooting Box Limited (S187)	S187.117	Rural lifestyle	RLZ-S6	Support	The standards are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives.	Retain Standards RLZ-S1- RLZ-S6.
Neil Construction Limited (S349)	S349.025	Rural residential	Overview	Oppose	The broader Tubbs Farm land area has already been subject to significant rural residential subdivision and development in accordance with resource consents and the existing planning framework. This has involved substantial infrastructure investment in this land to date, and has created an emerging residential land use pattern that should be continued	amend or delete overview to remove references to rural character and amenity, future growth of the urban area, and small-scale farming.
Timothy and Dion Spicer (S213)	S213.014	Rural residential	Objectives	Not Stated	Dion and Timothy Spicer consider that a discretionary activity status would be more appropriate as it enables such activities to occur while providing for case by case consideration of any proposed industrial activity within the context of the RRZ.	Amend the RRZ provisions so that industrial activities, or at least industrial activities ancillary to production, are a Discretionary Activity.
Timothy and Dion Spicer (S213)	S213.021	Rural residential	Objectives	Not Stated	Dion and Timothy Spicer consider that a discretionary activity status would be more appropriate as it enables such activities to occur while providing for case by case consideration of any proposed commercial activity within the context of the RRZ.	amend the RRZ provisions so that commercial activities, or at least industrial activities ancillary to production, are a Discretionary Activity.
Neil Construction Limited (S349)	S349.026	Rural residential	Objectives	Oppose	The broader Tubbs Farm land area has already been subject to significant rural residential subdivision and development in accordance with resource consents and the existing planning framework. This has involved substantial infrastructure investment in this land to date, and has created an emerging residential land use pattern that should be continued	amend or delete objectives to remove references to rural character and amenity, future growth of the urban area, and small-scale farming.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Transpower New Zealand Ltd (S454)	S454.112	Rural residential	Objectives	Not Stated	Objective RRZ-O1 sets out that the Rural Residential Zone is used predominantly for rural residential activities and compatible small-scale farming activities. 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 and operational need to locate in the Rural Residential Zone and needs to be provided for. A new objective is required to address this.	Insert new objective RRZ-Ox as follows: The Rural Residential zone is used by compatible activities and infrastructure, that have a functional or operational need to locate in the zone.
Ngā Kaingamaha o Ngāti Hine Charitable Trust (S555)	S555.003	Rural residential	Objectives	Support in part	The Rural Residential zone is a peri-urban zone which retains a rural character within an urban context noting there are often servicing constraints associated with the zone. However, as infrastructure is upgraded, sites within the zone will become more suitable for urban developments to meet the demands of future urban growth. We acknowledge that Objective RRZ-O3 has regard to urban growth, which seeks to ensure that "the ability of the land to be rezoned for urban development in the future is not compromised" however this objective caters for the long term only and disregards short to medium term urban growth. Many of the sites within the zone will be urbanised in the near future through infrastructure upgrades and while DIS-1 of Rule RRZ-R3 provides for one dwelling per 2,000m ² as a discretionary activity, sites when serviced can accommodate General Residential zone type developments as they no longer have the constraints normally associated with the Rural Residential zone. Based on the objective and policies of the Rural Residential zone as currently proposed, any urban development where	Insert additional objective to allow for urban growth where appropriate within the Rural Residential zone

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					appropriate (based on servicing, site context etc.) would be contrary to the Plan, consequently requiring a private plan change to enable the General Residential zoning prior to any district plan review under S79(1) of the RMA 1991. This effectively hinders urban growth to every 10 years	
Terra Group (S172)	S172.027	Rural residential	RRZ-O1	Support	Support objectives RRZ-01 to RRZ-03 as they will achieve positive outcomes for the proposed zone.	Retain as notified (inferred)
Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga (S331)	S331.072	Rural residential	RRZ-O1	Support in part	The submitter supports in part objective RRZ-O1 as it provides for residential activities and small-scale farming that are compatible with the rural character and amenity of the Rural Residential zone. However, the submitter considers other activities, such as educational facilities, to be compatible with the rural character and amenity of the Rural Residential zone. Educational facilities have an operational need to be in the Rural Residential zone and have been provided for further in rule RRZ-R6 of the proposed plan.	Amend objective RRZ-O1 as follows: The Rural Residential zone is used predominantly for rural residential activities, and small scale farming and other activities that are compatible with and support the rural character and amenity of the zone.
Terra Group (S172)	S172.030	Rural residential	RRZ-O2	Support	Support objectives RRZ-01 to RRZ-03 as they will achieve positive outcomes for the proposed zone.	Retain as notified (inferred)
Terra Group (S172)	S172.031	Rural residential	RRZ-O3	Support	Support objectives RRZ-01 to RRZ-03 as they will achieve positive outcomes for the proposed zone.	Retain as notified (inferred)
Horticulture New Zealand (S159)	S159.185	Rural residential	RRZ-O4	Support	The interface of the zone boundary is important especially where it borders the Rural Production zone	Retain Objective RRZ-O4
Timothy and Dion Spicer (S213)	S213.015	Rural residential	Policies	Not Stated	Dion and Timothy Spicer consider that a discretionary activity status would be more appropriate as it enables such activities to occur while providing for case by case consideration of any proposed industrial activity within the context of the RRZ.	Amend the RRZ provisions so that industrial activities, or at least industrial activities ancillary to production, are a Discretionary Activity.
Timothy and Dion Spicer (S213)	S213.018	Rural residential	Policies	Not Stated	Dion and Timothy Spicer consider that a discretionary activity status would be more appropriate as it enables such activities to occur while providing for case by case	amend the RRZ provisions so that rural industry activities are a Discretionary Activity

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					consideration of any proposed commercial activity within the context of the RRZ.	
Timothy and Dion Spicer (S213)	S213.022	Rural residential	Policies	Not Stated	Dion and Timothy Spicer consider that a discretionary activity status would be more appropriate as it enables such activities to occur while providing for case by case consideration of any proposed commercial activity within the context of the RRZ.	amend the RRZ provisions so that commercial activities, or at least industrial activities ancillary to production, are a Discretionary Activity.
Transpower New Zealand Ltd (S454)	S454.113	Rural residential	Policies	Not Stated	RRZ-P1 sets out the activities that are to be enabled in the Rural 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 infrastructure such as the National Grid is enabled in the Rural Residential zone.	Insert new policy RRZ-Px as follows: Enable compatible activities and infrastructure, that have a functional or operational need to locate in the Rural Residential zone.
Carbon Neutral NZ Trust (S529)	S529.157	Rural residential	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 a firm policy to protect a key natural resource - productive land - now and for future generations.
Ngā Kaingamaha o Ngāti Hine Charitable Trust (S555)	S555.004	Rural residential	Policies	Support in part	The Rural Residential zone is a peri-urban zone which retains a rural character within an urban context noting there are often servicing constraints associated with the zone. However, as infrastructure is upgraded, sites within the zone will become more suitable for urban developments to meet the demands of future urban growth. We acknowledge that Objective RRZ-O3 has	Insert additional policy to allow for urban growth where appropriate within the Rural Residential zone

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>regard to urban growth, which seeks to ensure that "the ability of the land to be rezoned for urban development in the future is not compromised" however this objective caters for the long term only and disregards short to medium term urban growth. Many of the sites within the zone will be urbanised in the near future through infrastructure upgrades and while DIS-1 of Rule RRZ-R3 provides for one dwelling per 2,000m² as a discretionary activity, sites when serviced can accommodate General Residential zone type developments as they no longer have the constraints normally associated with the Rural Residential zone.</p> <p>Based on the objective and policies of the Rural Residential zone as currently proposed, any urban development where appropriate (based on servicing, site context etc.) would be contrary to the Plan, consequently requiring a private plan change to enable the General Residential zoning prior to any district plan review under S79(1) of the RMA 1991. This effectively hinders urban growth to every 10 years</p>	
Terra Group (S172)	S172.028	Rural residential	RRZ-P1	Support	Support RRZ-P1 to P5, as they will achieve positive outcomes for the proposed zone.	Retain as notified (inferred)
Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga (S331)	S331.073	Rural residential	RRZ-P1	Support in part	<p>The submitter supports in part policy RRZ-P1 as it provides for activities compatible with the role, function and predominant character and amenity of the Rural Residential zone. However, educational facilities with student attendance higher than 4 may be required to support the rural environment and could be considered compatible with the role, function and predominant character and amenity.</p>	<p>Amend policy RRZ-P1 as follows: Enable activities that will not compromise the role, function and predominant character and amenity of the Rural Residential Zone, while ensuring their design, scale and intensity is appropriate, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> rural residential activities; small-scale farming activities; home business activities; visitor accommodation; and small-scale educational

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						facilities.
Neil Construction Limited (S349)	S349.027	Rural residential	RRZ-P1	Oppose	The broader Tubbs Farm land area has already been subject to significant rural residential subdivision and development in accordance with resource consents and the existing planning framework. This has involved substantial infrastructure investment in this land to date, and has created an emerging residential land use pattern that should be continued	amend or delete policy to remove references to rural character and amenity, future growth of the urban area, and small-scale farming.
Lynley Newport (S106)	S106.001	Rural residential	RRZ-P2	Oppose	Do not use the word "avoid" in isolation in policies, especially where the permitted activity rule suite enables activities that may well not be able to be consistent with Policy RRZ-P2 and where the site is already used for an activity that might be considered incompatible with the Zone.	Amend RRZ-P2 to read: Avoid Manage new activities that are potentially incompatible with the role, function and predominant character and amenity of the Rural Residential Zone including by:
Terra Group (S172)	S172.032	Rural residential	RRZ-P2	Support	Support RRZ-P1 to P5, as they will achieve positive outcomes for the proposed zone.	Retain as notified (inferred)
Neil Construction Limited (S349)	S349.028	Rural residential	RRZ-P2	Oppose	The broader Tubbs Farm land area has already been subject to significant rural residential subdivision and development in accordance with resource consents and the existing planning framework. This has involved substantial infrastructure investment in this land to date, and has created an emerging residential land use pattern that should be continued	amend or delete policy to remove references to rural character and amenity, future growth of the urban area, and small-scale farming.
Terra Group (S172)	S172.033	Rural residential	RRZ-P3	Support	Support RRZ-P1 to P5, as they will achieve positive outcomes for the proposed zone.	Retain as notified (inferred)

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Lynley Newport (S106)	S106.002	Rural residential	RRZ-P4	Oppose	The Rural Residential zone is a Rural Zone. Policy RRZ-P4 is dictating how a property owner MUST receive their phone/telecommunications connectivity and power connectivity. 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 advanced. Other Rural zones do not have a policy worded such as RRZ-P4 so why is Rural Residential any different?	Delete Policy RRZ-P4, or, if the policy is to be retained, amend as follows: Require Encourage all subdivision in the Rural Residential zone to provide thefollowing reticulated services to the boundary: telecommunications: fibre where it is available; copper where fibre is not available; copper where the area is identified for future fibre deployment. local electricity distribution network. And where it is proposed to relyon alternatives to the reticulated services outlined above, the alternatives shall be capable of providing the same level of service as conventionalreticulated services.
Terra Group (S172)	S172.034	Rural residential	RRZ-P4	Support	Support RRZ-P1 to P5, as they will achieve positive outcomes for the proposed zone.	Retain as notified (inferred)
Terra Group (S172)	S172.035	Rural residential	RRZ-P5	Support	Support RRZ-P1 to P5, as they will achieve positive outcomes for the proposed zone.	Retain as notified (inferred)
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S416)	S416.048	Rural residential	RRZ-P5	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	Insert additional matter as follows: the location and design of buildings adjacent to the railway corridor

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					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	
Timothy and Dion Spicer (S213)	S213.013	Rural residential	Rules	Not Stated	Dion and Timothy Spicer consider that a discretionary activity status would be more appropriate as it enables such activities to occur while providing for case by case consideration of any proposed industrial activity within the context of the RRZ.	amend the RRZ provisions so that industrial activities, or at least industrial activities ancillary to production, are a Discretionary Activity.
Timothy and Dion Spicer (S213)	S213.019	Rural residential	Rules	Not Stated	Dion and Timothy Spicer consider that a discretionary activity status would be more appropriate as it enables such activities to occur while providing for case by case consideration of any proposed commercial activity within the context of the RRZ.	amend the RRZ provisions so that rural industry activities are a Discretionary Activity.
Timothy and Dion Spicer (S213)	S213.023	Rural residential	Rules	Not Stated	Dion and Timothy Spicer consider that a discretionary activity status would be more appropriate as it enables such activities to occur while providing for case by case consideration of any proposed commercial activity within the context of the RRZ.	amend the RRZ provisions so that commercial activities, or at least industrial activities ancillary to production, are a Discretionary Activity.
Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust (S338)	S338.064	Rural residential	Rules	Not Stated	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	<p>Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish.
Brady Wild (S369)	S369.002	Rural residential	Rules	Support	The Rural Residential zone provisions provide for some non-residential activities as permitted activities (subject to controls), including visitor accommodation, small home business, small educational facilities, and rural produce retail. Support these provisions as they recognise that a variety of activities can be undertaken within rural areas in a manner which maintains rural amenity. Such provisions will also largely contribute to the social and economic well-being of the Far North District	Retain the Rural Residential zone rules
Kapiro Residents Association (S427)	S427.065	Rural residential	Rules	Support in part	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	<p>Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish.
<p>Kapiro Conservation Trust (S449)</p>	<p>S449.064</p>	<p>Rural residential</p>	<p>Rules</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.</p>	<p>Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish.
<p>Fire and Emergency New Zealand (S512)</p>	<p>S512.052</p>	<p>Rural residential</p>	<p>Rules</p>	<p>Not Stated</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>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</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					Emergency request that emergency service facilities are included as a permitted activity in all zones. The draft Plan currently only includes emergency services facilities as an activity in some zones and with varying activity status. In addition, fire stations have specific requirements with relation to setback distances and vehicle crossings. Fire and Emergency request that emergency service facilities are exempt from these standards	
Carbon Neutral NZ Trust (S529)	S529.164	Rural residential	Rules	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 rules to protect a key natural resource - productive land - now and for future generations.
Carbon Neutral NZ Trust (S529)	S529.213	Rural residential	Rules	Support in part	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish.
<p>Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust (S338)</p>	<p>S338.063</p>	<p>Rural residential</p>	<p>RRZ-R1</p>	<p>Not Stated</p>	<p>The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.</p>	<p>Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish.
Far North District Council (S368)	S368.069	Rural residential	RRZ-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.	<p>Amend RRZ-R1 ... New buildings or structures, and extensions or alterations to existing buildings or structures</p> <p>Activity status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>PER-1</p> <p>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 ... "</p>
Kapiro Residents Association (S427)	S427.062	Rural residential	RRZ-R1	Support in part	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	<p>Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish.
John Andrew Riddell (S431)	S431.125	Rural residential	RRZ-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)	S449.059	Rural residential	RRZ-R1	Support	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	<p>Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish.
<p>House Movers Section of New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc (S482)</p>	<p>S482.004</p>	<p>Rural residential</p>	<p>RRZ-R1</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>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".</p> <p>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</p>	<p>amend RRZ-R1 to:</p> <p>provide for relocated building as a permitted activity when relocated buildings meet performance standards and criteria (see schedule 1).</p> <p>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</p>
<p>Fire and Emergency</p>	<p>S512.099</p>	<p>Rural residential</p>	<p>RRZ-R1</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>Many zones hold objectives and policies related to servicing developments with</p>	<p>Insert new standard and/or matter of discretion across zones on</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
New Zealand (S512)					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.	infrastructureservicing (including emergency response transport/access and adequate watersupply for firefighting)
Carbon Neutral NZ Trust (S529)	S529.210	Rural residential	RRZ-R1	Support in part	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	<p>Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour. • Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish.
Brad Hedger (S267)	S267.002	Rural residential	RRZ-R2	Support in part	The rural residential zone could potentially become a residential zone, activities in this zone will be more residential than agricultural activities, form planning report there did not seem to be any consideration for climate change. Residential type activity creates impermeable surfaces. Lot sizes in these zones can vary 600m2 gives ample capacity for the construction of roadways, buildings for this type of activity, but allows some restriction on larger sites especially as they would not typically discharge into a reticulated system.	Amend PER-1 of RRZ-R2 to: The impermeable surface coverage of any site is no more than 12.5% or 2,500m2 600m2 , which ever is lesser.
Trent Simpkin (S283)	S283.012	Rural residential	RRZ-R2	Oppose	The impermeable surfaces rule is one of the most common rules breached when designing homes. Rural residential allows sites to be 2000m2 as per the subdivision rule. 12.5% of 2000m2 is 250m2. Most driveways are larger than 250m2, let alone adding the house roof area and any paths etc. This therefore means that nearly all homes in the rural residential area 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)	Amend from 12.5% maximum (250m2 on a 2000m2 site) to allow up to 500m2 to be realistic and/or insert a PER-2 which says if a TP10 report is provided by an engineer, the activity is permitted (inferred)
Neil Construction	S349.029	Rural residential	RRZ-R2	Oppose	The broader Tubbs Farm land area has already been subject to significant rural residential subdivision and development in	amend RZ-R2 by replacing "lesser" with "greater" to enable reasonable

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Limited (S349)					accordance with resource consents and the existing planning framework. This has involved substantial infrastructure investment in this land to date, and has created an emerging residential land use pattern that should be continued	impermeable surface area
Far North District Council (S368)	S368.104	Rural residential	RRZ-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 to insert RRZ-R2 PER-2Stormwater must be disposed of in accordance with Far North District Engineering Standards April 2022.
Puketotara Lodge Ltd (S481)	S481.005	Rural residential	RRZ-R2	Not Stated	The submitter seeks to ensure that the PDP adequately controls effects from stormwater discharge, particularly between sites or adjacent sites. The Operative Far North Plan contains a stormwater management rule in each zone, along with matters of discretion which Council can consider where the impermeable surface area exceeds what is allowed under the permitted activity rule. There is no specific "stormwater management" rule in the Rural Production zone in the PDP, however there is a rule relating to impermeable surface coverage. It is submitted that additional matters should be added to the list of relevant matters for discretion in the impermeable coverage rule in all zones, in order to better control effects between sites or adjacent sites,	Amend point c of the matters of discretion as follows: c. the availability of land for disposal of effluent and stormwater on the site without adverse effects on adjoining adjacent waterbodies (including groundwater and aquifers) or on adjoining adjoining sites; Insert the following as additional matters of discretion: <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-

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>developmentstormwater 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
Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited (S502)	S502.056	Rural residential	RRZ-R2	Support in part	Subdivision has been enabled as a Discretionary activity on sites up to 2000m2. 12.5% of 2000m2 is 250m2 which doesn't even cover the roof of many dwellings being consented at present, let alone driveway, parking areas, garden sheds and garages, pathways etc. which are associated with a dwelling. It is likely that with each 2000m2 site which is created that landuse consent will be required for a breach of this standard.	Amend and review the impermeable surface coverage for this zone to avoid unnecessary landuse consents in the future.
Elizabeth Irvine (S39)	S39.004	Rural residential	RRZ-R3	Oppose	There are a large number of sites within the RRZ with allotment sizes ranging from just under 2,000m2 to 4,000m2. It would be appropriate to recognise this pattern of development by including a new restricted discretionary activity for subdivisions with a minimum allotment size of 2,500m2 in the RRZ. Similarly, a new restricted discretionary activity for one residential unit within a site area of at least 2,500m2 should be included in the RRZ rules.	Provide for as a permitted activity a site area per residential unit of 3,000m2. Include a new restricted discretionary activity for one residential unit within a site area of at least 2,500m2 should be included in the RRZ rules.
Neil Construction Limited (S349)	S349.030	Rural residential	RRZ-R3	Oppose	The broader Tubbs Farm land area has already been subject to significant rural residential subdivision and development in accordance with resource consents and the existing planning framework. This has involved substantial infrastructure investment in this land to date, and has created an	amend RRZ-R3 so that the site area per residential unit is at least 3,000m2.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					emerging residential land use pattern that should be continued	
Far North District Council (S368)	S368.082	Rural residential	RRZ-R3	Support in part	he 'Residential activity' rule in zones that provide for a minor residential unit need to provide an exclusion for a 'minor residential unit'. The intent of the rule is to provide for a minor residential unit in addition to a principal residential unit on a site, it is not meant to be captured by PER-1 within the rule.	Amend RRZ-R3 Make the following amendments (the area2 will be relative to the zone) to the 'Residential activity' rule within the Rural Production zone, Rural Lifestyle zone, Rural Residential zone and the Settlement zone in the PDP. PER-1 The site area per residential unit is at least xxxm2. PER-1 does not apply to: i. a single residential unit located on a site less than xxxm2. ii. A minor residential unit constructed in accordance with rule Rxx-Rxx.
Northland Fish and Game Council (S436)	S436.013	Rural residential	RRZ-R3	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. 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	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
					equestrian arena in the vicinity of maimai used during the game bird hunting season.	
Ruby Coastal Investments Limited (S467)	S467.001	Rural residential	RRZ-R3	Oppose	This submission requests Rule RRZ-R3 DIS-1 minimum site area is reduced to 600m ² . The minimum lot area of 2000m ² is linked to the minimum area required to accommodate an individual lot wastewater treatment system and disposal field. Parts of the district that may suit residential now have been held back in the rural residential zone by the availability and timing of municipal infrastructure extension. Small to medium scale private community schemes for water and wastewater are available and remove the minimum lot area constraint.	Amend DIS-1 of Rule RRZ-R3 as follows: DIS-1: The site area per residential unit is at least 2,060 2,060m ² .
Timothy and Dion Spicer (S213)	S213.010	Rural residential	RRZ-R4	Support	It is considered that providing for visitor accommodation as a permitted activity represents a largely positive change for the subject site and other properties located in the RRZ. Such provision will foster the social and economic well-being of the Far North District and recognises that some rural properties can be appropriately utilised for activities other than production and residential development.	retain Rule RRZ-R4 Visitor Accommodation
Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (S425)	S425.054	Rural residential	RRZ-R4	Support in part	PHTTCCT support the provision for visitor accommodation in zones. It is considered that providing for this activity, particularly throughout the Zones that adjoin the Trail as a permitted activity 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). PHTTCCT acknowledged the rationale behind the inclusion of PER-1 in the Rural Production, Rural Residential, Rural Living and Settlement Zone but considers that this is too blunt given the number of shared access ways within the District, and has	Amend , RRZ-R4 as follows: "Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The visitor accommodation is within a residential unit, accessory building or minor residential unit. PER-2 The occupancy does not exceed 10 guests per night. PER-3 The site does not share access with another site. Where the site shares access with a The access to the site is set back

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					suggested wording that uses a setback to manage any likely noise or dust effects that could be experienced as a result of sharing an access	more than 20m from any residential unit, or minor residential unit on any site that shares the access."
Timothy and Dion Spicer (S213)	S213.011	Rural residential	RRZ-R5	Support	It is considered that providing for home business as a permitted activity represents a largely positive change for the subject site and other properties located in the RRZ. Such provision will foster the social and economic well-being of the Far North District, and recognises that some rural properties can be appropriately utilised for activities other than production and residential development.	retain RRZ-R5 Home Business
Trent Simpkin (S283)	S283.029	Rural residential	RRZ-R5	Oppose	This submission applies to all Building Coverage rules within all zones. The subdivision chapter allows Rural Residential sites to be subdivided down to 2000m ² (which is supported). 12.5% of 2000m ² is 250m ² which nowadays is not a 'huge' house. This needs to be larger, i.e. 20%	Amend the maximum building or structure coverage from 12.5% to 20% or offer an alternative pathway around this rule, by inserting a PER-2 which says if a building is above 20% or 2500m ² , it is permitted if a visual assessment and landscape plan is provided as part of the building consent.
Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (S425)	S425.059	Rural residential	RRZ-R5	Support	PHTTCCT support the provision for home business in zones. It is considered that providing for this activity as a permitted activity, particularly throughout the zones that adjoin the Trail, will help activate the Trail and ensure that that the potential in terms of social and economic impact can be realised (noting the comments made in the Transport Chapter in regards to parking).	retain as notified
John Andrew Riddell (S431)	S431.142	Rural residential	RRZ-R5	Not Stated	The amendment is necessary in order to achieve the purpose of the Act.	Amend PER-4 of Rule RRZ-R5 so that the hours of operation apply to when the business is open to the public
Northland Planning and Development	S502.057	Rural residential	RRZ-R5	Support in part	A home business could be utilizing a shed on site which may be larger than 40m ² . A business may only utilize a portion of a	Amend RRZ-R5 PER-1 The home business is undertaken within:

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
2020 Limited (S502)					building where the rest is set aside as private space. Utilizing an existing building which exceeds 40m2 should not be a trigger for consent. Moreover, even if business was utilizing a space greater than 40m2 other standards such as Per-2 & 3 are in place to control the effects such that the effects will be no more than minor on the surrounding environment.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. a residential unit; or 2. an accessory building that does not exceed 40m2 GFA; or 3. a minor residential unit.
Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga (S331)	S331.074	Rural residential	RRZ-R6	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes rule RRZ-R6 Educational facility and recommend the inclusion of a new provision (see submission #S331.017) to provide for educational facilities as a permitted activity in the Rural Residential zone in the Infrastructure Chapter. In conjunction with this relief, the submitter seeks the removal of this rule from the Rural Residential zone to limit rule duplication.</p> <p>However, if this relief is not granted, the submitter supports in part the permitted activity standards to provide for small scale educational facilities in the Rural Residential zone. However, educational facilities with student attendance higher than 4 will likely be required to support the rural environment and suggest student attendance not exceeding 30 to align with Ministry pre-school licences.</p> <p>The Ministry requests that all educational facilities are enabled in the Rural Residential zone to serve the education needs of the rural 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 RRZ-R6 Educational facility.or Amend rule RRZ-R6 Educational facility, as follows: Educational facility</p> <p>Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The educational facility is within a residential unit, accessory building or minor residential unit. PER-2 Hours of operation are between; 1. 7am-8pm Monday to Friday. 2. 8am-8pm Weekends and public holidays. PER-3 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, PER-2 or PER-3: Restricted DiscretionaryMatters of discretion are restricted to: a. Design and layout. b. Transport safety and efficiency. c. Scale of activity and</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>hours of operation.d. Infrastructure servicing.e. Potential reverse sensitivity effects on rural production operations.</p>
Timothy and Dion Spicer (S213)	S213.006	Rural residential	RRZ-R7	Support	The introduction of this rule largely represents a positive change as it specifically supports the continuation of farming activities in the RRZ.	retain RRZ-R7
Timothy and Dion Spicer (S213)	S213.007	Rural residential	RRZ-R10	Support	Dion and Timothy Spicer consider that providing for a MRU as a permitted activity in the RRZ represents a largely positive change for the subject site.	retain RRZ-R10
Far North District Council (S368)	S368.025	Rural residential	RRZ-R10	Support in part	Typo in matters of control ii. "sitting"	<p>Amend RRZ-R10 Matters of control are limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. the character and appearance of the residential unit(s) and any accessory building(s) in relation to the principal residential unit; ii. the sitting siting of the building(s), decks and outdoor areas relative to adjoining sites; iii. whether the building(s) are visually dominant and create a loss of privacy for surrounding residential units and their associated outdoor areas; iv. ability of the supporting reading network to cater for the additional vehicular and if applicable cycling and pedestrian traffic;

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>v. servicing requirements and any constraints of the site;</p> <p>vi. the each residential unit has sufficient outdoor open space, and there is sufficient room for any landscaping, egress and any accessory building(s) required;</p> <p>vii. whether the location of the building(s) and residential activity could create reverse sensitivity effects on adjacent and surrounding primary production activities;</p> <p>viii. whether the development will result in the site being unable to continue to undertake a primary production activity or undertake one in the future due to loss of productive land;</p> <p>ix. whether the layout of the development reduces the risk of future land fragmentation or sterilisation while maintaining the existing rural character of the surrounding area;</p> <p>x. any natural hazard affecting the site or surrounding area.</p>
<p>Timothy and Dion Spicer (S213)</p>	<p>S213.012</p>	<p>Rural residential</p>	<p>RRZ-R17</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>It is noted that Industrial Activities in the RRZ is a non-complying activity pursuant to Rule RRZ-R17. It is considered that such activity status is heavy-handed and does not recognise that there is a need for some</p>	<p>delete RRZ-R17</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					industrial activities to be undertaken in order to support rural production activities.	
Timothy and Dion Spicer (S213)	S213.016	Rural residential	RRZ-R18	Oppose	It is noted that Rural Industry activities in the RRZ is a non-complying activity pursuant to Rule RRZ-R19. It is considered that such activity status is heavy-handed and does not recognise that rural industry activities are essential to rural production activities.	delete RRZ-R18
Timothy and Dion Spicer (S213)	S213.017	Rural residential	RRZ-R18	Not Stated	Dion and Timothy Spicer consider that a discretionary activity status would be more appropriate as it enables such activities to occur while providing for case by case consideration of any proposed commercial activity within the context of the RRZ.	Amend the RRZ provisions so that rural industry activities are a Discretionary Activity
Timothy and Dion Spicer (S213)	S213.020	Rural residential	RRZ-R19	Oppose	It is noted that Commercial Activities in the RRZ is a non-complying activity pursuant to Rule RRZ-R19. It is considered that such activity status is heavy-handed and does not recognise that there is a need for some commercial activities to be undertaken in order to support rural production activities.	delete RRZ-R19 inferred
Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust (S338)	S338.067	Rural residential	Standards	Not Stated	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	<p>Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish.
Brady Wild (S369)	S369.003	Rural residential	Standards	Support	The Rural Residential zone provisions provide for some non-residential activities as permitted activities (subject to controls), including visitor accommodation, small home business, small educational facilities, and rural produce retail. Support these provisions as they recognise that a variety of activities can be undertaken within rural areas in a manner which maintains rural amenity. Such provisions will also largely contribute to the social and economic well-being of the Far North District	Retain the Rural Residential zone standards
Kapiro Residents Association (S427)	S427.068	Rural residential	Standards	Support in part	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	<p>Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish.
<p>Kapiro Conservation Trust (S449)</p>	<p>S449.063</p>	<p>Rural residential</p>	<p>Standards</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.</p>	<p>Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish.
<p>Carbon Neutral NZ Trust (S529)</p>	<p>S529.216</p>	<p>Rural residential</p>	<p>Standards</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.</p>	<p>Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish.
Terra Group (S172)	S172.029	Rural residential	RRZ-S1	Support	Support the general rules of RRZ-S1 to RRZ-S5, as they will achieve positive outcomes for the proposed zone.	Retain as notified (inferred)
Timothy and Dion Spicer (S213)	S213.008	Rural residential	RRZ-S1	Oppose	In Dion and Timothy Spicer's opinion, there is no logical reason to reduce the maximum building height from 9m to 8m.	amend Rule RRZ-S1 so that the maximum building height remains as 9m.
Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust (S338)	S338.058	Rural residential	RRZ-S1	Not Stated	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	<p>Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish.
<p>Kapiro Residents Association (S427)</p>	<p>S427.044</p>	<p>Rural residential</p>	<p>RRZ-S1</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.</p>	<p>Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish.
<p>Kapiro Conservation Trust (S449)</p>	<p>S449.054</p>	<p>Rural residential</p>	<p>RRZ-S1</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.</p>	<p>Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>fabric must be black or very dark colour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish.
<p>Carbon Neutral NZ Trust (S529)</p>	<p>S529.203</p>	<p>Rural residential</p>	<p>RRZ-S1</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.</p>	<p>Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour. Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish.
John Andrew Riddell (S431)	S431.184	Rural residential	RRZ-S2	Not Stated	Not stated	Retain the approach varying the required height to boundary depending on the orientation of the relevant boundary.
Terra Group (S172)	S172.003	Rural residential	RRZ-S3	Oppose	Requires clarification and more direction within the activity status regarding the activity listing. Setbacks resulting in more adverse effects should be listed as Discretionary. Where the effects are less than minor, and the setback infringement small in scale, the activity should be Restricted Discretionary.	Amend Standard RRZ-S3 to apply Discretionary activity status to setbacks resulting in more adverse effects, and restricted discretionary activity status where the setback infringement is small in scale and effects are less than minor.
Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust (S338)	S338.059	Rural residential	RRZ-S3	Not Stated	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish.
<p>KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S416)</p>	<p>S416.060</p>	<p>Rural residential</p>	<p>RRZ-S3</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>KiwiRail considers that a matter of discretion directing consideration of impacts on the safety and efficiency of the rail corridor is appropriate in situations where the 5m setback standard is not complied with in all zones adjacent to the railway corridor. Building setbacks are essential to address significant safety hazards associated with the operational rail corridor. The Proposed Plan enables a 1m setback from side and rear boundaries shared with the rail corridor, increasing the risk that poles, ladders, or</p>	<p>Insert a railway setback (refer to submission for examples)</p> <p>Insert the following matters of discretion into the standard:</p> <p>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 corridor</p> <p>the safe and efficient operation of the rail network</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>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 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.</p> <p>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>	

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Kapiro Residents Association (S427)	S427.045	Rural residential	RRZ-S3	Support in part	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	<p>Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour. • Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish.
Kapiro Conservation Trust (S449)	S449.055	Rural residential	RRZ-S3	Support	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are	Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries,

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	<p>and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour. • Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand (S512)	S512.075	Rural residential	RRZ-S3	Support in part	<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.</p> <p>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</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</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>firefighting access through the New Zealand Building Code (NZBC).</p>	<p>and egress from buildings. Planusers 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</p>
<p>Airbnb (S214)</p>	<p>S214.004</p>	<p>Rural residential</p>	<p>RRZ-S4</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<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</p>	<p>Amend rules to standardise the guest limit cap for permitted visitor accommodation to 10 across all zones and make the default non-permitted status restricted discretionary (as opposed to Discretionary) across all zones.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					Code of Conduct approach as piloted in New South Wales (NSW), Australia (with a robust compliance and enforcement mechanism, operating 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).	
Far North District Council (S368)	S368.050	Rural residential	RRZ-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 RRZ-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)	S502.058	Rural residential	RRZ-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 RRZ-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 MHWS PER-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 hazard mitigation undertaken by, or on behalf of, the local authority; or 3. a post and wire fence for the purpose of protection from farm stock; or 4. Lighting poles by, or on behalf of, the local authority; or 5. Footpaths and or paving no greater than 2m in width; or 6.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						Boundary fences or walls no more than 2m in height above ground level;
Timothy and Dion Spicer (S213)	S213.009	Rural residential	RRZ-S5	Support	It is considered that an increase in the permitted building coverage standards represents a largely positive change for properties located within the RRZ.	retain Rule RRZ-S5 Building or Structure Coverage
Lynley Newport (S100)	S100.001	Settlement	Overview	Support	I support the introduction of this zone and its application,	retain the settlement zone
Ian Ray (Joe) Carr (S397)	S397.002	Settlement	Overview	Support	This new Settlement zone is an appropriate zone in the District's suite of zones.	Retain the Settlement zone overview
Ian Ray (Joe) Carr (S397)	S397.003	Settlement	Objectives	Support	This new Settlement zone is an appropriate zone in the District's suite of zones.	Retain the Settlement zone objectives
Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga (S331)	S331.075	Settlement	RSZ-O1	Support	The submitter supports objective RSZ-O1 as it provides for a range of compatible activities, such as educational facilities, which sustain the rural and coastal settlements.	Retain objective RSZ-O1, as proposed.
Transpower New Zealand Ltd (S454)	S454.114	Settlement	RSZ-O1	Not Stated	Objective RSZ-O1 sets out the predominant uses of settlements. Transpower supports the intent of this objective to identify the activities that are likely to occur within the Settlement zone, however critical infrastructure, such as the National Grid, is not addressed clearly. 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. The objective should be made more explicit to ensure that it is clear that infrastructure such as the National Grid is contemplated in this zone.	Amend RSZ-O1 as follows: Rural and coastal settlements are used predominantly for residential activities and are sustained by a range of compatible activities, and services, and infrastructure.
Ian Ray (Joe) Carr (S397)	S397.004	Settlement	Policies	Support	This new Settlement zone is an appropriate zone in the District's suite of zones.	Retain the Settlement zone policies

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Carbon Neutral NZ Trust (S529)	S529.158	Settlement	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 protect a key natural resource - productive land - now and for future generations.
Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga (S331)	S331.076	Settlement	RSZ-P1	Support	The submitter supports policy RSZ-P1 as it enables complementary non-residential activities that support the role and function of the Settlement zone, such as educational facilities.	Retain policy RSZ-P1, as proposed.
Transpower New Zealand Ltd (S454)	S454.115	Settlement	RSZ-P1	Not Stated	Transpower supports the intent of this policy to identify the activities that are likely to occur within the Settlement zone, however critical infrastructure, such as the National Grid, is not addressed clearly. 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. The policy should be made more explicit to ensure that it is clear that infrastructure such as the National Grid is contemplated in this zone.	Amend RSZ-P1 as follows: Enable residential, and complementary non-residential activities and infrastructure , that support the role and function of the Settlement zone.
Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga (S331)	S331.077	Settlement	RSZ-P3	Support	The submitter supports policy RSZ-P3 as it enables complementary non-residential activities that support the role and function of the Settlement zone, such as educational facilities.	Retain policy RSZ-P3, as proposed.
Foodstuffs North Island Limited (S363)	S363.020	Settlement	Rules	Not Stated	The submitter considers that supermarkets should be provided for in the Rural Settlement Zone as a permitted activity.	Insert a new rule to provide for supermarkets as a permitted activity in the Rural Settlement Zone.
New Zealand Motor Caravan	S438.016	Settlement	Rules	Support in part	It is considered that camping grounds have similar impacts as in the General Residential Zone.	Amend Rural Settlement Zone rules to provide for camping grounds as

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Association (S438)						discretionary activities.
New Zealand Motor Caravan Association (S438)	S438.017	Settlement	Rules	Support in part	The proposed amendments would see compatible treatment of camping sites to camping grounds as amended in the submission.	Amend Settlement Zone rules to provide for camping sites as a discretionary activity (inferred).
Fire and Emergency New Zealand (S512)	S512.053	Settlement	Rules	Not Stated	Fire and Emergency support an activity for emergency service facilities being listed as an activity in zones. Please see Table 1 of the submission for the location of existing fire stations. Note that these are found in a range of zones. New fire stations may be necessary in order to continue to achieve emergency response time commitments in situations where development occurs, and populations change. In this regard it is noted that Fire and Emergency is not a requiring authority under section 166 of the RMA, and therefore does not have the ability to designate land for the purposes of fire stations. Provisions within the rules of the district plan are therefore, the best way to facilitate the development of any new fire stations within the district as urban development progresses. Fire and Emergency request that emergency service facilities are included as a permitted activity in all zones. The draft Plan currently only includes emergency services facilities as an activity in some zones and with varying activity status. In addition, fire stations have specific requirements with relation to setback distances and vehicle crossings. Fire and Emergency request that emergency service facilities are exempt from these standards	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
Fire and Emergency New Zealand (S512)	S512.076	Settlement	Rules	Support in part	Setbacks play a role in reducing spread of fire as well as ensuring Fire and Emergency personnel can get to a fire source or other emergency. An advice note is recommended to raise to	Insert advice note to setback standard. Building setback requirements are further controlled by the Building Code.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					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).	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 stage. Issuance of a resource consent does not imply that waivers of Building Code requirements will be considered/granted
Carbon Neutral NZ Trust (S529)	S529.165	Settlement	Rules	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 rules to protect a key natural resource - productive land - now and for future generations.
Radio New Zealand (S489)	S489.042	Settlement	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

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						ensure such risks are avoided
Foodstuffs North Island Limited (S363)	S363.026	Settlement	RSZ-R1	Not Stated	The submitter considers rule RSZ-R1 New buildings or structures, and extensions or alterations to existing buildings or structures, that building bulk and scale should be managed separately to the scale of activities.	Amend rule RSZ-R1 New buildings or structures, and extensions or alterations to existing buildings or structures to provide for an increase to buildings to a scale which is appropriate to the RSZ.
Far North District Council (S368)	S368.009	Settlement	RSZ-R1	Support in part	Provision needs to be made for the pedestrian frontage shown on the maps. This is an omission that was in the operative DP Commercial zone and not brought across in all instances within the PDP zones	Amend to Include reference to a standard in the 'New buildings or structures, and extensions or alterations to existing buildings or structures' rule, and include the standard for pedestrian frontage as seen in the Mixed Use zone.
John Andrew Riddell (S431)	S431.126	Settlement	RSZ-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
House Movers Section of New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc (S482)	S482.005	Settlement	RSZ-R1	Support in part	The Proposed Plan definition of "building" does not clearly include relocated buildings, and the existence of a separate definition of relocate buildings in the Proposed Plan appears to create a distinction between "buildings" and "relocated buildings". It is not clear that the permitted activity status applied in most zones to "new buildings and structures" also applies to the relocation of buildings. It is submitted that relocated buildings should have the same status as new buildings, and subject to the same performance standards unless there is any specific overlay or control which applies e.g. historic heritage	amend RSZ-R1 to: provide for relocated building as a permitted activity whenrelocated buildings meet performance standards and criteria (see schedule 1). insert a performance standard for use of a pre inspection report(schedule 2) restricted discretionary activity status for relocated buildings that do not meet the permitted activity status standards
Fire and Emergency	S512.100	Settlement	RSZ-R1	Support in part	Many zones hold objectives and policies related to servicing developments with	Insertnew standard and/or matter of discretion across zones on

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
New Zealand (S512)					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	infrastructureservicing (including emergency response transport/access and adequate watersupply for firefighting)
Trent Simpkin (S283)	S283.016	Settlement	RSZ-R2	Oppose	The impermeable surfaces rule is one of the most common rules breached when designing homes. The low thresholds means therefore means many homes will still require a resource consent for Impermeable surfaces. all RC's breaching impermeable surfaces require a TP10/Stormwater report from an engineer (already). This is a detailed design of the 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.	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)
Far North District Council (S368)	S368.105	Settlement	RSZ-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 RSZ-R2 PER-2Stormwater must be disposed of in accordance with Far North District Engineering Standards April 2022.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Puketotara Lodge Ltd (S481)	S481.006	Settlement	RSZ-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. 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: c. the availability of land for disposal of effluent and stormwater on the site without adverse effects on adjoining adjacent waterbodies (including groundwater and aquifers) or on adjoining adjacent sites; Insert the following as additional matters of discretion:</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.
Far North District Council (S368)	S368.083	Settlement	RSZ-R3	Support in part	<p>The 'Residential activity' rule in zones that provide for a minor residential unit need to provide an exclusion for a 'minor residential unit'. The intent of the rule is to provide for a minor residential unit in addition to a principal residential unit on a site, it is not meant to be captured by PER-1 within the rule.</p>	<p>Amend RSZ- R3 Make the following amendments (the area2 will be relative to the zone) to the 'Residential activity' rule within the Rural Production zone, Rural Lifestyle zone, Rural Residential zone and the Settlement zone in the PDP. PER-1 The site area per residential unit is at least xxxm2. PER-1 does not apply to:</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>i. a single residential unit located on a site less than xxxm2.</p> <p>ii. A minor residential unit constructed in accordance with rule Rxx-Rxx.</p>
Ian Ray (Joe) Carr (S397)	S397.005	Settlement	RSZ-R3	Support in part	The Permitted Residential Activity threshold of 3,000m2 is too high and out of context with the long established and well accepted lot sizes found at Okaihau.	<p>Amend the rule to:</p> <p>(1) Lower the Permitted Residential Activity PER-I threshold to 1,500 M2.</p> <p>(2) Introduce a restricted discretionary status with an allowable threshold of 1000 M2, with matters of discretion restricted to the availability of land for disposal of effluent and stormwater on the site without adverse effects on adjoining waterbodies (including groundwater and aquifers) or on adjoining sites.</p> <p>(3) Introduce a discretionary (DIS-I) status activity with a minimum lot size of 600m2. The activity status where compliance not achieved with this DIS-I should be non-complying</p>
Northland Fish and Game Council (S436)	S436.014	Settlement	RSZ-R3	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.</p> <p>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</p>	<p>Insert provisions that constrain housing and industrial developments near areas with recreational hunting values.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>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>	
<p>Airbnb (S214)</p>	<p>S214.005</p>	<p>Settlement</p>	<p>RSZ-R4</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<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, operating on a 'two strike' basis whereby bad actors are excluded from participating in the</p>	<p>Amend rules to standardise the guest limit cap for permitted visitor accommodation to 10 across all zones and make the default non-permitted status restricted discretionary (as opposed to Discretionary) across all zones.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					industry for a period of 5 years after repeated breaches of the Code).	
Far North District Council (S368)	S368.026	Settlement	RSZ-R4	Support in part	Correction: Matter of discretion f. should say 'wastewater treatment and disposal'	Amend RSZ-R4 Matters of discretion are restricted to: a. the number of visitors accommodated; b. the location and design of buildings, outdoor areas, parking and loading areas and access; c. hours of operation; d. noise, disturbance and loss of privacy of adjacent sites; e. screening and landscaping; f. wastewater treatment and disposal; g. water supply for drinking and firefighting; and h. stormwater disposal.
Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (S425)	S425.055	Settlement	RSZ-R4	Support in part	PHTTCCT support the provision for visitor accommodation in zones. It is considered that providing for this activity, particularly throughout the Zones that adjoin the Trail as a permitted activity 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). PHTTCCT acknowledged the rationale behind the inclusion of PER-1 in the Rural Production, Rural Residential, Rural Living and Settlement Zone but considers that this is too blunt given the number of shared access ways within the District, and has suggested wording that uses a setback to manage any likely noise or dust effects that could be experienced as a result of sharing an access	Amend RSZ-R4 as follows: "Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The visitor accommodation is within a residential unit, accessory building or minor residential unit. PER-2 The occupancy does not exceed 10 guests per night. PER-3 The site does not share access with another site. Where the site shares access with a The access to the site is set back more than 20m from any residential unit, or minor residential unit on any site that

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						shares the access."
Fire and Emergency New Zealand (S512)	S512.042	Settlement	RSZ-R4	Support	Fire and Emergency support the consideration of water supply for firefighting for visitor accommodation. However, this same matter of discretion should be applicable across many of the other activities listed across zone chapters. Particularly given that the Settlement zone notes that most settlements do not have reticulated water supply and so alternative firefighting water sources are essential for more than just visitor accommodation.	retain RSZ-R4
Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (S425)	S425.060	Settlement	RSZ-R5	Support	PHTTCCT support the provision for home business in zones. It is considered that providing for this activity as a permitted activity, particularly throughout the zones that adjoin the Trail, will help activate the Trail and ensure that that the potential in terms of social and economic impact can be realised (noting the comments made in the Transport Chapter in regards to parking).	retain as notified
John Andrew Riddell (S431)	S431.143	Settlement	RSZ-R5	Not Stated	The amendment is necessary in order to achieve the purpose of the Act.	Amend PER-4 of Rule RSZ-R5 so that the hours of operation apply to when the business is open to the public
Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited (S502)	S502.059	Settlement	RSZ-R5	Support in part	A home business could be utilizing a shed on site which may be larger than 40m2. A business may only utilize a portion of a building where the rest is set aside as private space. Utilizing an existing building which exceeds 40m2 should not be a trigger for consent. Moreover, even if a business was utilizing a space greater than 40m2 other standards such as PER-2 & 3 are in place to control the effects such that the effects will be no more than minor on the surrounding environment.	Amend RSZ-R5 PER-1 The home business is undertaken within: 1. a residential unit; or 2. an accessory building that does not exceed 40m2 GFA ; or 3. a minor residential unit.
Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te	S331.078	Settlement	RSZ-R6	Oppose	The submitter opposes rule RSZ-R6 and recommends the inclusion of a new provision (see submission #331.17) to provide for	Delete rule RSZ-R6 Educational Facility or

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Mātauranga (S331)					<p>educational facilities as a permitted activity in the Settlement zone in the Infrastructure Chapter. In conjunction with this relief, the submitter seeks the removal of this rule from the Settlement zone to limit rule duplication. However, if this relief is not granted, the Ministry supports the permitted activity standards to provide for small scale educational facilities in the Settlement zone. However, educational facilities with student attendance higher than 4 will likely be required to support the rural 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 Settlement zone to serve the education needs of the rural community and suggest a restricted discretionary activity status where compliance with the permitted standards cannot be achieved.</p>	<p>Amend rule RSZ-R6 Educational Facility, as follows: Educational facility Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The educational facility is within a residential unit, accessory building or minor residential unit. PER-2 Hours of operation are between; 1. 7am-8pm Monday to Friday. 2. 8am-8pm Weekends and public holidays. PER-3 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, PER-2 or PER-3: 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. d. Infrastructure servicing. e. Potential reverse sensitivity effects on rural production operations.</p>
Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust (S338)	S338.017	Settlement	RSZ-R8	Not Stated	<p>Settlement zones don't allow for small local shops or facilities at present. However, a combined dairy/café in larger Settlement zones would allow local people to walk to obtain everyday needs instead of driving 4 to 15 kms to the CBD, and could be allowed in</p>	<p>Retain Rule RSZ-R8 (inferred)</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					case where there are suitable locations, and where it would not create additional traffic problems or other adverse effects on local communities or small roads leading to the Settlements.	
Foodstuffs North Island Limited (S363)	S363.027	Settlement	RSZ-R8	Not Stated	The submitter considers rule RSZ-R8 Commercial activity, only provide for some commercial activities as a permitted activity being retail activities office activities and any activity that fails to comply is a discretionary activity which is inappropriate, inefficient and ineffective as the supermarkets are essential services for small communities and RSZ is the only zone eligible.	Amend rule RSZ-R8 Commercial activity, to clearly provide for supermarkets, with an appropriate GFA limit.
Foodstuffs North Island Limited (S363)	S363.028	Settlement	RSZ-R8	Not Stated	The submitter considers that rule RSZ-R8 Commercial activity, provides for retail and office activities at a larger scaler scale as a permitted activity within Moerewa, with a smaller scale applied to other settlements with no clear justification or s32 support for a smaller limit in other settlements.	Amend rule RSZ-R8 Commercial activity, to provide for supermarkets, with an appropriate GFA limit consistently across all settlements.
Kapiro Conservation Trust (S449)	S449.019	Settlement	RSZ-R8	Support in part	Settlement zones don't allow for small local shops or facilities at present. However, a combined dairy/café in larger Settlement zones would allow local people to walk to obtain everyday needs instead of driving 4 to 15 kms to the CBD, and could be allowed in case where there are suitable locations, and where it would not create additional traffic problems or other adverse effects on local communities or small roads leading to the Settlements.	Retain Rule RSZ-R8 (inferred)
Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK) (S522)	S522.039	Settlement	RSZ-R8	Support in part	Settlement zones don't allow for small local shops or facilities at present. However, a combined dairy/café in larger Settlement zones would allow local people to walk to obtain everyday needs instead of driving 4 to 15 kms to the CBD, and could be allowed in case where there are suitable locations, and where it would not create additional traffic problems or other adverse effects on local	Retain Rule RSZ-R8 (inferred)

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					communities or small roads leading to the Settlements.	
Carbon Neutral NZ Trust (S529)	S529.018	Settlement	RSZ-R8	Support in part	Settlement zones don't allow for small local shops or facilities at present. However, a combined dairy/café in larger Settlement zones would allow local people to walk to obtain everyday needs instead of driving 4 to 15 kms to the CBD, and could be allowed in case where there are suitable locations, and where it would not create additional traffic problems or other adverse effects on local communities or small roads leading to the Settlements.	Retain Rule RSZ-R8 (inferred)
Lynley Newport (S100)	S100.003	Settlement	RSZ-R10	Support	Support for the allowance for a minor residential unit within this zone	retain RSZ-R10
Yvonne Sharp (S90)	S90.003	Settlement	RSZ-S2	Oppose	The Proposed Plan changes the sunlight rules without any justification in the section 32 reports to indicate the basis of the change. Therefore it is not known whether the current rules are working or if the degree of change proposed is warranted. Further information is needed.	Amend the height in relation to boundary standards so they are consistent with those in the Operative District Plan (i.e. retain the existing standards in the District).
Chris Sharp (S313)	S313.003	Settlement	RSZ-S2	Oppose	The Proposed Plan changes the sunlight rules without giving reason for this in the section 32 reports. As it is unknown why or if any changes are actually warranted the changes from the current rules are unsupportable.	Amend the standard so it is consistent with the Operative District Plan Standards for sunlight.
John Andrew Riddell (S431)	S431.185	Settlement	RSZ-S2	Not Stated	Not stated	Retain the approach varying the required height to boundary depending on the orientation of the relevant boundary.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S416)	S416.061	Settlement	RSZ-S3	Support in part	For health and safety reasons, KiwiRail seek a setback for structures from the rail corridor boundary. While KiwiRail do not oppose development on adjacent sites, ensuring the ability to access and maintain structures without requiring access to rail land is important. Parts of the KiwiRail network adjoin	Insert a railway setback (refer to submission for examples) Insert the following matters of discretion into the standard:

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>commercial, mixed use, industrial and open space zones. These zone chapters do not currently include provision for boundary setbacks for buildings and structures. KiwiRail seek a boundary setback of 5m from the rail corridor for all buildings and structures.</p> <p>KiwiRail considers that a matter of discretion directing consideration of impacts on the safety and efficiency of the rail corridor is appropriate in situations where the 5m setback standard is not complied with in all zones adjacent to the railway corridor. Building setbacks are essential to address significant safety hazards associated with the operational rail corridor. The Proposed Plan enables a 1m setback from side and rear boundaries shared with the rail corridor, increasing the risk that poles, ladders, or even ropes for abseiling equipment, could protrude into the rail corridor and increasing the risk of collision with a train or electrified overhead lines. Further, there is a 600mm eave allowance within side and rear yards which restricts potential 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 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</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 corridor • the safe and efficient operation of the rail network

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>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.</p> <p>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>Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited (S502)</p>	<p>S502.060</p>	<p>Settlement</p>	<p>RSZ-S3</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>This rule does not exclude fences or walls. It is noted Rule RSZ-S7 requires a solid fence with a minimum height of 1.8m along a road boundary which is not occupied by buildings.</p>	<p>Amend RSZ-S3</p> <p>The building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure must be set back at least 1.2m from all site boundaries, except that the setback must be at least 3m measured from a road boundary.</p> <p>This standard does not apply to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. uncovered decks less than 1m in height above ground level; ii. fences and retaining walls less than 1.8m in height iii. underground wastewater infrastructure; iv. water tanks less than 2.7m in height above ground level; v. a building or structure exceeding this standard for a maximum distance of 10m along any one boundary other than a road or public boundary.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Far North District Council (S368)	S368.051	Settlement	RSZ-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' not 'constricts'	Amend RSZ-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)	S502.061	Settlement	RSZ-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 Standard RSZ-S4 as follows: 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 MHW PER-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 hazard mitigation undertaken by, or on behalf of, the local authority; or 3. a post and wire fence for the purpose of protection from farm stock; or 4. Lighting poles by, or on behalf of, the local authority; or 5. Footpaths and or paving no greater than 2m in width; or 6. Boundary fences or walls no more than 2m in height above

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						ground level;
Fire and Emergency New Zealand (S512)	S512.094	Settlement	RSZ-S5	Support in part	Fire and Emergency support the provision of an outdoor living space on the premise that while not directly intended, may provide access for emergency services and space for emergency egress. Fire and Emergency acknowledge that firefighting access requirements are managed through the NZBC however consider it important that these controls are 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 design. The NZBC requirements will have an influence over how a site is designed 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.	insert advice note to RSZ-S5 Advice note:Site layout requirements are further controlled by the Building Code. This includes the provision for firefighter access to buildings and egress from buildings. Plan users should refer to the applicable controls within the Building Code to ensure compliance can be achieved at the building consent stage. Issuance of a resource consent does not imply that waivers of Building Code requirements will be considered/granted.
Yvonne Sharp (S90)	S90.004	Settlement	RSZ-S7	Oppose	The standard is unduly restrictive. For example the Opito Bay settlement currently enjoys an open space environment where fences and screenings are minimal and there is a street vista which is open, accessible and reflects the close community ethos which prevails. The requirements in the standard will destroy this and create private fortresses. The deletion of the standard won't prevent owners wanting this degree of privacy from establishing it. It is noted that if RSZ-S7 is deleted, the rules relating to impermeable surfaces will still ensure a level of landscaping on most sites thereby also contributing to amenity as well as stormwater management.	Delete RSZ-S7 (Landscaping and Screening)

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Chris Sharp (S313)	S313.004	Settlement	RSZ-S7	Oppose	The standard is excessively restrictive. Doves Bays properties vary considerably in elevation and position. The proposed standard is inappropriate for a number of these sites. This community enjoys an open friendly lifestyle with the ability for those that wish a higher degree of privacy to create it. The proposed rules would impede and reduce the community interaction.	Delete RSZ-S7
Brian Francis Steere (S508)	S508.001	Settlement	RSZ-S7	Oppose	This standard is not appropriate to the Opito Bay community and imposes undue restrictions on the community. Opito Bay is a built up historic community that enjoys an amazing kiwi feel which is based around residents and holiday makers having open access to each others property. Many residents are older and having no fences or screenings adds to the safety and security of the community. By imposing 1.8m fences or screenings would destroy the community feel and the nature of Opito Bay. Residents always have the option of building a fence or can plant screenings that ensure privacy if desired. In fact, RSZ-S7 is likely to have some undesired consequences. Many properties are South facing and shading from overgrown boundary trees can be hazardous and dangerous as these shaded areas grow moss and mould on driveways. The current district plan has enough safeguards and RSZ-S7 is not appropriate in settlements like Opito Bay.	delete RSZ-S7
Brownie Family Trust (S74)	S74.006	Mixed use	Overview	Support in part	The phrases "The Mixed-Use zone provides a framework in which commercial and residential activities can coexist and it enables a range of compatible activities" and "...limited residential activities" are at odds with each other. If there is an appropriate	Amend the overview (inferred) to read as follows:..." <i>and beverage establishments as well as social and educational services, with</i>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					framework for commercial and residential activities to co-exist established, why is it necessary to limit residential activities? The limitation should be removed.	<i>limited residential activities."</i>
Far North Holdings Limited (S320)	S320.011	Mixed use	Overview	Not Stated	The submitter considers that amendments to the Overview of the Mixed Use zone are appropriate for all of the Far North Holdings Ltd (FNHL) landholdings, as it better reflects existing, consented and proposed land uses (s32 assessment provided with submission).	Amend the Overview section of the Mixed Use zone as follows: The District's urban business centres have traditionally been zoned commercial and contain retail activities, commercial services, food and beverage establishments as well as social and educational services, with limited residential activities. The Mixed Use zone provides a framework in which commercial and residential activities can co-exist and it enables a range of compatible activities. The focus of the zone is to revitalise urban centres and other identified areas such as the Opuā Marina, Marine Business Park, Commercial Estate, Colenzo Triangle and the Opuā Marine Development Area 'OMDA' , and support business owners, residents and visitors, while ensuring that associated effects are appropriately managed. The Mixed Use zone will contribute to the vibrancy, safety and prosperity of the District's urban centres, and other identified areas such as the Opuā Marina, Colenzo Triangle, Marine Business Park, Commercial Estate and the Opuā Marine Development Area 'OMDA' and

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>will be serviced by appropriate infrastructure.</p> <p>The Council has a responsibility under the RMA, the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and the RPS to ensure that there is sufficient land for housing and business to meet the future demands of the District, that development occurs in the right location and that it is appropriately serviced.</p>
McDonalds Restaurants NZ Limited (S385)	S385.019	Mixed use	Overview	Support in part	<p>The overview of the Mixed Use Zone provides for activities that are not defined (retail activities, and food and beverage). As per sub#1 and sub#2 McDonald's seeks clear definitions and nesting tables to provide clarity to plan users.</p> <p>McDonald's notes that the overview of the Zone suggests that it seeks to 'revitalise urban centres', however, the zone has been applied beyond urban centres which could create issues in terms of the integrity of this Chapter. As noted in sub#2 and section 2.0 McDonald's seeks that Council review their suite of zones to provide additional commercial zones.</p>	<p>Insert definitions for retail activities and food and beverage.</p>
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S561)	S561.117	Mixed use	Overview	Not Stated	<p>Introduce a framework of Objectives; Policies; Standards and rules; Matters of discretion; and Assessment Criteria to support the proposed Town Centre zone. In particular, a Town Centre zone is sought for Kerikeri to enable up to 6 storey buildings. Increased development height is sought for Kerikeri to support business and residential investment in the centre. While it is understood that FNDC are currently</p>	<p>Insert new provisions as set out in Appendix 5 to support the introduction of the proposed Town Centre zone.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					reviewing infrastructure within the District, it is noted that the Kerikeri - Waipapa Structure Plan 2007 (KKWSP) promotes a Mixed use zoned land and provision for a higher density Residential zone within the networked area. The findings of the current infrastructure review should be integrated into the zoning provisions for Kerikeri.	
Good Journey Limited (S82)	S82.004	Mixed use	Objectives	Oppose	The objectives are opposed in part. There are apparent errors in the plan drafting such that activities that were clearly intended to be permitted, will in fact trigger resource consent on the face of the wording.	Amend the Objectives in the Mixed Use zone
Russell Protection Society (INC) (S179)	S179.044	Mixed use	Objectives	Support		Retain objectives
Summerset Group Holdings Limited (S218)	S218.007	Mixed use	Objectives	Not Stated	expresses support for the submission of the Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand (submission 520) in its entirety.	Insert new objective supporting provision for a variety of densities, housing types and lot sizes that respond to housing needs and demand.
Transpower New Zealand Ltd (S454)	S454.116	Mixed use	Objectives	Not Stated	Objective MUZ-O1 sets out the activities that will occur in the Mixed Use zone. Transpower supports the intent of this objective to identify the activities that are likely to occur within the Mixed Use zone, 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. The new objective is required to make it explicit that infrastructure such as the National Grid is contemplated in Mixed Use zone.	Insert new objective MUZ-Ox as follows: The Mixed Use zone is used by compatible activities and infrastructure, that have a functional or operational need to locate in the zone.
Retirement Villages Association of New	S520.007	Mixed use	Objectives	Not Stated	Provision for retirement villages in the Mixed Use zone commensurate with the provisions sought by RVA in the General Residential zone	Insert new objective supporting provision for a variety of densities, housing types and lot sizes that respond to housing needs and

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Zealand Incorporated (S520)						demand.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S561)	S561.118	Mixed use	Objectives	Not Stated	Introduce a framework of Objectives; Policies; Standards and rules; Matters of discretion; and Assessment Criteria to support the proposed Town Centre zone. In particular, a Town Centre zone is sought for Kerikeri to enable up to 6 storey buildings. Increased development height is sought for Kerikeri to support business and residential investment in the centre. While it is understood that FNDC are currently reviewing infrastructure within the District, it is noted that the Kerikeri - Waipapa Structure Plan 2007 (KKWSP) promotes a Mixed use zoned land and provision for a higher density Residential zone within the networked area. The findings of the current infrastructure review should be integrated into the zoning provisions for Kerikeri.	Insert new provisions as set out in Appendix 5 to support the introduction of the proposed Town Centre zone.
Brownie Family Trust (S74)	S74.007	Mixed use	MUZ-O1	Support in part	The current drafting is a little unclear. Does "these activities" mean commercial, community etc. or residential?	Amend objective MUZ-O1 to read as follows: <i>The Mixed Use zone is the focal point for the District's commercial, community and civic activities, and provides for compatible residential development and compatible residential activities and is not incompatible with these activities.</i>
Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga (S331)	S331.079	Mixed use	MUZ-O1	Support in part	The submitter supports objective MUZ-O1 as the focal point for the District's commercial, community and civic activities and provides for residential development. However, the submitter requests that complimentary and compatible non-residential activities which have an operational need to be in the Mixed Use zone, such as educational facilities, are enabled.	Amend objective MUZ-O1 as follows: The Mixed Use zone is the focal point for the District's commercial, community and civic activities, and provides for complementary and compatible residential development and non-residential

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						activities which support the operation of the Mixed Use zone. where it complements and is not incompatible with these activities.
Z Energy Limited (S336)	S336.009	Mixed use	MUZ-O1	Support in part	Objective MUZ-01 is supported.	Retain Objective MUZ-01
Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited (S554)	S554.026	Mixed use	MUZ-O1	Support	KFO supports Objective MUZ-O1 as identifying that the Mixed Use Zone is the focal point for commercial, community and civic activities.	Retain the objective as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S561)	S561.079	Mixed use	MUZ-O1	Support in part	Kāinga Ora recommend the introduction of a Town Centre zone for Kerikeri township as the largest and fastest growing township in the Far North (and is consistent with National Planning Standards). The Mixed Use zone is generally supported as it provides for the existing commercial activities as well as residential activity. However, a Town Centre zone is considered more appropriate for Kerikeri as this will be in accordance with the government direction given through the NPS-UD enabling growth and investment in the key centre of the District. Kerikeri town is of sufficient urban size and predicted growth to be given a Town Centre zoning. While it is understood that the Council is currently reviewing infrastructure assets to better understand capacity, the requirement for adequate infrastructure to be in place to support development (as set out in policy MUZ-P01 below) ensures that any infrastructure constraints will be addressed when any new development is proposed.	Retain MUZ-O1 as notified with the introduction of a Town Centre zone for Kerikeri.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Brownie Family Trust (S74)	S74.008	Mixed use	MUZ-O2	Support	Development should fit the intended amenity for the zone.	Retain objective MUZ-O2 as notified.
Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust (S271)	S271.034	Mixed use	MUZ-O2	Support	Generally, support the objective as it requires consideration of urban design principals.	Retain as notified (inferred)
Z Energy Limited (S336)	S336.010	Mixed use	MUZ-O2	Support in part	Objective MUZ-02 is supported.	Retain Objective MUZ-02
Kapiro Conservation Trust (S446)	S446.035	Mixed use	MUZ-O2	Support	Generally, support the objective and policy as they require consideration of urban design principals.	Retain MUZ-O2 (inferred)
Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK) (S524)	S524.034	Mixed use	MUZ-O2	Support	Generally, support the objective as it requires consideration of urban design principals.	Retain as notified (inferred)
Carbon Neutral NZ Trust (S529)	S529.099	Mixed use	MUZ-O2	Support	Generally, support the objective as it requires consideration of urban design principals.	Retain as notified (inferred)
Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited (S554)	S554.027	Mixed use	MUZ-O2	Support	KFO supports Objective MUZ-O2 as appropriately providing for development that contributes positively to the vibrancy, safety and amenity of the zone.	Retain the objective as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S561)	S561.080	Mixed use	MUZ-O2	Support	This objective recognises the need for the commercial centres of the District to be developed while maintaining amenity.	Retain MUZ-O2 as notified
Brownie Family Trust (S74)	S74.009	Mixed use	MUZ-O3	Support in part	The objective should relate to subdivision in the Mixed Use zone	Amend objective MUZ-O3 as follows: <i>Enable land use and subdivision in the Light Industrial Mixed Use</i> zonewhere there is adequacy and capacity of available or programmed developmentinfrastructure to support it.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Lynley Newport (S137)	S137.001	Mixed use	MUZ-O3	Support in part	Objective MUZ-O3 includes typographical error.	Amend Objective MUZ-O3 as follows: Enable land use and subdivision in the Light Industrial Mixed Use Zone where there is adequacy and capacity available or programmed development infrastructure to support it.
Far North Holdings Limited (S320)	S320.012	Mixed use	MUZ-O3	Not Stated	The submitter considers objective MUZ-03 to contain an error and an unnecessary word (inferred).	Amend objective MUZ-03 to read as follows: Enable land use and subdivision in the Light Industrial Mixed Use zone where there is adequacy and capacity of available or programmed development infrastructure to support it.
Z Energy Limited (S336)	S336.011	Mixed use	MUZ-O3	Support in part	Objective MUZ-O3 refers to the Light Industrial zone. Z Energy questions whether this is an error and is instead meant to refer to the Mixed Use zone	Amend or clarify reference to Light Industrial zone in Objective MUZ-O3.
Far North District Council (S368)	S368.092	Mixed use	MUZ-O3	Support in part	Drafting error. Should be referencing the Mixed Use zone not the Light Industrial zone, needs to be changed	Amend MUZ-O3 Enable land use and subdivision in the Mixed use light industrial Mixed use zone where there is adequacy and capacity of available or programmed development infrastructure to support it.
John Andrew Riddell (S431)	S431.113	Mixed use	MUZ-O3	Not Stated	Not stated	Amend the reference to a Light Industrial zone in objective MUZ-O3 to the Mixed Use zone.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited (S554)	S554.028	Mixed use	MUZ-O3	Oppose	KFO supports the intent of Objective MUZ-O3, but seeks to clarify whether it should refer to the Mixed Use Zone, rather than the Light Industrial Zone. The Objective should also recognise that developer-led infrastructure solutions may be appropriate.	Amend Objective MUZ-O3 as follows: Enable land use and subdivision in the Light Industrial Mixed Use zone where there is adequacy and capacity of available or programmed development infrastructure, or a private infrastructure solution , to support it.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S561)	S561.081	Mixed use	MUZ-O3	Support	not stated	Retain MUZ-O3 as notified
Brownie Family Trust (S74)	S74.010	Mixed use	MUZ-O4	Support	Adverse effects created by the type of development should be managed.	Retain objective MUZ-O4 as notified.
Z Energy Limited (S336)	S336.012	Mixed use	MUZ-O4	Support in part	Objective MUZ-O4 is supported.	Retain Objective MUZ-O4
Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited (S554)	S554.029	Mixed use	MUZ-O4	Support	KFO supports Objective MUZ-O4 as recognising the need to manage adverse effects.	Retain the objective as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S561)	S561.082	Mixed use	MUZ-O4	Support	not stated	Retain MUZ-O4 as notified
Brownie Family Trust (S74)	S74.011	Mixed use	MUZ-O5	Oppose	The location of residential activities in relation to commercial activities won't achieve active frontages and will only limit development that might otherwise be compatible. Quality urban design and appropriate development standards are appropriate methods.	Delete the requirement in objective MUZ-O5 to locate residential activities above commercial activities from the objective.
Kairos Connection Trust and Habitat for	S138.017	Mixed use	MUZ-O5	Support in part	Understand that the Mixed Use zone has replaced the existing Commercial zone. Residential activities are provided for in the proposed zone, but only if these are located	Amend Objective MUZ-O5 as follows: <i>Residential activity is located</i> in the Mixed Use zone is

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Humanity Northern Region Ltd (S138)					<p>above ground level. Proposed Objective MUZ-O5 and Policy MUZ-P5 indicate that this is to ensure that active street frontages are maintained, and to avoid adverse effects on the function, role, sense of place and amenity of the Mixed Use zone, except where the boundary interface is with the Open Space zone.</p> <p>Support the continued ability to establish residential activities in the Mixed Use Zone. However, as not all building development on a Mixed Use site would necessarily affect street frontages and facades, particularly on a rear site, or if an apartment style building was located behind an existing building, seek that the ability to locate residential activities at ground level is enabled under specified circumstances.</p>	<p>located above commercial activities to ensure active street frontages, except where the interface is with the Open Space zone where adverse effects on street frontages are avoided.</p>
Z Energy Limited (S336)	S336.013	Mixed use	MUZ-O5	Support in part	Objective MUZ-05 is supported	Retain Objective MUZ-05
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (S356)	S356.116	Mixed use	MUZ-O5	Support	Supportive of mixed use zoning, but it would be good to understand the rationale for not using a town centre zone in Kerikeri, Kaitaia and Kaikohe - particularly as these settlements continue to grow and develop.	Retain MUZ-O5 as notified
Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited (S554)	S554.030	Mixed use	MUZ-O5	Support	KFO supports Objective MUZ-O5 and its recognition that residential activities may be appropriate above ground floor.	Retain the objective as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S561)	S561.083	Mixed use	MUZ-O5	Support in part	Residential use being prevented on the ground floor of buildings is opposed as this activity can be designed to complement the streetscape and it is a use that will be beneficial to centres. The zone has been applied to areas surrounding the main street of centres where residential activity would enhance the centre and buildings may be towards the rear of sites. The provision to restrict residential use should only be applied to the main street where a 'pedestrian	Retain MUZ-O5 with the following amendment: Residential activity in the Mixed Use zone where it is identified as a pedestrian frontage is located above commercial activities to ensure active street frontages, except where the interface is

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					frontage' overlay has been applied. The amendment sought will provide for and promote the redevelopment of these sites for residential use. If the policy and related rules are not amended then these Kāinga Ora sites' zoning is opposed and a residential zone is sought (as set out in submission section "Kāinga Ora Properties" below).	with the Open Space zone.
Good Journey Limited (S82)	S82.005	Mixed use	Policies	Oppose	The policies of the Mixed Use Zone are opposed in part. There are apparent errors in the plan drafting such that activities that were clearly intended to be permitted, will in fact trigger resource consent on the face of the wording.	Amend the Policies in the Mixed Use zone
Russell Protection Society (INC) (S179)	S179.045	Mixed use	Policies	Support		Retain policies
Summerset Group Holdings Limited (S218)	S218.008	Mixed use	Policies	Not Stated	expresses support for the submission of the Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand (submission 520) in its entirety.	Insert new policies commensurate with that sought by RVA for retirement villages in the General Residential zone
Far North Holdings Limited (S320)	S320.013	Mixed use	Policies	Not Stated	The submitter considers that a new policy MUZ-P9 is appropriate for all of the Far North Holdings Ltd (FNHL) landholdings, as it better reflects existing, consented and proposed land uses. (s32 assessment provided with submission).	Insert a new policy MUZ-P9 as follows: Promote the use of Development Areas to provide for areas where plans such s concept plans, structure plans, outline development plans, master plans or growth area plans, apply to determine future land use and development and when the associated development is complete the Development Area spatial layers are removed from through a trigger in the development area

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						provisions.
Foodstuffs North Island Limited (S363)	S363.021	Mixed use	Policies	Not Stated	The submitter considers that as a large number of Foodstuffs sites of interest have been zoned Mixed Use Zone, being the only commercial zone proposed. As drafted the Mixed Use Zone does not provide any form of policy direction with respect to appropriate business activities.	Amend to include policy in the Mixed Use Zone supporting and enabling supermarkets.
Transpower New Zealand Ltd (S454)	S454.117	Mixed use	Policies	Not Stated	MUZ-P1 sets out the activities that are to be enabled in the Mixed Use 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 infrastructure such as the National Grid is enabled in the Mixed Use zone.	Insert new policy MUZ-Px as follows: Enable compatible activities and infrastructure, that have a functional or operational need to locate in the Mixed Use zone.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (S520)	S520.008	Mixed use	Policies	Not Stated	Provision for retirement villages in the Mixed Use zone commensurate with the provisions sought by RVA in the General Residential zone	Insert new policies commensurate with that sought by RVA for retirement villages in the General Residential zone
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S561)	S561.119	Mixed use	Policies	Not Stated	Introduce a framework of Objectives; Policies; Standards and rules; Matters of discretion; and Assessment Criteria to support the proposed Town Centre zone. In particular, a Town Centre zone is sought for Kerikeri to enable up to 6 storey buildings. Increased development height is sought for Kerikeri to support business and residential investment in the centre. While it is understood that FNDC are currently reviewing infrastructure within the District, it is noted that the Kerikeri - Waipapa Structure	Insert new provisions as set out in Appendix 5 to support the introduction of the proposed Town Centre zone.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					Plan 2007 (KKWSP) promotes a Mixed use zoned land and provision for a higher density Residential zone within the networked area. The findings of the current infrastructure review should be integrated into the zoning provisions for Kerikeri.	
Brownie Family Trust (S74)	S74.012	Mixed use	MUZ-P1	Support in part	Is any change intended in the Mixed Use zone to achieve the outcomes sought by the Mixed Use zone provisions? If so, the intended amenity and development for the zone needs to be addressed.	Amend policy MUZ-P1 to include guidance to direct the nature of future development
Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga (S331)	S331.080	Mixed use	MUZ-P1	Support in part	The submitter supports in part policy MUZ-P1 as it enables a range of commercial, community, civic and residential activities in the Mixed Use zone. However, the submitter requests that non-residential activities which have a functional or operational need to be in the Mixed Use zone, such as educational facilities, are enabled.	Amend policy MUZ-P1 as follows: Enable a range of commercial, community, civic, and residential activities and non-residential activities in the Mixed Use zone where: a. it supports the function, operation , role, sense of place and amenity of the existing environment; and b. there is: i. existing infrastructure to support development and intensification, or ii. infrastructure capacity can be provided to service future development and intensification.
Z Energy Limited (S336)	S336.014	Mixed use	MUZ-P1	Support in part	Z Energy supports Policy MUZ-P1 and the recognition of the range of activities that can occur appropriately in the Mixed Use zone, including consideration of the existing environment. However, Z considers the focus should more appropriately be on	Amend Policy MUZ-P1 as follows: Enable a range of commercial, community, civic, and residential activities in the Mixed Use zone where: a. it they supports the function,

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					achieving the intent of the zone while recognising the existing environment.	role, sense of place and amenity of the zone, while recognising the existing environment; and b....
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (S356)	S356.117	Mixed use	MUZ-P1	Support	Supportive of mixed use zoning, but it would be good to understand the rationale for not using a town centre zone in Kerikeri, Kaitaia and Kaikohe - particularly as these settlements continue to grow and develop.	Retain MUZ-P1 as notified
Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited (S554)	S554.031	Mixed use	MUZ-P1	Support in part	KFO supports Policy MUZ-P1 as appropriately enabling a range of activities, however, the Policy should recognise that developer-led infrastructure may be appropriate, particularly as an interim solution before Council infrastructure is delivered.	Amend Policy MUZ-P1 as follows: Enable a range of commercial, community, civic and residential activities in the Mixed Use zone where: a) it supports the function, role, sense of place and amenity of the existing environment; and b) there is: i. existing infrastructure to support development and intensification, or ii. additional infrastructure capacity can be provided to service the development and intensification; oriii. a private infrastructure solution.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S561)	S561.084	Mixed use	MUZ-P1	Support	MUZ-P1 provides for a range of activities within the centres while ensuring any new development is supported by the necessary infrastructure.	Retain MUZ-P1 as notified
Brownie Family Trust (S74)	S74.013	Mixed use	MUZ-P2	Support	No comment provided.	Retain policy MUZ-P2 as notified.
Z Energy Limited (S336)	S336.015	Mixed use	MUZ-P2	Support	Policy MUZ-P2 is supported as Z Energy considers that any subdivision and associated development within the zone should have services and infrastructure available.	Retain Policy MUZ-P2

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Ed and Inge Amsler (S341)	S341.002	Mixed use	MUZ-P2	Oppose	The rationale for limiting office space in a commercial / mixed use zone is not clearly known. The type of activity should be supported, especially where other provisions seek to require bottom floor commercial uses, prior to residential activities being permitted. By using a GFA approach, the proposal also limits the intention of 'building up' as indicated by the MUZ height rules. The rule is not consistent with MUZ-R1-PER-2 which allows for 400m2 GFA coverage and seems to work against an office space activity specifically.	Delete the requirements which limit office coverage to 200m2 GFA in MUZ-R2 Commercial Activity - PER-2.
Far North District Council (S368)	S368.023	Mixed use	MUZ-P2	Support in part	Minor grammatical error in reference to c	Amend MUZ-P2 Require all subdivision in the Mixed Use zone to provide the following reticulated services to the boundary of each lot: a. telecommunications: i. fibre where it is available; ii. copper where fibre is not available; iii. copper where the area is identified for future fibre deployment. b. local electricity distribution network; and c. wastewater, potable water supply and stormwater where they are it is available.
Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited (S554)	S554.032	Mixed use	MUZ-P2	Support in part	KFO supports the intent of the policy, but considers that Policy MUZ-P2 should also recognise alternative means of 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 Mixed Use Zone or Developer Agreements can be entered into to facilitate	Amend Policy MUZ-P2 as follows: Require all subdivision in the Mixed Use zone to provide the following reticulated services to the boundary of each lot: a. telecommunications: i. fibre where it is available; ii. copper where fibre is not

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					extensions or upgrades to infrastructure. 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.	available; iii. copper where the area is identified for future fibre deployment. b. local electricity distribution network; and c. wastewater, potable water supply and stormwater where it is available.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S561)	S561.085	Mixed use	MUZ-P2	Support	These are standard requirements for subdivision and are considered appropriate matters.	Retain MUZ-P2 as notified
Brownie Family Trust (S74)	S74.014	Mixed use	MUZ-P3	Support	No comment provided.	Retain policy MUZ-P3 as notified
Lynley Newport (S137)	S137.002	Mixed use	MUZ-P3	Support in part	Support introduction of the Mixed Use zone and its application, however, believe too much attention is paid to how something looks (visual amenity). People will choose to reside in this zone because of convenience not because of visual outlook.	Delete part (a) of Policy MUZ-P3.
Te Hiku Community Board (S257)	S257.001	Mixed use	MUZ-P3	Support	We support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkept to maintain Amenity values in town centres.	Retain policy MUZ-P3 a) and b), requiring development in the Mixed Use zone to contribute positively to high quality streetscapes and pedestrian amenity.
Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust (S271)	S271.035	Mixed use	MUZ-P3	Support	Generally, support the policy as it requires consideration of urban design principals.	Retain as notified (inferred)
Z Energy Limited (S336)	S336.016	Mixed use	MUZ-P3	Support	Z Energy supports Policy MUZ-P3 and its focus on development contributing positively to amenity and safety without prescribing precisely how this is to be achieved. This is important as it recognises the functional	Retain Policy MUZ-P3

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					requirements of a range of activities, including existing service stations.	
Sean Frieling (S357)	S357.001	Mixed use	MUZ-P3	Support	Support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkept to maintain Amenity values in town centres.	Retain policy MUZ-P3 a) and b), requiring development in the Mixed Use zone to contribute positively to high quality streetscapes and pedestrian amenity.
Leah Frieling (S358)	S358.001	Mixed use	MUZ-P3	Support	We support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkept to maintain amenity values in town centres	Retain policy MUZ-P3 a) and b), requiring development in the Mixed Use zone to contribute positively to high quality streetscapes and pedestrian amenity
Kapiro Conservation Trust (S446)	S446.036	Mixed use	MUZ-P3	Support	Generally, support the objective and policy as they require consideration of urban design principals.	Retain MUZ-P3 (inferred)
Michael Foy (S472)	S472.001	Mixed use	MUZ-P3	Support	We support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkept to maintain Amenity values in town centres.	Retain policy MUZ-P3 a) and b), requiring development in the Mixed Use zone to contribute positively to high quality streetscapes and pedestrian amenity.
Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK) (S524)	S524.035	Mixed use	MUZ-P3	Support	Generally, support the policy as it requires consideration of urban design principals.	Retain as notified (inferred)
Carbon Neutral NZ Trust (S529)	S529.100	Mixed use	MUZ-P3	Support	Generally, support the policy as it requires consideration of urban design principals.	Retain as notified (inferred)
Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited (S554)	S554.033	Mixed use	MUZ-P3	Support	KFO supports Policy MUZ-P3 and the contribution it will make to creating well function urban environments.	Retain the policy as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S561)	S561.086	Mixed use	MUZ-P3	Support	These matters provide for quality development with integration with the surrounding transport network.	Retain MUZ-P3 as notified

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Brownie Family Trust (S74)	S74.015	Mixed use	MUZ-P4	Support	No comment provided	Retain policy MUZ-P4 as notified.
Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited (S554)	S554.034	Mixed use	MUZ-P4	Support	KFO supports Policy MUZ-P4 as appropriately managing the interface between Mixed Use zoning and adjacent residential or open space zones.	Retain the policy as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S561)	S561.087	Mixed use	MUZ-P4	Support	These matters enable adjoining residential and open space zones to be considered as part of any mixed use development.	Retain MUZ-P4 as notified
Brownie Family Trust (S74)	S74.016	Mixed use	MUZ-P5	Support in part	Compatible residential activities and visitor accommodation are an integral part of the Mixed Use zone. The activities should be managed with appropriate standards not restricted. As currently worded P5 contradicts P1 which enables residential activity.	Delete clause 'a ' from policy MUZ-P5, as follows - <i>Restrict activities that are likely to have an adverse effect on the function, role, sense of place and amenity of the Mixed Use zone, including:</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>residential activity, retirement facilities and visitor accommodation on the ground floor of buildings, except where a site adjoins an Open Space zone;</i> 2. <i>light or heavy industrial activity;</i> 3. <i>storage and warehousing;</i> 4. <i>large format retail activity over 400 m²; and</i> 5. <i>waste management activity.</i>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Kairos Connection Trust and Habitat for Humanity Northern Region Ltd (S138)	S138.018	Mixed use	MUZ-P5	Support in part	<p>Understand that the Mixed Use zone has replaced the existing Commercial zone. Residential activities are provided for in the proposed zone, but only if these are located above ground level. Proposed Objective MUZ-O5 and Policy MUZ-P5 indicate that this is to ensure that active street frontages are maintained, and to avoid adverse effects on the function, role, sense of place and amenity of the Mixed Use zone, except where the boundary interface is with the Open Space zone.</p> <p>Support the continued ability to establish residential activities in the Mixed Use Zone. However, as not all building development on a Mixed Use site would necessarily affect street frontages and facades, particularly on a rear site, or if an apartment style building was located behind an existing building, seek that the ability to locate residential activities at ground level is enabled under specified circumstances.</p>	<p>Amend Policy MUZ-P5 as follows:<i>Restrict activities that are likely to have an adverse effect on the function, role, sense of place and amenity of the Mixed Use zone, including:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>residential activity, retirement facilities and visitor accommodation on the ground floor of buildings, except where a site adjoins an Open Space zone adjacent to street frontages;</i> 2. <i>light or heavy industrial activity;</i> 3. <i>storage and warehousing;</i> 4. <i>large format retail activity over 400 m²; and</i> 5. <i>waste management activity.</i>
Josh Henwood (S256)	S256.001	Mixed use	MUZ-P5	Oppose	<p>If the dwelling is only residential, there is no reason to have residential activity on the ground floor.</p> <p>Also where the building is limited to only 5 metres high, so only one storey, the residential activity would have to be on the ground floor. Or is it the FNDC intention to have ALL of the Environmental area as</p>	<p>Amend policy to allow for residential activity on ground floor of new buildings, where there is only residential activity on the site.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					commercial activity only (if residential activity only allowed on first floor).	
Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust (S271)	S271.036	Mixed use	MUZ-P5	Support in part	Need to ensure good urban design outcomes are a requirement to consider.	<p>Amend MUZ-P5 (MUZ-P8 inferred)</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, density, design, amenity and character of the surrounding mixed use environment, and with the urban design guidelines; b. the location, scale and design of buildings or structures, outdoor storage areas, parking and internal roading; c. at zone interfaces: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. any setbacks, fencing, screening or landscaping required to address potential conflicts; ii. any adverse effects on the character and amenity of adjacent zones; d. 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. management of three waters infrastructure and trade waste; e. managing natural hazards;

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						f. the adequacy of roading infrastructure to service the proposed activity;g. alignment with any strategic or spatial document ;h. provisions made to ensure connectivity ; i. any adverse effects on historic heritage and cultural values, natural features and landscapes or indigenous biodiversity, and j. any historical, spiritual, or cultural association held by tangata whenua, with regard to the matters set out in Policy TW-P6.
Leisa Henwood (S285)	S285.002	Mixed use	MUZ-P5	Oppose	The policy does not make sense in areas restricted to 5m height (single storey) where residential then must be on the ground floor.	Amend MUZ-P5 to enable residential activities on the ground floor of new buildings.
Terry Henwood (S289)	S289.002	Mixed use	MUZ-P5	Oppose	The policy does not make sense in areas restricted to 5m height (single storey) where residential then must be on the ground floor.	Amend MUZ-P5 to enable residential activities on the ground floor of new buildings.
Bruce and Kim Rogers (S293)	S293.001	Mixed use	MUZ-P5	Oppose	The policy does not make provision for existing residential only sites. Residential activity on the ground floor of new buildings should continue to be permitted where residential activity only is present on site.	Amend policy MUZ-P5 to enable residential activity on the ground where of new buildings where there is only residential activity on site.
Bruce and Kim Rogers (S294)	S294.001	Mixed use	MUZ-P5	Oppose	The policy does not make provision for existing residential only sites. Residential activity on the ground floor of new buildings should continue to be permitted where residential activity only is present on site.	Amend policy MUZ-P5 to enable residential activity on the ground where of new buildings where there is only residential activity on site.
Kapiro Conservation Trust (S446)	S446.037	Mixed use	MUZ-P5	Support in part	Seek the following additions to ensure good urban design outcomes that a requirement to consider alignment with urban design guidelines (see earlier point seeking that	Amend MUZ-P5 (MUZ-P8 inferred) Manage land use and subdivision to address the effects of the activity requiring resource consent, including (but not limited to) consideration of

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					Council develops some) be included as a matter in this policy.	<p>the following matters where relevant to the application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. consistency with the scale, density, design, amenity and character of the surrounding mixed use environment, and with the urban design guidelines; b. the location, scale and design of buildings or structures, outdoor storage areas, parking and internal roading; c. at zone interfaces: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. any setbacks, fencing, screening or landscaping required to address potential conflicts; ii. any adverse effects on the character and amenity of adjacent zones; d. 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. management of three waters infrastructure and trade waste; e. managing natural hazards; f. the adequacy of roading infrastructure to service the proposed activity; g. alignment with any strategic or spatial document; h. provisions made to

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>ensure connectivity;</p> <p>i. any adverse effects on historic heritage and cultural values, natural features and landscapes or indigenous biodiversity, and</p> <p>j. any historical, spiritual, or cultural association held by tangata whenua, with regard to the matters set out in Policy TW-P6.</p>
<p>Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK) (S524)</p>	<p>S524.036</p>	<p>Mixed use</p>	<p>MUZ-P5</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>Need to ensure good urban design outcomes are a requirement to consider.</p>	<p>Amend MUZ-P5 (MUZ-P8 inferred)</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> <p>a. consistency with the scale, density, design, amenity and character of the surrounding mixed use environment, and with the urban design guidelines;</p> <p>b. the location, scale and design of buildings or structures, outdoor storage areas, parking and internal roading;</p> <p>c. at zone interfaces:</p> <p>i. any setbacks, fencing, screening or landscaping required to address potential conflicts;</p> <p>ii. any adverse effects on the character and amenity of adjacent zones;</p> <p>d. the adequacy and capacity of</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>available or programmed development infrastructure to accommodate the proposed activity; including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. opportunities for low impact design principles; ii. management of three waters infrastructure and trade waste; e. managing natural hazards; f. the adequacy of roading infrastructure to service the proposed activity; g. alignment with any strategic or spatial document; h. provisions made to ensure connectivity; i. any adverse effects on historic heritage and cultural values, natural features and landscapes or indigenous biodiversity, and j. any historical, spiritual, or cultural association held by tangata whenua, with regard to the matters set out in Policy TW-P6.
<p>Carbon Neutral NZ Trust (S529)</p>	<p>S529.101</p>	<p>Mixed use</p>	<p>MUZ-P5</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>Need to ensure good urban design outcomes are a requirement to consider</p>	<p>Amend MUZ-P5 (MUZ-P8 inferred) 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, density, design, amenity and character of the surrounding mixed use

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>environment, and with the urban design guidelines;</p> <p>b. the location, scale and design of buildings or structures, outdoor storage areas, parking and internal roading;</p> <p>c. at zone interfaces:</p> <p>i. any setbacks, fencing, screening or landscaping required to address potential conflicts;</p> <p>ii. any adverse effects on the character and amenity of adjacent zones;</p> <p>d. the adequacy and capacity of available or programmed development infrastructure to accommodate the proposed activity; including:</p> <p>i. opportunities for low impact design principles;</p> <p>ii. management of three waters infrastructure and trade waste;</p> <p>e. managing natural hazards;</p> <p>f. the adequacy of roading infrastructure to service the proposed activity;</p> <p>g. alignment with any strategic or spatial document;</p> <p>h. provisions made to ensure connectivity;</p> <p>i. any adverse effects on historic heritage and cultural values, natural features and landscapes or indigenous biodiversity, and</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						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)	S554.035	Mixed use	MUZ-P5	Oppose	The PDP provides for residential development within the Mixed Use Zone. The policy should clarify that such activities are not restricted within the Mixed Use zone provided they are above ground floor level. Some light industrial activities are complementary to the Mixed Use zone such as a warehouse facility. These types of activities where the effects can be mitigated should not be restricted by the Mixed Use Zone. If Policy MUZ-P5 restricts large format retail over 400m ² in size, this places undue restrictions on uses such as supermarkets which are suited to be located within the Mixed Use Zone. KFO seeks that the 400m ² restriction be reconsidered.	Amend Policy MUZ-P5 as follows: Restrict activities that are likely to have an adverse effect on the function, role, sense of place and amenity of the Mixed Use zone, including: a. residential activity, retirement facilities and visitor accommodation activities located on the ground floor of buildings, except where a site adjoins an Open Space zone; b. light or heavy industrial activity (excluding warehousing) ; c. storage and warehousing ; d. large format retail activity over 400 m² ; and e. waste management activity.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S561)	S561.088	Mixed use	MUZ-P5	Support in part	As noted above for Objective MUZ-O5, the restriction of residential activity on the ground floor of all areas in the Mixed Use zone is opposed. This policy restriction for residential use should be limited to the main street frontage as residential use elsewhere within the centre is a compatible activity and one that can be designed so as not to detract from the surrounding centre streetscape. The provision to restrict residential use should only be applied to the main street where a 'pedestrian frontage' overlay has been applied. The restriction on other activities	Retain MUZ-P5 with the following amendment: Restrict activities that are likely to have an adverse effect on the function, role, sense of place and amenity of the Mixed Use zone, including: a. residential activity, retirement facilities and visitor accommodation on the ground floor of buildings within the pedestrian frontage overlay , except where a site adjoins an Open Space zone;

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					listed is supported as these are less compatible with a centre zone.	b. light or heavy industrial activity; c. storage and warehousing; d. large format retail activity over 400 m ² ; and e. waste management activity.
Brownie Family Trust (S74)	S74.017	Mixed use	MUZ-P6	Support	No comment provided.	Retain policy MUZ-P6 as notified.
Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited (S554)	S554.036	Mixed use	MUZ-P6	Support	KFO supports Policy MUZ-P6 as appropriately encouraging efficient design.	Retain the policy as notified.
Brownie Family Trust (S74)	S74.018	Mixed use	MUZ-P7	Support	No comment provided.	Retain policy MUZ-P7 as notified.
Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga (S331)	S331.081	Mixed use	MUZ-P7	Support in part	The submitter supports in part policy MUZ-P7, in particular the consideration of the listed effects when assessing applications for educational facilities. However, the inclusion early childhood is unnecessary as the definition of 'educational facilities' includes early childhood centres.	Amend policy MUZ-P7, as follows: Consider the following effects when assessing applications to establish residential, early childhood , retirement and education facilities: a. the level of ambient noise; b. reduced privacy; c. shadowing and visual domination; and d. light spill.
Z Energy Limited (S336)	S336.017	Mixed use	MUZ-P7	Support in part	Z Energy considers that the amenity of more sensitive activities, such as residential activities, will be better protected where they	Amend Policy MUZ-P7 as follows: Consider the following effects when assessing applications to establish

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					have been appropriately designed to manage reverse sensitivity effects where there is an interface with lawfully established non-residential activities. The relief sought is consistent with design principle 1: The Site of the National medium density design guide (Ministry for the Environment, May 2022) which seeks that current or proposed nearby non-residential activities are identified and that residential development responds to them.	residential, early childhood, retirement and education facilities: a.the level of ambient noise; b.reduced privacy; c.shadowing and visual domination; and d.light spill-; and reverse sensitivity.
Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited (S554)	S554.037	Mixed use	MUZ-P7	Support	KFO supports Policy MUZ-P7 as recognising the need to manage the interface with sensitive activities establishing in the Mixed Use zone.	Retain the policy as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S561)	S561.089	Mixed use	MUZ-P7	Support	Policy MUZ-P7 is supported. These provisions will ensure the amenity of these more sensitive activities are considered when located within centres.	Retain MUZ-P7 as notified
Brownie Family Trust (S74)	S74.019	Mixed use	MUZ-P8	Support	No comment provided.	Retain policy MUZ-P8 as notified.
Z Energy Limited (S336)	S336.018	Mixed use	MUZ-P8	Support in part	Z Energy supports Policy MUZ-P8 in that it considers the interface between commercial and residential activities when assessing proposals for land use and subdivision in the Mixed Use zone. However, as currently drafted, this only relates to activities at zone interfaces, whereas such issues relate to conflicts between activities rather than zones per se, and therefore relief is recommended to ensure that the interface of activities is considered in such assessments. This would manage potential reverse sensitivity effects on existing service stations where they are adjacent to residential and commercial activities, notwithstanding the zone.	Amend policy MUZ-P8 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: ... c. at zone interfaces and the interface between commercial and noise-sensitive activities: i. any setbacks, fencing, screening or landscaping required to address potential conflicts; ii. any adverse effects on the character and amenity of

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						adjacent zones or the adjacent activity ; ...
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (S356)	S356.118	Mixed use	MUZ-P8	Support	Supportive of mixed use zoning, but it would be good to understand the rationale for not using a town centre zone in Kerikeri, Kaitaia and Kaikohe - particularly as these settlements continue to grow and develop.	Retain MUZ-P8 as notified
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S416)	S416.050	Mixed use	MUZ-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
Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited (S554)	S554.038	Mixed use	MUZ-P8	Support	KFO supports Policy MUZ-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)	S561.090	Mixed use	MUZ-P8	Support in part	As much of this zoned land is currently not developed to the scale, density, amenity and character anticipated in the Mixed Use zone, the policy wording needs to be amended to ensure that new developments are considered in the context of this anticipated Mixed Use environment rather than the existing environment. Kāinga Ora seek an amendment to the policy wording to reflect this.	Amend MUZ-P8 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, amenity and character of the planned mixed use environment ;...
Good Journey Limited (S82)	S82.006	Mixed use	Rules	Oppose	The rules of the Mixed Use Zone are opposed in part. There are apparent errors in the plan drafting such that activities that were clearly intended to be permitted, will in fact	Amend the rules in the Mixed Use zone

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>trigger resource consent on the face of the wording, and there is an undue emphasis on restricting retail that exceeds 400m2 in GFA by requiring fully discretionary resource consent.</p> <p>MUZ-R2 states that commercial activities are permitted where;</p> <p>The activity is a service station</p> <p>Any office does not exceed GFA of 200m2</p> <p>And that the activity status where compliance is not achieved is Discretionary.</p> <p>The mixture of double negatives in the wording of the rules is unfortunate and seems to have the effect of making retail a fully discretionary activity and service stations a permitted activity in the MUZ, which is the opposite of what is intended.</p> <p>This could be addressed by amending the wording of PER-1 to 'the activity is not a service station'</p> <p>Retail exceeding 400m2 in GFA should not be discouraged via a fully discretionary activity status in a district where retail is in general decline. The provisions should be reworded to incentivise retail of this nature but provide standards so that good urban design outcomes are the result.</p>	
<p>Kairos Connection Trust and Habitat for Humanity Northern Region Ltd (S138)</p>	<p>S138.020</p>	<p>Mixed use</p>	<p>Rules</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>Regarding the amenity of residential living in the Mixed Use zones, seek that the Council consider a minimum size for residential units because as presently proposed, there is no ability to ensure that units are suitably sized for habitation. The retention of noise insulation controls on residential units is supported.</p>	<p>Insert a new rule as follows (adopted from Auckland Unitary Plan City centre zone):The minimum net internal floor area of a residential unit shall be:- 35m² for studio unitsThe minimum net internal floor area for studio units may be reduced by 5m² where a balcony, ground floor terrace or roof terrace of 5m² or greater is provided.- 45m² for one or more bedroom unitThe</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						minimum net internal floor area for one or more bedroom units may be reduced by 8m² where a balcony, ground floor terrace or roof terrace of 8m² or greater is provided.
Kairos Connection Trust and Habitat for Humanity Northern Region Ltd (S138)	S138.024	Mixed use	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 submission, seek that the Council consider including a separate Inclusionary Housing chapter, or integrate throughout proposed subdivision and residential and mixed use zone chapters, provision for inclusionary housing that would require a 5% share of the estimated value of the sale of subdivided lots (or as appropriate to the Far North context) to a nominated CHP to ensure the establishment of affordable housing within its high growth urban environments. The appropriate % share of lots would need to be determined for the Far North District, as it would essentially be a financial contribution condition for which a district plan policy is required under Section 108 (10).	Insert a separate Inclusionary housing chapter, or integrate throughout proposed subdivision and residential and mixed use zone chapters, provision for inclusionary housing that would require a 5% share of the estimated value of the sale of subdivided lots (or as appropriate to the Far North context) to a nominated community housing provider to ensure the establishment of affordable housing within its high growth urban environments.
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections (S158)	S158.015	Mixed use	Rules	Oppose	The zone framework does not enable community corrections activities and provides discretionary activity status for these activities in accordance with the default "activities not otherwise listed in this chapter" rule MUZ-R17). Community corrections activities are essential social infrastructure and play a valuable role in reducing reoffending. They enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural well-being and for their health and safety. It is important that provision is made to enable non-custodial community	Insert a permitted activity rule in the Mixed Use zone for a "community corrections activity" as follows: MUZ-RX Community corrections activityActivity status: Permitted Activity status where compliance not achieved: Not applicable

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>corrections sites to establish, operate and redevelop, within appropriate areas. Industrial and commercial areas provide suitable sites for community corrections activities; in particular community work components often require large sites for yard-based activities and large equipment and/or vehicle storage.</p> <p>Community corrections activities are a compatible and appropriate activity in a Mixed Use zone. They are consistent with the character and amenity of such zones. Furthermore, as community corrections facilities are not sensitive to the effects of commercial environments (e.g. noise, high traffic movements, etc), they are not prone to reverse sensitivity.</p> <p>Requests that the respective rule framework for the Mixed Use zone be amended to provide for "community corrections activities" as a permitted activity.</p>	
Russell Protection Society (INC) (S179)	S179.046	Mixed use	Rules	Support		Retain the rules
Summerset Group Holdings Limited (S218)	S218.009	Mixed use	Rules	Not Stated	expresses support for the submission of the Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand (submission 520) in its entirety.	Insert new rules commensurate with that sought by RVA for retirement villages in the General Residential zone
Summerset Group Holdings Limited (S218)	S218.010	Mixed use	Rules	Not Stated	expresses support for the submission of the Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand (submission 520) in its entirety.	Insert a notification presumption commensurate with that sought by RVA for retirement villages in the General Residential zone
Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust (S338)	S338.020	Mixed use	Rules	Not Stated	The PDP should control the types, qualities and quantity of buildings occurring in towns such as Kerikeri. We need sensible design aesthetic in the new Mixed Use zone to preserve the character of the town. The PDP or other appropriate mechanism needs to set standards relating to older houses	Amend rules to preserve local character through the control of building types, qualities, quantity and design,

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					(sometimes in relatively poor condition) moved from elsewhere, low-cost housing and rental housing, so that quality standards are maintained for affordable housing.	
Paihia Properties Holdings Corporate Trustee Limited and UP Management Ltd (S344)	S344.031	Mixed use	Rules	Not Stated	The MUZ appears to have an unusual mix of activities permitted, with an onerous default to discretionary activity status. Due to the complicated nature of the commercial activities rules and the lack of definitions we are unable to confirm what activities would be permitted onsite. Both the MUZ and CE state that any activity not specifically provided for requires consent for a discretionary activity.	Amend the MUZ and overlay provisions to clarify the relationship between the zone and overlay rules; and reconsider the most appropriate zone of the site, including reviewing the limited commercial zone options. Insert additional (permitted activity) rules should the site remain MUZ. Amend the MUZ rules to provide clear permitted activities and consenting pathways with particular reference to definitions.
Kapiro Residents Association (S427)	S427.036	Mixed use	Rules	Support in part	The PDP should control the types, qualities and quantity of buildings occurring in towns such as Kerikeri. The PDP or other appropriate mechanism needs to set standards relating to older houses (sometimes in relatively poor condition) moved from elsewhere, low cost housing and rental housing, so that quality standards are maintained for affordable housing	Amend Mixed Use zone to preserve local character through the control of building types, qualities, quantity and design
New Zealand Motor Caravan Association (S438)	S438.012	Mixed use	Rules	Support in part	The NZMCA operates a number of campgrounds and park over properties that are present in a variety of zones. Allowing for more permissive rules around the establishment of campgrounds will make it easier to establish sites for self-contained vehicle-based camping in the Far North District. This will also create positive social and economic benefits for the community. The effects of camping grounds in the Mixed Use Zone are similar to other activities anticipated in the zone.	Amend the Mixed Use Zone rules to include a conditional activity status for Camping grounds (inferred).
New Zealand Motor Caravan	S438.013	Mixed use	Rules	Support in part	The NZMCA operates a number of campgrounds and park over properties that are present in a variety of zones. Allowing for	Amend Mixed Use Zone rules to provide for camping sites of 20 guests or under subject to noise standards

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Association (S438)					more permissive rules around the establishment of campgrounds will make it easier to establish sites for self-contained vehicle-based camping in the Far North District. This will also create positive social and economic benefits for the community. The proposed insertion is consistent with the treatment of other small scale visitor accommodation in the Mixed Use zone.	as a permitted activity.
Kapiro Conservation Trust (S449)	S449.027	Mixed use	Rules	Oppose	The PDP should control the types, qualities and quantity of buildings occurring in towns such as Kerikeri. We need sensible design aesthetic in the new Mixed Use zone to preserve the character of the town. The PDP or other appropriate mechanism needs to set standards relating to older houses (sometimes in relatively poor condition) moved from elsewhere, low-cost housing and rental housing, so that quality standards are maintained for affordable housing.	Amend rules to preserve local character through the control of building types, qualities, quantity and design,
Woolworths New Zealand Limited (S458)	S458.002	Mixed use	Rules	Support in part	This rule and policy framework suggest that large format retail, which a supermarket is currently classed as, needs to be restricted in this zone as it is likely to have adverse effects on the zone. Unlike the other activities listed above, there is no other zone which provides for large format retail activities. It is considered that a more enabling policy framework is required, which supports those limited activities and services, such as a supermarket, which are necessary to support businesses, residents and visitors, while ensuring that associated effects are appropriately managed.	Amend the rule and policy framework of the Mixed Urban Zone (MUZ) to specifically provide for supermarket activities as a Permitted Activity.
Karen and Graeme Laurie (S471)	S471.002	Mixed use	Rules	Oppose	The Mixed Use Zone (MUZ) is not the most appropriate zone for Kerikeri town centre for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MUZ does not give effect to Objective 1 and Policy 1 of the NPS-UD - Section 32 Evaluation - Urban Environments is incomplete and flawed (refer to submission for specific reasoning) 	Amend PDP by reviewing the suite of commercial zones proposed and rezone Kerikeri town centre to Town Centre Zone (or similar commercial zone) that appropriately reflects commercial development and activities within Kerikeri township, alternatively if relief not accepted by

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>- PDP does not provide strategic direction or policy support for the suite of urban zones proposed</p> <p>- MUZ provisions do not sufficiently enable a range of commercial activities.</p>	FNDC, amend the Mixed Use Zone provisions to provide for an increased range of commercial and community activities.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand (S512)	S512.054	Mixed use	Rules	Not Stated	<p>Fire and Emergency support an activity for emergency service facilities being listed as an activity in zones. Please see Table 1 of the submission for the location of existing fire stations. Note that these are found in a range of zones. New fire stations may be necessary in order to continue to achieve emergency response time commitments in situations where development occurs, and populations change. In this regard it is noted that Fire and Emergency is not a requiring authority under section 166 of the RMA, and therefore does not have the ability to designate land for the purposes of fire stations. Provisions within the rules of the district plan are therefore, the best way to facilitate the development of any new fire stations within the district as urban development progresses. Fire and Emergency request that emergency service facilities are included as a permitted activity in all zones. The draft Plan currently only includes emergency services facilities as an activity in some zones and with varying activity status. In addition, fire stations have specific requirements with relation to setback distances and vehicle crossings. Fire and Emergency request that emergency service facilities are exempt from these standards</p>	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
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (S520)	S520.009	Mixed use	Rules	Not Stated	<p>Provision for retirement villages in the Mixed Use zone commensurate with the provisions sought by RVA in the general Residential zone</p>	Insert new rules commensurate with that sought by RVA for retirement villages in the General Residential zone

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (S520)	S520.010	Mixed use	Rules	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 Mixed Use should not be publicly notified. Limited notification should only be used where a retirement village application proposes a breach of standards and the relevant effects threshold in the RMA is met	Insert a notification presumption commensurate with that sought by RVA for retirement villages in the General Residential zone
Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK) (S522)	S522.040	Mixed use	Rules	Oppose	We need sensible design aesthetic in the new mixed use zone to preserve the character of the town. The PDP or other appropriate mechanism needs to set standards relating to older houses (sometimes in relatively poor condition) moved from elsewhere, low cost housing and rental housing, so that quality standards are maintained for affordable housing.	Amend PDP to control the types, qualities and quantity of buildings occurring in towns such as Kerikeri [inferred].
Carbon Neutral NZ Trust (S529)	S529.026	Mixed use	Rules	Oppose	The PDP should control the types, qualities and quantity of buildings occurring in towns such as Kerikeri. We need sensible design aesthetic in the new Mixed Use zone to preserve the character of the town. The PDP or other appropriate mechanism needs to set standards relating to older houses (sometimes in relatively poor condition) moved from elsewhere, low-cost housing and rental housing, so that quality standards are maintained for affordable housing	Amend rules to preserve local character through the control of building types, qualities, quantity and design,
Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rēhia (S559)	S559.031	Mixed use	Rules	Support in part	We support the purpose of the mixed-use zone in the urban centre, providing residential opportunities and the ability for people to live and work within the heart of urban centres.	Insert new permitted activity rule in the Mixed Use zone which provides for ground level residential dwellings in locations that do not impact on street frontage (inferred).
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S561)	S561.120	Mixed use	Rules	Not Stated	Introduce a framework of Objectives; Policies; Standards and rules; Matters of discretion; and Assessment Criteria to support the proposed Town Centre zone. In particular, a Town Centre zone is sought for Kerikeri to enable up to 6 storey buildings.	Insert new provisions as set out in Appendix 5 to support the introduction of theproposed Town Centre zone.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					Increased development height is sought for Kerikeri to support business and residential investment in the centre. While it is understood that FNDC are currently reviewing infrastructure within the District, it is noted that the Kerikeri - Waipapa Structure Plan 2007 (KKWSP) promotes a Mixed use zoned land and provision for a higher density Residential zone within the networked area. The findings of the current infrastructure review should be integrated into the zoning provisions for Kerikeri.	
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S561)	S561.125	Mixed use	Rules	Oppose	This rule wording needs to be amended for more clarity. Commercial activity is defined in the plan and commercial service activity is listed separately as a Permitted activity. It is unclear whether this rule is solely applying to service station activity, in which case it could be listed as a Discretionary activity. Stating that Discretionary status applies to any activity where 'compliance not achieved with PER-1' could be interpreted as all commercial activity that is not a service station is Discretionary?	Delete MUZ-R2 in its entirety and include new provisions in the activity table to list Service Stations and offices > 200m2 as a Discretionary activity.
Paihia Properties Holdings Corporate Trustee Limited and UP Management Ltd (S344)	S344.029	Mixed use	Notes	Oppose	It is considered that a GFA of less than 400m2 with a default to discretionary activity where compliance cannot be achieved is particularly onerous within the MUZ given this is the only commercial zone providing for supermarket activities. It is considered that building bulk and scale should be managed separately to the scale of activities, MUZ-R1 note is confusing these effects, resulting unnecessary restrictions upon activities within the MUZ.	Delete the MUZ-R1 note.
Vaughan Norton-Taylor (S50)	S50.001	Mixed use	MUZ-R1	Oppose	Submitter opposes the permitted activity standard in the mixed use zone which requires that the GFA any new building or structure and extension to an existing building or structure does not exceed 400m2 GFA. The submitter contends that this	Delete MUZ-R1 (inferred)

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					restricts options for development without any justification for this change being provided.	
Brownie Family Trust (S74)	S74.020	Mixed use	MUZ-R1	Support	The provision is appropriate.	Retain rule MUZ-R1 as notified.
New Zealand Maritime Parks Ltd (S251)	S251.010	Mixed use	MUZ-R1	Support in part	NZMPL seek amendments to the building and structures provisions to ensure that a range of suitable buildings and structures can be established as a permitted activity. NZMPL considers that the 400m ² Gross Floor Area restriction for permitted activity with a default to discretionary activity where compliance is not achieved is particularly onerous approach. In the absence of any s32 justification for this threshold, NZMPL seeks that this be increased. Flexibility is also required for extensions and alterations for existing legally established structures. As currently drafted, any alteration to an existing building or structure that is already more than 400m ² GFA would require discretionary resource consent, regardless as to whether this is internal/external or the degree of change to the approved footprint.	Amend Rule MUZ -R1 as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increase threshold for coverage for new buildings or structures. - Insert a new clause which permits alterations where they do not result in an increased building footprint. - Default to a restricted discretionary activity for non- compliance with PER 2.
Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust (S338)	S338.024	Mixed use	MUZ-R1	Not Stated	The current height restriction of 12m in the Mixed Use zone should be strictly adhered to. Exceptions to this height limit should not be allowed for multi-unit developments or other purpose.	Amend Rule MUZ-R1 to remove the option of exceeding the height limit through the resource consent process
Paihia Properties Holdings Corporate Trustee Limited and UP Management Ltd (S344)	S344.028	Mixed use	MUZ-R1	Not Stated	It is considered that a GFA of less than 400m ² with a default to discretionary activity where compliance cannot be achieved is particularly onerous within the MUZ given this is the only commercial zone providing for supermarket activities. It is considered that building bulk and scale should be managed separately to the scale of activities, MUZ-R1 note is confusing these effects, resulting unnecessary restrictions upon activities within the MUZ.	Amend MUZ-R1 to provide for an increase to GFA, to ensure that supermarkets (buildings) can be established as a permitted activity and a restricted discretionary activity status where compliance cannot be achieved with the GFA cannot be achieved.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Foodstuffs North Island Limited (S363)	S363.022	Mixed use	MUZ-R1	Not Stated	The submitter considers that rule MUZ-R1 New buildings or structures, and extensions or alterations to existing buildings or structures, is onerous given the Mixed Use Zone is the only commercial zone providing for supermarket activities and that building bulk and scale should be managed separately to the scale of activities. In addition, the MUZ-R1 note is confusing these effects, resulting unnecessary restrictions upon activities within the MUZ.	Amend rule MUZ-R1 New buildings or structures, and extensions or alterations to existing buildings or structures, to provide for an increase to GFA, to ensure that supermarkets (buildings) can be established as a permitted activity and a restricted discretionary activity status where compliance cannot be achieved with the GFA cannot be achieved. Amend MUZ-R1 to provide for additions and alterations to existing buildings with a GFA of more than 400m2 where they do not change the existing footprint. Delete the MUZ-R1 note.
Far North District Council (S368)	S368.070	Mixed use	MUZ-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 MUZ-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 ... "
McDonalds Restaurants NZ Limited (S385)	S385.020	Mixed use	MUZ-R1	Support in part	McDonald's seek amendments to the building and structures provisions to ensure that McDonald's restaurants (buildings and structures) can be established as a permitted activity. As noted in sub#1 and sub#2 given the lack of definitions nesting table, it is difficult to understand how a McDonald's restaurant would be treated. Regardless, it is	Amend MUZ -R1 as follows: - Delete PER -1 - Increase threshold for coverage for new buildings or structures - Permit alterations where they do not result in an increased building footprint - Permit extensions of an appropriate scale where they comply with MUZ-

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					considered that PER-1 is unnecessary as resource consent will be required for the activity separately if it is not permitted which will provide Council the opportunity to consider the appropriateness of the activity. McDonalds considers that the 400m2 Gross Floor Area restriction for permitted activity with a default to discretionary activity where compliance is not achieved is particularly onerous approach. In the absence of any s32 justification for this threshold, McDonald's seeks that this be increased. Flexibility is also required for extensions and alterations for existing legally established structures. As currently drafted, any alteration to an existing building or structure that is already more than 400m2 GFA would require discretionary resource consent, regardless as to whether this is internal/external or the degree of change to the approved footprint	S1, MUZ-S2, MUZ-S3, MUZ-S4, MUZ-S10 to avoid unnecessary consenting requirements. - Default to a restricted discretionary activity for non- compliance with PER 2.
John Andrew Riddell (S431)	S431.127	Mixed use	MUZ-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)	S449.032	Mixed use	MUZ-R1	Support in part	The current height restriction of 12m in the Mixed Use zone should be strictly adhered to. Exceptions to this height limit should not be allowed for multi-unit developments or other purpose	Amend Rule MUZ-R1 to remove the option of exceeding the height limit through the resource consent process
House Movers Section of New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc (S482)	S482.006	Mixed use	MUZ-R1	Support in part	The Proposed Plan definition of "building" does not clearly include relocated buildings, and the existence of a separate definition of relocate buildings in the Proposed Plan appears to create a distinction between "buildings" and "relocated buildings". It is not clear that the permitted activity status applied in most zones to "new buildings and structures" also applies to the relocation of buildings. It is submitted that relocated	amend MUZ-R1 to: provide for relocated building as a permitted activity whenrelocated buildings meet performance standards and criteria (see schedule 1). insert a performance standard for use of a pre inspection report(schedule 2) restricteddiscretionary activity status for relocated buildings that do not

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					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	meet the permitted activity status standards
Fire and Emergency New Zealand (S512)	S512.101	Mixed use	MUZ-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)	S522.043	Mixed use	MUZ-R1	Support in part	The current height restriction of 12m in the Mixed Use zone should be strictly adhered to. Exceptions to this height limit should not be allowed for multi-unit developments or other purpose	Amend Rule MUZ-R1 to remove the option of exceeding the height limit through the resource consent process
Carbon Neutral NZ Trust (S529)	S529.031	Mixed use	MUZ-R1	Support in part	The current height restriction of 12m in the Mixed Use zone should be strictly adhered to. Exceptions to this height limit should not be allowed for multi-unit developments or other purpose	Amend Rule MUZ-R1 to remove the option of exceeding the height limit through the resource consent process
Vaughan Norton-Taylor (S536)	S536.001	Mixed use	MUZ-R1	Oppose	Limiting the gross floor area to 400 m ² in Rule MUZ-R1 restricts the options for development. No logic or reason are given for this change.	Delete Rule MUZ-R1 and retain status quo (inferred)
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S561)	S561.091	Mixed use	MUZ-R1	Support in part	The rule is supported as it provides for the management of building works carried out within the mixed use zone.	Retain MUZ-R1 as notified
Vaughan Norton-Taylor (S50)	S50.002	Mixed use	MUZ-R2	Oppose	Submitter opposes the permitted activity standard in this rule which restricts a commercial activity which is carried out within and office to 200m ² of gross floor area.	Delete MUZ-R2 (inferred)
Brownie Family Trust (S74)	S74.021	Mixed use	MUZ-R2	Support in part	It appears that under this rule any service station is permitted and all commercial activities are permitted provided that GFA is limited. Is this what is intended? Service	Amend to separate the rules for commercial activities and service stations. Change the activity status for a new service station to a

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					stations can generate adverse effects and these should be managed.	discretionary activity.
Lynley Newport (S137)	S137.003	Mixed use	MUZ-R2	Support in part	The Mixed Use zone is intended to enable commercial activity. Believe Rule MUZ-R2 includes a typographical error as it makes any commercial activity other than a service station a discretionary activity within the Mixed Use zone.	Amend Rule MUZ-R2 PER-1 as follows: The activity is not a service station.
New Zealand Maritime Parks Ltd (S251)	S251.011	Mixed use	MUZ-R2	Support in part	It is unclear whether the intentions of Rule MUZ-R2 is to enable service station activities and no other commercial activity, in any case it is NZMPL's view that this rule, given the purpose of the zone, should be amended to remove any restrictions to make it clear that the intended environment for all commercial activities is in the MUZ.	Amend Rule MUZ-R2 to delete PER-1 and PER-2.
Far North Holdings Limited (S320)	S320.014	Mixed use	MUZ-R2	Not Stated	The submitter considers that the deletion of MUZ-R2 Commercial Activity PER-2 is an appropriate and necessary relief to achieve the aims of this submission (s32 assessment provided with submission).	Amend MUZ-R2 to delete Commercial Activity PER-2 as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The activity is a service station. PER-2 Any office does not exceed GFA of 200m².
Z Energy Limited (S336)	S336.019	Mixed use	MUZ-R2	Support	Service Stations can appropriately operate in a range of zones and amongst a range of activities. Z Energy supports MUZ-R2 which permits Service Stations in the MUZ.	Retain Rule MUZ-R2
Foodstuffs North Island Limited (S363)	S363.025	Mixed use	MUZ-R2	Not Stated	The submitter considers that rule MUZ-R2 Commercial activity, as currently drafted, only provides for service stations and any office which does not exceed GFA of 200m ² as permitted activities and any activity that fails to comply is a discretionary activity. The submitter considers that this is completely inappropriate, inefficient and ineffective as the MUZ is the only	Amend rule MUZ-R2 Commercial activity, to provide for supermarkets, without a GFA limit.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					commercial zone intended to enable supermarkets.	
Vaughan Norton-Taylor (S536)	S536.002	Mixed use	MUZ-R2	Oppose	Limiting the gross floor area to 200 m ² in Rule MUZ-R2 encroaches on development options. No logic or reason are given for this change.	Delete Rule MUZ-R2 and retain status quo (inferred)
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S561)	S561.092	Mixed use	MUZ-R2	Oppose	This rule wording needs to be amended for more clarity. Commercial activity is defined in the plan and commercial service activity is listed separately as a Permitted activity. It is unclear whether this rule is solely applying to service station activity, in which case it could be listed as a Discretionary activity. Stating that Discretionary status applies to any activity where 'compliance not achieved with PER-1' could be interpreted as all commercial activity that is not a service station is Discretionary?	<p>Delete MUZ-R2 in its entirety and include new provisions in the activity table to list Service Stations and offices > 200m2 as a Discretionary activity.
Vaughan Norton-Taylor (S50)	S50.003	Mixed use	MUZ-R3	Oppose	Submitter is opposed to the activity of visitor accommodation within a residential unit is required to be that is located above the ground floor level of a building unless the residential unit existed at 27 July 2022. The submitter contends that no consideration for access for the disabled has been given, nor consideration as to the high cost of such a development and finally that no justification has been provided.	Amend MUZ-R3 to remove requirement for visitor accommodation to be above ground floor prior to 27 July 2022 (inferred) and delete the requirement for disabled access (inferred)
Brownie Family Trust (S74)	S74.022	Mixed use	MUZ-R3	Oppose	The rule as drafted is unduly harsh on new compatible visitor accommodation. Hotels and motels and new residential units should be allowed at ground floor if appropriate urban design standards are met.	Delete PER-1 of rule MUZ-R3
Airbnb (S214)	S214.006	Mixed use	MUZ-R3	Support in part	The proposed district plan allows for visitor accommodation as a permitted activity for less than or equal to 6-10 guests on site. If these conditions are not met, the activity is discretionary except in the settlement zone where it is restricted discretionary. Airbnb supports the overall approach to allow visitor accommodation to occur in all zones and	Amend rules to standardise the guest limit cap for permitted visitor accommodation to 10 across all zones and make the default non-permitted status restricted discretionary (as opposed to Discretionary) across all zones.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>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>	
<p>Far North Holdings Limited (S320)</p>	<p>S320.015</p>	<p>Mixed use</p>	<p>MUZ-R3</p>	<p>Not Stated</p>	<p>The submitter considers that the deletion of MUZ-R3 Visitor Accommodation, PER-1 is an appropriate and necessary relief to achieve the aims of this submission (s32 assessment provided with submission).</p>	<p>Delete MUZ-R3 Visitor Accommodation PER-1 as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1The visitor accommodation is within a residential unit that is located above the ground floor level of a building unless the residential unit existed at 27 July 2022. PER-2 The residential unit complies with standard:</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						NOISE-S5 Noise insulation.
Ed and Inge Amsler (S341)	S341.003	Mixed use	MUZ-R3	Oppose	The proposed rule seeks residential living above a ground floor or resource consent is required. Such above ground living reduces the potential of the zone to appropriately provide for residential land uses by reason that the cost of development associated with having to meet the rule may actively work against the zones intentions. Residential uses on the ground floor should be actively promoted.	Delete the requirements which promote visitor accommodation to only be located above the ground floor in MUZ-R3, Visitor Accommodation - PER-1.
Vaughan Norton-Taylor (S536)	S536.003	Mixed use	MUZ-R3	Oppose	Limiting visitor accommodation to first floor in Rule MUZ-R3 provides no consideration for access for the disabled, huge costs inflicted on development. No logic or reason are given for this change.	Delete Rule MUZ-R3 and retain status quo (inferred)
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S561)	S561.093	Mixed use	MUZ-R3	Support in part	Restrictions on residential and visitor accommodation activities at ground floor should only be limited to the 'pedestrian frontage' area identified on the planning maps (consistent with the amendments sought to the objectives and policies above).	Amend MUZ-R3 to include the following: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 Where the site is identified as a pedestrian frontage, the visitor accommodation is within a residential unit that is located above the ground floor level of a building. This rule does not apply to unless the residential units that existed at 27 July 2022. PER-2 The residential unit complies with standard: NOISE-S5 Noise insulation.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Brownie Family Trust (S74)	S74.023	Mixed use	MUZ-R4	Oppose	People should be able to live in and use a residential unit for residential activity that has been appropriately designed and consented.	Delete rule MUZ-R4
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections (S158)	S158.012	Mixed use	MUZ-R4	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 Mixed Use zone, Rule MUZ-R4.
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections (S158)	S158.014	Mixed use	MUZ-R4	Neutral	<p>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.</p> <p>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 rules applying to supported and transitional accommodation activities in the Mixed Use zone are amended. The zone framework would not otherwise enable supported residential care activities, and provides discretionary activity status for these activities in the zone, in accordance with the default "activities not otherwise listed in this chapter" rule MUZ-R17.</p> <p>Supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided for by Ara Poutama, 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.</p> <p>The Mixed Use zone includes suitable</p>	<p>Retain as notified the provisions applicable to "residential activities" in the Mixed Use zone.</p> <p>BUT - If Council are to retain the "supported residential care activity" definition, then amend the rule framework for the Mixed Use zone to include a permitted rule applying to "supported residential care activity" as follows:Activity status: PermittedWhere:PER-1The supported residential care activity is within a residential unit that is located above the ground floor level of a building unless the residential unit existed at 27 July 2022.PER-2The number of occupants does not exceed six.Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-1 or PER-2:Discretionary</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>locations for supported and transitional accommodation activities; as they are close to civic amenities and services. This is apparent in that the zones provide for residential activities as permitted, including aligned activities such as visitor accommodation.</p> <p>Supported and transitional accommodation activities are a compatible and appropriate activity in the Mixed Use zone. They are consistent with the character and amenity of the zone, and the effects of such can be managed through the imposition of a restriction on the maximum number of residents (six), as is the case in the General Residential zone.</p> <p>The enabled activities rule framework should be amended to provide for supported and transitional accommodation activities as a permitted activity (should the definition of "support residential care activity" be retained).</p>	
New Zealand Maritime Parks Ltd (S251)	S251.012	Mixed use	MUZ-R4	Support	NZMPL support the provision of mixed residential and commercial activities. This is considered to promote vibrancy and vitality within urban centres. Further, requiring residential activities to be established above street frontages ensures the active streetscapes.	Retain Rule MUZ-R4
Josh Henwood (S256)	S256.004	Mixed use	MUZ-R4	Oppose	If the site is also in the coastal environment zone, then you can only build to 5 metres high (one level). This rule then doesn't make any sense as there is no second level to have the residential activity on.	Amend the standard to allow for 1) residential activity on ground floor and 2) as per S257.003 increase permitted height to 8.5 metres in the Mixed Use Zone.
Trent Simpkin (S283)	S283.005	Mixed use	MUZ-R4	Oppose	Residential activities should be permitted on the ground floor also. There are many places in the mixed use zone that aren't likely going to be for retail activities (King St in Kerikeri for example), and more so for townhouse developments. And when designing townhouses, putting the living spaces above the ground floor is a lot more expensive -	Amend to permit residential activities on the ground floor of buildings also.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					plumbing, drainage, outdoor spaces i.e. decks etc.	
Leisa Henwood (S285)	S285.004	Mixed use	MUZ-R4	Oppose	With only being able to build 5m (single storey) this rule does not make sense. Even if allowed to build higher we see no reason to have a residential on the first floor if building back from the foreshore by 27m.	Amend rule MUZ-R4 to permit residential activity on ground floor and upper floors of new buildings.
Tristan Simpkin (S287)	S287.005	Mixed use	MUZ-R4	Oppose	Residential activities should be permitted on the ground floor also. There are many places in the mixed use zone that aren't likely going to be for retail activities (King St in Kerikeri for example), and more-so for townhouse developments. And when designing townhouses, putting the living spaces above the ground floor is a lot more expensive - plumbing, drainage, outdoor spaces i.e. decks etc.	Amend rule to permit residential living activities on ground floors of buildings.
Terry Henwood (S289)	S289.004	Mixed use	MUZ-R4	Oppose	With only being able to build 5m (single storey) this rule does not make sense. Even if allowed to build higher we see no reason to have a residential on the first floor if building back from the foreshore by 27m.	Amend rule MUZ-R4 to permit residential activity on ground floor and upper floors of new buildings.
Bruce and Kim Rogers (S293)	S293.002	Mixed use	MUZ-R4	Support in part	The rule does not make provision for existing residential only sites. Residential activity on the ground floor of new buildings should continue to be permitted where residential activity only is present on site.	Amend rule MUZ-R4 to permit residential activity on ground floor and upper floors of new buildings where there is a residential activity only on site.
Bruce and Kim Rogers (S294)	S294.003	Mixed use	MUZ-R4	Support in part	The rule does not make provision for existing residential only sites. Residential activity on the ground floor of new buildings should continue to be permitted where residential activity only is present on site.	Amend rule MUZ-R4 to permit residential activity on ground floor and upper floors of new buildings.
Ed and Inge Amsler (S341)	S341.004	Mixed use	MUZ-R4	Oppose	The proposed rule seeks residential living above a ground floor or resource consent is required. Such above ground living reduces the potential of the zone to appropriately provide for residential land uses by reason that the cost of development associated with having to meet the rule may actively work against the zones intentions. Residential uses on the ground floor should be actively promoted.	Delete requirements which promote residential activities to only be located above the ground floor in MUZ-R4 Residential Activity - PER 1.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Far North District Council (S368)	S368.006	Mixed use	MUZ-R4	Support in part	Drafting error. There is a need to consider a minimum net internal floor area for residential units in the Mixed Use zone, similar or the same as that proposed in the General Residential zone for Residential activity (multi-unit development). Doing so will retain control of amenity and quality of residential units in this zone.	Amend MUZ-R4 to apply a minimum net internal floor area for residential units in the Mixed Use zone, following investigation and consideration of appropriate minimum net internal floor area.
Northland Fish and Game Council (S436)	S436.015	Mixed use	MUZ-R4	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. 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.	Insert provisions that constrain housing and industrial developments near areas with recreational hunting values.
Kaitaia Business Association (S501)	S501.003	Mixed use	MUZ-R4	Support in part	The Kaitaia Business Association generally supports Rule MUZ-R4 and for residential activities to be located above the ground floor level. The Mixed Use Zone includes the main central business district where it is imperative to have active shop frontages to engage consumers by providing a shopper experience.	Amend Rule MUZ-R4 as follows: The residential activity excluding a residential activity for temporary overnight accommodation or emergency/assisted or social housing is within a residential

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>The Kaitaia Business Association received numerous complaints and concerns for a potential social housing project to be established in the CBD area. The KBA would not support social housing within the Mixed Use Zone. An exclusion clause is required in regard to residential activities for the purpose of temporary overnight or emergency/assisted or social housing within the CBD area.</p> <p>Kaitaia currently has some residential units located above commercial premises that are used by the property/business owners. Accommodation for temporary overnight, emergency, assisted or social housing is a different housing type that requires tenant management with specific needs not suitable for the CBD area.</p> <p>The General Residential Zone provides for this activity where social mix opportunities are available to increase social cohesion and neighborhood participation</p>	unit that is located above the ground floor level of a building unless the residential unit existed at 27 July 2022.
Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited (S502)	S502.031	Mixed use	MUZ-R4	Support in part	<p>Kaitaia currently has some residential units located above commercial premises that are used by the property/business owners. Accommodation for temporary overnight, emergency, assisted or social housing is a different housing type that requires tenant management with specific needs not suitable for the CBD area.</p> <p>The General Residential Zone provides for this activity where social mix opportunities are available to increase social cohesion and neighbourhood participation.</p> <p>The General Residential Zone provides for a variety of housing typologies and sizes where temporary overnight accommodation or emergency/assisted or social housing integrates similar effects to other residential activities.</p>	<p>Amend MUZ-R4 PER-1</p> <p>The residential activity excluding a residential activity for temporary overnight accommodation or emergency/assisted or social housing is within a residential unit that is located above the ground floor level of a building unless the residential unit existed at 27 July 2022.</p>
Kāinga Ora Homes and	S561.094	Mixed use	MUZ-R4	Support in part	Restrictions on residential and visitor accommodation activities at ground floor	Amend MUZ-R4 to include the following:

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Communities (S561)					should only be limited to the 'pedestrian frontage' area identified on the planning maps (consistent with the amendments sought to the objectives and policies above).	Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 Where the site is identified as a pedestrian frontage control on the planning maps, the residential activity is within a residential unit that is located above the ground floor level of a building. This rule does not apply to unless the residential units that existed at 27 July 2022.
Vaughan Norton-Taylor (S50)	S50.004	Mixed use	MUZ-R5	Oppose	Submitter opposes the permitted standard residential unit activity requirement that the residential unit is located above the ground floor level of a building unless it existed at 27 July 2022. The submitter considers that no consideration has been given to access for the disabled and no justification has been given for the rule.	Amend MUZ-R5 to remove requirement for residential units to be above ground floor prior to 27 July 2022 (inferred) and delete the requirement for disabled access (inferred)
Brownie Family Trust (S74)	S74.024	Mixed use	MUZ-R5	Oppose	New residential units should be allowed at ground floor if appropriate urban design standards are met and the development is compatible.	Delete PER-1 of rule MUZ-R5
Kairos Connection Trust and Habitat for Humanity Northern Region Ltd (S138)	S138.019	Mixed use	MUZ-R5	Support in part	Understand that the Mixed Use zone has replaced the existing Commercial zone. Residential activities are provided for in the proposed zone, but only if these are located above ground level. Proposed Objective MUZ-O5 and Policy MUZ-P5 indicate that this is to ensure that active street frontages are maintained, and to avoid adverse effects on the function, role, sense of place and amenity of the Mixed Use zone, except where the boundary interface is with the Open Space zone. Support the continued ability to establish residential activities in the Mixed Use Zone. However, as not all building development on	Amend PER-1 of Rule MUZ-R5 as follows: <i>PER-1 The residential unit is located above the ground floor level of a building where it adjoins a road boundary unless it existed at 27 July 2022.</i>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					a Mixed Use site would necessarily affect street frontages and facades, particularly on a rear site, or if an apartment style building was located behind an existing building, seek that the ability to locate residential activities at ground level is enabled under specified circumstances.	
Bruce and Kim Rogers (S293)	S293.004	Mixed use	MUZ-R5	Support in part	The rule does not make provision for existing residential only sites. Residential activity on the ground floor of new buildings should continue to be permitted where residential activity only is present on site.	Amend rule MUZ-R5 to permit residential activity on the ground floor of new buildings where residential activity only is present on site.
Bruce and Kim Rogers (S294)	S294.004	Mixed use	MUZ-R5	Support in part	The rule does not make provision for existing residential only sites. Residential activity on the ground floor of new buildings should continue to be permitted where residential activity only is present on site.	Amend rule MUZ-R5 to permit residential activity on the ground floor of new buildings where residential activity only is present on site.
Ed and Inge Amsler (S341)	S341.005	Mixed use	MUZ-R5	Oppose	The proposed rule seeks residential living above a ground floor or resource consent is required. Such above ground living reduces the potential of the zone to appropriately provide for residential land uses by reason that the cost of development associated with having to meet the rule may actively work against the zones intentions. Residential uses on the ground floor should be actively promoted.	Delete the requirements which promote residential units to only be located above the ground floor in MUZ-R5 Residential Unit - PER 1.
Far North District Council (S368)	S368.093	Mixed use	MUZ-R5	Support in part	Inconsistent wording, should read the same as MUZ-R3	Amend MUZ-R5 PER-2 The residential units established after 27 July 2022 comply comply with standard: NOISE-S5 Noise insulation.
McDonalds Restaurants NZ Limited (S385)	S385.021	Mixed use	MUZ-R5	Support	McDonalds supports providing for commercial activities as a permitted activity, however as noted in earlier submissions, and section 2.0 it is critical to the effectiveness and efficiency of the plan that it is clear to	Retain as notified subject to the changes sought in sub#5 which seeks that Council clarify what a restaurant and café activity is, and that they are

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					plan users what is incorporated as a commercial activity that it includes 'restaurants and cafes' which is a term that needs to be defined.	a subset of commercial activity.
David Truscott (S476)	S476.005	Mixed use	MUZ-R5	Oppose	The mixed use zone rules will discourage development in Rawene town centre, demand for new commercial premises is low and the town will benefit from residential development on vacant land in the zone. Rules restricting residential activity to the above the ground floor are unnecessary.	Amend MUZ-R5 (inferred) PER1 to allow residential activity on the ground floor in the Rawene Mixed Use Zone.
Vaughan Norton-Taylor (S536)	S536.004	Mixed use	MUZ-R5	Oppose	Limiting residential units to first floor in Rule MUZ-R5 provides no consideration for access for the disabled, huge costs inflicted on development. No logic or reason are given for this change.	Delete Rule MUZ-R5 and retain status quo (inferred)
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S561)	S561.095	Mixed use	MUZ-R5	Support in part	Restrictions on residential and visitor accommodation activities at ground floor should only be limited to the 'pedestrian frontage' area identified on the planning maps (consistent with the amendments sought to the objectives and policies above.	Amend MUZ-R5 to include the following: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 Where the site is identified as a pedestrian frontage, the residential unit is located above the ground floor level of a building. This rule does not apply to unless the residential units that existed at 27 July 2022. PER-2 Residential units established after 27 July 2022 comply with standard: NOISE-S5 Noise insulation. PER-3a. Each Residential Unit shall be a minimum of 35m2 Gross Floor Area for a studio and 45m2 Gross Floor Area for units containing one or more

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>bedrooms. The GFA excludes areas used as garaging or balconies.b. Each residential unit with habitable internal space at ground floor shall be provided with an outdoor living space in a continuous area, with a minimum area of 20m² and a minimum dimension of 4m. Where the unit is located at first floor or above, it shall be provided with an outdoor living space in the form of a balcony that is a minimum area of 8m² and a minimum dimension of 1.5m.c. Balconies or living area windows at first floor level or above shall be setback a minimum of 4m from internal boundaries, with bedroom windows setback a minimum of 1m. No setbacks are required for:i. Windows associated with a hall, stairwell, or bathroom;ii. Windows that are frosted;iii. Windows that are more than 90 degrees to the boundary;iv. Windows where the sill height is more than 1.6m above internal floor level.</p> <p>...Activity status where</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						compliance not achieved with PER-3: Restricted discretionaryMatters of discretion are restricted to:a. Occupant amenity.b. The degree to which the outdoor living space will receive sunlight.c. The accessibility and convenience of the outdoor living space for occupiers.d. Proximity to communal or public open space.
Brownie Family Trust (S74)	S74.050	Mixed use	MUZ-R6	Support	These activities are appropriate within a Mixed Use zone provided that they are appropriately designed and are compatible with existing built development.	Retain rule MUZ-R6 as notified.
Ed and Inge Amsler (S341)	S341.006	Mixed use	MUZ-R6	Support	The zone provisions should enable such uses without secondary limitations and this is supported.	Retain permitted activity status for activities in Rules MUZ-R6-11.
Brownie Family Trust (S74)	S74.051	Mixed use	MUZ-R7	Support	These activities are appropriate within a Mixed Use zone provided that they are appropriately designed and are compatible with existing built development.	Retain rule MUZ-R7 as notified.
Ed and Inge Amsler (S341)	S341.015	Mixed use	MUZ-R7	Support	The MUZ appears to have an unusual mix of activities permitted, with an onerous default to discretionary activity status. Due to the complicated nature of the commercial activities rules and the lack of definitions we are unable to confirm what activities would be permitted onsite.	Retain permitted activity status for activities in Rules MUZ-R6-11.
Brownie Family Trust (S74)	S74.052	Mixed use	MUZ-R8	Support	These activities are appropriate within a Mixed Use zone provided that they are appropriately designed and are compatible with existing built development.	Retain rule MUZ-R8 as notified.
Ed and Inge Amsler (S341)	S341.016	Mixed use	MUZ-R8	Support	The MUZ appears to have an unusual mix of activities permitted, with an onerous default to discretionary activity status. Due to the complicated nature of the commercial	Retain permitted activity status for activities in Rules MUZ-R6-11.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					activities rules and the lack of definitions we are unable to confirm what activities would be permitted onsite.	
Brownie Family Trust (S74)	S74.053	Mixed use	MUZ-R9	Support	These activities are appropriate within a Mixed Use zone provided that they are appropriately designed and are compatible with existing built development.	Retain rule MUZ-R9 as notified.
Ed and Inge Amsler (S341)	S341.017	Mixed use	MUZ-R9	Support	The MUZ appears to have an unusual mix of activities permitted, with an onerous default to discretionary activity status. Due to the complicated nature of the commercial activities rules and the lack of definitions we are unable to confirm what activities would be permitted onsite.	Retain permitted activity status for activities in Rules MUZ-R6-11.
Brownie Family Trust (S74)	S74.054	Mixed use	MUZ-R10	Support	These activities are appropriate within a Mixed Use zone provided that they are appropriately designed and are compatible with existing built development.	Retain rule MUZ-R10 as notified.
Ed and Inge Amsler (S341)	S341.018	Mixed use	MUZ-R10	Support	The MUZ appears to have an unusual mix of activities permitted, with an onerous default to discretionary activity status. Due to the complicated nature of the commercial activities rules and the lack of definitions we are unable to confirm what activities would be permitted onsite.	Retain permitted activity status for activities in Rules MUZ-R6-11.
Brownie Family Trust (S74)	S74.025	Mixed use	MUZ-R11	Support	These activities are appropriate within a Mixed Use zone provided that they are appropriately designed and are compatible with existing built development.	Retain rule MUZ-R11 as notified.
Ed and Inge Amsler (S341)	S341.019	Mixed use	MUZ-R11	Support	The MUZ appears to have an unusual mix of activities permitted, with an onerous default to discretionary activity status. Due to the complicated nature of the commercial activities rules and the lack of definitions we are unable to confirm what activities would be permitted onsite.	Retain permitted activity status for activities in Rules MUZ-R6-11.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S561)	S561.096	Mixed use	MUZ-R11	Oppose	This rule appears to duplicate rule MUZ-R6.	Delete Rule MUZ-R11 in its entirety.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Brownie Family Trust (S74)	S74.026	Mixed use	MUZ-R12	Support	The listed activities are appropriate for the Mixed Use zone provided generated effects are managed by way of resource consent.	Retain rule MUZ-R12 as notified.
Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga (S331)	S331.082	Mixed use	MUZ-R12	Oppose	The submitter opposes rule MUZ-R12 Educational Facility (see submission #S331.017) and wishes the plan to provide for educational facilities as a permitted activity in the Mixed Use zone in the Infrastructure Chapter. In conjunction with this relief, the submitter seeks the removal of this rule from the Mixed Use zone to limit rule duplication. However, if this relief is not granted, the submitter also opposes the Discretionary activity status for educational facilities in the Mixed Use zone. The Ministry requests that educational facilities are enabled in the Mixed Use zone to serve the education needs of the community and suggest a Permitted activity status subject to compliance with the noise insulation standard. If compliance with this standard cannot be achieved, a Restricted Discretionary activity status is suggested with the following matters of discretion.	Delete rule MUZ-R12 Educational Facility or Amend rule MUZ-R12 Educational Facility as follows: Educational facility Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Permitted Where: PER-1 Educational facilities established after 27 July 2022 comply with standard: NOISE-S5 Noise insulation. Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-1: Restricted discretionary Matters of discretion are restricted to: a) the matters of discretion of the infringed standard.b) traffic generation, safety and access;c) provision of parking; andd) consideration of reverse sensitivity effects.Activity status where compliance not achieved: Not applicable
Brownie Family Trust (S74)	S74.027	Mixed use	MUZ-R13	Support	The listed activities are appropriate for the Mixed Use zone provided generated effects are managed by way of resource consent.	Retain rule MUZ-R13 as notified.
Brownie Family Trust (S74)	S74.028	Mixed use	MUZ-R14	Support	The listed activities are appropriate for the Mixed Use zone provided generated effects are managed by way of resource consent.	Retain rule MUZ-R14 as notified.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Brownie Family Trust (S74)	S74.029	Mixed use	MUZ-R15	Support	The listed activities are appropriate for the Mixed Use zone provided generated effects are managed by way of resource consent.	Retain rule MUZ-R15 as notified.
Brownie Family Trust (S74)	S74.030	Mixed use	MUZ-R16	Support	The listed activities are appropriate for the Mixed Use zone provided generated effects are managed by way of resource consent.	Retain rule MUZ-R16 as notified.
McDonalds Restaurants NZ Limited (S385)	S385.022	Mixed use	MUZ-R16	Oppose	As noted earlier, Drive-through is not a defined activity, as such it is difficult to understand if a McDonald's drive through would be captured by this definition. On the assumption that it would be captured, McDonald's oppose Drive-through activities as a discretionary activity in the Mixed Use Zone, and notes that this activity is not currently provided for as a permitted activity in any zone. McDonalds seek that this activity be permitted in the Mixed Use Zone.	Insert provision to provide for drive-through as a permitted activity in the Mixed Use zone.
Brownie Family Trust (S74)	S74.031	Mixed use	MUZ-R17	Support	The listed activities are appropriate for the Mixed Use zone provided generated effects are managed by way of resource consent.	Retain rule MUZ-R17 as notified.
Brownie Family Trust (S74)	S74.032	Mixed use	MUZ-R18	Support in part	New residential units should be allowed at ground floor if appropriate urban design standards are met and the development is compatible. The other activities are best suited to other zones and should not be enabled in the Mixed Use zone.	Delete rule MUZ-R18
Brownie Family Trust (S74)	S74.033	Mixed use	MUZ-R19	Support in part	New residential units should be allowed at ground floor if appropriate urban design standards are met and the development is compatible. The other activities are best suited to other zones and should not be enabled in the Mixed Use zone.	Retain rule MUZ-R19 as notified.
Brownie Family Trust (S74)	S74.034	Mixed use	MUZ-R20	Support in part	New residential units should be allowed at ground floor if appropriate urban design standards are met and the development is compatible. The other activities are best suited to other zones and should not be enabled in the Mixed Use zone.	Retain rule MUZ-R20 as notified.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Brownie Family Trust (S74)	S74.035	Mixed use	MUZ-R21	Support in part	New residential units should be allowed at ground floor if appropriate urban design standards are met and the development is compatible. The other activities are best suited to other zones and should not be enabled in the Mixed Use zone	Retain rule MUZ-R21 as notified.
Brownie Family Trust (S74)	S74.036	Mixed use	MUZ-R22	Support in part	New residential units should be allowed at ground floor if appropriate urban design standards are met and the development is compatible. The other activities are best suited to other zones and should not be enabled in the Mixed Use zone	Retain rule MUZ-R22 as notified.
Good Journey Limited (S82)	S82.007	Mixed use	Standards	Oppose	The standards in the Mixed Use zone are opposed in part. There are apparent errors in the plan drafting such that activities that were clearly intended to be permitted, will in fact trigger resource consent on the face of the wording.	Amend the standards in the Mixed Use zone
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S561)	S561.121	Mixed use	Standards	Not Stated	Introduce a framework of Objectives; Policies; Standards and rules; Matters of discretion; and Assessment Criteria to support the proposed Town Centre zone. In particular, a Town Centre zone is sought for Kerikeri to enable up to 6 storey buildings. Increased development height is sought for Kerikeri to support business and residential investment in the centre. While it is understood that FNDC are currently reviewing infrastructure within the District, it is noted that the Kerikeri - Waipapa Structure Plan 2007 (KKWSP) promotes a Mixed use zoned land and provision for a higher density Residential zone within the networked area. The findings of the current infrastructure review should be integrated into the zoning provisions for Kerikeri.	Insert new provisions as set out in Appendix 5 to support the introduction of the proposed Town Centre zone.
Brownie Family Trust (S74)	S74.004	Mixed use	MUZ-S1	Support	Planning Maps - Building Height Limit (Area A). The height limit is appropriate to ensure that residential development is not dominated by an inappropriate scale of development. The height limit is compatible with existing development.	Retain the Building Height Limit (Area A) overlay as notified.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Brownie Family Trust (S74)	S74.037	Mixed use	MUZ-S1	Support	The height restriction in Area A is appropriate given the existing development and surrounding mapped overlays.	Retain standard MUZ-S1 as notified.
Russell Protection Society (INC) (S179)	S179.047	Mixed use	MUZ-S1	Oppose	the Russell commercial area is characterized by single and two story buildings which blend in well with the village atmosphere of the township. The operative district plan recognizes this by specifying the following: (b) The maximum height of any building in the following Commercial zones shall be 8.5m: (i) Russell (Map 89)	Amend to reflect operative plan height limit for Russell commercial area of 8.m , consistent with the proposals for Paihia
New Zealand Maritime Parks Ltd (S251)	S251.013	Mixed use	MUZ-S1	Support	NZMPL supports the 12m building height for buildings and structures.	Retain Standard MUZ-S1
Far North Holdings Limited (S320)	S320.016	Mixed use	MUZ-S1	Not Stated	The submitter considers that standard MUZ-S1 should include additional clauses which are appropriate for all of the Far North Holdings Ltd (FNHL) landholdings, as it better reflects existing, consented and proposed land uses. (s32 assessment provided with submission).	<p>Insert into standard MUZ-S1 Maximum Height, two additional clauses as follows:</p> <p>The maximum height of a building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure, is 12m above ground level, except:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. the maximum height differs within the following areas that are mapped within Paihia: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area A: 8.5m • Area B: 10m; and ii. that any fence or standalone wall along a side or rear boundary which adjoins a site zoned General Residential, Rural Residential, Rural Lifestyle, Māori Purpose - Urban, Open Space, Natural Open Space, or Sport and Recreation does not exceed 2m in height. iii. The height limit within the OMDA is 16m above ground level. iv. The height limit at Marine

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						Business Park, Commercial Estate, and Colenzo Triangle where the maximum height limit is 12m.
Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust (S338)	S338.023	Mixed use	MUZ-S1	Not Stated	The current height restriction of 12m in the Mixed Use zone should be strictly adhered to. Exceptions to this height limit should not be allowed for multi-unit developments or other purpose.	Retain Standard MUZ-S1
Ed and Inge Amsler (S341)	S341.007	Mixed use	MUZ-S1	Oppose	The standard allows 12m building height which is supported to encourage development.	Retain maximum height limit in MUZ-S1.
Paihia Properties Holdings Corporate Trustee Limited and UP Management Ltd (S344)	S344.030	Mixed use	MUZ-S1	Not Stated	It is considered that a GFA of less than 400m2 with a default to discretionary activity where compliance cannot be achieved is particularly onerous within the MUZ given this is the only commercial zone providing for supermarket activities. It is considered that building bulk and scale should be managed separately to the scale of activities, MUZ-R1 note is confusing these effects, resulting unnecessary restrictions upon activities within the MUZ.	Amend Standards MUZ S1-S9 to give effect to the relief sought for MUZ-R1 (inferred)
McDonalds Restaurants NZ Limited (S385)	S385.023	Mixed use	MUZ-S1	Support	McDonald's supports the 12m building height for buildings and structures.	Retain as notified
Kapiro Residents Association (S427)	S427.020	Mixed use	MUZ-S1	Support in part	Allowing exceptions to the height limit of 12m, would undermine the Council's objective.	Retain proposed maximum height restriction of 12m in the Mixed Use Zone and exceptions to these height limits should not be allowed for multi-unit developments or other purpose.
John Andrew Riddell (S431)	S431.109	Mixed use	MUZ-S1	Not Stated	The Mixed Use Zone applies to parts of Kororāreka/Russell. Some of the provisions in the Mixed Use Zone should be amended to ensure consistency with the Kororāreka Russell Township Zone and with the Kororāreka Russell Heritage Area Overlay	Amend standard MUZ-S1 so that a maximum height of 8.5 m applies to the Mixed Use zone at Kororāreka/Russell
John Andrew Riddell (S431)	S431.110	Mixed use	MUZ-S1	Not Stated	The Mixed Use Zone applies to parts of Kororāreka/Russell. Some of the provisions	Amend the Mixed Use Zone standard to ensure consistency the Kororāreka

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					in the Mixed Use Zone should be amended to ensure consistency with the Kororāreka Russell Township Zone and with the Kororāreka Russell Heritage Area Overlay	Russell provisions.
Kapiro Conservation Trust (S449)	S449.029	Mixed use	MUZ-S1	Support	The current height restriction of 12m in the Mixed Use zone should be strictly adhered to. Exceptions to this height limit should not be allowed for multi-unit developments or other purpose.	Retain Standard MUZ-S1
Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK) (S522)	S522.019	Mixed use	MUZ-S1	Support	The current height restriction of 12m in the Mixed Use zone should be strictly adhered to. Exceptions to this height limit should not be allowed for multi-unit developments or other purpose.	Retain Standard MUZ-S1
Carbon Neutral NZ Trust (S529)	S529.028	Mixed use	MUZ-S1	Support	The current height restriction of 12m in the Mixed Use zone should be strictly adhered to. Exceptions to this height limit should not be allowed for multi-unit developments or other purpose.	Retain Standard MUZ-S1
Brownie Family Trust (S74)	S74.038	Mixed use	MUZ-S2	Support in part	The intention of the standard is supported in principle. To create compatible developments some effects may also be needed within the zone and not just between zone boundaries.	Insert provisions in standard MUZ-S2 to control the impact of development within the Mixed Use zone
Russell Protection Society (INC) (S179)	S179.048	Mixed use	MUZ-S2	Support		Retain MUZ-S2
New Zealand Maritime Parks Ltd (S251)	S251.014	Mixed use	MUZ-S2	Support	NZMPL supports no height in relation to boundary standard for where the site adjoins industrial or mixed use zoned sites.	Retain Standard MUZ-S2
Ed and Inge Amsler (S341)	S341.008	Mixed use	MUZ-S2	Oppose	It is unclear what the true shadowing effects may be from a potential development on the Marsden Road site to the adjoining Natural Open Space Zone which is currently vegetated. Exemptions should be provided where these situations occur.	Amend to provide exemptions should be made for areas which adjoin Open Space or Natural Open Space zones currently covered in protected vegetation in MUZ-S2.
Paihia Properties Holdings	S344.033	Mixed use	MUZ-S2	Not Stated	It is considered that a GFA of less than 400m2 with a default to discretionary activity where compliance cannot be achieved is	Amend Standards MUZ S1-S9 to give effect to the relief sought for MUZ-R1

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Corporate Trustee Limited and UP Management Ltd (S344)					particularly onerous within the MUZ given this is the only commercial zone providing for supermarket activities. It is considered that building bulk and scale should be managed separately to the scale of activities, MUZ-R1 note is confusing these effects, resulting unnecessary restrictions upon activities within the MUZ.	(inferred)
McDonalds Restaurants NZ Limited (S385)	S385.024	Mixed use	MUZ-S2	Support	McDonald's supports no height in relation to boundary standard for where the site adjoins industrial or mixed use zoned sites.	Retain as notified
John Andrew Riddell (S431)	S431.111	Mixed use	MUZ-S2	Not Stated	The Mixed Use Zone applies to parts of Kororāreka/Russell. Some of the provisions in the Mixed Use Zone should be amended to ensure consistency with the Kororāreka Russell Township Zone and with the Kororāreka Russell Heritage Area Overlay	Amend the Mixed Use Zone standard to be consistent with the Kororāreka Russell provisions.
John Andrew Riddell (S431)	S431.186	Mixed use	MUZ-S2	Not Stated	Not stated	Retain the approach varying the required height to boundary depending on the orientation of the relevant boundary.
Brownie Family Trust (S74)	S74.039	Mixed use	MUZ-S3	Support in part	Setbacks between developments are necessary to ensure that adverse effects are appropriately. Zero setbacks can compromise urban amenity. Quality Urban design can manage effects such as shading.	Insert controls in standard MUZ-S3 to manage effects generated between developments within the Mixed Use zone.
Russell Protection Society (INC) (S179)	S179.049	Mixed use	MUZ-S3	Support		Retain MUZ-S3
New Zealand Maritime Parks Ltd (S251)	S251.015	Mixed use	MUZ-S3	Support	NZMPL support no setback requirements where the site adjoins industrial or mixed use zoned	Retain Standard MUZ-S3
Josh Henwood (S256)	S256.002	Mixed use	MUZ-S3	Oppose	We do not support this standard because we do not believe such large setbacks are necessary, as may loose significant areas of buildable land.	Amend standard to a minimum setback of 1.2 metres
Leisa Henwood (S285)	S285.003	Mixed use	MUZ-S3	Oppose	We do not believe set backs are necessary. Our flat site is very small and set backs we will loose a significant portion of our land	Delete standard MUZ-S3 so there are no setbacks required in MUZ.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Terry Henwood (S289)	S289.003	Mixed use	MUZ-S3	Oppose	We do not believe set backs are necessary. Our flat site is very small and set backs we will loose a significant portion of our land	Delete standard MUZ-S3 so there are no setbacks required in MUZ.
Bruce and Kim Rogers (S294)	S294.002	Mixed use	MUZ-S3	Support	Support this standard as setbacks in the Mixed Use zone are not necessary and if setbacks were required they would lose the use of a significant portion of their land.	Retain the standard with no setbacks for sites in the Mixed Use Zone (inferred because standard only applies setbacks where sites adjoin other more sensitive zones).
Ed and Inge Amsler (S341)	S341.009	Mixed use	MUZ-S3	Support in part	With such a narrow site, the Marsden Road property needs minimal setbacks to enjoy potential development opportunities. The 0m road setback is supported as a means to located buildings close to the road frontage.	Delete rear setback of 3m from a Natural Open Space zone, and retain the 0m setback from the road is supported in MUZ-S3.
Paihia Properties Holdings Corporate Trustee Limited and UP Management Ltd (S344)	S344.034	Mixed use	MUZ-S3	Not Stated	It is considered that a GFA of less than 400m2 with a default to discretionary activity where compliance cannot be achieved is particularly onerous within the MUZ given this is the only commercial zone providing for supermarket activities. It is considered that building bulk and scale should be managed separately to the scale of activities, MUZ-R1 note is confusing these effects, resulting unnecessary restrictions upon activities within the MUZ.	Amend Standards MUZ S1-S9 to give effectto the relief sought for MUZ-R1 (inferred)
McDonalds Restaurants NZ Limited (S385)	S385.025	Mixed use	MUZ-S3	Support	McDonald's support no setback requirements where the site adjoins industrial or mixed use zoned	Retain as notified
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S416)	S416.062	Mixed use	MUZ-S3	Support in part	For health and safety reasons, KiwiRail seek a setback for structures from the rail corridor boundary. While KiwiRail do not oppose development on adjacent sites, ensuring the ability to access and maintain structures without requiring access to rail land is important. Parts of the KiwiRail network adjoin commercial, mixed use, industrial and open space zones. These zone chapters do not currently include provision for boundary setbacks for buildings and structures.	Insert a railway setback (refer to submission for examples) Insert the following matters of discretion into the standard: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the location and design of the building as it relates to the ability to safely use, access and maintain buildings

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>KiwiRail seek a boundary setback of 5m from the rail corridor for all buildings and structures.</p> <p>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 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,</p>	<p>without requiring access on, above or over the rail corridor</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the safe and efficient operation of the rail network

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					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.	
John Andrew Riddell (S431)	S431.112	Mixed use	MUZ-S3	Not Stated	The Mixed Use Zone applies to parts of Kororāreka/Russell. Some of the provisions in the Mixed Use Zone should be amended to ensure consistency with the Kororāreka Russell Township Zone and with the Kororāreka Russell Heritage Area Overlay	Amend the Mixed Use Zone standard to be consistent with the Kororāreka Russell provisions.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand (S512)	S512.077	Mixed use	MUZ-S3	Support in part	Setbacks play a role in reducing spread of fire as well as ensuring Fire and Emergency personnel can get to a fire source or other emergency. An advice note is recommended to raise to plan users (e.g. developers) early on in the resource consent process that there is further control of building setbacks and firefighting access through the New Zealand Building Code (NZBC).	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 stage. Issuance of a resource consent does not imply that waivers of Building Code requirements will be considered/granted

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Brownie Family Trust (S74)	S74.040	Mixed use	MUZ-S4	Support	The provision provides protection from flooding and sea level rise. It also ensures access to waterways and the ocean.	Retain standard MUZ-S4 as notified.
Russell Protection Society (INC) (S179)	S179.050	Mixed use	MUZ-S4	Support		Retain MUZ-S4
Far North Holdings Limited (S320)	S320.017	Mixed use	MUZ-S4	Not Stated	The submitter considers that standard MUZ-S4 Setback from MHWS, requires an additional clause relating to activities in a Marine Exemption Area, which is appropriate, as it better reflects existing, consented and proposed land uses (s32 assessment provided with submission).	Insert into standard MUZ-S4 Setback from MHWS an additional clause as follows: The building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure must be set back at least 26m from MHWS. This standard does not apply to: i. activities in a Marine Exemption Area
Ed and Inge Amsler (S341)	S341.010	Mixed use	MUZ-S4	Oppose	There is no rationale provided outlining why the existing exemption has not been carried out in this instance. The current rule works against the proposed 0m road setback and will force development to be located further from the road frontage.	Delete 26m setback from MHWS for 46-48 Marsden Road, Paihia, and amend to include exemptions provided for in 12.7.6.1.1(vii) of the ODP which allows for an exemption to the setbacks where there is a legally formed road.
Paihia Properties Holdings Corporate Trustee Limited and UP Management Ltd (S344)	S344.035	Mixed use	MUZ-S4	Not Stated	It is considered that a GFA of less than 400m ² with a default to discretionary activity where compliance cannot be achieved is particularly onerous within the MUZ given this is the only commercial zone providing for supermarket activities. It is considered that building bulk and scale should be managed separately to the scale of activities, MUZ-R1 note is confusing these effects, resulting unnecessary restrictions upon activities within the MUZ.	Amend Standards MUZ S1-S9 to give effect to the relief sought for MUZ-R1 (inferred)

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Far North District Council (S368)	S368.052	Mixed use	MUZ-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 MUZ-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)	S502.033	Mixed use	MUZ-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 MUZ-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 MHW PER-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 hazard mitigation undertaken by, or on behalf of, the local authority; or 3. a post and wire fence for the purpose of protection from farm stock; or 4. Lighting poles by, or on behalf of, the local authority; or 5. Footpaths and or paving no greater than 2m in width; or 6. Boundary fences or walls no more than 2m in height above ground level;

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Waitangi Limited (S503)	S503.036	Mixed use	MUZ-S4	Not Stated	<p>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.</p> <p>The definition for a Structure includes any building, equipment, device, or other facility, made by people and which is fixed to land; and includes any raft.</p> <p>There are many structures fixed to land such as stock fences that have a functional requirement to be located within 26m of the MHWS. Exclusion of this is consistent with NATC-R1.</p> <p>Lighting poles by or on behalf of FNDC have been sought as these are generally within legal road (which assumes the zoning of the neighboring site) or within park areas. In the case of the Waitangi Estate, the site contains a boat ramp and other infrastructure utilized by the general public which may at times require lighting not covered by a designation. Exclusions have been sought for footpaths and paving for both private and public use. In terms of the Waitangi Estate footpaths and paving convey people from Paihia onto the site and through to the Treaty grounds, and the Haruru Falls walking track among other uses. Generally, these are setback more than 30m from the coast but there are instances on the site where existing shell pathways are within the setback which may at some point require an upgrade. A 2m wide footpath has been sought to enable easy passing by two mobility scooters. The impact of sealing pathways is considered minor.</p> <p>Boundary fences and walls are also sought to be excluded so long as they are no more than 2m in height. This is because they are now captured under the definition of structure.</p>	<p>Amend Standard MUZ-S4 as follows:PER-1</p> <p>The building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure must be set back at least 26m from MHWS PER-2PER-2 The building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure within the 30m setback from MHWS is required for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. restoration and enhancement purposes; or 2. natural hazard mitigation undertaken by, or on behalf of, the local authority; or 3. a post and wire fence for the purpose of protection from farm stock; or 4. Lighting poles by, or on behalf of, the local authority or NZTA; or 5. Footpaths and or paving no greater than 2m in width; or 6. Boundary fences or walls no more than 2m in

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						height above ground level.
Brownie Family Trust (S74)	S74.041	Mixed use	MUZ-S5	Support	The provision enables active frontages.	Retain standard MUZ-S5 as notified
Russell Protection Society (INC) (S179)	S179.051	Mixed use	MUZ-S5	Support		Retain MUZ-S5
Te Hiku Community Board (S257)	S257.002	Mixed use	MUZ-S5	Support	We support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkept to maintain Amenity values in town centres.	Retain MUZ-S5 standards for pedestrian frontages identified on the planning maps.
Z Energy Limited (S336)	S336.020	Mixed use	MUZ-S5	Support in part	<p>The pedestrian frontage overlays are identified on both road boundaries at Z Kaikohe and the Commerce Street Road boundary at the Z service station in Kaitaia. Standard MUZ-S5 would apply if Z Energy, on their established sites, was seeking consent for a building or structure, and states: "The principal public entrance to the building must be located on the front boundary".</p> <p>This built-form outcome is not necessarily practical in the context of a service station and is incongruous with the permitted activity status of service stations under Rule MUZ-R2.</p> <p>Service stations are vehicle-oriented activities and the "entrance" or entrances to a service station site are typically via vehicle accesses from a main road or roads to a forecourt, with the retail building setback within the site for functional reasons. Requiring a resource consent application for infringing this standard due to a functional requirement, particularly where associated with a lawfully established activity, is not considered the most appropriate way of</p>	<p>Amend Standard MUZ-S5 (inferred) to acknowledge that in some circumstances it may not be appropriate for a building to be located on the front boundary of the site, as follows:</p> <p>For sites with pedestrian frontage identified on the planning maps:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. At least 65% of the building frontage at ground floor must be is clear glazing; and 2. The principal public entrance to the building must be located on the front boundary, Except where the activity is a service station.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					achieving the intended outcome of the zone and standard.	
Paihia Properties Holdings Corporate Trustee Limited and UP Management Ltd (S344)	S344.036	Mixed use	MUZ-S5	Not Stated	It is considered that a GFA of less than 400m ² with a default to discretionary activity where compliance cannot be achieved is particularly onerous within the MUZ given this is the only commercial zone providing for supermarket activities. It is considered that building bulk and scale should be managed separately to the scale of activities, MUZ-R1 note is confusing these effects, resulting unnecessary restrictions upon activities within the MUZ.	Amend Standards MUZ S1-S9 to give effect to the relief sought for MUZ-R1 (inferred)
Sean Frieling (S357)	S357.002	Mixed use	MUZ-S5	Support	Support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkept to maintain Amenity values in town centres.	Retain MUZ-S5 standards for pedestrian frontages identified on the planning maps.
Leah Frieling (S358)	S358.002	Mixed use	MUZ-S5	Support	We support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkept to maintain amenity values in town centres.	Retain Standard MUZ-S5 for pedestrian frontages identified on the planning maps.
Foodstuffs North Island Limited (S363)	S363.023	Mixed use	MUZ-S5	Not Stated	The submitter considers that standard MUZ-S5 Pedestrian Frontage, is particularly onerous given that the within the MUZ is the only commercial zone providing for supermarket activities.	Amend standard MUZ-S5 Pedestrian Frontage, to provide an exemption for supermarkets from pedestrian frontage requirements.
Far North District Council (S368)	S368.094	Mixed use	MUZ-S5	Support in part	Drafting change to improve readability and understanding	Amend MUZ-S5 1 . At least 65% of the building frontage at ground floor must be clear glazing; and 2. The principal public entrance to the building must be located on the road front boundary.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Michael Foy (S472)	S472.002	Mixed use	MUZ-S5	Support	We support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkept to maintain Amenity values in town centres.	Retain MUZ-S5 standards for pedestrian frontages identified on the planning maps
Brownie Family Trust (S74)	S74.042	Mixed use	MUZ-S6	Support	Verandahs provide a pleasant environment in a commercial setting.	Retain standard MUZ-S6 as notified
Russell Protection Society (INC) (S179)	S179.052	Mixed use	MUZ-S6	Support		Retain MUZ-S6
Te Hiku Community Board (S257)	S257.003	Mixed use	MUZ-S6	Support	We support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkept to maintain Amenity values in town centres.	Retain MUZ-S6 standards for verandahs on sites with pedestrian frontage identified on the planning maps.
Z Energy Limited (S336)	S336.021	Mixed use	MUZ-S6	Support in part	<p>Standard MUZ-S6 requires, for sites with a pedestrian frontage identified on the planning maps:</p> <p>(1) all buildings (including alterations and extensions to existing) to be built up to the road boundary; and</p> <p>(2) that a verandah on the relevant road boundary is provided.</p> <p>The performance standard would appear to relate to buildings only which is supported however it is a performance standard associated with permitted activity Rule MUZ-R1 which permits new buildings and structures... the principle of the standard is supported insofar as it related to new or altered buildings, but not a structure.</p> <p>The standard appears to apply if Z Energy was seeking consent for a building on an existing site with a pedestrian frontage, and requires a building at the relevant road boundary and a verandah to extend the full width of the building elevation. This is not practical in the context of a service station, where the buildings on the site are usually a canopy over the refuelling area and the</p>	<p>Amend Standard MUZ-S6 (inferred) to clarify that it does not apply to buildings that have a functional need to be set back from the road boundary, as follows:</p> <p>For sites with pedestrian frontage identified on the planning maps:</p> <p>1. Any new building, or extension or alteration to a building (including alterations to the façade) must be built up to the road boundary; and</p> <p>2. A verandah must be provided for the full frontage of the road boundary of the site. The verandah shall:</p> <p>a. directly adjoin any adjacent veranda so there is no horizontal gap to provide continuous pedestrian coverage; and</p> <p>b. have a minimum height of 3m and a maximum height of 6m above the footpath immediately below; and</p> <p>c. be setback a minimum of 300mm and a maximum of 600mm from a vertical line measured up from the face of the kerb. Except where the</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					ancillary retail building to one side or to the rear. Z Energy considers that greater recognition of these existing activities and their operational and functional requirements that prevent compliance is needed, noting the investment associated with the existing commercial activities, the benefits they provide to the community and the need for them to be maintained and upgraded from time to time. Furthermore, requiring a resource consent application for infringing this standard due to a functional requirement in particular, that associated with a lawfully established activity, is not considered the most appropriate way of achieving the intended outcome of the zone and standard.	activity is a service station.
Paihia Properties Holdings Corporate Trustee Limited and UP Management Ltd (S344)	S344.037	Mixed use	MUZ-S6	Not Stated	It is considered that a GFA of less than 400m2 with a default to discretionary activity where compliance cannot be achieved is particularly onerous within the MUZ given this is the only commercial zone providing for supermarket activities. It is considered that building bulk and scale should be managed separately to the scale of activities, MUZ-R1 note is confusing these effects, resulting unnecessary restrictions upon activities within the MUZ.	Amend Standards MUZ S1-S9 to give effect to the relief sought for MUZ-R1 (inferred)
Sean Frieling (S357)	S357.003	Mixed use	MUZ-S6	Support	Support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkept to maintain Amenity values in town centres.	Retain MUZ-S6 standards for verandahs on sites with pedestrian frontage identified on the planning maps.
Leah Frieling (S358)	S358.003	Mixed use	MUZ-S6	Support	We support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkept to maintain amenity values in town centres.	Retain Standard MUZ-S6
Foodstuffs North Island Limited (S363)	S363.024	Mixed use	MUZ-S6	Not Stated	The submitter considers that standard MUZ-S6 Verandah, is particularly onerous given that the within the MUZ is the only	Amend standard MUZ-S6 Verandah, to provide an exemption for supermarkets from verandah

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					commercial zone providing for supermarket activities.	requirements.
McDonalds Restaurants NZ Limited (S385)	S385.026	Mixed use	MUZ-S6	Support in part	McDonald's Kerikeri is subject to a pedestrian frontage overlay. McDonalds seek that MUZ-S6 be amended so that it does not apply to extensions and alterations. Further, McDonald's considers that 65% clear glazing on building frontages will generate issues in terms of passive solar gain and seek that this be reduced. It is difficult to understand the justification behind this figure, accordingly, McDonald's seeks that this be reduced to 25% which will still provide for active street frontages.	Amend MUZ-S6 as follows (or to same effect). For sites with pedestrian frontage identified on the planning maps: 1.Any new building must have: 1.a. At least 25% 65% of the building frontage at ground floor must be clear glazing; and 2.b. The principal public entrance to the building must be located on the front boundary
LJ King Ltd (S464)	S464.014	Mixed use	MUZ-S6	Support	Support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mixed use zones to have presented and upkept to maintain amenity values in town centres.	Retain MUZ-S6 as notified.
Michael Foy (S472)	S472.003	Mixed use	MUZ-S6	Support	We support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkept to maintain Amenity values in town centres.	Retain MUZ-S6 standards for verandahs on sites with pedestrian frontage identified on the planning maps.
Elbury Holdings (S485)	S485.015	Mixed use	MUZ-S6	Support	support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkept to maintain Amenity values in town centres.	Retain MUZ-S6 as notified.
Kaitaia Business Association (S501)	S501.001	Mixed use	MUZ-S6	Support in part	Request an amendment to Standard MUZ-S6 and introduction of bylaw that will require property owners to maintain the exterior of their buildings so the town has a presentable amenity in line with the intent of the Pedestrian Frontage Rule imposed by the District Plan. The proposed by-law (as attached to submission) will allow Council to employ contractors to complete works on those buildings detracting from the amenity of the	Amend Standard MUZ-S6 to include new point 3. as follows: 3.Verandah facades must comply with the Amenity Protection By-Law and be regularly maintained and cleaned accordingly. <i>(Refer to submission for a copy of proposed bylaw)</i>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					town centre and will do the work required and bill the owner accordingly.	
Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited (S502)	S502.032	Mixed use	MUZ-S6	Support in part	The Kaitia Business Association recently commissioned a Retail Strategy Report completed by First Retail which discusses the unmaintained buildings and dated public realm that creates an impression of decline. The sites with Pedestrian Frontage have existing verandas some of which are well maintained and contribute to the overall vibrancy of the town centre. Other sites have been left to become dilapidated and unattractive with old signage from 20+ years ago with peeling paint and mould which detracts from the overall amenity of the town centre.	Amend MUZ-S6 For sites with pedestrian frontage identified on the planning maps: 1. Any new building, or extension or alteration to a building (including alterations to the façade) must be built up to the road boundary; and 2. A verandah must be provided for the full frontage of the road boundary of the site. The verandah shall: a. directly adjoin any adjacent veranda so there is no horizontal gap to provide continuous pedestrian coverage; and b. have a minimum height of 3m and a maximum height of 6m above the footpath immediately below; and c. be setback a minimum of 300mm and a maximum of 600mm from a vertical line measured up from the face of the kerb. 3. Verandah facades must comply with the Amenity Protection By-Law and be regularly maintained and cleaned accordingly.
Elbury Holdings (S519)	S519.015	Mixed use	MUZ-S6	Support	We support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkept to maintain Amenity values in town centres.	Retain MUZ-S6 as notified.
Elbury Holdings (S541)	S541.013	Mixed use	MUZ-S6	Support	We support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkept to maintain Amenity values in town centres.	Retain MUZ-S6 standards for verandahs on sites with pedestrian frontage identified on the planning maps.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
LJ King Limited (S543)	S543.014	Mixed use	MUZ-S6	Support	We support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkept to maintain Amenity values in town centres.	Retain MUZ-S6 as notified.
LJ King Limited (S547)	S547.014	Mixed use	MUZ-S6	Support	We support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkept to maintain Amenity values in town centres.	Retain MUZ-S6 as notified
Brownie Family Trust (S74)	S74.043	Mixed use	MUZ-S7	Support	This provides for appropriate visual amenity.	Retain standard MUZ-S7 as notified
Russell Protection Society (INC) (S179)	S179.053	Mixed use	MUZ-S7	Support		Retain MUZ-S7
Te Hiku Community Board (S257)	S257.004	Mixed use	MUZ-S7	Support	We support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkept to maintain Amenity values in town centres.	Retain MUZ-S7 standards for screening of outdoor storage areas from adjoining sites and roads.
Paihia Properties Holdings Corporate Trustee Limited and UP Management Ltd (S344)	S344.038	Mixed use	MUZ-S7	Not Stated	It is considered that a GFA of less than 400m2 with a default to discretionary activity where compliance cannot be achieved is particularly onerous within the MUZ given this is the only commercial zone providing for supermarket activities. It is considered that building bulk and scale should be managed separately to the scale of activities, MUZ-R1 note is confusing these effects, resulting unnecessary restrictions upon activities within the MUZ.	Amend Standards MUZ S1-S9 to give effect to the relief sought for MUZ-R1 (inferred)
Sean Frieling (S357)	S357.004	Mixed use	MUZ-S7	Support	Support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkept to maintain Amenity values in town centres.	Retain MUZ-S7 standards for screening of outdoor storage areas from adjoining sites and roads.
Leah Frieling (S358)	S358.004	Mixed use	MUZ-S7	Support	We support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used	Retain Standard MUZ-S7

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					zones to have presented and upkept to maintain amenity values in town centres.	
McDonalds Restaurants NZ Limited (S385)	S385.027	Mixed use	MUZ-S7	Support in part	McDonald's Kerikeri is subject to a pedestrian frontage overlay. McDonalds seek that MUZ-S6 be amended so that it does not apply to extensions and alterations. McDonald's is concerned that this provision may prevent property owners upgrading the exterior of existing buildings which could result in perverse urban design outcomes and impacts on streetscape.	Amend MUZ-S7 as follows: For sites with pedestrian frontage identified on the planning maps: 1. Any new building, or extension or alteration to a building (including alterations to the façade) must be built up to the road boundary; and 2. A verandah must be provided for the full frontage of the road boundary of the site. The verandah shall: a. directly adjoin any adjacent veranda so there is no horizontal gap to provide continuous pedestrian coverage; and b. have a minimum height of 3m and a maximum height of 6m above the footpath immediately below; and c. be setback a minimum of 300mm and a maximum of 600mm from a vertical line measured up from the face of the kerb.
McDonalds Restaurants NZ Limited (S385)	S385.028	Mixed use	MUZ-S7	Support in part	McDonald's seeks flexibility within the drafting of provisions so that MUZ-S7 is not triggered where an alteration of extension to a legally established building or structure that contains a permitted activity (see sub# 18).	Amend MUZ-S7 to provide flexibility for alterations and extensions.
LJ King Ltd (S464)	S464.015	Mixed use	MUZ-S7	Support	Support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of	Retain MUZ-S7 as notified.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					commercial buildings in the new mixed use zones to have presented and upkept to maintain amenity values in town centres.	
Michael Foy (S472)	S472.004	Mixed use	MUZ-S7	Support	We support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkept to maintain Amenity values in town centres.	Retain MUZ-S7 standards for screening of outdoor storage areas from adjoining sites and roads.
Elbury Holdings (S485)	S485.016	Mixed use	MUZ-S7	Support	support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkept to maintain Amenity values in town centres.	Retain MUZ-S7 as notified.
Elbury Holdings (S519)	S519.016	Mixed use	MUZ-S7	Support	We support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkept to maintain Amenity values in town centres.	Retain MUZ-S7 as notified.
Elbury Holdings (S541)	S541.014	Mixed use	MUZ-S7	Support	We support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkept to maintain Amenity values in town centres.	Retain MUZ-S7 standards for screening of outdoor storage areas from adjoining sites and roads.
LJ King Limited (S543)	S543.015	Mixed use	MUZ-S7	Support	We support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkept to maintain Amenity values in town centres.	Retain MUZ-S7 as notified.
LJ King Limited (S547)	S547.015	Mixed use	MUZ-S7	Support	We support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkept to maintain Amenity values in town centres.	Retain MUZ-S7 as notified
Brownie Family Trust (S74)	S74.044	Mixed use	MUZ-S8	Support in part	The standard is supported in principle. Landscaping can soften an otherwise hard looking development.	Amend standard MUZ-S8 to include a provision to manage visibility and ensure pedestrian safety near vehicle crossings (in particular). Visual sight lines need to be maintained for the safety of traffic and pedestrians.
Russell Protection	S179.054	Mixed use	MUZ-S8	Support		Retain MUZ-S8

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Society (INC) (S179)						
Te Hiku Community Board (S257)	S257.005	Mixed use	MUZ-S8	Support	We support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkept to maintain Amenity values in town centres.	Retain MUZ-S8 standards for 50% landscaping and screening along road boundaries.
Z Energy Limited (S336)	S336.022	Mixed use	MUZ-S8	Support in part	Standard MUZ-S8 (Landscaping and screening on a road boundary) requires, inter alia, that landscaping along a road boundary shall be a minimum height of 1m at installation and shall achieve a continuous screen of 1.8m in height and 1.5m in width within five years. Any changes to existing service stations, for example, will have to consider this standard which is not currently achieved at any of the three sites identified in the submission. Moreover, it is unlikely to be achievable for a number of functional requirement reasons, including traffic safety. Z Energy opposes the imposition of this standard to existing service stations sites. Z Energy accepts that landscaping along the road boundary can enhance the attractiveness of a site and mitigate the effects of the development of the site. For service station sites, however, incorporating trees into front boundary landscaping is problematic. It is clear from the standard that the Council anticipates the planting of trees or plants that will be substantial enough to form a visual screen over time. At service station sites, which have a significant number of traffic movements into and out of the site per day and where visibility to the forecourt and to signage is critical to a successful and safe operation, substantial trees or hedging can create a nuisance commercially and in terms of root extent and traffic safety. Requiring trees, and in particular in this instance, screening, can block the view of	Amend Standard MUZ-S8 to exclude existing service station sites from the landscaping requirements. This could be achieved by including the following additional exemption to the standard: 1. Where a site adjoins a road boundary, at least 50% of that road boundary not occupied by buildings or driveways shall be landscaped with plants or trees. 2. The landscaping shall be a minimum height of 1m at installation and shall achieve a continuous screen of 1.8m in height and 1.5m in width within five years. Except where: a. the site is utilised by an existing service station activity.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					signage and the forecourt, block visibility of vehicles entering and exiting, develop root systems that interfere with existing infrastructure and services and be difficult to achieve at service stations due to vehicle crossing requirements, tanker tracking and signage visibility	
Paihia Properties Holdings Corporate Trustee Limited and UP Management Ltd (S344)	S344.039	Mixed use	MUZ-S8	Not Stated	It is considered that a GFA of less than 400m2 with a default to discretionary activity where compliance cannot be achieved is particularly onerous within the MUZ given this is the only commercial zone providing for supermarket activities. It is considered that building bulk and scale should be managed separately to the scale of activities, MUZ-R1 note is confusing these effects, resulting unnecessary restrictions upon activities within the MUZ.	Amend Standards MUZ S1-S9 to give effect to the relief sought for MUZ-R1 (inferred)
Sean Frieling (S357)	S357.005	Mixed use	MUZ-S8	Support	Support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkept to maintain Amenity values in town centres.	Retain MUZ-S8 standards for 50% landscaping and screening along road boundaries.
Leah Frieling (S358)	S358.005	Mixed use	MUZ-S8	Support	We support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkept to maintain amenity values in town centres.	Retain Standard MUZ-S8
McDonalds Restaurants NZ Limited (S385)	S385.029	Mixed use	MUZ-S8	Support in part	McDonald's seeks flexibility within the drafting of provisions so that MUZ-S7 is not triggered where an alteration of extension to a legally established building or structure that contains a permitted activity (see sub# 18).	Amend MUZ-S8 to provide flexibility for alterations and extensions
LJ King Ltd (S464)	S464.016	Mixed use	MUZ-S8	Support	Support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mixed use zones to have presented and upkept to maintain amenity values in town centres.	Retain MUZ-S8 as notified.
Michael Foy (S472)	S472.005	Mixed use	MUZ-S8	Support	We support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used	Retain MUZ-S8 standards for 50% landscaping and screening along road boundaries

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					zones to have presented and upkept to maintain Amenity values in town centres	
Elbury Holdings (S485)	S485.017	Mixed use	MUZ-S8	Support	support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkept to maintain Amenity values in town centres.	Retain MUZ-S8 as notified.
Elbury Holdings (S519)	S519.017	Mixed use	MUZ-S8	Support	We support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkept to maintain Amenity values in town centres.	Retain MUZ-S8 as notified.
Elbury Holdings (S541)	S541.015	Mixed use	MUZ-S8	Support	We support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkept to maintain Amenity values in town centres.	Retain MUZ-S8 standards for 50% landscaping and screening along road boundaries.
LJ King Limited (S543)	S543.016	Mixed use	MUZ-S8	Support	We support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkept to maintain Amenity values in town centres.	Retain MUZ-S8 as notified
LJ King Limited (S547)	S547.016	Mixed use	MUZ-S8	Support	We support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkept to maintain Amenity values in town centres.	Retain MUZ-S8 as notified
Brownie Family Trust (S74)	S74.045	Mixed use	MUZ-S9	Support in part	The standard is supported in principle. Landscaping can soften an otherwise hard looking development. Visual sight lines need to be maintained for the safety of traffic and pedestrians. This could be a problem near shared access points.	Amend standard MUZ-S9 to include a provision to manage visibility and ensure pedestrian safety near vehicle crossings (in particular)
Russell Protection Society (INC) (S179)	S179.055	Mixed use	MUZ-S9	Support		Retain MUZ-S9
Paihia Properties Holdings Corporate Trustee	S344.040	Mixed use	MUZ-S9	Not Stated	It is considered that a GFA of less than 400m2 with a default to discretionary activity where compliance cannot be achieved is particularly onerous within the MUZ given this is the only commercial zone providing for	Amend Standards MUZ S1-S9 to give effect to the relief sought for MUZ-R1 (inferred)

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Limited and UP Management Ltd (S344)					supermarket activities. It is considered that building bulk and scale should be managed separately to the scale of activities, MUZ-R1 note is confusing these effects, resulting unnecessary restrictions upon activities within the MUZ.	
Far North District Council (S368)	S368.095	Mixed use	MUZ-S9	Support in part	Typo, should be site not side	Amend MUZ-S9 Side Site boundaries that adjoin any zone other than Mixed Use, Light Industrial or Heavy Industrial must:
Vaughan Norton-Taylor (S50)	S50.005	Mixed use	MUZ-S10	Oppose	The submitter opposes the requirement in this standard for coverage in the mixed use zone that at least 10% of the site shall be planted in grass, vegetation or landscaped with permeable material. The submitter considers that no consideration has been given to the value of the land that this requirement will consume.	Amend to remove the requirement for coverage in the mixed use zone being 10% (inferred)
Brownie Family Trust (S74)	S74.046	Mixed use	MUZ-S10	Support	Softening a site with landscaping and ensuring stormwater is appropriately managed is supported.	Retain standard MUZ-S10 as notified.
Russell Protection Society (INC) (S179)	S179.056	Mixed use	MUZ-S10	Support		Retain MUZ-S10
Brad Hedger (S267)	S267.003	Mixed use	MUZ-S10	Support	This is a good rule it encourages permeable areas and potentially amenity in these spaces.	Retain MUZ-S10.
McDonalds Restaurants NZ Limited (S385)	S385.030	Mixed use	MUZ-S10	Support in part	McDonald's seeks flexibility within the drafting of provisions so that MUZ-S10 is not triggered where an alteration of extension to a legally established building or structure that contains a permitted activity (see sub# 18).	Amend MUZ-S10 to provide flexibility for alterations and extensions.
Vaughan Norton-Taylor (S536)	S536.005	Mixed use	MUZ-S10	Oppose	Retaining at least 10% of the site in grass provides no consideration for the value of the	Delete Standard MUZ-S10 and retain status quo (inferred)

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					land that it will consume. No logic or reason are given for this change.	
Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust (S338)	S338.040	Light industrial	Overview	Not Stated	The Light Industrial zone may be located next to General Residential or Mixed Use zones. Connectivity and amenity should be considered in all zones, while public spaces should be considered for the majority of zones where people live or work.	Amend the overview as follows: ... Activities within this zone may include light manufacturing, contractor depots, automotive and marine repair, service industries, and some compatible commercial activities. Unlike the Mixed Use zone, the Light Industrial zone is not required to focus on pedestrian access or amenity or provide public spaces. It may also serve as a buffer between the Heavy Industrial zone and General Residential or Mixed Use zones...
Bunnings Limited (S371)	S371.016	Light industrial	Overview	Support	Bunnings acknowledges that the intent of the zone is to provide for light industrial activities and supports the provision for compatible commercial activities, such as trade suppliers (noting S371.004).	Retain the Overview
Kapiro Residents Association (S427)	S427.027	Light industrial	Overview	Oppose	We disagree with this sentence, especially since the Light Industrial zone may be located next to residential or mixed use zones. Connectivity and amenity should be considered in all zones, while public spaces should be considered for the majority of zones where people live or work.	Amend Light Industrial Zone Overview to delete the following sentence: ".... the Light Industrial Zone is not required to focus on pedestrian access or amenity or provide public spaces ".
Kapiro Conservation Trust (S449)	S449.040	Light industrial	Overview	Oppose	The Light Industrial zone may be located next to residential or mixed use zones. Connectivity and amenity should be considered in all zones, while public spaces should be considered for the majority of zones where people live or work.	Amend the overview as follows: ... Activities within this zone may include light manufacturing, contractor depots, automotive and marine repair, service industries, and some compatible commercial activities.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						Unlike the Mixed Use zone, the Light Industrial zone is not required to focus on pedestrian access or amenity or provide public spaces. It may also serve as a buffer between the Heavy Industrial zone and General Residential or Mixed Use zones...
Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK) (S522)	S522.026	Light industrial	Overview	Oppose	The Light Industrial zone may be located next to residential or mixed use zones. Connectivity and amenity should be considered in all zones, while public spaces should be considered for the majority of zones where people live or work.	Amend the overview as follows: ... Activities within this zone may include light manufacturing, contractor depots, automotive and marine repair, service industries, and some compatible commercial activities. Unlike the Mixed Use zone, the Light Industrial zone is not required to focus on pedestrian access or amenity or provide public spaces. It may also serve as a buffer between the Heavy Industrial zone and General Residential or Mixed Use zones...
Carbon Neutral NZ Trust (S529)	S529.039	Light industrial	Overview	Oppose	The Light Industrial zone may be located next to residential or mixed use zones. Connectivity and amenity should be considered in all zones, while public spaces should be considered for the majority of zones where people live or work.	Amend the overview as follows: ... Activities within this zone may include light manufacturing, contractor depots, automotive and marine repair, service industries, and some compatible commercial activities. Unlike the Mixed Use zone, the Light Industrial zone is not required to focus on pedestrian access or amenity or provide public spaces. It may also serve as a buffer between the Heavy Industrial

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						zone and General Residential or Mixed Use zones...
Waste Management NZ Limited (S360)	S360.002	Light industrial	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
Transpower New Zealand Ltd (S454)	S454.118	Light industrial	Objectives	Not Stated	Critical infrastructure such as the National Grid sometimes has a functional or operational need to locate in the Light Industrial Zone and needs to be 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 objective is required to address this.	Insert new objective LIZ-Ox as follows: The Light Industrial zone is used by compatible activities and infrastructure, that have a functional or operational need to locate in the zone.
Ngawha Generation Limited (S432)	S432.006	Light industrial	LIZ-O1	Support in part	NGL is largely supportive of the LIZ objectives as notified. However as identified in Sub point #2 above, clarity is required on the definition of "light industrial activities". Depending on how that is defined, further amendments may be required to the LIZ objectives.	Amend LIZ-O1-O5, subject to the requested amendments to include a new definition for 'light industrial activities', to ensure that appropriate activities (such as activities related to the construction, operation and maintenance of structures associated with renewable electricity generation) are recognised and provided for in the Light Industrial Zone.
Ngawha Generation Limited (S432)	S432.030	Light industrial	LIZ-O2	Support in part	NGL is largely supportive of the LIZ objectives as notified. However as identified in Sub point #2 above, clarity is required on the definition of "light industrial activities". Depending on how that is defined, further	Amend LIZ-O1-O5, subject to the requested amendments to include a new definition for 'light industrial activities', to ensure that appropriate activities (such as activities related to the construction, operation and

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					amendments may be required to the LIZ objectives.	maintenance of structures associated with renewable electricity generation) are recognised and provided for in the Light Industrial Zone.
Mainfreight Limited (S509)	S509.002	Light industrial	LIZ-O2	Support in part	not stated	amend Objective LIZ-O2(b) to include reference to "warehouse and logistics facilities".
Ngawha Generation Limited (S432)	S432.031	Light industrial	LIZ-O3	Support in part	NGL is largely supportive of the LIZ objectives as notified. However as identified in Sub point #2 above, clarity is required on the definition of "light industrial activities". Depending on how that is defined, further amendments may be required to the LIZ objectives.	Amend LIZ-O1-O5, subject to the requested amendments to include a new definition for "light industrial activities", to ensure that appropriate activities (such as activities related to the construction, operation and maintenance of structures associated with renewable electricity generation) are recognised and provided for in the Light Industrial Zone.
Ngawha Generation Limited (S432)	S432.032	Light industrial	LIZ-O4	Support in part	NGL is largely supportive of the LIZ objectives as notified. However as identified in Sub point #2 above, clarity is required on the definition of "light industrial activities". Depending on how that is defined, further amendments may be required to the LIZ objectives.	Amend LIZ-O1-O5, subject to the requested amendments to include a new definition for "light industrial activities", to ensure that appropriate activities (such as activities related to the construction, operation and maintenance of structures associated with renewable electricity generation) are recognised and provided for in the Light Industrial Zone.
Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga (S331)	S331.083	Light industrial	LIZ-O5	Support in part	The submitter supports in part objective LIZ-O5 as it includes a limited range of commercial activities which support light industrial activities. However, the submitter considers educational facilities (e.g., forklift driver training), to have an operational need in the Light Industrial zone.	Amend objective LIZ-O5 as follows: The Light Industrial zone accommodates a limited range of commercial activities which either support light industrial activities, have an operational need to be located within the zone or are not anticipated in the Mixed Use Light Industrial zone.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Z Energy Limited (S336)	S336.024	Light industrial	LIZ-O5	Support	Objective LIZ-O5 (inferred) seeks to accommodate a limited range of commercial activities which either support light industrial activities or that are not anticipated in the MUZ. Z Energy supports this outcome sought. Whilst the MUZ anticipates service stations (provided for as a permitted activity through the PDP) truck stops are an activity that supports many light industrial activities and can operate appropriately in a light industrial area.	Retain Objective LIZ-O5 (Inferred)
Bunnings Limited (S371)	S371.017	Light industrial	LIZ-O5	Support	Bunnings support Objective LIZ-O5 but seek more directive language given that some activities (including trade suppliers) are permitted	Amend Objective LIZ-O5 as follows: The Light Industrial zone accommodates provides for a limited range of commercial activities which either support light industrial activities or are not anticipated in the Mixed Use zone
Ngawha Generation Limited (S432)	S432.033	Light industrial	LIZ-O5	Support in part	NGL is largely supportive of the LIZ objectives as notified. However as identified in Sub point #2 above, clarity is required on the definition of "light industrial activities". Depending on how that is defined, further amendments may be required to the LIZ objectives.	Amend LIZ-O1-O5, subject to the requested amendments to include a new definition for "light industrial activities", to ensure that appropriate activities (such as activities related to the construction, operation and maintenance of structures associated with renewable electricity generation) are recognised and provided for in the Light Industrial Zone.
Waste Management NZ Limited (S360)	S360.005	Light industrial	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	Amend the policies to provide for waste management facilities

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					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.	
Transpower New Zealand Ltd (S454)	S454.119	Light industrial	Policies	Not Stated	LIZ-P1 sets out the activities that are to be enabled in the Light Industrial 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 infrastructure such as the National Grid is enabled in the Light Industrial zone.	Insert new policy LIZ-Px as follows: Enable compatible activities and infrastructure, that have a functional or operational need to locate in the Light Industrial zone.
Ngawha Generation Limited (S432)	S432.007	Light industrial	LIZ-P1	Support in part	NGL is largely supportive of the LIZ policies as notified. However as identified in Sub #2 and 3 above, clarity is required on the definition of "light industrial activities" and "heavy industrial activities". This is particularly relevant for LIZ-P3(a) which seeks to avoid the establishment of "heavy industrial activities" that do not support the function these terms are defined, further amendments may be required to the LIZ objectives.	Amend LIZ-P1-P6, subject to the requested amendments to include a new definition for "light industrial activities" and "heavy industrial activities", to ensure that appropriate activities (such as activities related to the construction, operation and maintenance of structures associated with renewable electricity generation) are recognised and provided for in the Light Industrial Zone.
Far North District Council (S368)	S368.019	Light industrial	LIZ-P2	Support in part	Minor grammatical correction in reference to c.	Amend LIZ-P2 Require all subdivision in the Light Industrial zone to provide the following reticulated services to the boundary of each lot: a. telecommunications: i. fibre where it is available; ii. copper where fibre is not available;

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>iii. copper where the area is identified for future fibre deployment.</p> <p>b. local electricity distribution network; and</p> <p>c. wastewater, potable water supply and stormwater where they are it is available</p>
Ngawha Generation Limited (S432)	S432.034	Light industrial	LIZ-P2	Support in part	NGL is largely supportive of the LIZ policies as notified. However as identified in Sub #2 and 3 above, clarity is required on the definition of "light industrial activities" and "heavy industrial activities". This is particularly relevant for LIZ-P3(a) which seeks to avoid the establishment of "heavy industrial activities" that do not support the function these terms are defined, further amendments may be required to the LIZ objectives.	Amend LIZ-P1-P6, subject to the requested amendments to include a new definition for "light industrial activities" and "heavy industrial activities", to ensure that appropriate activities (such as activities related to the construction, operation and maintenance of structures associated with renewable electricity generation) are recognised and provided for in the Light Industrial Zone.
Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga (S331)	S331.084	Light industrial	LIZ-P3	Support in part	The submitter supports in part policy LIZ-P3, as the avoidance of activities that do not support the function of the Light Industrial zone is considered necessary. However, the submitter considers educational facilities (e.g., forklift driver training), to have an operational need to establish in the Light Industrial zone	Amend policy LIZ-P3 as follows: Avoid the establishment of activities that do not support the function and operation of the Light Industrial zone, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. heavy industrial activities; b. residential activities; c. community facilities; d. retirement villages; e. child care centres; and education facilities; and g. sport and recreation facilities.
Grant Alan Billington and Georgina	S372.003	Light industrial	LIZ-P3	Oppose	Refer to the full submission for detailed reasons for the decision requested which includes, but not limited to the avoidance (of	Amend LIZ-P3 which seeks to avoid the establishment of residential

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
McGarry (S372)					residential activities) requirement within LIZ-P3 is not consistent with considering effects of activities, rather its supports the removal of activities entirely.	activities.
Ngawha Generation Limited (S432)	S432.035	Light industrial	LIZ-P3	Support in part	NGL is largely supportive of the LIZ policies as notified. However as identified in Sub #2 and 3 above, clarity is required on the definition of "light industrial activities" and "heavy industrial activities". This is particularly relevant for LIZ-P3(a) which seeks to avoid the establishment of "heavy industrial activities" that do not support the function these terms are defined, further amendments may be required to the LIZ objectives.	Amend LIZ-P1-P6, subject to the requested amendments to include a new definition for "light industrial activities" and "heavy industrial activities", to ensure that appropriate activities (such as activities related to the construction, operation and maintenance of structures associated with renewable electricity generation) are recognised and provided for in the Light Industrial Zone.
Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga (S331)	S331.085	Light industrial	LIZ-P4	Support in part	The submitter supports in part policy LIZ-P4 as it allows commercial activities in the Light Industrial zone. However, the Ministry considers educational facilities (e.g., forklift driver training), to have an operational need in the Light Industrial zone.	Amend policy LIZ-P4 as follows: Allow commercial activities in the Light Industrial zone that: a. are complementary to and support light industrial activities; or b. have an operational need to be located in the Light Industrial zone; or c. require larger sites and may not accommodate amenity values anticipated in the Mixed Use zone.
Z Energy Limited (S336)	S336.025	Light industrial	LIZ-P4	Support	Policy LIZ-P4 seeks to allow some commercial activities that are complementary to and support light industrial activities. Z Energy supports this policy and considers that this should include truck stops as they	Retain Policy LIZ-P4

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					operate in a manner that complements and supports many light industrial activities.	
Ngawha Generation Limited (S432)	S432.036	Light industrial	LIZ-P4	Support in part	NGL is largely supportive of the LIZ policies as notified. However as identified in Sub #2 and 3 above, clarity is required on the definition of "light industrial activities" and "heavy industrial activities". This is particularly relevant for LIZ-P3(a) which seeks to avoid the establishment of "heavy industrial activities" that do not support the function these terms are defined, further amendments may be required to the LIZ objectives.	Amend LIZ-P1-P6, subject to the requested amendments to include a new definition for "light industrial activities" and "heavy industrial activities", to ensure that appropriate activities (such as activities related to the construction, operation and maintenance of structures associated with renewable electricity generation) are recognised and provided for in the Light Industrial Zone.
Ngawha Generation Limited (S432)	S432.037	Light industrial	LIZ-P5	Support in part	NGL is largely supportive of the LIZ policies as notified. However as identified in Sub #2 and 3 above, clarity is required on the definition of "light industrial activities" and "heavy industrial activities". This is particularly relevant for LIZ-P3(a) which seeks to avoid the establishment of "heavy industrial activities" that do not support the function these terms are defined, further amendments may be required to the LIZ objectives.	Amend LIZ-P1-P6, subject to the requested amendments to include a new definition for "light industrial activities" and "heavy industrial activities", to ensure that appropriate activities (such as activities related to the construction, operation and maintenance of structures associated with renewable electricity generation) are recognised and provided for in the Light Industrial Zone.
Mainfreight Limited (S509)	S509.003	Light industrial	LIZ-P5	Oppose	not stated	delete LIZ-P5
Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust (S271)	S271.037	Light industrial	LIZ-P6	Support in part	Ensuring connectivity is provided for is critical through these areas to ensure integrated and well connected communities.	Amend LIZ-P6 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 light industrial environment and purpose of the zone; b. alignment with any

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>strategic or spatial document;c. provisions made to ensure connectivity; d. the location, scale and design of buildings or structures, outdoor storage areas, parking and internal roading; e. for non-industrial activities: i. scale and compatibility with industrial activities; ii. potential reverse sensitivity effects on industrial activities. f. at zone interfaces: i. any setbacks, fencing, screening or landscaping required to address potential conflicts; ii. any adverse effects on the character and amenity of adjacent zones. g. the adequacy and capacity of available or programmed development infrastructure to accommodate the proposed activity; including: i. opportunities for low impact design principles; ii. management of three waters infrastructure and trade waste such as industrial by-products. h. managing natural hazards; i. the adequacy of roading infrastructure to service the proposed activity;</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						j. any adverse effects on historic heritage and cultural values, natural features and landscapes or indigenous biodiversity; and k. any historical, spiritual, or cultural association held by tangata whenua, with regard to the matters set out in Policy TW-P6.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S416)	S416.051	Light industrial	LIZ-P6	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
Ngawha Generation Limited (S432)	S432.038	Light industrial	LIZ-P6	Support in part	NGL is largely supportive of the LIZ policies as notified. However as identified in Sub #2 and 3 above, clarity is required on the definition of "light industrial activities" and "heavy industrial activities". This is particularly relevant for LIZ-P3(a) which seeks to avoid the establishment of "heavy industrial activities" that do not support the function these terms are defined, further amendments may be required to the LIZ objectives.	Amend LIZ-P1-P6, subject to the requested amendments to include a new definition for "light industrial activities" and "heavy industrial activities", to ensure that appropriate activities (such as activities related to the construction, operation and maintenance of structures associated with renewable electricity generation) are recognised and provided for in the Light Industrial Zone.
Kapiro Conservation Trust (S446)	S446.038	Light industrial	LIZ-P6	Support in part	The LIZ is located on many of the urban center peripheries and in some instances between commercial and residential. Ensuring connectivity is provided for is critical through these areas to ensure integrated and well connected communities.	Amend LIZ-P6 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

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>to the application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. consistency with the scale, density, design and character of the light industrial environment and purpose of the zone; b. alignment with any strategic or spatial document; c. provisions made to ensure connectivity; d. the location, scale and design of buildings or structures, outdoor storage areas, parking and internal roading; e. for non-industrial activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. scale and compatibility with industrial activities; ii. potential reverse sensitivity effects on industrial activities. f. at zone interfaces: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. any setbacks, fencing, screening or landscaping required to address potential conflicts; ii. any adverse effects on the character and amenity of adjacent zones. g. 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. management of three waters infrastructure and trade waste

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>such as industrial by-products.</p> <p>h. managing natural hazards;</p> <p>i. the adequacy of roading infrastructure to service the proposed activity;</p> <p>j. any adverse effects on historic heritage and cultural values, natural features and landscapes or indigenous biodiversity; and</p> <p>k. any historical, spiritual, or cultural association held by tangata whenua, with regard to the matters set out in Policy TW-P6.</p>
<p>Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK) (S524)</p>	<p>S524.037</p>	<p>Light industrial</p>	<p>LIZ-P6</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>Ensuring connectivity is provided for is critical through these areas to ensure integrated and well connected communities.</p>	<p>Amend LIZ-P6</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> <p>a. consistency with the scale, density, design and character of the light industrial environment and purpose of the zone;</p> <p>b. alignment with any strategic or spatial document;</p> <p>c. provisions made to ensure connectivity;</p> <p>d. the location, scale and design of buildings or structures, outdoor storage areas, parking and internal roading;</p> <p>e. for non-industrial activities:</p> <p>i. scale and compatibility with</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>industrial activities;</p> <p>ii. potential reverse sensitivity effects on industrial activities.</p> <p>f. at zone interfaces:</p> <p>i. any setbacks, fencing, screening or landscaping required to address potential conflicts;</p> <p>ii. any adverse effects on the character and amenity of adjacent zones.</p> <p>g. the adequacy and capacity of available or programmed development infrastructure to accommodate the proposed activity; including:</p> <p>i. opportunities for low impact design principles;</p> <p>ii. management of three waters infrastructure and trade waste such as industrial by-products.</p> <p>h. managing natural hazards;</p> <p>i. the adequacy of roading infrastructure to service the proposed activity;</p> <p>j. any adverse effects on historic heritage and cultural values, natural features and landscapes or indigenous biodiversity; and</p> <p>k. any historical, spiritual, or cultural association held by tangata whenua, with regard to the matters set out in Policy TW-</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						P6.
Carbon Neutral NZ Trust (S529)	S529.102	Light industrial	LIZ-P6	Support in part	Ensuring connectivity is provided for is critical through these areas to ensure integrated and well connected communities.	<p>Amend LIZ-P6</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, density, design and character of the light industrial environment and purpose of the zone; b. alignment with any strategic or spatial document; c. provisions made to ensure connectivity; d. the location, scale and design of buildings or structures, outdoor storage areas, parking and internal roading; e. for non-industrial activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. scale and compatibility with industrial activities; ii. potential reverse sensitivity effects on industrial activities. f. at zone interfaces: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. any setbacks, fencing, screening or landscaping required to address potential conflicts; ii. any adverse effects on the character and amenity of adjacent zones. g. the adequacy and capacity of available or programmed development infrastructure to

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>accommodate the proposed activity; including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. opportunities for low impact design principles; ii. management of three waters infrastructure and trade waste such as industrial by-products. h. managing natural hazards; i. the adequacy of roading infrastructure to service the proposed activity; j. any adverse effects on historic heritage and cultural values, natural features and landscapes or indigenous biodiversity; and k. any historical, spiritual, or cultural association held by tangata whenua, with regard to the matters set out in Policy TW-P6.
<p>Waste Management NZ Limited (S360)</p>	<p>S360.008</p>	<p>Light industrial</p>	<p>Rules</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>Amend the rules to provide for waste management facilities</p>
<p>Bunnings Limited (S371)</p>	<p>S371.018</p>	<p>Light industrial</p>	<p>Rules</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>There is currently no permitted activity status for any light industrial activities that the overview indicates are provided for in the</p>	<p>Amend the rule framework for light industrial activities to increase the</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					Light Industrial zone. While this is not necessarily of interest to Bunnings, it is critical to the integrity of the Chapter particularly noting that 'light industrial activity' is not a defined term	threshold for.
Grant Alan Billington and Georgina McGarry (S372)	S372.002	Light industrial	Rules	Oppose	Refer to the full submission for detailed reasons for the decision requested which include, but not limited to, the following: Restricted Discretionary Activity - a potential middle ground for Council to at least consider the suite of potential effects that may relate to each site; noise provisions allow for consideration of noise sensitive activities either on site or any other site - these taken together promotes sufficient protection of incompatibility; the overview section suggests that compatible residential activities may be appropriate in certain circumstances.	Amend, if the site (8 Waterfront Drive, Mangonui) is accepted to be rezoned as Light Industrial Zone, the activity status of LIZ-R11 Residential Activity, LIZ-R12 Retirement Village and LIZ-R13 Visitor Accommodation to Restricted Discretionary.
Ngawha Generation Limited (S432)	S432.014	Light industrial	Rules	Oppose	Subject to the definition of "light industrial activities" and associated nesting tables sought in sub points #1-3 above, the light industrial zone provisions need an explicit rule permitting appropriate "industrial activities" and "light industrial activities" in the LIZ Chapter.	Amend, subject to the requested amendments to include a new definition for "light industrial activities", to LIZ rules to permit appropriate activities (including activities related to the construction, operation and maintenance of structures associated with renewable electricity generation).
Northland Fish and Game Council (S436)	S436.009	Light industrial	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. 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.	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
					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.	
New Zealand Motor Caravan Association (S438)	S438.018	Light industrial	Rules	Support in part	The effects of camping grounds in the Light Industrial Zone is similar to effects generated by camping grounds in the Mixed Use Zone. Camping grounds also have limited potential for reverse sensitivities in the Light Industrial Zone.	Amend the Light Industrial Zone rules to include a conditional activity status for camping grounds.
New Zealand Motor Caravan Association (S438)	S438.019	Light industrial	Rules	Support in part	The proposed amendments would see compatible treatment of camping sites to camping grounds as amended in the submission.	Amend the Light Industrial Zone rules to include a conditional activity status for camping sites.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand (S512)	S512.055	Light industrial	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	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
					Emergency request that emergency service facilities are included as a permitted activity in all zones. The draft Plan currently only includes emergency services facilities as an activity in some zones and with varying activity status. In addition, fire stations have specific requirements with relation to setback distances and vehicle crossings. Fire and Emergency request that emergency service facilities are exempt from these standards	
Radio New Zealand (S489)	S489.039	Light industrial	Notes	Support in part	Part of the zone is within 1,000m of RNZ's facilities and RNZ seeks the addition of a note	Insert a note as follows: There is a risk that significant tall structures (ie. higher than 40m) within 1,000m of Radio New Zealand's Facilities at Waipapakauri or Ōhaeawai, could present a safety risk from electro magnetic coupling. Developers of such structures should consult with Radio New Zealand at the planning stage to ensure such risks are avoided
Puketona Business Park Limited (S45)	S45.002	Light industrial	LIZ-R1	Not Stated	The provisions of the Light Industrial zone require amendment to ensure they best achieve the purpose of the Act and the overarching intent of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 in respect of well-functioning urban environments and indeed the PDP's stated strategic directions. PBPL considers a requirement to seek resource consent for new buildings with greater than 450m ² Gross Business Area effectively renders the majority of light industrial activity unable to establish within this zone without resource consent. Very few	Delete PER-1 of Rule LIZ-R1

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					light industrial activities will comply with that unnecessarily restrictive threshold. Indeed, light industrial activities have a functional and operational requirement for greater floorspace than commercial (excluding large format retail) and mixed-use activities.	
Ti Toki Farms Limited (S262)	S262.003	Light industrial	LIZ-R1	Oppose	The submitter opposes LIZ-R1 and considers that the zone is being restrained by a limit on the GBA and it is not clear what Council is trying to achieve with this provision and it should be deleted.	Delete LIZ-R1 - PER 1, PER-2 and PER-3b-d
Waste Management NZ Limited (S360)	S360.012	Light industrial	LIZ-R1	Oppose	There is no rational basis for the threshold for the area of buildings within the Light Industrial zone. It is not necessary to apply a threshold to the gross business area (or gross floor area) of activities or new buildings within the Light Industrial zone, noting that other standards are proposed to manage the effects of the location and scale of buildings. The threshold is a blunt instrument which does not adequately recognise the requirements for the efficient design and operation of industrial activities, including transfer stations, and should be deleted	Delete PER-1 of Rule LIZ-R1
Foodstuffs North Island Limited (S363)	S363.029	Light industrial	LIZ-R1	Not Stated	The submitter considers that rule LIZ-R1 New buildings or structures, and extensions or alterations to existing buildings or structures, with a default to discretionary activity is a particularly onerous approach. Flexibility is also required for extensions and alterations for existing legally established structures. As currently notified, any alteration to an existing building or structure that is already more than 450m2 GBA would require discretionary resource consent, regardless as to whether this is internal/external or the degree of change to the approved footprint. finally, in regard to PER-2 note that no industrial activities have been provided for in the Light Industrial Zone as a permitted activity.	Amend rule LIZ-R1 New buildings or structures, and extensions or alterations to existing buildings or structures to default to a restricted discretionary activity and to enable additional and alterations where they do not change the existing footprint and remove the reference to industrial activities in PER 2.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Far North District Council (S368)	S368.011	Light industrial	LIZ-R1	Support in part	Provision needs to be made for the pedestrian frontage shown on the maps. This is an omission that was in the operative DP Commercial zone and not brought across in the light industrial PDP zone.	Amend to Include reference to a standard in the 'New buildings or structures, and extensions or alterations to existing buildings or structures' rule, and include the standard for pedestrian frontage as seen in the Mixed Use zone.
Far North District Council (S368)	S368.071	Light industrial	LIZ-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 LIZ-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 ... "
Bunnings Limited (S371)	S371.019	Light industrial	LIZ-R1	Support in part	Bunnings seek amendment to the building and structure provisions to ensure that Bunnings Warehouse (buildings and structures) can be established as a permitted activity where an appropriate GBA is met (PER-1). It is considered that a GBA of less than 450m ² for permitted activity with a default to discretionary activity where compliance is not achieved is particularly onerous approach	Amend Rule LIZ -R1 as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase threshold for coverage for new buildings or structures • Permit alterations where they do not result in an increased building footprint • Permit extensions of an appropriate scale where they comply with LIZ-S1, LIZ-S2, LIZ-S3, LIZ-S4, LIZ-S8 to avoid unnecessary consenting requirements. • Default to a restricted discretionary activity for non-compliance with PER 1 or PER-2.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend PER-2 to refer to 'permitted activities' instead of 'industrial activities'
Bunnings Limited (S371)	S371.020	Light industrial	LIZ-R1	Support	Bunnings supports enabling trade suppliers in the Light Industrial zone as a permitted activity noting the amendments sought to the definition of trade supplier (see S371.004)	Retain Rule LIZ-R1
LD Family Investments Limited (S384)	S384.003	Light industrial	LIZ-R1	Support in part	<p>The introduction of the new Light Industrial Zone is being restrained by a limit on the GBA. If the issue of the GBA relates to stormwater management, traffic movements and other factors then this questions Council zoning principles (if any) associated with the site and surrounds.</p> <p>In terms of any ancillary activity, if this is located within or attached to the principle industrial building / activity, then the effects are in essence internalised. It is not clear what Council is trying to achieve with this provision and it should be deleted.</p>	<p>Delete the following from LIZ-R1: Activity status: Permitted Where PER-1 The building or structure on the site does not exceed a GBA of 450m². PER-2 Any ancillary activity (including residential activity) occupies no more than 15% of the GFA of the industrial building, and is located within or is attached to the same building as the industrial activity. PER-3 The building or structure complies with standards: LIZ-S1 Maximum height LIZ-S2 Height in relation to boundary LIZ-S3 Setback (excluding from MHWS or wetland, lake and river margins) LIZ-S4 Setback from MHWS LIZ-S5 Outdoor storage LIZ-S6 Landscaping and screening on road boundaries. LIZ-S7 Landscaping for sites that adjoin any sites other than mixed use of industrial.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>LIZ-S8 Coverage.</p> <p>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PeER-3: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion are restricted to: a. the matters of discretion of any infringed standard; b. the extent of the necessity locate the ancillary activity with the industrial activity. c. the extent to which the ancillary activity may result in trade distribution effects, or impacts on the function of the Light Industrial Zone; and d. the extent to which the ancillary activity adversely impacts on the transport network and road safety.</p> <p>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-1 or PER-2: Discretionary</p>
John Andrew Riddell (S431)	S431.128	Light industrial	LIZ-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
Ngawha Generation Limited (S432)	S432.008	Light industrial	LIZ-R1	Oppose	NGL considers that the 450m2 GFA limit in this rule is an unnecessary restriction. Industrial activities within a light industrial area typically require large buildings. Subject to compliance with the bulk and location	Amend LIZ-R1 to delete PER-1.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					standards (e.g., coverage) there is no other logical reason to impose a GFA restriction on buildings or structures in an industrial area.	
House Movers Section of New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc (S482)	S482.007	Light industrial	LIZ-R1	Support in part	The Proposed Plan definition of "building" does not clearly include relocated buildings, and the existence of a separate definition of relocate buildings in the Proposed Plan appears to create a distinction between "buildings" and "relocated buildings". It is not clear that the permitted activity status applied in most zones to "new buildings and structures" also applies to the relocation of buildings. It is submitted that relocated buildings should have the same status as new buildings, and subject to the same performance standards unless there is any specific overlay or control which applies e.g. historic heritage	amend LIZ-R1 to: provide for relocated building as a permitted activity whenrelocated buildings meet performance standards and criteria (see schedule 1). insert a performance standard for use of a pre inspection report(schedule 2) restricteddiscretionary activity status for relocated buildings that do not meet thepermitted activity status standards
Mainfreight Limited (S509)	S509.004	Light industrial	LIZ-R1	Oppose	Rules LIZ-R1 PER-1 and HIZ-R1 specifically relate to new buildings, providing for new buildings as permitted activities. Rules LIZ-R1-PER-1 and HIZ-R1-PER-2 specifically provide for activities ancillary to and industrial activity as a permitted activity, and both the LIZ and HIZ list other activities, such as trade suppliers, as permitted activities. However, neither the LIZ or HIZ contain any rule specifying that industrial activities are permitted. As such, it appears that industrial activities fall to be a discretionary activity in LIZ and HIZ, pursuant to rules LIZ-R9 and HIZ-R8 respectively	delete LIZ-R1 PER-1 relating to maximum building size within the light industry zone
Mainfreight Limited (S509)	S509.005	Light industrial	LIZ-R1	Support in part	Rules LIZ-R1 PER-1 and HIZ-R1 specifically relate to new buildings, providing for new buildings as permitted activities. Rules LIZ-R1-PER-1 and HIZ-R1-PER-2 specifically provide for activities ancillary to and industrial activity as a permitted activity, and both the LIZ and HIZ list other activities, such as trade suppliers, as permitted activities. However, neither the LIZ or HIZ contain any	amend LIZ-R1 to specially address industrial activities as permitted

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					rule specifying that industrial activities are permitted. As such, it appears that industrial activities fall to be a discretionary activity in LIZ and HIZ, pursuant to rules LIZ-R9 and HIZ-R8 respectively.	
Fire and Emergency New Zealand (S512)	S512.102	Light industrial	LIZ-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)
Ngawha Generation Limited (S432)	S432.009	Light industrial	LIZ-R2	Support	NGL supports these activities being permitted in the Light Industrial Zone.	Retain LIZ-R2 as notified.
FNR Properties Limited (S437)	S437.001	Light industrial	LIZ-R2	Support	The provision is supported as it represents a positive change for 142 and 134 North Road, Kaitaia and surrounding properties.	Retain Rule LIZ-R2 as notified.
Ngawha Generation Limited (S432)	S432.010	Light industrial	LIZ-R3	Support	NGL supports these activities being permitted in the Light Industrial Zone.	Retain LIZ-R3 as notified.