

Appendix 2 – Officer's Recommended Decisions on Submissions on the Rural Residential Zone

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|--|---|---|------------------------|---|
| S349.025 | Neil Construction Limited | 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. | | Reject | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Neil Construction Limited submission on the RRZ chapter |
| FS62.059 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 1 | | 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 | Disallow | Re-zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland) in Rural Production or Horticulture zone etc | Accept | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Neil Construction Limited submission on the RRZ chapter |
| FS333.046 | Maree Hart | | Oppose | <p>These submissions seek inappropriate changes, such as re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, Spoonbill Drive and Kingfisher Drive from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential. Some points seek to weaken the policies and rules / standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural Lifestyle zone and Rural Residential zone, e.g. S349 seeks to delete references to 'rural character' and 'amenity' for the Rural Residential zone.</p> <p>The scale and intensity of urban/residential development sought by these submissions would create a new township in the rural areas at the northern end of Landing Road; this scale and density of development is not anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans.</p> | Disallow | Re-zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland) in Rural Production or Horticulture zone etc | Accept | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Neil Construction Limited submission on the RRZ chapter |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|------------|-----------------|---|--|------------------------|---|
| | | | | It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area that lacks relevant infrastructure and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town in future. Their proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects, such as a large increase in traffic on Landing Road, one-lane bridge and other adverse effects noted under my Further Submission 1 above. | | | |
| S213.014 | Timothy and Dion Spicer | 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. | Reject | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General Comments |
| S213.021 | Timothy and Dion Spicer | 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. | Reject | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General Comments |
| S555.003 | Ngā Kaingamaha o Ngāti Hine Charitable Trust | Objectives | Support in part | <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p> | Insert additional objective to allow for urban growth where appropriate within the Rural Residential zone | Reject | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 3: RRZ Overview, Objectives and Policies |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|------------|------------|---|--|---|------------------------|---|
| | | | | <p>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> | | | | |
| S454.112 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | Objectives | Not Stated | <p>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.</p> | <p>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.</p> | | Reject | <p>Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions</p> |
| FS243.158 | Kainga Ora Homes and Communities | | Oppose | <p>Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, as it is inconsistent with its primary submission. The amendment is unnecessary</p> | Disallow | (Similar relief sought to above submission - numerous points) | Accept in part | <p>Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions</p> |
| FS369.504 | Top Energy | | Support | <p>Top Energy supports the objective to provide for infrastructure that has a functional or operational need to locate in the zone.</p> | Allow | | Reject | <p>Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.4</p> |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|------------|----------|--|---|--|------------------------|---|
| | | | | | | | | Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions |
| S349.026 | Neil Construction Limited | 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. | | Reject | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Neil Construction Limited submission on the RRZ chapter |
| FS62.060 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 1 | | 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 | Disallow | Re-zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland) in Rural Production or Horticulture zone etc. | Accept | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Neil Construction Limited submission on the RRZ chapter |
| FS333.047 | Maree Hart | | Oppose | <p>These submissions seek inappropriate changes, such as re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, Spoonbill Drive and Kingfisher Drive from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential. Some points seek to weaken the policies and rules / standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural Lifestyle zone and Rural Residential zone, e.g. S349 seeks to delete references to 'rural character' and 'amenity' for the Rural Residential zone.</p> <p>The scale and intensity of urban / residential development sought by these submissions would create a new township in the rural areas at the northern end of Landing Road; this scale and density of development is not anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans. It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area that lacks relevant infrastructure</p> | Disallow | Re-zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland) in Rural Production or Horticulture zone etc. | Accept | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Neil Construction Limited submission on the RRZ chapter |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|---|-----------|-----------------|--|---|------------------------|---|
| | | | | and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town in future. Their proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects, such as a large increase in traffic on Landing Road, one-lane bridge and other adverse effects noted under my Further Submission 1 above. | | | |
| S172.027 | Terra Group | RRZ-01 | Support | Support objectives RRZ-01 to RRZ-03 as they will achieve positive outcomes for the proposed zone. | Retain as notified (inferred) | Accept | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RRZ Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| S331.072 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | RRZ-01 | Support in part | The submitter supports in part objective RRZ-01 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-01 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. | Reject | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions |
| S172.030 | Terra Group | RRZ-02 | Support | Support objectives RRZ-01 to RRZ-03 as they will achieve positive outcomes for the proposed zone. | Retain as notified (inferred) | Accept | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RRZ Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| S172.031 | Terra Group | RRZ-03 | Support | Support objectives RRZ-01 to RRZ-03 as they will achieve positive outcomes for the proposed zone. | Retain as notified (inferred) | Accept | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RRZ Overview, |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|------------|---|--|---|------------------------|---|
| | | | | | | | | Objectives and Policies |
| S159.185 | Horticulture New Zealand | RRZ-O4 | Support | The interface of the zone boundary is important especially where it borders the Rural Production zone | Retain Objective RRZ-O4 | | Accept | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RRZ Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS151.30 | Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust | | Support | | Allow | | Accept | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RRZ Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS570.347 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Oppose | Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions. | Disallow | Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission | Accept in part | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RRZ Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS566.361 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Oppose | Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission | Disallow | Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission | Accept in part | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RRZ Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS569.383 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Oppose | Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission | Disallow | Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission | Accept in part | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RRZ Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| S213.015 | Timothy and Dion Spicer | 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 industrial activities, or at least industrial activities ancillary to production, are a Discretionary Activity. | | Reject | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|--|--|------------------------|---|
| | | | | consideration of any proposed industrial activity within the context of the RRZ. | | | Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General Comments |
| S213.018 | Timothy and Dion Spicer | 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 rural industry activities are a Discretionary Activity | Reject | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General Comments |
| S213.022 | Timothy and Dion Spicer | 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. | Reject | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General Comments |
| S555.004 | Ngā Kaingamaha o Ngāti Hine Charitable Trust | Policies | Support in part | <p>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.</p> <p>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 2,000m² 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,</p> | Insert additional policy to allow for urban growth where appropriate within the Rural Residential zone | Reject | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RRZ Overview, Objectives and Policies |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|------------|---|---|---|------------------------|--|
| | | | | 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. | | | | |
| S454.113 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | 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. | | Reject | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions |
| FS243.169 | Kainga Ora Homes and Communities | | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, as it is inconsistent with its primary submission. The amendment is unnecessary. | Disallow | (Similar relief sought to above submission - numerous points) | Accept in part | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions |
| FS369.505 | Top Energy | | Support | Top Energy supports the objective to provide for infrastructure that has a functional or operational need to locate in the zone. | Allow | | Reject | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions |
| S529.157 | Carbon Neutral NZ Trust | 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 | Amend policies to have a firm policy to protect a key natural resource - productive land - now and for future generations. | | Accept in part | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|-------------------|--|-----------|----------|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| | | | | 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. | | | | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL |
| FS570.2045 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL |
| FS566.2059 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL |
| FS569.2081 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL |
| S172.028 | Terra Group | RRZ-P1 | Support | Support RRZ-P1 to P5, as they will achieve positive outcomes for the proposed zone. | Retain as notified (inferred) | | Accept | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RRZ Overview, Objectives and Policies |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|---|-----------|-----------------|--|---|--|------------------------|--|
| S331.073 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | RRZ-P1 | Support in part | 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. | 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: a. rural residential activities; b. small-scale farming activities; c. home business activities; visitor accommodation; and d. small-scale educational facilities. | | Reject | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions |
| S349.027 | Neil Construction Limited | 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. | | Reject | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Neil Construction Limited submission on the RRZ chapter |
| FS62.061 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 1 | | 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. | Disallow | Re-zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland) in Rural Production or Horticulture zone etc. | Accept | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Neil Construction Limited submission on the RRZ chapter |
| FS333.048 | Maree Hart | | Oppose | These submissions seek inappropriate changes, such as re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, Spoonbill Drive and Kingfisher Drive from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential. Some points seek to weaken the policies and rules/standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural Lifestyle zone and Rural Residential zone, e.g. S349 seeks to delete | Disallow | Re-zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland) in Rural Production or Horticulture zone etc. | Accept | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Neil Construction Limited submission on the RRZ chapter |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|---|--|------------------------|---|
| | | | | <p>references to 'rural character' and 'amenity' for the Rural Residential zone.</p> <p>The scale and intensity of urban/residential development sought by these submissions would create a new township in the rural areas at the northern end of Landing Road; this scale and density of development is not anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans. It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area that lacks relevant infrastructure and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town in future.</p> <p>Their proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects, such as a large increase in traffic on Landing Road, one-lane bridge and other adverse effects noted under my Further Submission 1 above.</p> | | | | |
| S172.032 | Terra Group | RRZ-P2 | Support | Support RRZ-P1 to P5, as they will achieve positive outcomes for the proposed zone. | Retain as notified (inferred) | | Accept | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RRZ Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| S106.001 | Lynley Newport | 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 : | | Reject | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RRZ Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS172.188 | Audrey Campbell-Frear | | Support | For the reasons set out in this primary submission. | Allow | | Reject | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RRZ Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS196.56 | Joe Carr | | Support | as per submission | Allow | | Reject | RRZ S42A Report |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|--|---|--|------------------------|--|
| | | | | | | | | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RRZ Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS196.57 | Joe Carr | | Support | as per submitter | Allow | | Reject | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RRZ Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| S349.028 | Neil Construction Limited | 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. | | Reject | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Neil Construction Limited submission on the RRZ chapter |
| FS62.062 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 1 | | 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 | Disallow | Re-zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland) in Rural Production or Horticulture zone etc. | Accept | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Neil Construction Limited submission on the RRZ chapter |
| FS333.049 | Maree Hart | | Oppose | These submissions seek inappropriate changes, such as re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, Spoonbill Drive and Kingfisher Drive from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential. Some points seek to weaken the policies and rules / standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural Lifestyle zone and Rural Residential zone, e.g. S349 seeks to delete | Disallow | Re-zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland) in Rural Production or Horticulture zone etc. | Accept | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Neil Construction Limited submission on the RRZ chapter |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|--|------------------------|---|
| | | | | <p>references to 'rural character' and 'amenity' for the Rural Residential zone.</p> <p>The scale and intensity of urban / residential development sought by these submissions would create a new township in the rural areas at the northern end of Landing Road; this scale and density of development is not anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans. It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area that lacks relevant infrastructure and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town in future.</p> <p>Their proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects, such as a large increase in traffic on Landing Road, one-lane bridge and other adverse effects noted under my Further Submission 1 above.</p> | | | |
| S172.033 | Terra Group | RRZ-P3 | Support | Support RRZ-P1 to P5, as they will achieve positive outcomes for the proposed zone. | Retain as notified (inferred) | Accept | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RRZ Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| S172.034 | Terra Group | RRZ-P4 | Support | Support RRZ-P1 to P5, as they will achieve positive outcomes for the proposed zone. | Retain as notified (inferred) | Accept in part | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RRZ Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| S106.002 | Lynley Newport | RRZ-P4 | Oppose | <p>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.</p> <p>Telecommunications no longer must be in ground fibre or copper wire; power no longer must be conventional nonrenewable means.</p> | 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 the following reticulated services to the boundary: telecommunications: fibre where it is available; copper where fibre is not | Accept in part | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RRZ Overview, Objectives and Policies |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|--|--|------------------------|---|
| | | | | Technology has advanced. Other Rural zones do not have a policy worded such as RRZ-P4 so why is Rural Residential any different? | available; copper where the area is identified for future fibre deployment. local electricity distribution network. And where it is proposed to rely on alternatives to the reticulated services outlined above, the alternatives shall be capable of providing the same level of service as conventional reticulated services. | | |
| FS172.189 | Audrey Campbell-Frear | | Support | For the reasons set out in this primary submission. | Allow | Accept in part | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RRZ Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS196.58 | Joe Carr | | Support | As per submitter | Allow | Accept in part | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RRZ Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| S172.035 | Terra Group | RRZ-P5 | Support | Support RRZ-P1 to P5, as they will achieve positive outcomes for the proposed zone. | Retain as notified (inferred) | Accept in part | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RRZ Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| S416.048 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | 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 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 | Reject | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|------------|--|--|--|------------------------|--|
| FS243.134 | Kainga Ora Homes and Communities | | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the requested 5m setback; a considerably reduced set back would provide adequate space for maintenance activities within sites adjacent to the rail network. In doing so, it will continue to protect the safe, efficient, and effective operation of the rail infrastructure while balancing the cost on landowners. The amendments are unnecessary. | Disallow | Insert additional matter as follows: the location and design of buildings adjacent to the railway corridor | Accept | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions |
| S172.001 | Terra Group | Rules | Support | The rules promote positive outcomes for the proposed Rural Residential Zone. | Retain Rules RRZ-R1 to RRZ-R10 as notified. | | Accept in part | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General Comments |
| S213.013 | Timothy and Dion Spicer | 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. | | Reject | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General Comments |
| S213.019 | Timothy and Dion Spicer | 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. | | Reject | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General Comments |
| S213.023 | Timothy and Dion Spicer | 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. | | Reject | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General Comments |
| S369.002 | Brady Wild | 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 | Retain the Rural Residential zone rules | | Accept in part | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General Comments |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|---|------------------------|--|
| | | | | 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 | | | |
| S512.052 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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. | Reject | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions |
| S427.065 | Kapiro Residents Association | 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 | Accept in part | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|---|-----------|------------|---|---|------------------------|---|
| | | | | | <p>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.</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>RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards</p> |
| S338.064 | Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust | 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 boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted | Accept in part | <p>Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions</p> <p>RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards</p> |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|-------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|--|-------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| | | | | | 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. <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. | | | |
| FS570.1002 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards |
| FS566.1016 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions RRZ S42A Report |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|-------------------|--|-----------|------------|--|---|-------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| | | | | | | | | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards |
| FS569.1038 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards |
| S529.164 | Carbon Neutral NZ Trust | 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. | | Accept in part | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL |
| FS570.2052 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|-------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|---|-------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| | | | | | | | | Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL |
| FS566.2066 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL |
| FS569.2088 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL |
| S529.213 | Carbon Neutral NZ Trust | 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 must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting | | Accept in part | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|-------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|--|-------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| | | | | | or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour. <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. | | | |
| FS570.2100 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards |
| FS566.2114 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General comments |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|-------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|--|-------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| | | | | | | | | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards |
| FS569.2136 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards |
| S449.064 | Kapiro Conservation Trust | 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. | 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 | | Accept in part | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|-------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|---|--|------------------------|--|
| | | | | | maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour. <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. | | | |
| FS569.1863 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | | Accept in part | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards |
| FS570.1880 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | | Accept in part | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|--|--|------------------------|--|
| | | | | | | | Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards |
| S368.069 | Far North District Council | 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. | Amend RRZ-R1 ... New buildings or structures, and extensions or alterations to existing buildings or structures Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The new building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure, will accommodate a permitted (where applicable, words to the effect...'or controlled, or restricted discretionary') activity ... " | Accept in part | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General comments |
| S512.099 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | RRZ-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). | Reject | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan Wide or Rural Wide Submissions |
| S427.062 | Kapiro Residents Association | 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. | 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 | Accept in part | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|---|-----------|-----------------|--|---|-------------------------|------------------------|--|
| | | | | | 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. <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. | | | Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards |
| S482.004 | House Movers Section of New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc | RRZ-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 RRZ-R1 to: Provide for relocated building as a permitted activity when relocated buildings meet performance standards and criteria (see schedule 1). Insert a performance standard for use of a pre inspection report (schedule 2) restricted discretionary activity status for relocated buildings that do not meet the permitted activity status standards. | | Accept in part | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan Wide or Rural Wide Submissions |
| FS23.150 | Des and Lorraine Morrison | | Support | It is important that provision is made in all zones for relocatable buildings to enable choice, reuse of existing housing, and to make it clear what the activity status is for such buildings. | Allow | Allow the relief sought | Accept in part | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|---|-----------|------------|---|---|--------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| | | | | This is particularly the case in urban zones. | | | | Key Issue 4: Plan Wide or Rural Wide Submissions |
| S431.125 | John Andrew Riddell | 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. | | Reject | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan Wide or Rural Wide Submissions |
| FS332.125 | Russell Protection Society | | Support | The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds. | Allow | Allow the original submission. | Reject | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan Wide or Rural Wide Submissions |
| S338.063 | Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust | RRZ-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 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 | | Accept in part | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|-------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|--|-------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| | | | | | or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour. <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. | | | |
| FS570.1001 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards |
| FS566.1015 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|-------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|--|-------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| | | | | | | | | Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards |
| FS569.1037 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards |
| S529.210 | Carbon Neutral NZ Trust | 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. | 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 | | Accept in part | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|-------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|---|-------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| | | | | | 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. <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. | | | |
| FS570.2097 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards |
| FS566.2111 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|--|-------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| | | | | | | | | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards |
| FS569.2133 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards |
| S449.059 | Kapiro Conservation Trust | 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. | 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 | | Accept in part | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General comments |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|-------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|---|--|------------------------|--|
| | | | | | 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. <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. | | | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards |
| FS569.1858 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | | Accept in part | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards |
| FS570.1875 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | | Accept in part | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|--|--|------------------------|--|
| | | | | | | | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards |
| S267.002 | Brad Hedger | 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 600m ² 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 , whichever is lesser. | Reject | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: RRZ-R2 Impermeable Surface Coverage Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions |
| S481.005 | Puketotara Lodge Ltd | 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 | 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: <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 | Accept in part | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: RRZ-R2 Impermeable Surface Coverage Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|---|-----------|----------|--|--|------------------------|---|
| | | | | discretion in the impermeable coverage rule in all zones, in order to better control effects between sites or adjacent sites, | <p>stormwater 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 | | |
| S283.012 | Trent Simpkin | RRZ-R2 | Oppose | <p>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.</p> <p>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 it's acceptable.</p> <p>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)</p> | Amend from 12.5% maximum (250m ² on a 2000m ² site) to allow up to 500m ² 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). | Reject | <p>RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4</p> <p>Key Issue 4: RRZ-R2 Impermeable Surface Coverage</p> <p>Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4</p> <p>Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions</p> |
| FS44.36 | Northland Planning & Development 2020 Ltd | | Support | Where SWMGMT is the only breach, a TP10 report is provided and approved by FNDC under their Engineering approval application the activity can be permitted. | Allow in part | Reject | <p>RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4</p> <p>Key Issue 4: RRZ-R2 Impermeable Surface Coverage</p> <p>Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4</p> |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|-------------------------------|---|------------------------|--|
| | | | | | | | | Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions |
| FS570.826 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Oppose | Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions. | Disallow | Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission | Accept in part | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: RRZ-R2 Impermeable Surface Coverage Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions |
| FS566.840 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Oppose | Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission | Disallow | Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission | Accept in part | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: RRZ-R2 Impermeable Surface Coverage Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions |
| FS569.862 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Oppose | Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission | Disallow | Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission | Accept in part | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: RRZ-R2 Impermeable Surface Coverage |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|---|-----------|-----------------|--|--|--|------------------------|--|
| | | | | | | | | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions |
| S502.056 | Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited | RRZ-R2 | Support in part | Subdivision has been enabled as a Discretionary activity on sites up to 2000m ² . 12.5% of 2000m ² is 250m ² 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 2000m ² 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. | | Accept in part | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: RRZ-R2 Impermeable Surface Coverage Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions |
| FS172.221 | Audrey Campbell-Frear | | Support | For the reasons set out in this primary submission. | Allow | | Accept in part | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: RRZ-R2 Impermeable Surface Coverage Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions |
| S349.029 | Neil Construction Limited | RRZ-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 | Amend RZ-R2 by replacing "lesser" with "greater" to enable reasonable impermeable surface area | | Reject | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|--|-------------------------------|--|------------------------|---|
| | | | | 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. | | | | Key Issue 1: Neil Construction Limited submission on the RRZ chapter |
| FS62.063 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 1 | | 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 | Disallow | Re-zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland) in Rural Production or Horticulture zone etc. | Accept | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Neil Construction Limited submission on the RRZ chapter |
| FS333.050 | Maree Hart | | Oppose | <p>These submissions seek inappropriate changes, such as re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, Spoonbill Drive and Kingfisher Drive from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential. Some points seek to weaken the policies and rules/standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural Lifestyle zone and Rural Residential zone, e.g. S349 seeks to delete references to 'rural character' and 'amenity' for the Rural Residential zone.</p> <p>The scale and intensity of urban / residential development sought by these submissions would create a new township in the rural areas at the northern end of Landing Road; this scale and density of development is not anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans. It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area that lacks relevant infrastructure and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town in future.</p> <p>Their proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects, such as a large increase in traffic on Landing Road, one-lane bridge and other adverse effects noted under my Further Submission 1 above.</p> | Disallow | Re-zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland) in Rural Production or Horticulture zone etc. | Accept | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Neil Construction Limited submission on the RRZ chapter |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|---|------------------------|---|
| S368.082 | Far North District Council | RRZ-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 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 | Accept | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: RRZ-R3 Residential Activity |
| S467.001 | Ruby Coastal Investments Limited | 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 2,000 600m ² . | Reject | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: RRZ-R3 Residential Activity |
| S39.004 | Elizabeth Irvine | RRZ-R3 | Oppose | There are a large number of sites within the RRZ with allotment sizes ranging from just under 2,000m ² to 4,000m ² . 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 2,500m ² in the RRZ. Similarly, a new restricted discretionary activity for one residential unit within a site | Provide for as a permitted activity a site area per residential unit of 3,000m ² . Include a new restricted discretionary activity for one residential unit within a site area of at least 2,500m ² should be included in the RRZ rules. | Reject | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: RRZ-R3 Residential Activity |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|---|--|------------------------|---|
| | | | | area of at least 2,500m ² should be included in the RRZ rules. | | | | |
| FS172.233 | Audrey Campbell-Frear | | Support | For the reasons set out in this primary submission. | Allow | | Reject | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: RRZ-R3 Residential Activity |
| S349.030 | Neil Construction Limited | 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 emerging residential land use pattern that should be continued | Amend RRZ-R3 so that the site area per residential unit is at least 3,000m ² . | | Reject | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Neil Construction Limited submission on the RRZ chapter |
| FS62.064 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 1 | | 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 | Disallow | Re-zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland) in Rural Production or Horticulture zone etc. | Accept | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Neil Construction Limited submission on the RRZ chapter |
| FS333.051 | Maree Hart | | Oppose | These submissions seek inappropriate changes, such as re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, Spoonbill Drive and Kingfisher Drive from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential. Some points seek to weaken the policies and rules/standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural Lifestyle zone and Rural Residential zone, e.g. S349 seeks to delete references to 'rural character' and 'amenity' for the Rural Residential zone. The scale and intensity of urban / residential development sought by these submissions would create a new township in the rural areas at the northern end of Landing Road; this | Disallow | Re-zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland) in Rural Production or Horticulture zone etc. | Accept | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Neil Construction Limited submission on the RRZ chapter |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|---|-----------|-----------------|--|---|------------------------|---|
| | | | | <p>scale and density of development is not anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans. It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area that lacks relevant infrastructure and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town in future.</p> <p>Their proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects, such as a large increase in traffic on Landing Road, one-lane bridge and other adverse effects noted under my Further Submission 1 above.</p> | | | |
| S213.010 | Timothy and Dion Spicer | 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 | Accept | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General Comments |
| S425.054 | Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust | RRZ-R4 | Support in part | <p>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 regard to parking).</p> <p>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.</p> | <p>Amend , RRZ-R4 as follows:</p> <p>Activity status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>PER-1 The visitor accommodation is within a residential unit, accessory building or minor residential unit.</p> <p>PER-2 The occupancy does not exceed 10 guests per night.</p> <p>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</p> | Reject | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|---|-----------|-----------------|---|--|----------------------------|------------------------|--|
| | | | | | residential unit, or minor residential unit on any site that shares the access. | | | |
| FS548.128 | Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc | | Oppose | The setback sought is unnecessary and not realistic. It should be expected that there will be noise and potentially dust in the rural environment. It should be up to the providers of visitors' accommodation to ensure their facilities are able to cope with the elements that make up the rural environment. | Disallow | Decline the relief sought. | Accept | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions |
| S213.011 | Timothy and Dion Spicer | 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 | | Accept | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions |
| S425.059 | Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust | 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 regard to parking). | Retain as notified | | Accept | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions |
| S502.057 | Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited | RRZ-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 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 RRZ-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. | | Reject | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: RRZ-R5 – Home Business |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|------------|--|---|---|------------------------|---|
| FS172.222 | Audrey Campbell-Frear | | Support | For the reasons set out in this primary submission. | Allow | | Reject | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: RRZ-R5 – Home Business |
| S431.142 | John Andrew Riddell | 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 | | Accept | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: RRZ-R5 – Home Business |
| FS332.142 | Russell Protection Society | | Support | The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds. | Allow | Allow the original submission. | Accept | RLR S42A Report Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: RRZ-R5 – Home Business |
| S283.029 | Trent Simpkin | RRZ-S5 | Oppose | This submission applies to all Building Coverage rules within all zones. The subdivision chapter allows Rural Residential sites to be subdivided down to 2000m2 (which is supported). 12.5% of 2000m2 is 250m2 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 2500m2, it is permitted if a visual assessment and landscape plan is provided as part of the building consent. | | Reject | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards |
| FS570.843 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Oppose | Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions. | Disallow | Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission | Accept in part | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards |
| FS566.857 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Oppose | Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission | Disallow | Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission | Accept in part | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards |
| FS569.879 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Oppose | Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission | Disallow | Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission | Accept in part | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|---|-----------|----------|---|---|------------------------|---|
| S331.074 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | 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 licenses.</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:</p> <p>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;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 7am-8pm Monday to Friday. 2. 8am-8pm Weekends and public holidays. <p>PER-3 The number of students attending at one time does not exceed 30, 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:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. | Accept in part | <p>Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report</p> <p>Section 5.2.4</p> <p>Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions</p> |
| S213.006 | Timothy and Dion Spicer | RRZ-R7 | Support | <p>The introduction of this rule largely represents a positive change as it specifically supports the continuation of farming activities in the RRZ.</p> | Retain RRZ-R7 | Accept | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|---|------------------------|--|
| | | | | | | | Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General Comments |
| S213.007 | Timothy and Dion Spicer | 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 | Accept in part | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General Comments |
| S368.025 | Far North District Council | RRZ-R10 | Support in part | Typo in matters of control ii. "sitting" | Amend RRZ-R10 Matters of control are limited to: <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; v. servicing requirements and any constraints of the site; 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; vii. whether the location of the building(s) and residential activity could create reverse sensitivity effects on adjacent | Accept in part | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General Comments |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|------------|---|--|------------------------|--|
| | | | | | <p>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> | | |
| S213.012 | Timothy and Dion Spicer | RRZ-R17 | Oppose | 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 industrial activities to be undertaken in order to support rural production activities. | Delete RRZ-R17 | Reject | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General Comments |
| S213.016 | Timothy and Dion Spicer | 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 | Reject | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General Comments |
| S213.017 | Timothy and Dion Spicer | 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 | Reject | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General Comments |
| S213.020 | Timothy and Dion Spicer | 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 | Delete RRZ-R19 inferred | Reject | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|---|------------------------|---|
| | | | | commercial activities to be undertaken in order to support rural production activities. | | | Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General Comments |
| S172.002 | Terra Group | Standards | Support | The standards promote positive outcomes for the proposed Rural Residential Zone. | Retain standards RRZ-S1 to RRZ-S5 as notified (except for RRZ-S3 as per submission point 172.003). | Accept in part | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards |
| S369.003 | Brady Wild | 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 | Accept in part | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards |
| S427.068 | Kapiro Residents Association | 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. | 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 | Accept in part | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|---|-----------|------------|---|---|------------------------|---|
| | | | | | <p>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. | | |
| S338.067 | Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust | 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 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 | Accept in part | <p>Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions</p> <p>RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards</p> |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|-------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|--|-------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| | | | | | community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish. | | | |
| FS570.1005 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards |
| FS566.1019 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards |
| FS569.1041 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|---|------------------------|---|
| | | | | | | | <p>Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions</p> <p>RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards</p> |
| S529.216 | Carbon Neutral NZ Trust | 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 | Accept in part | <p>Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions</p> <p>RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards</p> |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|-------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|--|-------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| | | | | | discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish. | | | |
| FS570.2103 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards |
| FS566.2117 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|--|-------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| FS569.2139 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards |
| S449.063 | Kapiro Conservation Trust | 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. | 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. | | Accept in part | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|-------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|---|--|------------------------|--|
| | | | | | <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. | | | |
| FS569.1862 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | | Accept in part | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards |
| FS570.1879 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | | Accept in part | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|---|------------------------|---|
| | | | | | | | Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards |
| S213.008 | Timothy and Dion Spicer | 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. | Reject | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards |
| S427.044 | Kapiro Residents Association | RRZ-S1 | 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 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. | Accept in part | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|---|-----------|------------|---|---|-------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| S172.029 | Terra Group | 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) | | Accept in part | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards |
| S338.058 | Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust | 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. | 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-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish. | | Accept in part | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards |
| FS570.996 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|-------------------|--|-----------|----------|---------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|---|
| | | | | | | | | Key Issue 5: Definitions RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards |
| FS566.1010 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards |
| FS569.1032 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|---|------------------------|--|
| | | | | | | | Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards |
| S529.203 | Carbon Neutral NZ Trust | RRZ-S1 | 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 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. | Accept in part | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| FS570.2090 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards |
| FS566.2104 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards |
| FS569.2126 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|--|------------------------|---|
| | | | | | | | Key Issue 5: Definitions RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards |
| S449.054 | Kapiro Conservation Trust | RRZ-S1 | 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. | 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-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted | Accept in part | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|-------------------|--|-----------|------------|---|--|--|------------------------|--|
| | | | | | discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish. | | | |
| FS569.1853 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | | Accept in part | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards |
| FS570.1870 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | | Accept in part | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards |
| S431.184 | John Andrew Riddell | RRZ-S2 | Not Stated | Not stated | Retain the approach varying the required height to boundary depending on the orientation of the relevant boundary. | | Accept | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.7 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|---|------------------------|---|
| | | | | | | | Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards |
| S172.003 | Terra Group | 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. | Accept in part | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards |
| S512.075 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | RRZ-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. | Reject | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions |
| S427.045 | Kapiro Residents Association | 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. | 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 | Accept in part | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|--|---|------------------------|---|
| | | | | | <p>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. | | |
| S416.060 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | RRZ-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 setbacks for buildings and structures.</p> <p>KiwiRail seek a boundary setback of 5m from the rail corridor for all buildings and structures. KiwiRail considers that a matter of discretion directing consideration of impacts on the safety and efficiency of the rail corridor is appropriate in situations where the 5m setback standard is not complied with in all zones adjacent to the railway corridor.</p> <p>Building setbacks are essential to address significant safety hazards associated with the operational rail corridor. The Proposed Plan enables a 1m setback from side and rear boundaries shared with the rail corridor, increasing the risk that poles, ladders, or even ropes for abseiling equipment, could protrude into the rail corridor and increasing the risk of</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 the safe and efficient operation of the rail network.</p> | Accept | <p>Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report</p> <p>Section 5.2.4</p> <p>Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions</p> |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|-------------------------------|--|------------------------|---|
| | | | | <p>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> | | | | |
| FS243.146 | Kainga Ora Homes and Communities | | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the requested 5m setback; a considerably reduced set back would provide adequate space for maintenance activities within sites adjacent to | Disallow | | Reject | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|---|-----------|------------|---|---|-------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| | | | | the rail network. In doing so, it will continue to protect the safe, efficient, and effective operation of the rail infrastructure while balancing the cost on landowners. The amendments are unnecessary. | | | | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions |
| S338.059 | Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust | 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 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. | | Accept in part | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards |
| FS570.997 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|-------------------|--|-----------|----------|---------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| | | | | | | | | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards |
| FS566.1011 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards |
| FS569.1033 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions RRZ S42A Report |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|--|------------------------|---|
| | | | | | | | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards |
| S449.055 | Kapiro Conservation Trust | 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 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. | Accept in part | <p>Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report</p> <p>Section 5.2.5</p> <p>Key Issue 5: Definitions</p> <p>RRZ S42A Report</p> <p>Section 5.2.3</p> <p>Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General comments</p> <p>Section 5.2.7</p> <p>Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards</p> |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|--|--|--|------------------------|--|
| FS569.1854 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | | Accept in part | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards |
| FS570.1871 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | | Accept in part | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RRZ Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards |
| S214.004 | Airbnb | RRZ-S4 | 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 | 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. | | Reject | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|---|----------------------|------------------------|--|
| | | | | <p>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 industry for a period of 5 years after repeated breaches of the Code).</p> | | | | Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions |
| FS23.066 | Des and Lorraine Morrison | | Support | Support standardizing the number applying to permitted visitor accommodation activities across all zones. Taking a consistent approach will make it easier for the plan provisions to be applied and understood. The effects are not likely to differ significantly in residential zones. | Allow | Allow relief sought. | Reject | Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions |
| S213.009 | Timothy and Dion Spicer | 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 | | Accept in part | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RRZ Standards |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|--|------------------------|--|
| S172.008 | Terra Group | SUB-S1 | Support | Support the allotment sizes for the Rural Residential Zone. The proposed lot sizes represent an appropriate transition between the Urban and Rural Zones, regarding a transition between urban and rural density and land use effects. | Retain as notified (inferred) | Accept | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Residential Zone |
| S224.002 | Jim Longhurst | SUB-S1 | Support | I am in support for the subdivision minimum lot size applying to Rural Residential remaining as they are - clause in question SUB-S1 minimum lot sizes. | [Retain SUB-S1 applying to Rural Residential Zone]. | Accept | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Residential Zone |
| FS289.11 | Reuben Wright | | Oppose | Support the 2000m ² discretionary standard but it is considered that a controlled minimum lot size of 3000m ² in the RRZ better reflects actual land use and rural residential amenity than the current 4000m ² lot size proposed. | Allow in part | Reject | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Residential Zone |
| S39.003 | Elizabeth Irvine | SUB-S1 | Oppose | Ms Irvine opposes the minimum allotment size of 4,000m ² for a controlled activity subdivision within the RRZ. because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> there are a large number of sites within the Rural Residential Zone 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 2,500m ² in the Rural Residential Zone. Similarly, a new restricted discretionary activity for one residential unit within a site area of at least 2,500m ² should be included in the RRZ rules. | Amend S1 to provide: Minimum lot size for controlled activity reduced to 3,000m ³ (instead of 4,000m ³) and insert new restricted discretionary activity minimum lot size of 2,500m ² | Reject | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Residential Zone |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|---|-----------|----------|---|---|--|------------------------|--|
| FS172.232 | Audrey Campbell-Frear | | Support | For the reasons set out in this primary submission. | Allow | | Reject | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Residential Zone |
| FS289.10 | Reuben Wright | | Support | Research previously undertaken in Whangarei DC found that generally the area required on rural properties for a dwelling access and curtilage areas was around 2500m ² . This reflects the current pattern of development in rural areas. A controlled activity lot size of 3000m ² would better reflect the actual land development pattern for rural residential sites rather than an arbitrary 4000m ² lot size which is defined solely by the fact it is the imperial 'acre of land. | Allow | | Reject | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Residential Zone |
| S39.002 | Elizabeth Irvine | SUB-S1 | Support | Ms Irvine supports the minimum allotment size for a discretionary activity subdivision within the RRZ being reduced to 2,000m ² from 3,000m ² under the Rural Living zone in the Operative Far North District Plan. | Retain the 2000m ² minimum allotment size for a discretionary activity subdivision within the Rural Residential zone | | Accept | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Residential Zone |
| FS116.4 | Bruce Donovan | | Support | | Allow | | Accept | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Residential Zone |
| FS44.16 | Northland Planning & Development 2020 Ltd | | Support | Agree that the 2000m ² lot size should be provided for within the rural-residential zone as lots of this size can be effectively managed within the zone. | Allow | | Accept | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|---|-----------|----------|--|--|--|------------------------|--|
| | | | | Allows for smaller allotments which are within serviced areas. | | | | the Rural Residential Zone |
| FS172.231 | Audrey Campbell-Frear | | Support | For the reasons set out in this primary submission. | Allow | | Accept in part | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Residential Zone |
| FS289.9 | Reuben Wright | | Support | A 2000m ² minimum lot size is generally considered to be appropriate for on-site servicing and retention of amenity in a rural residential setting. | Allow | | Accept | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Residential Zone |
| S174.004 | Tristan Simpkin | SUB-S1 | Support | Engineers, wastewater designer and the Whangarei District have proved that Rural Residential sites can have an effective stormwater and wastewater system on lots as small as 2000m ² . | Retain the proposed standard for Rural Residential, which has a minimum lot size of 2000m ² . | | Accept | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Residential Zone |
| FS116.5 | Bruce Donovan | | Support | | Allow | | Accept | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Residential Zone |
| FS44.21 | Northland Planning & Development 2020 Ltd | | Support | Agree that the 2000m ² lot size should be provided for within the rural-residential zone as lots of this size can be effectively managed within the zone. | Allow | | Accept | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|--|--|--|------------------------|--|
| | | | | | | | | the Rural Residential Zone |
| FS29.21 | Trent Simpkin | | Support | Agree fully with keeping the 2000m ² size for Rural Residential land. It is large enough for tanks, sewer system and other services to be tended to onsite and ensures the best use of land in the rural residential zone. | Allow | | Accept | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Residential Zone |
| FS289.12 | Reuben Wright | | Support | 2000m ² minimum lot size as a discretionary activity in the RRZ is considered appropriate given it is the minimum size that provides for on-site servicing and rural residential amenity. | Allow | | Accept | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Residential Zone |
| S349.017 | Neil Construction Limited | SUB-S1 | Oppose | A better outcome in these circumstances is to utilise the land more efficiently for rural residential use, adding much needed housing to Kerikeri in a way that does not impose any burden on the community in terms of providing or funding infrastructure. | Amend SUB-S1 to provide for lots of 3,000m ² as a controlled activity and 2,000m ² as a discretionary activity in both the Rural Lifestyle Zone and the Rural Residential Zone | | Reject | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Neil Construction Limited submission on the RRZ chapter <i>Note: This submission point is duplicated in Appendix 2 of other relevant rural section 42A reports with respect to SUB-S1 amendments for those rural zones.</i> |
| FS67.79 | The Shooting Box Limited | | Support | To provide for a more efficient use of a scarce land resource | Allow | | Reject | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|--|-------------------------------|---|------------------------|---|
| | | | | | | | | Key Issue 1: Neil Construction Limited submission on the RRZ chapter |
| FS68.78 | P S Yates Family Trust | | Support | To provide for a more efficient use of a scarce land resource | Allow | | Reject | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Neil Construction Limited submission on the RRZ chapter |
| FS69.76 | Setar Thirty Six Limited | | Support | To provide for a more efficient use of a scarce land resource | Allow | | Reject | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Neil Construction Limited submission on the RRZ chapter |
| FS66.146 | Bentzen Farm Limited | | Support | To provide for a more efficient use of a scarce land resource | Allow | | Reject | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Neil Construction Limited submission on the RRZ chapter |
| FS62.051 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 1 | | Oppose | A better outcome in these circumstances is to utilise the land more efficiently for rural residential use, adding much needed housing to Kerikeri in a way that does not impose any burden on the community in terms of providing or funding infrastructure. | Disallow | Re-zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland) in Rural Production or Horticulture zone etc | Accept | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Neil Construction Limited submission on the RRZ chapter |
| FS333.038 | Maree Hart | | Oppose | These submissions seek inappropriate changes, such as re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, Spoonbill Drive and Kingfisher | Disallow | Re-zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland) in Rural Production or Horticulture zone etc | Accept | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Neil Construction |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|--|--|--|------------------------|--|
| | | | | <p>Drive from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential. Some points seek to weaken the policies and rules / standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural Lifestyle zone and Rural Residential zone, e.g. S349 seeks to delete references to 'rural character' and 'amenity' for the Rural Residential zone.</p> <p>The scale and intensity of urban/residential development sought by these submissions would create a new township in the rural areas at the northern end of Landing Road; this scale and density of development is not anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans.</p> <p>It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area that lacks relevant infrastructure and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town in future. Their proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects, such as a large increase in traffic on Landing Road, one-lane bridge and other adverse effects noted under my Further Submission 1 above.</p> | | | | Limited submission on the RRZ chapter |
| S9.003 | Ken Lewis Limited | SUB-S1 | Support | The subdivision standards reflect efficient use of land. | Retain min lot sizes for Rural Residential Zone. | | Accept | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Residential Zone |
| FS116.2 | Bruce Donovan | | Support | | Allow | | Accept | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Residential Zone |
| S25.001 | Trent Simpkin | SUB-S1 | Support | Supports the proposed minimum lot size for Rural Residential Zone because engineers | Retain Discretionary minimum lot size of 2000m ² for the Rural Residential Zone | | Accept | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|---|-----------|-----------------|--|-------------------------------|--|------------------------|--|
| | | | | wastewater designers and the like have proved that Rural Residential sites can have an effective stormwater and wastewater system on lots as small as 2000m ² , so i support this minimum size. | | | | Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Residential Zone |
| FS116.3 | Bruce Donovan | | Support | | Allow | | Accept | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Residential Zone |
| FS44.10 | Northland Planning & Development 2020 Ltd | | Support | Agree that the 2000m ² lot size should be provided for within the rural-residential zone as lots of this size can be effectively managed within the zone. | Allow | | Accept | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Residential Zone |
| FS45.8 | Tristan Simpkin | | Support | Support. Good change that brings FNDC into line with other councils. | Allow | | Accept | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Residential Zone |
| FS289.8 | Reuben Wright | | Support | A minimum 2000m ² lot size is generally accepted as the minimum required for suitable on-site servicing and amenity in a rural residential setting. | Allow | | Accept | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Residential Zone |
| FS113.3 | Martin O Brien | | Support in part | If land is to be reduced to 2,000m ² with onsite wastewater systems, then there should be a consent notice restricting either the metre square of building area or amount of | Allow in part | | Accept in part | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB- |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|--|--|--|------------------------|---|
| | | | | bedrooms to reduce occupancy. We have trouble fitting wastewater fields on to properties that have a lot of buildings. For example, a piece of land could have a 250m ² driveway, a large home with 4 bedrooms plus a sleepout. Add into the mix a swimming pool plus a couple of offsets from stormwater drains and there is no space for wastewater. A restriction on this at subdivision would sort this issue. | | | | S1 as it applies to the Rural Residential Zone |
| S179.106 | Russell Protection Society (INC) | SUB-S1 | Support in part | Support in order to retain the level of protection previously afforded by the General Coastal, coastal living and coastal residential zones in the operative plan | Retain Sub -S1 minimum allotment sizes for Kororareka Russell Township zone, rural production , rural residential, rural lifestyle | | Accept in part | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Residential Zone <i>Note: This submission point is duplicated in Appendix 2 of other relevant rural section 42A reports with respect to SUB-S1 amendments for those rural zones.</i> |
| FS23.062 | Des and Lorraine Morrison | | Support in part | Agree it is important to ensure effects of subdivision, including cumulative effects, are appropriately considered during consenting processes. Also agree with the lot sizes proposed for Kororāreka zone, and the other zones to the extent this is consistent with our primary submission. | Allow in part | Allow relief sought to the extent relief sought is consistent with our primary submission. | Accept in part | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Residential Zone |
| FS372.033 | John Andrew Riddell | | Support | The minimum lot sizes are consistent with Part 2 of the Act, with national policy statements and with the Regional Policy Statement for Northland. | Allow | Grant the submission and retain the minimum allotment sizes for Kororāreka Russell Township, Rural | Accept | RRZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB- |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|---------|--|------------------------|--|
| | | | | | Production, Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle zones. | | S1 as it applies to the Rural Residential Zone |