



SECTION 42A REPORT

Rural Lifestyle Zone

1	Executive summary	3
2	Introduction	4
	2.1 Author and qualifications	4
	2.2 Code of Conduct	5
3	Scope/Purpose of Report	5
4	Statutory Requirements	6
	4.1 Statutory documents	6
	4.1.1 Resource Management Act.....	6
	4.1.2 National Policy Statements.....	6
	4.1.3 National Environmental Standards	8
	4.1.4 National Planning Standards.....	8
	4.1.5 Treaty Settlements	9
	4.1.6 Iwi Management Plans.....	9
	4.2 Section 32AA evaluation	9
	4.3 Procedural matters.....	10
	4.3.1 Pre-hearing meetings	10
	4.3.2 Proposed Plan Variation 1	10
5	Consideration of submissions received	10
	5.1 Overview of submissions received.....	10
	5.2 Officer Recommendations	11
	5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Neil Construction Limited submission on the RLZ chapter	12
	5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies.....	13
	5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ Rules – General Comments.....	16
	5.2.4 Key Issue 4: RLZ-R2 – Impermeable surface coverage	27
	5.2.5 Key Issue 5: RLZ-R3 - Residential Activity.....	29
	5.2.6 Key Issue 6: RLZ-R5 - Home Business.....	30
	5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards	32



5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Lifestyle Zone36

6 Conclusion 38

Appendix 1.1: Recommended amendments to Rural Lifestyle Zone chapter

Appendix 1.2: Recommended amendments to Subdivision chapter

Appendix 2: Recommended decisions on submissions to Rural Lifestyle Zone chapter

List of Abbreviations

Table 1: List of Submitters and Abbreviations of Submitters’ Names

Submitter Number	Abbreviation	Full Name of Submitter
S148	Summit Forests	Summit Forests New Zealand Limited
S159	Horticulture NZ	Horticulture New Zealand
S167	Bentzen Farm	Bentzen Farm Trust
S168	P S Yates	P S Yates Family Trust
S187	The Shooting Box	The Shooting Box Limited
S331	MOE	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga
S338	Our Kerikeri	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust
S368	FNDC	Far North District Council
S416	KiwiRail	KiwiRail Holdings Limited
S425	Twin Coast Cycle Trail	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust
S438	NZMCA	New Zealand Motor Caravan Association
S454	Transpower	Transpower New Zealand Limited
S481	Puketotara Lodge	Puketotara Lodge Limited
S482	Heavy Haulage Assoc Inc	House Movers Section of New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc
S512	FENZ	Fire and Emergency New Zealand

Note: This table contains a list of submitters relevant to this topic which are abbreviated, and does not include all submitters relevant to this topic. For a summary of all submitters please refer to Section 5.1 of this report (overview of submitters). Appendix 2 to this Report also contains a table with all submission points relevant to this topic.

Table 2: Other abbreviations

Abbreviation	Full Term
FNDC	Far North District Council
NPS-IB	National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity 2023
NPS-HPL	National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land 2022



NES-CF	National Environment Standards for Commercial Forestry 2023 (Previously National Environment Standards for Plantation Forestry)
PDP	Proposed Far North District Plan
RMA	Resource Management Act 1991
RPS	Regional Policy Statement
MHWS	Mean High Water Springs

1 Executive summary

1. The Far North Proposed District Plan ("PDP") was publicly notified in July 2022. The Rural Lifestyle Zone ("RLZ") chapter is located under Rural, in the Area-Specific Matters section of the PDP.
2. There are 163 original submissions points on the RLZ chapter, including 92 submissions in support, 39 supporting in part and 15 in opposition¹. There are also 185 further submission points received on those original submissions.
3. This report should be read in conjunction with the Rural Wide Issues and the Rural Production Zone (RPROZ) report as it contains analysis and recommendations in Key Issues 1-5 that are relevant to all rural zones including the RLZ. The analysis in that report has not been repeated in this report to reduce repetition and ensure consistent recommendations where the same issue has been raised across multiple rural zones.
4. The submissions are largely supportive of the RLZ overview, objectives and policies. The majority of submissions requested amendments related to RLZ rules and standards and SUB-S1 (as it relates to the RLZ) to reflect various outcomes sought by submitters.
5. This report has been prepared in accordance with Section 42A of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and outlines recommendations in response to the issues raised in submissions. This report is intended to both assist the Hearings Panel to make decisions on the submissions and further submissions on the PDP and also provide submitters with an opportunity to see how their submissions have been evaluated, and to see the recommendations made by officers prior to the hearing.
6. The key changes recommended in this report relate to:
 - a. Amendments to rules and standards to align with recommendations made in the Rural Wide Issues and Rural Production Zone (RPROZ) section 42A report.
 - b. Amendments to SUB-S1 to reduce minimum lot sizes in the RLZ to align with RLZ-R3.

¹ 17 submissions were recorded as not stating a position.



2 Introduction

2.1 Author and qualifications

7. My full name is Melissa Leanne Pearson, and I am a Principal Planning and Policy Consultant at SLR Consulting New Zealand Limited, based in Auckland.
8. I hold a Bachelor of Planning (Hons) at the University of Auckland and am a Full Member of the New Zealand Planning Institute.
9. I have 16 years' experience as a resource management practitioner in New Zealand, which has included working for both the private sector and for central and local government on a range of resource consent and policy projects. My private sector planning experience ranges from obtaining resource consents for small and large scale residential and subdivision developments in the Auckland Region, development of private plan changes in both Auckland and Waikato for residential and commercial developments and consenting and policy development experience for clients in the telecommunication, intensive primary production, and community facility sectors.
10. My public sector planning experience involves a significant amount of central government policy research and development relating to telecommunications, forestry, climate change, highly productive land, and infrastructure. My local government policy experience involves drafting of district plan provisions in the Far North, Kaipara, Waikato, Hamilton, and Queenstown Lakes districts for local authorities.
11. My public sector planning experience involves a significant amount of central government policy research and development relating to telecommunications, forestry, climate change, highly productive land, and infrastructure. My local government policy experience involves drafting of district plan provisions in the Far North, Kaipara, Waikato, Hamilton, and Queenstown Lakes districts for local authorities.
12. These projects have given me significant experience with all parts of the Schedule 1 process from both the public and private sector perspectives, including provision research and development, provision drafting, the preparation of section 32 and 42A reports, preparation of submissions and further submissions, presentation of evidence at council hearings, preparation and resolution of appeals and Environment Court mediation.
13. I have been closely involved in the development and implementation of numerous national direction instruments under the RMA (national policy statements and national environmental standards), from the policy scoping stage through to policy decisions and drafting, the preparation of section 32 evaluation reports and implementation guidance. This includes close involvement in national direction instruments relating to highly productive land.



14. I have been working with the Far North District Council (FNDC) on the PDP since 2021. My involvement in the PDP initially involved refining certain chapters in response to submissions on the draft district plan and preparing the associated section 32 evaluation reports, specifically on rural topics. Since mid-2023, I have been working with the FNDC PDP team analysing submissions.
15. I was involved in the development of the Rural Lifestyle Zone chapter (as part of review work for all of the rural zone chapters) prior to notification, including peer reviewing the chapter and inputting into the section 32 report. I was engaged by FNDC to be the reporting officer for this topic in early 2024.

2.2 Code of Conduct

16. I confirm that I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses in the Environment Court Practice Note 2023 and that I have complied with it when preparing this report. Other than when I state that I am relying on the advice of another person, this evidence is within my area of expertise. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions that I express.
17. I am authorised to give this evidence on the Council's behalf to the Proposed District Plan hearings commissioners ("Hearings Panel").

3 Scope/Purpose of Report

18. This report has been prepared in accordance with Section 42A of the Resource Management Act to:
 - a. assist the Hearings Panel in making their decisions on the submissions and further submissions on the Proposed District Plan; and
 - b. provide submitters with an opportunity to see how their submissions have been evaluated and the recommendations being made by officers, prior to the hearing.
19. This report responds to submissions specific to the provisions of the RLZ chapter.
20. I am aware that there are some requests for rezoning which apply to land that is currently zoned RLZ in the PDP. These rezoning requests will not be addressed in this report. Rather, each is to be considered via Hearing Streams 15A to 15D to enable a full consideration of the zone change requests and relevant submitter evidence, against an agreed set of criteria, alongside other zone request changes and taking into consideration the recommended provisions for the zone chapters.
21. Wherever possible, I have provided a recommendation to assist the Hearing Panel.



22. Separate to the Section 42A report recommendations in response to submissions, Council has made a number of Clause 16(2) amendments to the PDP to achieve consistent formatting of rules and standards, including inserting semi colons between each standard, followed by “and” after the second to last standard (where all of the standards must be met to comply) or “or” after the second to last standard (when only one of the standards must be met to comply). These changes are neutral and do not alter the effect of the rules or standards, they simply clarify the intent. The Clause 16 corrections are reflected in **Appendix 1.1** to this Report (Recommended amendments to the Rural Lifestyle chapter).

4 Statutory Requirements

4.1 Statutory documents

23. I note that the Rural Section 32 report provides detail of the relevant statutory considerations applicable to the rural zone chapters.
24. It is not necessary to repeat the detail of the relevant RMA sections and full suite of higher order documents here. Consequently, no further assessment of these documents has been undertaken for the purposes of this report.
25. However, it is important to highlight the higher order documents which have been subject to change or introduced since notification of the Proposed Plan which must be given effect to. Those that are relevant to the RLZ chapter and the rural environment in general are discussed in section 4.1.2 below.

4.1.1 Resource Management Act

26. The Government elected in October 2023, repealed both the Spatial Planning Act 2023 and Natural and Built Environment Act 2023 on 22 December 2023 and reinstated the RMA as New Zealand’s primary resource management policy and plan making legislation. The Government has indicated that the RMA will ultimately be replaced, with work on replacement legislation to begin in 2024. The Government has indicated that this replacement legislation will be introduced to parliament this term of government (i.e. before the next central government election in 2026). However, at the time of writing, details of the new legislation and exact timing are unknown. The RMA continues to be in effect until when and if this new replacement legislation is passed.

4.1.2 National Policy Statements

4.1.2.1 National Policy Statements Gazetted since Notification of the PDP

27. The PDP was prepared to give effect to the National Policy Statements that were in effect at the time of notification (27 July 2022). This section provides a summary of the National Policy Statements, relevant to the rural topic that have been gazetted since notification of the PDP. As District Plans must be “prepared in accordance with” and “give effect to” a National Policy



Statement, the implications of the relevant National Policy Statements on the PDP must be considered.

28. The National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity (NPS-IB) took effect on 4 August 2023. This was after the PDP was notified (27 July 2022), but while it was open for submissions. The objective of the NPS-IB is to maintain indigenous biodiversity so there is at least no overall loss in indigenous biodiversity. The objective is supported by 17 policies. These include Policy 1 and Policy 2 relating to the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi and the exercise of kaitiakitanga by tangata whenua in their rohe. The approach to give effect to the NPS-IB was considered in detail through the Ecosystem and Indigenous Biodiversity in Hearing 4.
29. The NPS-HPL took effect on 17 October 2022, The NPS-HPL has a single objective: "*Highly productive land is protected for use in land-based primary production, both now and for future generations*". The objective is supported by nine policies and a set of implementation requirements setting out what local authorities must do to give effect to the objective and policies of the NPS-HPL, including restrictions on the urban rezoning, rural lifestyle rezoning, and subdivision of highly productive land (HPL) and requirements to protect HPL from inappropriate use and development.
30. The NPS-HPL has recently been amended, with changes gazetted on 16 August 2024, resulting in the removal of consenting barriers for new infrastructure, including renewable energy projects, indoor primary production and greenhouses. Driving amendments, was the agriculture, horticulture and renewable energy sectors' concerns surrounding the NPS restricting activities needing to be located on highly productive land. These amendments came into effect on 14 September 2024. The extent to which the rural zones require amendment to give effect to the NPS-HPL is considered in Key Issue 2 in the Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A report.
31. I note that the direction in the NPS-HPL with respect to protecting HPL is not directly relevant to the RLZ chapter as there no land zoned RLZ which meets the definition of HPL in the NPS-HPL. As the land zoned RLZ was notified in the PDP prior to the NPS-HPL coming into effect (and is therefore subject to a Council initiated notified plan change to rezone it to rural lifestyle), it does not meet the definition of HPL under the transitional definition of HPL in clause 3.5(7).

4.1.2.2 National Policy Statements – Announced Future Changes

32. In October 2023 there was a change in government and several announcements have been made regarding work being done to amend various national direction instruments. None of these announcements are likely to have a direct impact on the RLZ.
33. Of relevance to the rural chapters of the PDP, further amendments to the NPS-HPL have been signalled for 2025 but have not yet been actioned, including the need to enable housing growth and remove associated



consenting barriers. The Government has signalled these amendments will be consulted on in early 2025 as part of a wider national direction programme. This work may include changes to the definition of 'Highly Productive Land' to enable more flexibility for urban development.

4.1.3 National Environmental Standards

34. The National Environment Standards for Commercial Forestry 2017 (NES-CF), which amend the NES-PF, came into effect on 3 November 2023. In addition to regulating the effects of plantation forestry, the NES-CF now regulates "exotic continuous-cover forestry", which is commercial forestry not intended to be harvested (i.e. carbon forestry). As such, the NES-CF now applies to all types of forestry deliberately established for commercial purposes (permanent indigenous forestry is not regulated under the NES-CF). In addition to bringing exotic continuous-cover forestry within scope, the changes in the NES-CF:
- a. Allow plan rules to be more stringent or lenient to manage afforestation relating to both types of forestry.²
 - b. Introduce a range of operational changes, including a new permitted activity standard for managing forestry slash at harvest and new requirements around management of wilding trees.

4.1.4 National Planning Standards

35. The National Planning Standards determine the sections that should be included in a District Plan, including the Strategic Direction chapters, and how the District Plan should be ordered. The RLZ chapter provisions proposed and recommended in this report follow this guidance. Specifically:
- a. Definitions as each relates to RLZ in Key Issue 5 of the Rural Wide Issues and RLZ in the s42A report.
36. Also of relevance are the National Planning Standard descriptions of rural zones as follows:

Rural Lifestyle	Areas used predominantly for a residential lifestyle within a rural environment on lots smaller than those of the General rural and Rural production zones, while still enabling primary production to occur.
------------------------	---

² Regulation 6(4A) of the NES-CF.



4.1.5 Treaty Settlements

37. There have been no further Deeds of Settlement signed to settle historic Treaty of Waitangi Claims against the Crown, in the Far North District, since the notification of the PDP.

4.1.6 Iwi Management Plans

38. Section 74 of the RMA requires that a local authority must take into account any relevant planning document recognised by an iwi authority and lodged with the territorial authority.
39. When the PDP was notified in July 2022, Council had 14 hapū/iwi management planning documents which had been formally lodged with Council, as listed in the PDP section 32 overview report. Council took these management plans, including the broader outcomes sought, into account in developing the PDP. Of the 14 hapū/iwi management planning documents, only two have been revised since notification of the PDP –
 - a. Ngā Tikanga mo te Taiao o Ngāti Hine' the Ngāti Hine Environmental Management Plan
 - b. Ahipara Takiwā Environmental Management Plan.
40. A summary of the key issues that are relevant to the rural environment covered in these two hapū/iwi management planning documents is contained in Section 4.1.6 of the Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ section 42A report and is not repeated here.

4.2 Section 32AA evaluation

41. This report uses 'key issues' to group, consider and provide reasons for the recommended decisions on similar matters raised in submissions. Where changes to the provisions of the PDP are recommended, these have been evaluated in accordance with Section 32AA of the RMA.
42. The section 32AA further evaluation for each key issue considers:
 - a. Whether the amended objectives are the best way to achieve the purpose of the RMA.
 - b. The reasonably practicable options for achieving those objectives.
 - c. The environmental, social, economic and cultural benefits and costs of the amended provisions.
 - d. The efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions for achieving the objectives.
 - e. The risk of acting or not acting where there is uncertain or insufficient information about the provisions.



43. The section 32AA further evaluation for recommended amendments to the PDP also contains a level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance of the anticipated effects of the changes that have been made. Recommendations on editorial, minor and consequential changes that do not change the policy intent are not evaluated under section 32AA of the RMA in this report.

4.3 Procedural matters

4.3.1 Pre-hearing meetings

44. Due to the clarity of submissions, no correspondence or meetings with submitters needed to be undertaken.

4.3.2 Proposed Plan Variation 1

45. FNDC notified Proposed Plan Variation 1 (Minor Corrections and Other Matters) for public submissions on 14 October 2024. The submission period closes on 14 November 2023. Proposed Plan Variation 1 makes minor amendments to correct minor errors, amend provisions that are having unintended consequences, remove ambiguity and improve clarity and workability of provisions. This includes amendments to the zoning of some properties, and the Coastal flood hazard areas.
46. Plan Variation 1 does not propose any amendments that are directly relevant to the RLZ topic.

5 Consideration of submissions received

5.1 Overview of submissions received

47. There are 163 original submissions points on the RLZ chapter, including 92 submissions in support, 39 supporting in part and 15 in opposition³. There are also 185 further submission points received on those original submissions.
48. The main submissions on the RLZ chapter came from:
- a. Central and Local Government, namely FNDC (S368) and MOE (S331).
 - b. State-Owned Enterprises, such as Transpower (S454) and KiwiRail (S416).
 - c. Non-governmental organisations, such as Kapiro Conservation Trust (S442) and Our Kerikeri (S338), Heavy Haulage Assoc Inc (S482) and NZCMA (S438).

³ 17 submissions were recorded as not stating a position.



- d. The primary production sector, such as Horticulture New Zealand (S159), and Summit Forests (S148).
 - e. A group of large landowners in the RLZ with some common interests, such as Bentzen Farm (S167), P S Yates (S333), Setar Thirty Six (S168) and The Shooting Box (S187).
 - f. Other individual submitters, such as Michael John Winch (S67), John Andrew Riddell (S431) and Robert Adams (S155).
49. The key issues identified in this report are set out below:
- a. Key Issue 1: Neil Construction Limited submission on the RLZ chapter
 - b. Key Issue 2: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies
 - c. Key Issue 3: RLZ Rules – General comments
 - d. Key Issue 4: RLZ-R2 – Impermeable surface coverage
 - e. Key Issue 5: RLZ-R3 – Residential activity
 - f. Key Issue 6: RLZ-R5 – Home business
 - g. Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
 - h. Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Lifestyle Zone.
50. Section 5.2 constitutes the main body of the report and considers and provides recommendations on the decisions requested in submissions. In some cases, due to the repetition of submission content, it is not efficient to respond to each individual submission point raised in the submissions. Instead, this part of the report groups similar submission points together under key issues. This thematic response assists in providing a concise response to, and recommended decision on, submission points.
51. Key Issues 1-5 of the Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ chapter respond to submission that have implications for the RLZ e.g. deciding on the suite of rural zones for the Far North District, giving effect to the NPS-HPL, plan-wide submissions and definitions. The analysis in Key Issues 1-5 of the Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ section 42A report should be read alongside this report and is not repeated here for efficiency and to reduce replication across these reports.

5.2 Officer Recommendations

52. A copy of the recommended plan provisions for the RLZ chapter is provided in **Appendix 1.1 – Recommended amendments to the Rural Lifestyle chapter**. A copy of the recommended amendments to SUB-S1 is



provided **Appendix 1.2 – Recommended amendments to the Subdivision chapter.**

53. A full list of submissions and further submissions on the RLZ chapter is contained in **Appendix 2 – Recommended Decisions on Submissions to this report.** Recommendations for RLZ chapter that result from the recommendations in Key Issues 1-5 of the Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ section 42A reports, are found in **Appendix 2 – Recommended Decisions on Submissions to this report.**

5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Neil Construction Limited submission on the RLZ chapter

Overview

Provision(s)	Officer Recommendation(s)
Various	No amendments

Analysis of Submissions on Key Issue 1: Neil Construction Limited submission on the RLZ chapter

Matters raised in submissions

54. Neil Construction Limited (S349.020 to S349.024) have submitted on the RLZ objectives and policies, plus RLZ-R2 (impermeable surfaces), RLZ-R3 (residential activity) and RLZ-S3 (setbacks). All the amendments requested to these provisions aim to enable residential development in the RLZ at a level more akin to the Rural Residential Zone (RRZ). Requested amendments from Neil Construction Limited include deleting references to rural character and amenity from the policy direction and allowing more intensive levels of residential activity by increasing impermeable surface thresholds and removing yard setbacks for lots greater than 5,000m². Neil Construction Limited also seek an amendment to SUB-S1 to reduce the minimum lot size in the RLZ to 3,000m² as a controlled activity and 2,000m² as a discretionary activity (S349.017).

Analysis

55. I have considered this group of submission points together as the package of relief being sought is an alternative outcome to Neil Construction’s primary relief, which is the rezoning of the ‘Tubbs Farm’⁴ land from RLZ to RRZ, which will be considered at Hearing 15D. I note that Neil Construction Limited’s submission on the RLZ provisions requests amendments that impact all land zoned RLZ, not just the Tubbs Farm land. If this package of relief were to be granted, I consider that would effectively erase the distinctions between the RLZ and RRZ and enable a level of residential development across the RLZ that I do not support from a planning perspective. As per the overview of the RLZ (which is consistent with the description of a rural lifestyle zone in the National Planning Standards) the

⁴ Approximately 68ha of land located on the corner of Kapiro Road and Redcliffs Rd in Kerikeri. The Tubbs Farm rezoning submission will be considered in Hearing Stream 15D – Rezoning Kerikeri-Waipapa in October 2025.



intention of the RLZ is to enable “people to undertake primary production activities, or primarily undertake a residential activity while having the option of growing their own food, or having horses or other livestock at a domestic scale.”⁵ I do not consider that 2,000-3,000m² enabled across the RLZ would achieve this outcome as primary production activities are not viable on lots of this size and it would be difficult to manage reverse sensitivity issues, particularly in adjacent areas zoned RPROZ⁶.

56. In my view, the question of whether more small lot subdivision opportunities should be enabled in additional areas in the Far North district (i.e. 2,000-3,000m² sized lots) through more RRZ zoning is best addressed as part of the rezoning hearings set down for August-October 2025. If it is deemed appropriate to zone more areas RRZ or provide additional small lot capacity, the most appropriate locations for this growth can be identified and assessed through considering rezoning requests, such as Neil Construction Limited’s rezoning request for Tubbs Farm. This will ensure that rural residential growth opportunities are only enabled in suitable rural locations, as opposed to a blanket relaxing of provisions in the RLZ that would enable increased levels of residential activity in locations where this is not compatible with adjacent primary production activities and/or rural amenity expectations.

Recommendation

57. For the reasons set out above, I recommend that the submission points from Neil Construction Limited on the provisions of the RLZ and SUB-S1 as it relates to the RLZ are rejected as set out in **Appendix 2**.

Section 32AA evaluation

58. I do not recommend any amendments to the RLZ provisions or SUB-S1 as it relates to the RLZ in response to these submissions and therefore no further evaluation is required under section 32AA of the RMA.

5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies

Overview

Provision(s)	Officer Recommendation(s)
RLZ Overview	Minor amendment to clarify intent
RLZ Objectives	Retain as notified
RLZ Policies	Minor change to chapeau of RLZ-P4, otherwise retain as notified

Analysis of Submissions on Key Issue 2: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies

⁵ Paragraph 2 of the RLZ overview as notified.

⁶ As required by RLZ-O4 and RLZ-P3 as notified.



Matters raised in submissions

Overview

59. Horticulture NZ (S159.178) supports the wording of the RLZ overview as is consistent with the description of the rural lifestyle zone in the National Planning Standards.
60. A group of submitters, including The Shooting Box (S187.090), Setar Thirty Six (S168.105), P S Yates (S333.097) and Bentzen Farm (S167.103), support the RLZ overview in part but raise concerns over the accuracy of the wording. These submitters note that not all areas of the RLZ are located close to urban areas and settlements, for example in Parekura Bay in the eastern Bay of Islands. They request an amendment to the RLZ overview to clarify this 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."

Objectives and policies

61. The same group of submitters as above, including The Shooting Box (S187), Setar Thirty Six (S168), P S Yates (S333) and Bentzen Farm Limited (S167), support retaining all RLZ objectives and policies as notified in the PDP as they consider these provisions are the most appropriate to achieve the purpose of the RMA and give effect to high order planning documents.
62. Horticulture NZ (S159.179 and S159.180) supports the retention of RLZ-O4 and RLZ-P3 as notified in the PDP on the basis that it is important that activities in the RLZ do not compromise activities in the adjacent Rural Production Zone.
63. Michael John Winch (S67.014) requests that an additional matter is added to RLZ-P4 to allow for consideration of adverse effects on the life-supporting capacity of soil and the protection of HPL when processing land use and subdivision applications.

Analysis

Overview

64. I agree with The Shooting Box (and others) that not every single area of RLZ is necessarily close to an urban area or settlement. I consider that the addition of the words 'most of' to the second paragraph of the overview is a more accurate reflection of where RLZ is located in the Far North district. I recommend an amendment below in response to these submissions to this effect.



65. I also recommend that the phrase 'versatile soils' is replaced with 'productive land' in the last paragraph of the RLZ Overview for the reasons set out in Key Issue 2 of the Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ section 42A report.

Objectives and policies

66. I acknowledge the support from Horticulture NZ and The Shooting Box (and others) for various RLZ objectives and policies and I agree that these provisions are largely fit for purpose.
67. I disagree with Michael John Winch that an additional matter relating to adverse effects on the life-supporting capacity of soil and the protection of HPL should be added into RLZ-P4. Although the RLZ does provide for small scale farming activities, the primary purpose of the zone, in my view (and as reflected in the National Planning Standards), is to provide for low density residential activities that are compatible with the rural character and amenity anticipated in the RLZ. The RLZ is also important, in my view, as it provides a pre-determined suitable location for rural lifestyle development that can absorb demand for this scale of living and direct that pressure away from areas of HPL in more productive zones, i.e. the RPROZ and HZ. As discussed in Section 4.1.2.1 above, land zoned RLZ does not meet the transitional definition of HPL in clause 3.5(7) of the NPS-HPL⁷. As such, I do not consider that protecting HPL and the life supporting capacity of soil should be relevant matters when considering land use and subdivision applications in the RLZ.
68. I do recommend amending the chapeau of RLZ-P4 to match the recommended format for equivalent 'consideration' policies in other rural zones for the reasons set out in Key Issue 10 of the Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ section 42A report.

Recommendation

69. For the reasons set out above, I recommend that the submissions on the RLZ overview, objectives and policies are accepted, accepted in part and rejected as set out in **Appendix 2**. I do not recommend any amendments to the RLZ objectives.
70. I recommend that the words '*most of*' are added into the second paragraph of the RLZ overview.
71. I recommend that the words '*versatile soils*' are replaced with the words '*productive land*' in the last paragraph of the RLZ overview.
72. I recommend that that chapeau of RLZ-P4 is amended to use the same wording as RPROZ-P7 in the Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ section 42A report and earlier section 42A reports.

⁷ According to FNDC GIS analysis, just under 9% of the RLZ is LUC 1-3 land and most of this has already been fragmented to a level that precludes viable primary production. As such, the amount of land that has the potential to be highly productive in the RLZ is low.



Section 32AA evaluation

73. I consider that the addition of the words 'most of' is a minor amendment to clarify intent and, as it is part of the Overview statement, does not require further assessment under section 32AA of the RMA. The rationale for replacing versatile soils with productive land has already been considered with respect to section 32AA in Key Issue 2 of the Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ section 42A report and that analysis is not repeated here.
74. The rationale for the amended chapeau wording of RLZ-P4 has been assessed under section 32AA in other PDP reports with similar 'consideration policies' (e.g. CE-P10 in Hearing Stream 4), where it was concluded that the amendments will achieve a more efficiently drafted chapeau that more effectively explains the intended purpose of the policy.

5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ Rules – General Comments

Overview

Provision(s)	Officer Recommendation(s)
RLZ-R1, RLZ-R6, RLZ-R19, RLZ-R25, Advice Note 2	Amendments to align with recommendations in the Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ section 42A report
RLZ-R4, RLZ-R7, RLZ-R8, RLZ-R12, RLZ-R13 to RLZ-R18, RLZ-R20 to RLZ-R24, RLZ-R26 to RLZ-R28	Retain as notified
RLZ-R9	Minor amendment to fix error and to align with recommendations in the Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ section 42A report
RLZ-R10	Amendment to apply rule to forestry activities not regulated by the NES-CF
RLZ-R11	Consequential amendment to amend activity status for non-compliance with PER-1
Advice note 2	Minor amendment to correct error and align with Coastal Environment section 42A report
New advice note 3	Consequential amendment to refer to Mineral Extraction Zone objectives and policies
New advice note 4	Consequential amendment to align with the NES-CF
New rule RLZ-RX	Artificial crop protection structures and crop support structures



Analysis of Submissions on Key Issue 3: Rules – General Comments

Matters raised in submissions

General

75. The majority of RLZ rules attracted very few submissions. As such, I have addressed these RLZ rules under a single 'rules' key issue. Rules that attracted a larger number of submissions are addressed separately in Key Issues 4-6 below.
76. A group of submitters, including The Shooting Box (S187), Setar Thirty Six (S168), P S Yates (S333) and Bentzen Farm (S167), support retaining all rules as notified in the PDP as they consider these are the most appropriate to achieve the purpose of the RMA and give effect to high order planning documents.
77. Te Waka Pupuri Putea (S477.020) supports retaining the RLZ rules relating to rural amenity and residential activities, specifically supporting rules that provide for activities such as retirement villages and aged care facilities when they are in close proximity to town centres such as Kaitaia.
78. NZCMA (S438.010, S438.011) support the RLZ rules in part but request amendments to provide for camping sites that cater for 10 guests or less as a permitted activity, with camping sites catering for more than 10 guests requiring consent for a restricted discretionary activity (as opposed to discretionary under RLZ-R13). NZCMA are requesting these amendments to make it easier to establish sites for self-contained vehicle-based camping.
79. FNDC (S368.044) requests a minor correction to Advice Note 2 to include the missing word "chapter".

Crop Protection Structures

80. Our Kerikeri (S338.055), Kapiro Residents Association (S427.064), Kapiro Conservation Trust (S449.051) and Carbon Neutral NZ Trust (S529.212) support the RLZ rules in part and request retention of rules and standards for crop protection and support structures setbacks. However, these submitters consider that additional rules for such structures are required to prevent further adverse effects on visual amenity and rural character. These submitters have included suggested wording for amended provisions in their submissions.

Setbacks from the RPROZ and HZ

81. Horticulture NZ (S159) has made a series of submissions requesting setbacks for sensitive activities from a boundary with the RPROZ and/or HZ as follows:



- a. Amendment to RLZ-R6 requiring that educational facilities are set back at least 20m from the RPROZ boundary (S159.183)
 - b. Amendment to RLZ-S3 requiring that visitor accommodation, educational facilities and habitable buildings are set back 20m from the RPROZ boundary (and also the HZ boundary in the case of habitable buildings) (S159.181, S159.182 and S159.184)
82. Horticulture NZ consider that these setbacks from the RPROZ and/or HZ are necessary to give effect to RLZ-O4, being that *"Land use and subdivision in the Rural Lifestyle zone does not compromise the effective and efficient operation of primary production activities in the adjacent Rural Production Zones."*

RLZ-R1

83. FNDC (S368.068) supports RLZ-R1 in part but raises concerns with the rule as it is currently drafted. FNDC considers that, to breach this rule as notified, the activity becomes discretionary which was not the intent if the activity itself is permitted, controlled or restricted discretionary. FNDC request that PER-1 of RLZ-R1 is amended to include controlled and/or restricted discretionary activities in addition to permitted activities.

RLZ-R4

84. Willowridge Developments Limited (S250.027) and Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew (S386.026) both support RLZ-R4 as notified and request that the rule be retained.
85. Robert Adams (S155.001) requests deletion of PER-3 of RLZ-R4, which requires that a visitor accommodation activity have a separate driveway in order to be a permitted activity. Robert Adams is concerned that owners of adjacent sites that share access over a common driveway would be prevented from setting up visitor accommodation as a permitted activity. Robert Adams considers that requiring separate driveways creates impermeability issues, decreases landscaping and is a waste of resources and site coverage.

RLZ-R6

86. Northland Planning and Development (S502.054) support RLZ-R6 in part but express concern as it appears that museums, marae, town halls and similar community spaces do not fall under the definition of 'accessory building'. Northland Planning and Development consider buildings of this nature often host educational programmes and that this should be able to continue without triggering consent. Northland Planning and Development therefore request that amendments are made to RLZ-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-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 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.

RLZ-R9

87. FNDC (S386.045) requests a minor amendment to address a drafting error, i.e. the missed reference to "PER-2" in column 3 of RLZ-R9.

RLZ-R10

88. PF Olsen Limited (S91.022) and Summit Forests (S148.050) note there are no provisions within the NES-PF that allow councils to be more stringent in relation to versatile soils as proposed in PER-1 in RLZ-R10. These submitters draw particular attention to Regulation 6 of the NES-PF, which establishes where councils may have more stringent rules than the NES-PF regulations and note that protection of HPL is not listed in Regulation 6. PF Olsen Limited are particularly concerned regarding perverse outcomes stemming from primary production activities being segmented by LUC classes. The submitters request that all primary production activities within the RLZ are able to establish on land in the RLZ, regardless of the LUC land class.

RLZ-R11

89. Lynley Newport (S99.001) supports RLZ-R11 in part but requests the separation distance between the minor residential unit and the principal residential unit in PER-4 be increased from 15m to 30m, and the minimum site area per minor residential unit (PER-2) is reduced from one hectare to 5,000m².
90. Willowridge Developments Limited (S20.028) and Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew (S386.027) request deletion of PER-2 in RLZ-R11 (i.e. only allowing a minor unit on a site 1ha or greater) or provide justification as to



why this density control is necessary for a minor residential unit. These submitters also consider that a controlled or restricted discretionary activity status is more appropriate than the notified discretionary activity status when conditions PER-1 to PER-4 are not met. Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew also request the deletion of PER-4 relating to the 15m separation distance.

RLZ-R13

91. NZMCA (S438.010) request that the activity status of RLZ-R13 – Camping grounds is amended from discretionary to restricted discretionary, with assessment criteria relating to traffic and visual impacts. NZMCA consider that there are social and economic benefits associated with making it easier to establish self-contained vehicle based camping sites in the Far North district.

Analysis

Consequential amendments

92. There are several amendments recommended in the Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ section 42A report that I consider require consequential amendments to wording of RLZ rules for consistency under clause 10(2)(b) of Schedule 1, despite there being no RLZ specific submissions on these rules. These amendments are as follows:
 - a. Amendment to the note in RLZ-R19 Rural industry to clarify that it does not include rural produce retail as follows (aligns with the wording recommended for RPROZ-R24 in Key Issue 25):

***Note:** Rural Produce Retail is controlled by RLZ-R9 and Rural Produce Manufacturing is controlled by RLZ-R12.*
 - b. Amendment to RLZ-R25 to add in a reference to intensive outdoor primary production as well as intensive indoor primary production (aligns with the wording recommended for RPROZ-R23 in Key Issue 25).

General comments

93. With respect to the NZCMA submission requesting a more permissive pathway for camping sites, I disagree that camping sites are an activity that should be encouraged in the RLZ. Similar to the issues that were discussed in Key Issue 25 of the Rural Wide and RPROZ section 42A report, I do not see this as an equity issue between visitor accommodation rules (which have a permitted pathway under RLZ-R4) and camping grounds as the two activities differ in terms of their effects, including impacts on anticipated amenity in the RLZ. RLZ-R4 restricts visitor accommodation to being within a residential unit, accessory building or minor residential unit. The requirement to be indoors helps to manage potential reverse sensitivity



effects on any primary production activities within the RLZ (or in the adjacent RPROZ) as well as keep the levels of rural lifestyle character and amenity consistent with what might be expected from regular residential activities in the RLZ. I consider that there are potential issues associated with camping sites relating to noise, traffic and amenity that should be assessed through a discretionary activity consent process. As such I do not recommend any amendments in response to this submission.

94. I agree with FNDC that the omission of the word 'chapter' from Advice Note 2 is an error and recommend that this is amended. I also recommend that a consequential amendment is made to Advice Note 2 for integration and consistency with recommendations in the Coastal Environment and Natural Character topics (under clause 10(2)(b) of Schedule 1), for the reasons set out in Key Issue 26 of the Rural Wide and RPROZ section 42A report.
95. Finally, I recommend that two new advice notes are inserted relating to mineral extraction activities and the NES-CF that align with equivalent notes recommended to be inserted into the RPROZ chapter under clause 10(2)(b) of Schedule 1, for the reasons set out in Key Issues 14 and 23 of the Rural Wide and RPROZ section 42A report.

Crop Protection Structures

96. As discussed in Key Issue 5 in the Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A report, I have recommended new definitions for artificial crop protection structures and crop support structures as I agree that these are not 'buildings' and that specific controls are required with respect to their design and location that are different from other generic structures in the RLZ. To be consistent with my recommendations on RPROZ-R1, I recommend a separate rule for artificial crop protection structures and crop support structures to ensure they are not confused with other parts of RLZ-R1. In my view, RLZ-R1 is the core rule that manages buildings and structures in the RLZ and will be used extensively by most plan users seeking to construct something on their properties. It is in the best interests of all plan users that RLZ-R1 remains clear and simple to read and understand, without exceptions for various activities. Refer to Key Issue 5 for full analysis of provisions relating to artificial crop protection structures and crop support structures.
97. As such, I recommended a new rule for artificial crop protection structures and crop support structures that mirrors the same wording as recommended for the RPROZ, as well as consequential amendments to RLZ-R1, RLZ-S1 and RLZ-S3.

Setbacks from the RPROZ and HZ

98. I agree with Horticulture NZ that additional setbacks from the boundary of a RPROZ or HZ for sensitive activities would better achieve RLZ-O4 and assist with protecting adjacent primary production activities from reverse sensitivity effects. I note that the exact wording of the Horticulture NZ submission does not consistently request the same relief for each type of



sensitive activity, e.g. an amendment to the educational facility rule is requested to RLZ-R6 but the equivalent relief for visitor accommodation and habitable buildings is requested via an amendment to RLZ-S3.

99. I consider that the most effective and consistent way to address this submission is by amending RLZ-S3 and applying a 20m setback to both the RPROZ and HZ for all sensitive activities. This setback will apply to both visitor accommodation and educational activities but also any other type of activity listed in the 'sensitive activity' definition, e.g. marae and places of assembly.
100. I also recommend the consequential inclusion of reciprocal setback standards for sensitive activities from intensive indoor and outdoor farming activities and buildings or structures used to house, milk or feed stock (as per my recommendations in Key Issue 26 of the Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ section 42A report) to provide additional reverse sensitivity protection for primary production activities. I consider that the combination of the RLZ-S3 20m RPROZ and HZ boundary setback, plus the two new standards applying to sensitive activities will effectively manage potential reverse sensitivity issues at the zone interface between the RLZ and the RPROZ/HZ. These amendments to existing standards and recommended new standards are included in the recommendations for standards in Key Issue 6 below.

RLZ-R1

101. I agree with FNDC that RLZ-R1 as currently drafted does not account for buildings or structures required for controlled or restricted discretionary activities. I have recommended an amendment to RLZ-R1 to remedy this issue, as set out in the recommendations below.
102. I also note that minor amendments are required to RLZ-R1 to specifically refer to relocated buildings for the reasons set out in Key Issue 4 of the Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ section 42A report. I have recommended that these amendments are made in the recommendations section below.

RLZ-R4

103. I understand that Robert Adams is concerned that the requirement for a visitor accommodation activity to be accessed via a separate driveway to be a permitted activity is unreasonable and inefficient. In my view, the purpose of PER-3 is to ensure that the potential adverse effects on neighbours are minimal, given that this is a permitted activity condition. Having a separate driveway reduces potential traffic and noise effects on neighbouring properties resulting from visitors arriving and leaving from the site. If someone that shared a driveway with their neighbour wished to set up a visitor accommodation activity, the purpose of the resource consent process is not to force the applicant to provide a separate driveway (resulting in associated extra impermeable surface and associated cost), rather it is to ensure that any adverse noise and traffic effects on neighbouring properties



are appropriate mitigated. In some cases, this may involve getting written approval from the other owner(s) of the shared driveway. In this context, I consider that PER-4 of RLZ-R4 is appropriate and I do not recommend any changes as a result of this submission point.

RLZ-R6

104. I agree with Northland Planning and Development and Waitangi Limited that RLZ-R6 does not provide for the types of educational activities that typically occur on marae, in museums and in other types of community facilities, but this is not what the rule was drafted to control. RLZ-R6 is designed primarily to manage small-scale educational facilities in residential settings rather than in public facilities and is not intended to restrict educational activities occurring within community facilities. As discussed in Key Issue 18 of the Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ section 42A report in relation to visitor accommodation and marae, I consider that marae fall within the definition of community facility, and similarly I consider that museums, town halls and other similar facilities are also community facilities, which are discretionary activities in the RLZ. As such, I do not recommend any amendments to RLZ-R6 to explicitly provide for museums, marae or other similar facilities to be used as educational facilities.
105. I do, however, recommend consequential amendments to RLZ-R6 under clause 10(2)(b) of Schedule 1 to make failing to comply with the permitted conditions for an educational facility a restricted discretionary activity, rather than a discretionary activity. This change has resulted from the submission made by MOE for the reasons set out in Key Issue 4 of the Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ section 42A report.

RLZ-R9

106. I agree with the minor correction to the wording of PER-2 in the right hand column in RLZ-R9 requested by FNDC (S386.045) and recommend that this change be accepted. I also consider that the wording of PER-1 requires amendment to align with the equivalent recommended changes to RPROZ-R10 to clarify how the boundary setbacks should apply (as requested by Federated Farmers (S421.222)).

RLZ-R10

107. Firstly, I consider that new forestry activities are unlikely to occur in the RLZ given the potential value of the land for rural lifestyle activities and the fragmented nature of the land. However, for consistency I consider that forestry activities in the RLZ should be treated the same as I have recommended for the RPROZ. As outlined under Key Issue 4 of the Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ section 42A report, I am recommending amendments to RLZ provisions to refer to 'forestry activities' to align with the NPS-HPL and also a new definition of 'forestry activity' that aligns with both the NES-CF and NPS-HPL. I also conclude in Key Issue 4 that there are



no clear statutory directives or locally specific factors that justify a more stringent approach for forestry activities on versatile soils (or HPL).

108. It is my recommendation that all commercial forestry is regulated under the NES-CF and, as per my recommendations on the RPROZ chapter, I recommend amendments to RLZ-R10 so that it applies to forestry activities not regulated under the NES-CF. This ensures that permanent indigenous forestry and sustainable indigenous tree harvesting under the Forestry Act 1949 are permitted in the RLZ as a land-use activity and do not face unnecessary consent requirements (note I have already recommended an equivalent advice note relating to the NES-CF above).

RLZ-R11

109. With respect to PER-4 and the 15m separation distance, I consider this to be an important tool to ensure that the minor residential unit remains spatially connected to the principal residential unit. In my view, the principal and minor residential units are a package development and, if clustered together, minimise the potential reverse sensitivity effects on surrounding primary production activities, which may still be occurring in the RLZ or in adjacent RPROZ and HZ. In my view, if there are site specific characteristics that necessitate a wider separation distance then those can be assessed through the resource consent process. Similarly, if the minimum site size has been complied with, i.e. 1 hectare, then I consider that there should be sufficient land to provide shared gardens, landscaping and manoeuvrability while still complying with the 15m separation distance.
110. In terms of the 1ha minimum site size under PER-2, I understand that this was chosen deliberately to exclude the smaller, legacy 5,000m² lots in the RLZ from having the ability to add on a minor residential unit and to keep the rules consistent with the RPROZ. Although I am aware that this will prevent the landowners of these smaller lots from building a minor residential unit, in my opinion a 5,000m² site with two residential units does not fit the rural character or amenity anticipated in the RLZ (which anticipates a single principal residential unit on a 2ha lot under RLZ-R3). I also consider that it is appropriate to limit the opportunity for a minor residential unit to lots over 1ha in size as this aligns well with my recommended amendment to the minimum lot size in the RLZ (recommended to be decreased from 2ha to 1ha as per my analysis in Key Issue 8 below).
111. However, to be consistent with my recommendations for RPROZ-R19 in Key Issue 24 of the Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ section 42A report, I consider that failing to comply with either the minimum site size, number of minor residential units or maximum footprint conditions (i.e. PER-1, PER-2 and PER-5 of RLZ-R11) should be non-complying. It is non-complying to have more than one minor residential unit on a site under equivalent rules in the



RPROZ, RRZ and RSZ⁸ and the discretionary activity status for PER-1 infringements in RLZ-R11 is clearly an error. I recommend that an infringement of PER-1 relating to the number of minor residential units on a site not exceeding one should be a non-complying activity.

RLZ-R13

112. With respect to the NZMCA request for a restricted discretionary activity status for camping grounds, I do not agree that this is a type of activity that should be more enabled in the RLZ. Under RLZ-R13 as notified, camping grounds of any scale or type are a discretionary activity due to potential issues relating to traffic, noise and impacts on rural character and amenity. The submitter has not suggested any particular measures to manage these potential effects other than including matters of discretion relating to visual amenity effects and traffic. I consider that camping grounds are not an activity that people already living in the RLZ would be expecting to establish as a restricted discretionary activity and that the potential adverse effects associated with a camping ground could be broader than just visual amenity and traffic. As such, I do not recommend any amendments to RLZ-R13 as a result of this submission.

Recommendation

113. For the reasons set out above, I recommend that the general submissions on the RLZ rules are accepted, accepted in part and rejected as set out in **Appendix 2**.
114. I recommend that Advice Note 2 above the Rules table is amended as follows:
- This zone chapter does not contain rules relating to setbacks to waterbodies and MHWS for buildings or structures or setbacks to waterbodies and MHWS for earthworks and indigenous vegetation clearance. The Natural Character chapter contains rules for activities within wetland, lake and river margins and the Coastal Environment chapter contains rules for activities within the coastal environment. The Natural Character chapter and the Coastal Environment chapter should be referred to in addition to this zone chapter.*
115. I recommend that new Advice Notes 3 and 4 are inserted relating to mineral extraction objectives and policies and the NES-CF to align with equivalent notes in the RPROZ chapter.
116. I recommend the insertion of a new rule to manage artificial crop protection structures and crop support structures in the RLZ to align with the equivalent rule recommended for insertion into the RPROZ chapter.

⁸ RPROZ-R19, RRZ-R10 and RSZ-R10.



117. I recommend that PER-1 of RLZ-R1 is amended to read '*The new building or structure, relocated building or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure, will accommodate a permitted, controlled or restricted discretionary activity.*'
118. I recommend consequential amendments to RLZ-R1 to clarify that the rule does not apply to artificial crop protection structures and crop protection support structures and other consequential amendments to align with the equivalent wording for R1 rules, as per Key Issue 15 of the Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ section 42A report.
119. I recommend that the activity status of RLZ-R6 for educational facilities is amended to restricted discretionary (when permitted conditions are not complied with) and that new matters of discretion are inserted to align with RPROZ-R6.
120. I recommend that the right-hand column of RLZ-R9 is amended to refer to 'PER-2' and that the wording of PER-1 is aligned with the recommended wording for RPROZ-R10.
121. I recommend that RLZ-R10 is amended to only apply to forestry activities not regulated under the NES-CF.
122. I recommend that RLZ-R11 is amended so that failing to comply with PER-1 is a non-complying activity.
123. I recommend that consequential amendments are made to RLZ-R19 and RLZ-R25 as set out in paragraph 104 above.

Section 32AA evaluation

124. I consider that my recommended amendments to Advice Note 2 are consequential resulting from recommendations in the Coastal Environment section 42A report. Similarly, I consider that my recommended insertion of two new advice notes relating to mineral extraction activities and the NES-CF are consequential resulting from recommendations in the Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ section 42A report. As such, it is my view that no evaluation for these recommended amendments is required under section 32AA of the RMA.
125. I consider that the amendments to RLZ-R1 and RLZ-R9 are either minor amendments to clarify intent or to fix errors and do not require further assessment under section 32AA of the RMA.
126. I consider that the new rule for artificial crop protection structures and crop support structures (and consequential amendments to RLZ-R1, RLZ-S1 and RLZ-S3) is an effective way to clarify and consolidate the rules and standards that apply to these activities without further complicating the drafting of RLZ-R1. I consider that the refined drafting has not changed the intent of the notified provisions with respect to artificial crop protection structures



and crop support structures, rather it is a structural change to assist with interpretation. On this basis, in my view, no evaluation for this recommended new rule is required under section 32AA of the RMA.

- 127. I consider that the rationale for amending the activity status of RLZ-R6 has been sufficiently addressed in the Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ section 42A report. As such, I do not repeat the section 32AA evaluation here.
- 128. I consider that the rationale for amending RLZ-R10 to align with the NES-CF has been sufficiently addressed in response to aligning other RPROZ provisions with the NES-CF in Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ section 42A report. As such, I do not repeat the section 32AA evaluation here.
- 129. I consider that the amendment to RLZ-R11 is a minor change to align the activity status for infringing PER-1 with other equivalent minor residential unit rules in other rural zones and essentially is to fix an inconsistency error. On this basis, in my view, no evaluation for this recommended new rule is required under section 32AA of the RMA.
- 130. The recommended amendments to RLZ-R19 and RLZ-R25 have been assessed under equivalent rules in the Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ section 42A report and the section 32AA evaluation for these rules is not repeated here.

5.2.4 Key Issue 4: RLZ-R2 – Impermeable surface coverage

Overview

Provision(s)	Officer Recommendation(s)
RLZ-R2	Minor amendment to align with recommendations in the Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ section 42A report

Analysis of Submissions on Key Issue 4: RLZ-R2 - Impermeable Surface coverage

Matters raised in submissions

- 131. Michael John Winch (S67.015, S67.016) supports retaining the impermeable surface coverage thresholds in RLZ-R2 but opposes the lack of protection for the life-supporting capacity of the soil and highly productive land and requests an additional matter of discretion be inserted into RLZ-R2 to this effect.
- 132. Robert Adams (S149.001) considers that RLZ-R2 (and also RLZ-S5 relating to building or structure coverage) are too restrictive and not equitable for rear sites that are less than 2ha in site area with long driveways, particularly those properties along the length of Long Beach Road. Robert Adams requests RLZ-R2 (and RLZ-S5 for consistency) are amended so that lots under 2 ha and/or with an access lot can calculate impermeable and building coverage using net site area.



Analysis

133. Although I agreed with Michael Winch's equivalent submission points on the RPROZ and HZ rules with respect to a new matter of discretion, I disagree that adding an equivalent matter of discretion relating to life-supporting capacity of the soil and highly productive land is appropriate in the RLZ, for the same reasons as I outlined in Key Issue 2 above.
134. I understand the concern raised by Robert Adams and agree that using gross site area to calculate stormwater is not equitable for all shapes and sizes of site. Rear sites with long, pan-handled access lots and/or long driveways can use a disproportionate amount of their impermeable surface allowance on accessing the site, with little allocation left for buildings. However, using net site area for the impermeable surface calculations inevitably makes the rule more permissive and results in larger amounts of stormwater runoff from sites. I understand retaining the status quo approach to calculating impermeable surfaces from the ODP was a deliberate decision by Council and has been applied consistently across the PDP. Given concerns raised about increasing stormwater runoff in the wider rural environment (refer to Key Issue 16 in the Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ section 42A report) and lack of more detailed information as to how much additional impermeable surface coverage would be enabled across the RLZ if net site area was used for the calculation, I do not agree with amending RLZ-R2 to use net site area.
135. However, I do recommend that minor amendments to RLZ-R2 – Impermeable surfaces are required to align the matters of discretion with other equivalent impermeable surface rules for the reasons set out in Key Issue 4 of the Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ section 42A report. I have recommended that these amendments are made in the recommendations section below.

Recommendation

136. For the reasons set out above, I recommend that the submissions on RLZ-R2 are accepted, accepted in part and rejected as set out in **Appendix 2**.
137. I recommend that matter of discretion c) in RLZ-R2 be amended as set out in Key Issue 4 of the Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ section 42A report.
138. I recommend that a new matter g) be inserted into RLZ-R2 as set out in Key Issue 4 of the Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ section 42A report.

Section 32AA evaluation

139. The rationale for the amended matters of discretion in RLZ-R2 with respect to section 32AA is set out in Key Issue 4 of the Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ section 42A report and is not repeated here.



5.2.5 Key Issue 5: RLZ-R3 - Residential Activity

Overview

Provision(s)	Officer Recommendation(s)
RLZ-R3	Minor amendment to exempt minor residential units

Analysis of Submissions on Key Issue 5: RLZ-R3 - Residential Activity

Matters raised in submissions

140. FNDC (S368.081) supports RLZ-R3 in part and requests amendments to exclude a 'minor residential unit' from this rule as it is intended that RLZ-R11 provides for a minor residential unit in addition to a principal residential unit on a site. This relief is consistent with similar relief requested in other rural zones e.g. RPROZ-R3.
141. Willowridge Developments Limited (S250.026) generally supports RLZ-R3, however they consider that rural lifestyle living activities could be easily accommodated down to a density of one residential unit per 5,000m², as provided in the ODP Coastal Living Zone. Willowridge Developments Limited requests that RLZ-R3 is amended to provide for residential intensity of one residential unit per 5,000m² as a permitted activity.

Analysis

142. I agree with the submission from FNDC that minor residential units should be excluded from RLZ-R3 for clarity. After discussing the drafting of this rule internally with Council staff, I understand that this was the original intention of the rule, otherwise the minor residential unit rule (RLZ-R10) would have no purpose and would never be utilised. This amendment is also consistent with other recommendations to equivalent rules in other rural zones e.g. RPROZ.
143. With respect to the submission from Willowridge Developments Limited, I consider that it is important that the residential activity provisions in the RLZ align with the minimum lot sizes for the RLZ in SUB-S1 to ensure that the subdivision provisions are not undermined by more permissive residential activity provisions. As outlined in my other rural zone section 42A reports, in my experience, once a residential unit is constructed there is often increased pressure to subdivide around that residential unit on the basis that there are no tangible environmental effects from new legal boundaries being drawn and new titles issued. If residential activity provisions allow for more residential units to be constructed on a site than the number of lots provided for in the subdivision rules, it is very difficult for Council staff to reject subdivision applications and the residential activity provisions often become the accepted number of lots able to be subdivided by default.
144. I note that, as discussed in Key Issue 8 below, there is currently a disconnect between RLZ-R3 and SUB-S1 with respect to the RLZ, as the minimum controlled lot size is 4ha but RLZ-R3 allows for one residential unit per 2ha.



My recommendations on minimum lot sizes address submissions on SUB-S1 requesting better alignment with RLZ-R3 and recommend that these two provisions be 'coupled' together in the same way as in other rural zones, but my recommendations do not require any amendments to RLZ-R3.

Recommendation

145. For the reasons set out above, I recommend that the submissions on RLZ-R3 are accepted, accepted in part and rejected as set out in **Appendix 2**.
146. I recommend that an additional exemption from PER-1 is added into RLZ-R3 as follows:

"PER-1 does not apply to:

- i. a single residential unit located on a site less than 2ha.*
- ii. A minor residential unit constructed in accordance with rule RLZ-R10."*

Section 32AA evaluation

147. I consider that the amendment to RLZ-R3 is a minor amendment to clarify intent and does not change the intention of the rule from what was originally notified. On this basis, in my view, no evaluation for this recommended amendment to RLZ-R3 is required under section 32AA of the RMA.

5.2.6 Key Issue 6: RLZ-R5 - Home Business

Overview

Provision(s)	Officer Recommendation(s)
RLZ-R5	Minor amendments to align with the Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ section 42A report

Analysis of Submissions on Key Issue 6: RLZ-R5 - Home Business

Matters raised in submissions

148. John Andrew Riddell (S431.141) requests that PER-4 of RLZ-R5 is amended to apply the hours of operation to when the business is open to the public.
149. Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited (S502.053) support RLZ-R5 in part but request that PER-1 is amended to remove the maximum gross floor area restriction for accessory buildings. The submitter argues that home businesses should be able to utilise existing buildings such as farm sheds that might exceed 40m² without triggering the need for resource consent. This submitter considers that, if a business were to utilise an accessory building exceeding 40m², PER-2 and PER-3 are sufficient to control adverse effects.



Analysis

150. John Andrew Riddell requests amendments to PER-4 of RLZ-R5 with respect to the hours of operation of home businesses. I agree that not all home businesses will be 'open to the public' and therefore limiting operation hours for small, work from home businesses with no face-to-face customers is likely to be overly restrictive. However, I have concerns with an open-ended condition, as suggested by John Andrew Riddell, that states that the hours of operation should match when the business is open to the public without any indication of suitable opening hours for a public facing business. For a permitted activity condition to be effective, it needs to be measurable against a specific limit. As such, I recommend retaining the operating hours in PER-4 of RLZ-R5 but clarifying that these hours only restrict when a business can be open to the public, not the hours a business can operate.
151. I acknowledge the concerns of Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited and that they are seeking more flexibility from RLZ-R5, particularly when utilising existing accessory buildings. I agree that, in some cases, the controls on number of persons engaged in the home business and the requirement to undertake all activities within a building or have the activities screened will manage off-site effects on neighbouring properties. However, the intent of the GFA limit on accessory buildings is to put a check point in place to check the scale and nature of the home business. There may be some commercial or industrial activities that only employ a few people but create adverse effects such as noise, dust, traffic movements etc that do not fit well in a rural lifestyle environment. Having no GFA limits on accessory buildings increases the likelihood that a full scale commercial or industrial activity is able to set up in the RLZ when it is better located in an urban zone. As such, I do not recommend removing the GFA limit from RLZ-R5.

Recommendation

152. For the reasons set out above, I recommend that the submissions on RLZ-R5 are accepted, accepted in part and rejected as set out in **Appendix 2**.
153. I recommend that the wording of PER-4 in RLZ-R5 is amended to clarify that the permitted condition relating to operating hours only applies to the hours that a business is open to the public.

Section 32AA evaluation

154. I consider that the amendment to PER-4 in RLZ-R5 is a minor change to clarify how the rule should be applied and that it does not change the intent of the rule. As such, no further evaluation is required under section 32AA of the RMA in my view.



5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards

Overview

Provision(s)	Officer Recommendation(s)
RLZ-S1	Consequential amendment to remove standards applying to artificial crop protection and support structures
RLZ-S2, RLZ-S5	Retain as notified
RLZ-S3	Consequential amendments to align with equivalent standard RPROZ-S3, as per the Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ section 42A report
New standard RLZ-SX	Insert sensitive activity setback from the boundary of a Mineral Extraction Zone
New standard RLZ-SY	Insert setback standard for sensitive activities from existing intensive indoor and outdoor primary production activities
New standard RLZ-SZ	Insert setback standard for sensitive activities from buildings for housing, milking or feeding stock

Analysis of Submissions on Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards

Matters raised in submissions

General comments

155. A group of submitters, including The Shooting Box (S187), Setar Thirty Six (S168), P S Yates (S333) and Bentzen Farm Limited (S167), support retaining all RLZ standards as notified in the PDP as they consider these are the most appropriate to achieve the purpose of the RMA and give effect to high order planning documents.
156. Imerys Performance Minerals Asia Pacific (S65.014) request the insertion of a new standard requiring sensitive activities to be set back from the boundary of a Mineral Extraction Overlay, similar to RPROZ-S7. Ventia Ltd (S424.011⁹) also requests that an equivalent standard to RPROZ-S7 is inserted into the RLZ to protect Mineral Extraction Overlays.

Crop Protection Structures

157. Our Kerikeri (S338), Kapiro Residents Association (S427), Kapiro Conservation Trust (S449) and Carbon Neutral NZ Trust (S529) support the RLZ standards in part and request retention of rules and standards for crop protection and support structures setbacks. However, these submitters consider that additional standards for such structures are required to prevent further adverse effects on visual amenity and rural character. These

⁹ Note that this submission was incorrectly allocated to the Mineral Extraction overlay topic in the Summary of Submissions. It has been assessed here as it clearly relates to a request for a new standard in the RLZ.



submitters have included suggested wording for amended provisions in their submissions.

RLZ-S2

158. John Andrew Riddell (S431.183) supports RLZ-S2 on the basis that he agrees with varying the height in relation to boundary standard depending on the orientation of the boundary.

RLZ-S3

159. Willowridge Development Limited (S250.029) support RLZ-S3 in part but request that only one setback standard applies to side boundaries, as opposed to a 'tiered' setback with different setbacks for 5,000m² sites.

RLZ-S4

160. FNDC (S368.049) requests a minor amendment to RLZ-S4 to fix the misspelling of constraints in clause (d).

RLZ-S5

161. Trent Simpkin (S283.031) opposes all building coverage rules in all zones, including RLZ-S5¹⁰. In the case of the RLZ, the submitter requests that the maximum building or structure coverage allowance increases from 12.5% to 20%. As an alternative, the submitter suggests inserting a PER-2 that says if a building is above 20% site coverage or 2,500m², it is a permitted activity if a visual assessment and landscape plan is provided as part of the building consent.

Analysis

General comments

162. I agree with Imerys Performance Minerals Asia Pacific and Ventia Ltd that there is the potential that some RLZ land may be located within 100m of the boundary of a Mineral Extraction Zone in the future (previously Mineral Extraction Overlay¹¹). As such, I agree that there should be an equivalent standard to RPROZ-S7 in the RLZ. I recommend a new standard to address this in the recommendations section below.
163. I also consider that the reciprocal standards inserted into the RPROZ to protect indoor and outdoor primary production activities and buildings housing animals should be inserted into the RLZ as a consequential amendment for consistency, given that there will be existing primary production activities located in the RLZ, plus primary production activities located in adjacent RPROZ and HZ zones.

¹⁰ Note that this submission point was incorrectly allocated to RLZ-R5 in the published Summary of Submissions. As it clearly relates to RLZ-S5 and the building coverage controls in the RLZ, it has been assessed in this section of the section 42A report.

¹¹ Refer to Key Issue 1 of the Mineral Extraction section 42A report, prepared by Ms Lynette Morgan, dated 18 October 2024.



Crop Protection Structures

164. I agree with Horticulture NZ that artificial crop protection structures and crop support structures should not be subject to the full range of standards set out under RLZ-R1. I have recommended the insertion of a new rule to specifically manage artificial crop protection structures and crop support structures in Key Issue 3 above, which consolidates the applicable permitted activity conditions relating to height and setbacks into a single rule. This negates the need for RLZ-S1 and RLZ-S3 to include standards specifically for artificial crop protection structures or crop support structures, so these references can be deleted as a consequential amendment.

RLZ-S2

165. I acknowledge that John Andrew Riddell requests retention of RLZ-S2 as notified in the PDP, and I recommend that this standard is retained.

RLZ-S3

166. As discussed in Key Issue 28 of the Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ section 42A report, less stringent setbacks have been imposed for accessory buildings on sites that are less than 5,000m² to recognise that it is harder to meet the RLZ wide setbacks on these small sites, which were able to be created under the ODP subdivision rules. It also recognises that accessory buildings are typically less vulnerable to the types of adverse effects listed above. RLZ-S3 was also drafted to be consistent with equivalent standard RPROZ-S3, which includes the same exemptions for sites less than 5,000m². As such, I do not recommend any amendments to RLZ-S3 as a result of this submission as it would result in an inconsistent approach for sites less than 5,000m² between the RLZ and the RPROZ.
167. However, I do recommend additional consequential amendments to RLZ-S3 to align with the recommended amendments to RPROZ-S3 (as set out in Key Issue 28 of the Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ section 42A report) to retain consistency between these standards, e.g. amendments relating to setbacks from commercial forests and unsealed roads. This also includes new matters of discretion relating to rail corridor safety and operational efficiency to address concerns raised by KiwiRail.
168. I also recommend new 20m setbacks for habitable buildings from shared boundaries with RPROZ and HZ land, for the reasons set out in Key Issue 3 above in response to the submissions from Horticulture NZ.

RLZ-S4

169. RLZ-S4 is already recommended to be deleted, as per Key Issue 20 of the Coastal Environment section 42A report. As such I do not need to address the submission points of FNDC and Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited in respect of this standard.



RLZ-S5

170. I disagree with Trent Simpkin that the building coverage control should be increased from 12.5% to 20%. This is a significant increase and well in excess of the 15% impermeable coverage rule in RLZ-R2. I also disagree that there should be an alternative permitted pathway for activities that exceed 20% coverage or 2,500m² by way of a visual assessment and landscape plan. As discussed in relation to the submitter's request for a permitted activity pathway for non-compliance with RLZ-R2 where there is a TP10 report, this type of pathway would give considerable discretion to landscape architects, enabling them to effectively approve landscaping and planting plans to mitigate built dominance, privacy and amenity/character effects without any Council oversight. I recommend that this submission point is rejected.

Recommendation

171. For the reasons set out above, I recommend that the submissions on the RLZ standards are accepted, accepted in part and rejected as set out in **Appendix 2**.
172. I recommend that an equivalent standard to RPROZ-S7 (including recommended amendments to RPROZ-S7 as set out in the Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ section 42A report) is included in the RLZ chapter.
173. I recommend that RLZ-S1 and RLZ-S3 are amended to remove references to artificial crop protection structures or crop support structures.
174. I recommend that consequential amendments are made to RLZ-S3 to align with recommended amendments to RPROZ-S3 (as set out in the Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ section 42A report) and that a new setback is included requiring buildings containing sensitive activities to be set back 20m from the boundary of land zoned RPROZ or HZ.
175. I recommend that two new standards are inserted to align with the setbacks in the RPROZ to protect existing intensive indoor and outdoor primary production activities from new sensitive activities and existing primary production activities involving buildings or structures that are used to house, milk or feed stock from new sensitive activities.

Section 32AA evaluation

176. All of the recommended amendments to the RLZ standards are to align with recommendations made to equivalent standards in the Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ section 42A report. As such, the section 32AA evaluation for the amendments to standards is not repeated here.
177. The only exception is the 20m setback for buildings containing sensitive activities from the boundary of land zoned RPROZ or HZ. I consider a setback to be an effective method of controlling potential reverse sensitivity effects at the zone boundary with more productive land that is likely to contain



existing primary production activities. It also provides additional protection for horticultural activities that are not protected by the new recommended standards relating to primary production activities involving animals. As such, I consider that my recommended amendments to RLZ-S3 will be more effective and efficient in achieving the relevant objectives in the PDP than the notified standard and are therefore appropriate in terms of section 32AA of the RMA.

5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Lifestyle Zone

Overview

Provision(s)	Officer Recommendation(s)
SUB-S1	Amended to reduce minimum lot sizes for the RLZ

Analysis of Submissions on Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Lifestyle Zone

Matters raised in submissions

178. Russell Protection Society (S179.106) support SUB-S1 and request that the minimum lot sizes for RLZ are retained as they continue the protection previously afforded by ODP zones in the coastal environment.
179. There were 6 submissions¹² received on SUB-S1 that oppose the minimum lot sizes and associated activity status of subdivision applications in the RLZ, either in full or in part. The general relief sought in submissions is to either request reductions in minimum lot sizes or request retention of the ODP subdivision minimum lot sizes.
180. The reasons for opposing SUB-S1 as it relates to RLZ include:
 - a. A 2ha site of lawn and gardens is difficult and expensive to maintain without livestock (Michael John Winch (S67.009)).
 - b. The Far North district needs to be growing, not shrinking, so more properties need to be provided for people to live on (Trent Simpkin (S24.002) and Tristan Simpkin (S286.002)).
 - c. The minimum lot sizes are too small to be used for commercially viable productive uses and too large for typical lifestyle purposes (Braedon & Cook Limited (S401.003) and Meridian Farm Ltd (S403.003))
 - d. The controlled minimum lot size for the RLZ in SUB-S1 should be consistent with the 2ha minimum site area per residential unit in

¹² Note that Neil Construction Limited (S349) also made submissions on SUB-S1 with respect to the RLZ. This submission point has been assessed in Key Issue 1 above as part of the package of relief related to the Tubbs Farm site.



PER-1 in RLZ-R3 (Willowridge Developments Limited (S250.012) and Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew (S386.018)).

- e. Smaller lot sizes that are less than 1 hectare (i.e. 5,000m²) can still maintain and enhance the rural amenity of the zone, while providing sites that are able to be effectively managed by the owners as a small productive / lifestyle lot (Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited (S502.082)).

181. The requested relief includes:

- a. A 2ha controlled minimum lot size (Braedon & Cook Limited (S401.003) and Meridian Farm Ltd (S403.003), Willowridge Developments Limited (S250.012) and Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew (S386.018)).
- b. A 1ha discretionary minimum lot size (Braedon & Cook Limited (S401.003) and Meridian Farm Ltd (S403.003), Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited (S502.082), Michael John Winch (S67.009))
- c. A 5,000m² discretionary minimum lot size (Trent Simpkin (S24.002), Tristan Simpkin (S286.002))

Analysis

- 182. I agree with Willowridge Developments Limited and others that there is a disconnect between the controlled minimum lot size for the RLZ in SUB-S1 (being 4ha) and the residential activity rule RLZ-R3 (which allows one residential unit per 2ha). As discussed in Key Issue 5 above, I support RLZ-R3 being coupled to SUB-S1, so that the same level of residential intensity in the RLZ is enabled under both these provisions. If small lot subdivision is enabled around existing dwellings (even if the dwellings have to be existing at a certain date to qualify), it makes it difficult to reject other subdivision applications for lots around new dwellings, or subdivision around minor dwellings. In my view, the existence of a dwelling should not entitle a landowner to additional lots – if there is a genuine need for subdivision around existing dwellings then an applicant can apply for a non-complying activity subdivision and demonstrate how the proposal is in accordance with RLZ-P4 and other relevant RLZ objectives and policies.
- 183. Rather than amending RLZ-R3 to be more restrictive (i.e. one residential dwelling per 4ha to match the controlled minimum lot size), I agree with submitters such as Braedon & Cook Limited that a more appropriate set of minimum lot sizes for the RLZ is 2ha as a controlled activity and 1ha as a discretionary activity. This is in keeping with my wider philosophy for subdivision in the rural environment, which is to be more conservative with minimum lot sizes in the productive rural zones (RPROZ and HZ) and instead provide capacity for living opportunities in the rural environment towards zones specifically designed for that purpose e.g. RLZ, RRZ and RSZ. I



consider that providing more capacity for subdivision in the RLZ may reduce pressure on land zoned RPROZ and HZ and support reductions in potential reverse sensitivity effects on primary production activities if residential demand is directed into the RLZ.

Recommendation

184. For the reasons set out above, I recommend that the submissions on SUB-S1 as it relates to the RLZ are accepted, accepted in part and rejected as set out in **Appendix 2**.
185. I recommend that SUB-S1 is amended to provide for a controlled minimum lot size of 2ha and a discretionary minimum lot size of 1ha in the RLZ.

Section 32AA evaluation

186. I consider that reducing the minimum lot sizes in the RLZ is an appropriate response to requests for alignment between SUB-S1 and the residential intensity enabled under RLZ-S3 given that it will ensure a consistent approach to keeping these two provisions 'coupled', as is the case for every other rural zone in the PDP. I consider that a smaller minimum lot size in the RLZ will result in more efficient use of the land zoned for rural lifestyle purposes and will be effective in increasing rural lifestyle capacity in parts of the Far North District best placed to accommodate that growth, as opposed to allowing ad hoc small lots to establish in the RPROZ or HZ. As such, I consider that my recommended amendments to SUB-S1 will be more effective and efficient in achieving the relevant objectives in the PDP than the notified standard and are therefore appropriate in terms of section 32AA of the RMA.

6 Conclusion

187. This report has provided an assessment of submissions received in relation to the RLZ chapter. The primary amendments that I have recommended relate to:
 - a. Amendments to rules and standards to align with recommendations made in the Rural Wide Issues and Rural Production Zone (RPROZ) section 42A report.
 - b. Amendments to SUB-S1 to reduce minimum lot sizes in the RLZ to align with RLZ-R3.
188. Section 5.2 considers and provides recommendations on the decisions requested in submissions. I consider that the submissions on the RLZ chapter should be accepted, accepted in part, rejected or rejected in part, as set out in my recommendations of this report and in **Appendix 2**.
189. I recommend that provisions for the RLZ chapter be amended as set out in the RLZ chapter in **Appendix 1.1** below for the reasons set out in this report. The consequential amendments made to the RLZ as result of the



recommendations in the Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A report are also contained in **Appendix 1.1**. I recommend that the amendments to SUB-S1 in the Subdivision chapter be amended as set out in **Appendix 1.2** below for the reasons set out in this report.

Recommended by: Melissa Pearson, Principal Planning Consultant, SLR Consulting

Approved by: James R Witham – Team Leader District Plan, Far North District Council.

Date: 4 November 2024