Appendix 2 – Officer's Recommended Decisions on Submissions (Horticulture Processing)

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S454.133	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	Due to its linear nature and the requirement to connect new electricity generation to the National Grid, regardless of where the new generation facilities are located, transmission lines may need to traverse any zone within the Far North District. None of the Special Purpose zones have objectives, policies or rules that provide for critical infrastructure such as transmission facilities that may be located, or need to be located, within these zones to support the activities that occur there.	Amend the provisions in the Horticulture Processing Special Purpose zone to ensure that critical infrastructure, such as transmission facilities, is provided for.		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan Wide or Rural Wide Issues
FS369.017	Top Energy		Support	Top Energy supports the provision of critical infrastructure (including electricity) within the Kauri Cliffs Special Purpose Zone	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 Issues
S159.013	Horticulture New Zealand	HORTICULTURE PROCESSING FACILITY	Support	Provides a reasonable overview of activities undertaken in a facility	Retain definition of 'Horticulture processing facility'		Accept	HPFZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: HPFZ Overview, objectives, policies and associated definitions
FS151.166	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept	HPFZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: HPFZ Overview, objectives, policies and associated definitions

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS570.175	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	HPFZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: HPFZ Overview, objectives, policies and associated definitions
FS566.189	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	HPFZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: HPFZ Overview, objectives, policies and associated definitions
FS569.211	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	HPFZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: HPFZ Overview, objectives, policies and associated definitions
S159.169	Horticulture New Zealand	Overview	Support	Specific provision for the horticulture processing facilities is supported.	Support the Overview		Accept	HPFZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: HPFZ Overview, objectives, policies and associated definitions
FS151.12	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept	HPFZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: HPFZ Overview, objectives, policies and associated definitions
FS151.13	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept	HPFZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: HPFZ Overview, objectives,

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
								policies and associated definitions
FS570.331	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	HPFZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: HPFZ Overview, objectives, policies and associated definitions
FS566.345	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	HPFZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: HPFZ Overview, objectives, policies and associated definitions
FS569.367	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	HPFZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: HPFZ Overview, objectives, policies and associated definitions
S159.170	Horticulture New Zealand	HPFZ-O1	Support	The contribution of horticulture processing facilities is recognised and supported	Retain Objective HPFZ-O1		Accept	HPFZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: HPFZ Overview, objectives, policies and associated definitions
FS151.14	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept	HPFZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: HPFZ Overview, objectives, policies and associated definitions
FS570.332	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	HPFZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
								Key Issue 2: HPFZ Overview, objectives, policies and associated definitions
FS566.346	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	HPFZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: HPFZ Overview, objectives, policies and associated definitions
FS569.368	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	HPFZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: HPFZ Overview, objectives, policies and associated definitions
S331.103	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	HPFZ-O2	Support	The submitter supports objective HPFZ-O2, as it enables activities that are ancillary to horticulture such as educational facilities (e.g., horticultural training centres).	Retain objective HPFZ-O2, as proposed.		Accept	HPFZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: HPFZ Overview, objectives, policies and associated definitions
S159.171	Horticulture New Zealand	HPFZ-O2	Support	No comment	Retain Objective HPFZ-O2		Accept	HPFZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: HPFZ Overview, objectives, policies and associated definitions
FS151.15	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept	HPFZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: HPFZ Overview, objectives, policies and associated definitions

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS570.333	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	HPFZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: HPFZ Overview, objectives, policies and associated definitions
FS566.347	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	HPFZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: HPFZ Overview, objectives, policies and associated definitions
FS569.369	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	HPFZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: HPFZ Overview, objectives, policies and associated definitions
S159.172	Horticulture New Zealand	HPFZ-O4	Support	Avoiding reverse sensitivity on horticulture processing facilities is important	Retain Objective HPFZ-O4		Accept	HPFZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: HPFZ Overview, objectives, policies and associated definitions
FS151.17	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept	HPFZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: HPFZ Overview, objectives, policies and associated definitions
FS570.334	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	HPFZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: HPFZ Overview, objectives,

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
								policies and associated definitions
FS566.348	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	HPFZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: HPFZ Overview, objectives, policies and associated definitions
FS569.370	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	HPFZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: HPFZ Overview, objectives, policies and associated definitions
S159.173	Horticulture New Zealand	HPFZ-P1	Support	Specific provision for the horticulture processing facilities is supported	Retain Policy HPFZ-P1		Accept	HPFZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: HPFZ Overview, objectives, policies and associated definitions
FS151.16	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept	HPFZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: HPFZ Overview, objectives, policies and associated definitions
FS151.18	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept	HPFZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: HPFZ Overview, objectives, policies and associated definitions
FS570.335	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	HPFZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
								Key Issue 2: HPFZ Overview, objectives, policies and associated definitions
FS566.349	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	HPFZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: HPFZ Overview, objectives, policies and associated definitions
FS569.371	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	HPFZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: HPFZ Overview, objectives, policies and associated definitions
S159.174	Horticulture New Zealand	HPFZ-P3	Support in part	The policy only seeks to 'manage' land use that compromises the purpose and function of the Horticulture Processing Facilities zone. There should be a more active approach to avoid compromising the zone	Amend Policy HPFZ-P3 to provide a more active approach to avoid compromising the zone		Accept	HPFZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: HPFZ Overview, objectives, policies and associated definitions
FS151.19	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept	HPFZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: HPFZ Overview, objectives, policies and associated definitions
FS570.336	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	HPFZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: HPFZ Overview, objectives, policies and associated definitions

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS566.350	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	HPFZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: HPFZ Overview, objectives, policies and associated definitions
FS569.372	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	HPFZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: HPFZ Overview, objectives, policies and associated definitions
S512.063	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Rules	Not Stated	Fire and Emergency support an activity for emergency service facilities being listed as an activity in zones. Please see Table 1 of the submission for the location of existing fire stations. Note that these are found in a range of zones. New fire stations may be necessary in order to continue to achieve emergency response time commitments in situations where development occurs, and populations change. In this regard it is noted that Fire and Emergency is not a requiring authority under section 166 of the RMA, and therefore does not have the ability to designate land for the purposes of fire stations. Provisions within the rules of the district plan are therefore, the best way to facilitate the development of any new fire stations within the district as urban development progresses. Fire and Emergency request that emergency service facilities are included as a permitted activity in all zones. The draft Plan currently only	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				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			
S368.078	Far North District Council	HPFZ-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 HPFZ-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	HPFZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: HPFZ Rules
S512.112	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	HPFZ-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
S512.113	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	HPFZ-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	Insert new standard and/or matter of discretion across zones on infrastructure servicing (including emergency response	Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.4

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				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.	transport/access and adequate water supply for firefighting)			Key Issue 4: Plan Wide or Rural Wide Submissions
S482.013	House Movers Section of New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc	HPFZ-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 HPFZ-R1 to: Provide for relocated buildings 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 HPFZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Plan Wide Submissions Applicable to the HPFZ
FS23.160	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	It is important that provision is made in all zones for relocatable buildings to enable choice, reuse of existing housing, and to make it clear what the activity status is for such buildings. This is particularly the case in urban zones.	Allow	Allow the relief sought	Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan Wide or Rural Wide Submissions HPFZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Plan Wide Submissions

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
								Applicable to the HPFZ
S431.135	John Andrew Riddell	HPFZ-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
FS332.135	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
S269.004	Brad Hedger	HPFZ-R2	Support in part	Unable to determine how effects from climate change has been considered for maintaining this level of impermeable surface coverage. The changes in regards to rainfall are significant currently designers are adding an additional 20% to intensities for climate change, this will increase stormwater run off from entire catchments and the effects will increase especially in regards to ground water recharge and overland flow paths. This is also supported from the work that NRC has done on river/stream catchments which show the effects from flooding increasing due to development and effects from climate change. The NRC assessment is limited to stream flows and flooding, the effects from development and overland flow paths to streams and rivers does not seem to be considered. In my opinion properties downstream of	Amend PER-1 of HPFZ-R2: The impermeable surface coverage of any site is no more than 30% **or 3,000m2, whichever is the lesser.**		Reject	HPFZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: HPFZ Rules

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				development will be receiving between 5-10% more stormwater flows over the next 10 years and 20% over the next 30 years. Currently impermeable surfaces coverage is linked to % of area, these areas can be quite large in rural areas i.e., 5ha property can have 1.5ha of impermeable surfaces before trigging a consent or using mitigation measures that may be located right on a boundary discharging to a downstream property or stream, it would be assumed that this may be spread out our there would be a buffer with permeable areas, but my observation is that commercial activity in these zones occurs at the boundary due to access obviously the runoff volume from the 1.5ha property will have a much larger effect on downstream properties.			
S481.013	Puketotara Lodge Ltd	HPFZ-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	Amend point c of the matters of discretion as follows: c. the availability of land for disposal of effluent and stormwater on the site without adverse effects on ~~adjoining~~ **adjacent** waterbodies (including groundwater and aquifers) or on ~~adjoining~~ **adjacent** sites; Insert the following as additional matters of discretion: • **Avoiding nuisance or damage to adjacent or downstream properties;** • **The extent to which the diversion and discharge maintains pre-development**	Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan Wide or Rural Wide Submissions HPFZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Plan Wide Submissions Applicable to the HPFZ

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				should be added to the list of relevant matters for discretion in the impermeable coverage rule in all zones, in order to better control effects between sites or adjacent sites,	**stormwater run-off flows and volumes;** • **The extent to which the diversion and discharge mimics natural run-off patterns.**			
S159.175	Horticulture New Zealand	HPFZ-R2	Oppose	An impermeable surface area of no more than 30% is very restrictive for a processing facility	Amend PER-1 of Rule HPFZ-R2 as follows: The impermeable surface coverage of any site is no more than ~~30%~~ **70%**.		Accept in part	HPFZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: HPFZ Rules
FS151.20	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part	HPFZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: HPFZ Rules
FS570.337	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	HPFZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: HPFZ Rules
FS566.351	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	HPFZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: HPFZ Rules
FS569.373	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	HPFZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: HPFZ Rules
S283.023	Trent Simpkin	HPFZ-R2	Oppose	The impermeable surfaces rule is one of the most common rules breached when designing homes. The low thresholds mean therefore means many homes will still require a resource consent for Impermeable surfaces. all RC's breaching impermeable surfaces require a TP10/Stormwater report from an engineer (already). This is a detailed	Amend to increase impermeable surface coverage maximum to be realistic based on the site of lots allowed for the zone and/or insert a PER-2 which says if a TP10 report is provided by an engineer, the activity is permitted (inferred).		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan Wide or Rural Wide Submissions

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				design of the strormwater management onsite and shouldn't require FNDC to look at it and tick the box to say its acceptable. Why don't we have a PER-2 which says that if a TP10 report is provided by an engineer, it's permitted? (one solution to reduce the number of RC's for Council to process, and assist with getting back to realistic processing times). This submission point applies to all zones.				
FS570.837	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	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan Wide or Rural Wide Submissions
FS566.851	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	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan Wide or Rural Wide Submissions
FS569.873	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	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan Wide or Rural Wide Submissions
S331.104	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	HPFZ-R5	Support	The submitter supports rule HPFZ-R5 Activities not otherwise listed in this chapter, i.e. educational facilities, as a discretionary activity status to avoid reverse sensitivity effects in the Horticulture Processing Facilities zone.	Retain rule HPFZ-R5 Activities not otherwise listed in this chapter, as proposed.		Accept	HPFZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: HPFZ Rules

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S159.176	Horticulture New Zealand	HPFZ-S1	Support	12m is the general height of cool stores	Retain Standard HPFZ-S1		Accept	HPFZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: HPFZ Standards
FS151.21	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept	HPFZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: HPFZ Standards
FS570.338	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	HPFZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: HPFZ Standards
FS566.352	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	HPFZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: HPFZ Standards
FS569.374	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	HPFZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: HPFZ Standards
S431.194	John Andrew Riddell	HPFZ-S2	Not Stated	Not stated	Retain the approach varying the required height to boundary depending on the orientation of the relevant boundary.		Accept	HPFZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: HPFZ Standards
S512.086	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	HPFZ-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	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.**		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan Wide or Rural Wide Submissions

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				access through the New Zealand Building Code (NZBC).	**Issuance of a resource consent does not imply that waivers of Building Code requirements will be considered/granted.**			
S159.177	Horticulture New Zealand	HPFZ-S6	Support	Opotiki had similar rules which were supported	Retain Standard HPFZ-S6		Accept	HPFZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: HPFZ Standards
FS151.22	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept	HPFZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: HPFZ Standards
FS570.339	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	HPFZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: HPFZ Standards
FS566.353	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	HPFZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: HPFZ Standards
FS569.375	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	HPFZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: HPFZ Standards