

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S427.025	Kapiro Residents Association	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	<p>As noted in the draft DP, the council has a responsibility under the RMA and Regional Policy Statement to protect highly versatile soils and prevent land fragmentation and sterilisation, including from reverse sensitivity.</p> <p>We consider that further residential development on productive land should be avoided.</p>	Retain PDP provisions that will prevent further land fragmentation, sprawling development, and loss of productive agricultural/horticultural land.	Accept in part	<p>Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report</p> <p>Section 5.2.1</p> <p>Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP</p>
S535.007	John and Rose Whitehead	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	<p>The Horticulture zone is not an appropriate zone for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The Horticulture zone does not achieve the purpose of the RMA insofar as it does not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources; b. The Horticulture zone fails to give effect to the National Planning Standards and the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL); c. The Horticulture Zone section 32 evaluation is incomplete and flawed: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. The evaluation does not provide sufficient level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance of creating a special purpose zone; ii. The evaluation fails to consider the full range of zoning options and identify reasonably 	Delete the proposed Horticulture zone in its entirety, rezoning areas Rural Production, General Rural, Commercial or Rural Residential as appropriate.	Reject	<p>Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report</p> <p>Section 5.2.1</p> <p>Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP</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>practicable options to achieve objectives;</p> <p>iii. The evaluation fails to evaluate appropriate zone criteria and boundaries;</p> <p>d. The PDP does not provide strategic direction or policy support for the suite of rural zones proposed, nor does it support the Horticultural Zone;</p> <p>e. The Horticulture zone has only been proposed within the Kerikeri area; and</p> <p>f. The Horticulture zone provisions are not sufficiently different from the Rural Production Zone (and in some instances are more permissive).</p>				
FS99.2	Frederick Laurence & Ellen June Voigt		Support	<p>We recognise that the council has a responsibility under the RMA and Regional Policy Statement to protect highly versatile soils and prevent land fragmentation and sterilisation, including from reverse sensitivity.</p> <p>The current horticultural zoning does not consider the location of highly versatile soils as shown on my property recently inspected by QV as significantly not suitable for horticulture. This property also does not have a connection to the Kerikeri Irrigation Supply and is in fact marginal farmland. There is also a significant area that is too steep to allow worthwhile horticulture care.</p> <p>There must be provision for soil assessment before zoning any property as a Horticulture Zone. The current rural production zoning fits the nature of this area much better than the proposed Horticulture zone.</p>	Allow		Reject	<p>Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report</p> <p>Section 5.2.1</p> <p>Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP</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
FS130.2	Tia Healey-Jellick		Support	I agree with all that has been stated here...the plan is not tailored to the many people it affects, it is only tailored to the few who want horticultural zoning, which affects many many individual properties.	Allow		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS99.3	Frederick Laurence & Ellen June Voigt		Support	Reasons	Allow		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS172.22	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	The reasons given in this primary submission and in my primary submission.	Allow		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS394.006	Michael Francis Toft, Robert George Vellenoweth and Colleen Wendy, Wardlaw, AJ Maloney Trustee Limited, Donald Frank Orr, Vivien Marie Coad, Deanna Lee MacDonald, Dianne Catherine Hamilton, Robert		Support	For the reasons given within the Original Submission	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP

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
	Hamilton, Timothy George Sopp, Mathew Robert Hill, Barry Charles Young, Joan Catherine Young, Campbell Family Trustee Limited							
FS354.022	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	The submitter seeks to delete the Horticultural Zone in its entirety. HortNZ opposes the deletion as the zone has been developed in response to issues faced by growers in the district to ensure that horticultural production can operate without constraints from reverse sensitivity effects. In addition the zone is likely to assist in achieving the objectives of the NPSHPL.	Disallow	Disallow S535.007 and retain the horticultural zone.	Accept	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
S534.007	Roger Atkinson	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	The Horticulture zone is not an appropriate zone for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The Horticulture zone does not achieve the purpose of the RMA insofar as it does not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources; b. The Horticulture zone fails to give effect to the National Planning Standards and the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL); c. The Horticulture Zone section 32 evaluation is incomplete and flawed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The evaluation does not provide sufficient level of detail that corresponds 	Delete the proposed Horticulture zone in its entirety, rezoning areas Rural Production, General Rural, Commercial or Rural Residential as appropriate.		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP

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>to the scale and significance of creating a special purpose zone;</p> <p>ii. The evaluation fails to consider the full range of zoning options and identify reasonably practicable options to achieve objectives;</p> <p>iii. The evaluation fails to evaluate appropriate zone criteria and boundaries;</p> <p>d. The PDP does not provide strategic direction or policy support for the suite of rural zones proposed, nor does it support the Horticultural Zone;</p> <p>e. The Horticulture zone has only been proposed within the Kerikeri area; and</p> <p>f. The Horticulture zone provisions are not sufficiently different from the Rural Production Zone (and in some instances are more permissive).</p>				
FS130.1	Tia Healey-Jellick		Support	The plan is a broad plan that does not take in to consideration individual properties or businesses, it is about meeting the needs of a few at the expense of many.	Allow		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS172.11	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	The reasons given in this primary submission and in my primary submission.	Allow		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ 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: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS350.007	Puketona Lodge Ltd		Support	<p>The reasons given in the original submission and primary submission of the submitter.</p> <p>The Horticulture zone is not an appropriate zone for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The Horticulture zone does not achieve the purpose of the RMA insofar as it does not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources; b. The Horticulture zone fails to give effect to the National Planning Standards and the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL); c. The Horticulture Zone section 32 evaluation is incomplete and flawed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The evaluation does not provide sufficient level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance of creating a special purpose zone; ii. The evaluation fails to consider the full range of zoning options and identify reasonably practicable options to achieve objectives; iii. The evaluation fails to evaluate appropriate zone criteria and boundaries; 	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP

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"> d. The PDP does not provide strategic direction or policy support for the suite of rural zones proposed, nor does it support the Horticultural Zone; e. The Horticulture zone has only been proposed within the Kerikeri area; and f. The Horticulture zone provisions are not sufficiently different from the Rural Production Zone (and in some instances are more permissive). 				
FS394.005	Michael Francis Toft, Robert George Vellenoweth and Colleen Wendy, Wardlaw, AJ Maloney Trustee Limited, Donald Frank Orr, Vivien Marie Coad, Deanna Lee MacDonald, Dianne Catherine Hamilton, Robert Hamilton, Timothy George Sopp, Mathew Robert Hill, Barry Charles Young, Joan Catherine Young, Campbell		Support	For the reasons given within the Original Submission	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP

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
	Family Trustee Limited							
FS354.021	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	The submitter seeks to delete the Horticultural Zone in its entirety. HortNZ opposes the deletion as the zone has been developed in response to issues faced by growers in the district to ensure that horticultural production can operate without constraints from reverse sensitivity effects. In addition the zone is likely to assist in achieving the objectives of the NPSHPL.	Disallow	Disallow S534.007 and retain the horticultural zone.	Accept	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS441.007	Adrian and Sue Knight		Support	Delete the proposed Horticulture zone in its entirety, rezoning areas Rural Production, General Rural, Commercial or Rural Residential as appropriate.	Allow	Delete	Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
S454.132	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 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
FS155.29	Fiona King		Support		Allow		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan Wide or Rural Wide Issues

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
FS354.012	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	The National Grid does not traverse the Horticultural Zone so specific provisions in that zone are not needed.	Disallow	Allow S454.132 to the extent that it provides clarity to the Plan	Accept	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan Wide or Rural Wide Issues
FS369.016	Top Energy		Support	Top Energy supports the provision of critical infrastructure (including electricity) within the Horticulture 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
S559.033	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rēhia	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support	We support the creation of zones for horticulture use and processing and the rationale being to protect the productive capacity of areas around Kerikeri and Waipapa, especially given soil quality and water supply available to support such use.	Retain the Horticulture Zone as notified (inferred).		Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS151.341	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS277.21	Jenny Collison		Support	Why destroy what is needed for future food production? Blanket ban on development in these areas	Allow		Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP

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
FS570.2223	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS348.060	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS566.2237	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS569.2259	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
S159.006	Horticulture New Zealand	New Definition	Not Stated	A new Horticulture zone has been provided for under special purpose zone. A definition should be provided for this zone.	Insert definition of Horticulture zone		Reject	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
FS151.157	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS570.168	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 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS566.182	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 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS569.204	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 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
S474.001	David Lesley Penberthy and Elena Lvovna Belyakova and Ors	SUB-S1	Support in part	The site (110 Waipapa West Road, Waipapa) has a current rural zoning (Rural Production), yet is used for residential purposes having a residential unit and a minor residential unit. This submission proposes to maintain the proposed Horticulture (Special Purpose) Zoning but to modify Standard SUB-S1 to recognise those allotments that are currently significantly less than that anticipated and those that currently have no horticultural productivity; while ensuring reverse sensitivity effects are	Amend subdivision minimum allotment table to recognise allotments which are under 1.5 hectares in size at the Operative date of the Plan Change have subdivisional provision to 5000m ² as a Controlled Activity and 3000m ² as a Non-Complying Activity, or other consequential zoning and provision amendments to achieve this relief.		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 and the Horticulture 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
				appropriately considered and provided for.				
S359.018	Northland Regional Council	SUB-S1	Support in part	Providing for subdivision down to 4ha in the Horticulture zone has potential to fragment highly productive land (e.g. enable lifestyle/rural residential use) and compromise objectives to avoid reverse sensitivity issues (spray use is a particular concern and generates a significant number of incidents for NRC). Suggest any subdivision resulting in lots sizes below 10ha should trigger a non-complying activity status consistent with Section 3.8 of NPS-HPL "Avoiding subdivision of highly productive land".	Amend the thresholds applying to the Horticulture zone in standard SUB-S1, to require resource consent as a non-complying activity where lots are less than 10ha.		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 and the Horticulture Zone
FS44.25	Northland Planning & Development 2020 Ltd		Oppose	Some land within the proposed horticulture zone is not in fact land which can be utilised for horticulture use, due to the soils on some of the sites not being highly versatile soils as well as many other factors. Imposing a non-complying status on lots created which are less than 10ha in size will create large allotments in the zone which are cannot be utilised for horticulture use and are also too large to be maintained for lifestyle use. This will create economic turmoil on these land owners.	Disallow		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 and the Horticulture Zone
FS25.084	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Support	Greenfield development is a more appropriate and more cost-effective way of meeting housing demands. Retrofitting networks to service infill development can be problematic and costly, particularly where existing development has already established infrastructure.	Allow	Allow original submission to the extent that hazard prone areas are correctly identified and mapped and that there are appropriate consent triggers that enable more detailed assessment in appropriate circumstances.	Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 and the Horticulture Zone
FS325.058	Turnstone Trust Limited		Support	TT further submits that greenfield development is a more appropriate and more cost-effective way of meeting housing demands. Retrofitting networks	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject	HZ 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
				to service infill development can be problematic and costly, particularly where existing development has already established infrastructure.				Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 and the Horticulture Zone
FS354.142	Horticulture New Zealand		Support in part	The submitter seeks a more rigorous activity status for the Horticulture Zone. HortNZ has sought that the activity status be amended to ensure that there is more control on subdivision to protect highly productive soils.	Allow	Allow S359.018	Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 and the Horticulture Zone
FS570.1054	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 and the Horticulture Zone
FS346.479	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS and Part 2 of the RMA and the NPS IB.Forest & Bird supports the full submission other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 and the Horticulture Zone
FS566.1068	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 and the Horticulture Zone
FS569.1090	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 and the Horticulture 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
S359.015	Northland Regional Council	SUB-S1	Support in part	<p>Support the creation of zones for horticulture use and processing and the rationale being to protect the productive capacity of areas around Kerikeri and Waipapa, especially given soil quality and water supply available to support such use and the pressure from fragmentation and reverse sensitivity. We see this as being consistent with direction in the NPS for Highly Productive Land.</p> <p>However, we note controlled activity lot size for subdivision in the Horticulture zone is 10ha and discretionary activity lot size is 4ha. Given the proximity to Waipapa and Kerikeri, demand for lifestyle blocks in these areas is likely to be high and we suggest that larger minimum lot sizes and/or more restrictive activity status for development would provide better protection for these areas</p>	Amend the thresholds applying to the Horticulture zone in standard SUB-S1, to increase the lot sizes.		Accept in part	<p>HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8</p> <p>Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 and the Horticulture Zone</p>
FS24.61	Lynley Newport		Oppose	I'm not sure I could support increasing minimum lot sizes in the Horticulture Zone if this zone is supposed to apply to the best highly productive soils in the district. Have had some examples where productivity of soils is not that great, begging the question of accuracy of zoning application.	Disallow		Accept in part	<p>HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8</p> <p>Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 and the Horticulture Zone</p>
FS25.081	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Support	Greenfield development is a more appropriate and more cost-effective way of meeting housing demands. Retrofitting networks to service infill development can be problematic and costly, particularly where existing development has already established infrastructure.	Allow	Allow original submission to the extent that hazard prone areas are correctly identified and mapped and that there are appropriate consent triggers that enable more detailed assessment in appropriate circumstances.	Accept in part	<p>HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8</p> <p>Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 and the Horticulture Zone</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
FS325.055	Turnstone Trust Limited		Support	TT further submits that greenfield development is a more appropriate and more cost-effective way of meeting housing demands. Retrofitting networks to service infill development can be problematic and costly, particularly where existing development has already established infrastructure.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 and the Horticulture Zone
FS570.1051	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 and the Horticulture Zone
FS346.476	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS and Part 2 of the RMA and the NPS IB.Forest & Bird supports the full submission other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 and the Horticulture Zone
FS566.1065	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 and the Horticulture Zone
FS569.1087	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 and the Horticulture Zone
S559.034	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rēhia	SUB-S1	Support in part	Given the proximity to Waipapa and Kerikeri, demand for lifestyle blocks in these areas is likely to be high. The	Amend SUB-S1 to provide for larger minimum lot sizes and/or a more restrictive activity status for development in the Horticulture Zone (inferred).		Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1

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
				amendment would provide better protection for these areas.				and the Horticulture Zone
FS151.342	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 and the Horticulture Zone
FS570.2224	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 and the Horticulture Zone
FS348.061	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 and the Horticulture Zone
FS566.2238	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 and the Horticulture Zone
FS569.2260	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 and the Horticulture Zone
S190.002	Thomson Survey Ltd	SUB-S1	Oppose	I am generally not opposed to removing restricted discretionary minimum lot size provisions, EXCEPT for the Rural Production and Horticultural Zones.	Insert the following minimum lot size for the Horticultural Zone: Restricted Discretionary Activity:		Reject	HZ 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
				<p>This zoning has been applied to large portions of the district. The rural nature of the district and the fact that rural and horticultural production accounts a large chunk of the district's economic activity and forms a major part of the district's community, suggests that Council should be spending more time and effort listening to that rural community.</p> <p>The Council has imposed punitive and restrictive rules to the zones, apparently regardless of a property's productive capacity or existing lot sizes and land use patterns, seemingly not caring that such restrictions are likely to render many marginal productive units uneconomic to continue productive use on because of an inability for the property owner to diversify or reduce debt burden. Where a zone covers such a wide area, and exhibits such a wide range of physical characteristics and lot sizes, a one size fits all approach is not supportable or sustainable for the rural community.</p> <p>The objective is to protect agricultural and horticultural production capabilities, as per Objective SUB-04. SUB-04 Subdivision provides for the:</p> <p>a. Protection of highly productive land;</p> <p>Where "highly productive land" is defined as:</p> <p>land that is, or has the potential to be, highly productive for farming activities. It includes versatile soils and Land Use Capability Class 4 land and other Land Use Capability classes Land Use Capability, or has the potential to be, highly productive having regard to:</p> <p>a. Soil type;</p>	<p>In each five year period, up to 2 lots of between 3,000m2 and 1ha over the period of the life of the District Plan;</p> <p>If the Council has concerns about introducing the multiple small lot option as a restricted discretionary activity then it could be introduced as a discretionary activity option. The key should be in the matters to be considered when assessing the land's suitability - location, physical attributes</p>		<p>Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 and the Horticulture Zone</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>b. Physical characteristics; c. Climate conditions; and d. Water availability.</p> <p>Additionally for the Rural Production Zone: SUB-PB Avoid rural lifestyle subdivision in the Rural Production zone unless the subdivision:</p> <p>b. will not result in the loss of versatile soils for primary production activities.</p> <p>In the PDP, "versatile soils" are defined as: soils that are Land Use Capability Classes 1c1, 2e1, 2w1, 2w2, 2s1, 3e1, 3e5, 3s1, 3s2, 3s4</p> <p>There are large areas in the rural and horticultural localities where the existing properties are not economic productive units. Many rural properties contain soils with Land Use Capability (LUC) Classes between 4-6. Class 4 LUC soils have low arable land which is only suitable for occasional cropping, and Classes 5-6 are not suitable for arable use. By its own definition, the FNDC does not consider Class 4 LUC soils to be versatile. Classes 5-6 LUC land have productive capabilities limited to pasture or forestry. Soil suitability decreases as the LUC Class numbers increase. The PDP does not make any allowance for subdivision on areas of rural and horticultural lands that contain these soil types with limited productivity.</p> <p>Restricting subdivision options across the entire zone will likely have serious negative impact on the rural community:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The subdivision regime being proposed will prevent the ability for farmers and horticulturalists to retire in 			

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>their existing homes with a small area of land;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will prevent farmers/horticulturalists and their families from creating small blocks for younger family members to build on and enter the property market; • Reduce the ability of farmers/horticulturalists to decrease debt burden; • Discourage diversification. • Rural and horticultural workers are not always provided on-site accommodation as part of their employment. It is functional and necessary for these workers to be able to source small rural properties which allow them to work more closely to their places of employment, rather than commuting from less suitable urban environments. Not only is this functional and necessary, but it is also more environmentally and economically sustainable than longer distance travel and would comply with policy TRAN-P2 d. <p>The Rural Production and Horticultural zones are areas that have scope to have more options available, whilst not negatively impacting on overall productive capacity. There are options for subdivision that should and can be available whilst still being consistent with central government requirements to protect highly versatile soils for productive use.</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>There needs to be more options than currently being proposed, designed to enable more case by case assessment of the suitability of the land for subdivision to the minimum lot size specified, e.g. there is very little negative impact on overall productivity of a property if 1 or 2 small lots (3,000-lha lots) are subdivided off, especially if around existing homes and on land not considered highly productive or on highly versatile soils.</p> <p>I also doubt the logic for applying a Sha minimum size for discretionary activity lots on the Rural Production Zone. This area seems too small to be a standalone productive unit, yet far too large to be managed for lifestyle/boutique farming, particularly on LUC class soils which have reduced productivity. It would be more appropriate to keep the size at 4ha and is in keeping with the proposed discretionary size for the new Horticultural Zone, which has similar productive characteristics.</p> <p>I have submitted elsewhere that there is land in the Rural Production Zone that is likely more appropriately zoned Rural Lifestyle Zone. The latter should be applied in more areas, especially where there are enclaves of rural land already in blocks of less than 8ha.</p>				
FS172.251	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support in part	For the reasons set out in this primary submission and my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Allow in part		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 and the Horticulture Zone
FS115.004	Glen and Sheryl Moore		Support	Proposed Subdivision rules for the Horticulture zone are too restrictive.	Allow	Amend SUB-S1 minimum lot sizes applying to the Horticulture Zone to	Reject	HZ 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
						provide for in each five year period, up to 2 lots of between 3,000m2 and 1ha and 4ha as a restricted discretionary activity		Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 and the Horticulture Zone
FS327.004	LMD Planning Consultancy		Support	The proposed Subdivision rules for the Rural Production zone are too restrictive.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 and the Horticulture Zone
FS394.002	Michael Francis Toft, Robert George Vellenoweth and Colleen Wendy, Wardlaw, AJ Maloney Trustee Limited, Donald Frank Orr, Vivien Marie Coad, Deanna Lee MacDonald, Dianne Catherine Hamilton, Robert Hamilton, Timothy George Sopp, Mathew Robert Hill, Barry Charles Young, Joan Catherine Young, Campbell Family Trustee Limited		Support	For the reasons given within the Original Submission	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 and the Horticulture 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
FS354.138	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	HortNZ opposes changes to the minimum lot sizes in the Rural Production and Horticultural zones. In particular the NPSHPL must be given effect to avoid subdivision of highly production land.	Disallow	Disallow S190.002	Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 and the Horticulture Zone
FS354.140	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	Introducing a further layer in the Horticultural Zone as sought is not effects based and will not achieve the objectives and policies in the Plan. The change sought will lead to greater fragmentation of Highly productive land and does not give effect to the NPSHPL.	Disallow	Disallow S190.002	Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 and the Horticulture Zone
FS566.013	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 and the Horticulture Zone
FS569.045	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 and the Horticulture Zone
FS570.008	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 and the Horticulture Zone
S540.002	Geoffrey Raymond Lodge	SUB-S1	Oppose	The Council has imposed punitive and restrictive rules to the zones, apparently regardless of a property's productive capacity or existing lot sizes and land use patterns, seemingly not caring that such restrictions are likely to render	Insert the following minimum lot size for the Horticultural Zone: Restricted Discretionary: In each five year period, up to 2 lots of between 3,000m² and		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1

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
				many marginal productive units uneconomic to continue productive use on because of an inability for the property owner to diversity or reduce debt burden. Where a zone covers such a wide area, and exhibits such a wide range of physical characteristics and lot sizes, a one size fits all approach is not supportable or sustainable for the rural community.	1 ha over the period of the life of the District Plan.			and the Horticulture Zone
FS172.336	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support in part	For the reasons stated in this primary submission, noting my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Allow in part		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 and the Horticulture Zone
S317.034	Two M Investments Limited	SUB-S1	Support	The submitter considers that the standard SUB-S1 minimum allotment size as it applies to the Horticulture Zone reflects an appropriate size to enable horticultural development on a site or allowing non-horticultural development to be undertaken without interfering with adjoining horticultural operations.	Retain the standard SUB-S1 minimum allotment size as it applies to the Horticulture zone.		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 and the Horticulture Zone
FS354.141	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	The submitter seeks to retain the minimum lot sizes in the Horticultural Zone This is supported to achieve the objectives and policies in the Plan.	Allow	Allow S317.034	Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 and the Horticulture Zone
FS566.955	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 and the Horticulture Zone
S159.134	Horticulture New Zealand	Overview	Support	The inclusion of a specific Horticulture zone is supported	Retain the Overview		Accept in part	HZ 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 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS151.301	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS172.44	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS570.296	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS566.310	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS569.332	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: 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
S549.001	Levin Stones Holding Limited, Keri Keri Park Lodge Limited	Overview	Oppose	<p>The Horticulture Zone (HZ) is not an appropriate zone for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HZ does not achieve the purpose of the RMA insofar as it does not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources; • HZ fails to give effect to the National Planning Standards and the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL); • HZ Section 32 evaluation is incomplete and flawed (refer specifics in full submission) • PDP does not provide strategic direction or policy support for the suite of rural zones proposed, nor does it support the Horticultural Zone • HZ provisions are not sufficiently different from the Rural Production Zone (and in some instances are more permissive). 	Delete the proposed Horticulture Zone in its entirety, rezoning areas Rural Production, General Rural, Commercial or Rural Residential Zones as appropriate.		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS172.33	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	The reasons given in this primary submission and in my primary submission.	Allow		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS565.001	Levin Stone Holdings Limited		Support	The reasons given in this primary submission and in my primary submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ 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: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS350.056	Puketona Lodge Ltd		Support	<p>The reasons given in the original submission and primary submission of the submitter.</p> <p>The Horticulture Zone (HZ) is not an appropriate zone for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HZ does not achieve the purpose of the RMA insofar as it does not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources; • HZ fails to give effect to the National Planning Standards and the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL); • HZ Section 32 evaluation is incomplete and flawed (refer specifics in full submission) • PDP does not provide strategic direction or policy support for the suite of rural zones proposed, nor does it support the Horticultural Zone • HZ provisions are not sufficiently different from the Rural Production Zone (and in some instances are more permissive). 	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS441.047	Adrian and Sue Knight		Support	The reasons given in this primary submission and in my primary submission.	Allow	Delete	Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP

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
FS354.259	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	The submitter seeks the deletion of the Horticulture Zone. HortNZ considers that the zone is an appropriate response to issues faced by growers in the Far North District and support its retention.	Disallow	Disallow S549.001	Accept	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS570.2186	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 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS566.2200	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 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS569.2222	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 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
S252.002	Hall Nominees Ltd	Overview	Oppose	The Horticulture zone is not an appropriate zone for the following reasons: a. The Horticulture zone does not achieve the purpose of the RMA insofar as it does not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources;	Delete the proposed Horticulture zone in its entirety, rezoning areas Rural Production, General Rural, Commercial or Rural Residential zones as appropriate.		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP

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"> b. The Horticulture zone fails to give effect to the National Planning Standards and the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL); c. The Horticulture zone section 32 evaluation is incomplete and flawed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The evaluation does not provide sufficient level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance of creating a special purpose zone; ii. The evaluation fails to consider the full range of zoning options and identify reasonably practicable options to achieve objectives; iii. The evaluation fails to evaluate appropriate zone criteria and boundaries; d. The PDP does not provide strategic direction or policy support for the suite of rural zones proposed, nor does it support the Horticultural Zone; e. The Horticulture zone has only been proposed within the Kerikeri area; and f. The Horticulture zone provisions are not sufficiently different from the Rural Production zone (and in some instances are more permissive). <p>The proposed Horticulture zone fails to give effect to the National Planning</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>Standards and does not comply with the zone framework standard 8, mandatory direction 3.</p> <p>While FNDC have proposed the Horticulture zone as a "special purpose zone", the proposed Horticulture zone does not comply with of the special purpose zone criteria as required under mandatory direction 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Are significant to the district, region or country <p>Comment:</p> <p>The proposed Horticulture zone has been applied selectively to the Kerikeri area and has not been mapped throughout the district despite there being other areas of current or future intensive horticulture.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. Are impracticable to be managed through another zone <p>Comment:</p> <p>Horticultural land could be managed via both the Rural Production zone or the General Rural zone. The purpose of the Rural Production zone is to provide for areas predominantly used for primary production activities, whilst the General Rural zone is to provide for primary production activities and a range of activities that support primary production. Council has not utilised the General Rural zone, nor has section 32 evaluation been undertaken to consider this option.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> c. Are impractical to be managed through a combination of spatial layers. <p>Comment:</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>A review of the proposed Rural Production zone and Horticulture zone provisions has confirmed that there is very little difference between the provisions of the two zones, therefore it is entirely possible to manage horticultural land by way of a zone (and a spatial layer if there is section 32 justification for a spatial response).</p> <p>FNDC have established zone criteria to support the mapping and identification of the Horticulture zone including that the land must be located within the Kerikeri/Waipapa area. This criterion is contrary to the NPS-HPL. Whilst it is acknowledged that the NPS-HPL was released following the PDP notification for submission, Council must give effect to the NPS-HPL and this policy statement sufficiently provides for the protection of highly productive land, rendering the Horticulture Zone defunct.</p> <p>Under the National Planning Standards, the strategic direction provisions are key to understand the balance and trade-offs between often conflicting matters of national, regional and local importance. The proposed Strategic Direction objectives and policies are silent with respect to the proposed rural zones. The Overview Section 32 evaluation does not include any evaluation of the proposed objectives. The National Planning Standards provide a number of rural zone options which have not been evaluated within the Rural Environment section 32.</p> <p>In the absence of complete section 32 evaluation, it is not possible to understand why Council have chosen the suite of zones proposed. The purpose of the Horticulture zone is</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
				to manage land fragmentation and reverse sensitivity effects and achieve greater protection of highly productive land. The proposed Horticulture zone (particularly that west of Kerikeri Road) is already fragmented not only by existing residential and commercial activities, but by smaller allotments. The Horticulture zone includes land that is not viable for horticulture due to factors such as soil type, lot sizes, and proximity of rural residential neighbours restricting the ability to spray (reverse sensitivity).				
FS172.39	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	The reasons given in this primary submission and in my primary submission.	Allow		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS350.028	Puketona Lodge Ltd		Support	The reasons given in the original submission and primary submission of the submitter. The Horticulture zone is not an appropriate zone for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The Horticulture zone does not achieve the purpose of the RMA insofar as it does not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources; b. The Horticulture zone fails to give effect to the National Planning Standards and the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL); 	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP

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"> c. The Horticulture zone section 32 evaluation is incomplete and flawed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The evaluation does not provide sufficient level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance of creating a special purpose zone; ii. The evaluation fails to consider the full range of zoning options and identify reasonably practicable options to achieve objectives; iii. The evaluation fails to evaluate appropriate zone criteria and boundaries; d. The PDP does not provide strategic direction or policy support for the suite of rural zones proposed, nor does it support the Horticultural Zone; e. The Horticulture zone has only been proposed within the Kerikeri area; and f. The Horticulture zone provisions are not sufficiently different from the Rural Production zone (and in some instances are more permissive). 				
FS394.003	Michael Francis Toft, Robert George Vellenoweth and Colleen Wendy, Wardlaw, AJ Maloney Trustee Limited,		Support	For the reasons given within the Original Submission	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP

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
	Donald Frank Orr, Vivien Marie Coad, Deanna Lee MacDonald, Dianne Catherine Hamilton, Robert Hamilton, Timothy George Sopp, Mathew Robert Hill, Barry Charles Young, Joan Catherine Young, Campbell Family Trustee Limited							
FS441.023	Adrian and Sue Knight		Support	Delete the proposed Horticulture zone in its entirety, rezoning areas Rural Production, General Rural, Commercial or Rural Residential zones as appropriate	Allow	Delete	Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS354.257	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	The submitter seeks the deletion of the Horticulture Zone. HortNZ considers that the zone is an appropriate response to issues faced by growers in the Far North District and support its retention.	Disallow	Disallow S252.002	Accept	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS570.719	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 5.2.1

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: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS566.733	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 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS569.755	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 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
S340.001	Rosemorn Industries Limited	Overview	Oppose	The Horticulture Zone should be abandoned in favour of the Rural Production Zone. The Rural Production Zone chapter in the PFNDP includes specific policy direction (including avoidance policies) regarding the use of highly productive land (see RPROZ-O1, O2, O3 and P1, P2, P4, P5, P6 and P7). These provisions provide adequate protection for highly productive land against the encroachment of development, and/or inappropriate land use. The Horticulture Zone, as a consequence, is not necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land.	Delete the Horticulture Zone in favour of the Rural Production Zone.		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS172.110	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission and in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Allow		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ 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: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS350.033	Puketona Lodge Ltd		Support	<p>The reasons given in the original submission and primary submission of the submitter to delete the Horticulture Zone.</p> <p>The Horticulture Zone should be abandoned in favour of the Rural Production Zone. The Rural Production Zone chapter in the PFNDP includes specific policy direction (including avoidance policies) regarding the use of highly productive land (see RPROZ-O1, O2, O3 and P1, P2, P4, P5, P6 and P7). These provisions provide adequate protection for highly productive land against the encroachment of development, and/or inappropriate land use. The Horticulture Zone, as a consequence, is not necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land.</p>	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS441.028	Adrian and Sue Knight		Support	Delete the Horticulture Zone in favour of the Rural Production Zone.	Allow	Delete	Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS354.258	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	The submitter seeks the deletion of the Horticulture Zone. HortNZ considers that the zone is an appropriate response to issues faced by growers in the Far North District and support its retention.	Disallow	Disallow S340.001	Accept	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP

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
S340.005	Rosemorn Industries Limited	Objectives	Oppose	The objectives of the Horticulture Zone should be updated to provide clear direction on when, or under what circumstances it is appropriate for existing commercial and industrial activities to be extended. Clear direction is required given the level of investment associated with purchasing properties and establishing the existing activities, and the implications that the PFNDP could have with respect to any future plans for those sites and activities.	Amend, if Horticulture Zone is not deleted, include objectives to provide clear direction on when it is appropriate to extend existing commercial and/or industrial activities.		Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS172.112	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission and in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Allow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS354.260	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	Policy HZ-P2 provides direction that land uses that are incompatible with the purpose function and character of the zone are avoided. Industrial and commercial activities generally do not have a functional need to locate in the zone and are more appropriately located in another zone. Existing use rights will apply to those activities currently located in the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow	Disallow S340.005	Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
S455.002	Yvonne Steinemann	Objectives	Oppose	I do not support chemical horticulture taking precedence over home owners having the right to fresh air at all times. FNDC should have better zone planning so there is not this conflict between neighbouring zones. Organic and non-polluting methods should be incentivised. For example, we have a lot of problems in our local Taipa area with chemical horticulture situated right next to residential area and school, kindergarten, childcare centres etc. Kiwifruit chemicals are well known to	Amend objectives of horticulture special purpose zone to have clear parameters of operation that give residents top priority, and do not impact whatsoever on residents and nearby rural lifestyle folks.		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: 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
				interfere with human health and hormonal systems.				
FS172.119	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support in part	For the reasons set out in this primary submission and in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Allow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
S159.135	Horticulture New Zealand	HZ-O1	Support	Providing for horticultural activities is supported	Retain Objective HZ-O1		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS172.45	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS570.297	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS566.311	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS569.333	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	HZ 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: Overview, Objectives and Policies
S506.002	Antony Egerton and Stefanie Egerton	HZ-O1	Support	As the owners of the property at 494A Kerikeri Road, Kerikeri, we are happy that FNDC has taken the initiative to protect high quality soils that are necessary for the continuation of orchards in Kerikeri. It shows FNDC support to 'care about food-growing abilities at our doorstep' for future generations to be fed from. It is consistent with the Northland Regional Policy Statement and the newly released National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land which aims to protect versatile soils for food production for New Zealanders.	Retain Objectives as provided in the Proposed District Plan for the Horticulture Zone.		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS172.345	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons stated in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
S331.099	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	HZ-O2	Support	The submitter supports objective HZ-O2 as it enables activities that are ancillary to horticulture such as educational facilities (e.g., horticultural training centres)	Retain objective HZ-O2, as proposed.		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
S159.136	Horticulture New Zealand	HZ-O2	Support	Providing for ancillary activities for horticulture is supported	Retain Objective HZ-O2		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: 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
FS151.302	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS172.46	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS570.298	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS566.312	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS569.334	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
S506.005	Antony Egerton and Stefanie Egerton	HZ-O2	Support	As the owners of the property at 494A Kerikeri Road, Kerikeri, we are happy that FNDC has taken the initiative to protect high quality soils that are necessary for the continuation of orchards in Kerikeri. It shows FNDC	Retain objectives		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: 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
				support to 'care about food-growing abilities at our doorstep' for future generations to be fed from. It is consistent with the Northland Regional Policy Statement and the newly released National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land which aims to protect versatile soils for food production for New Zealanders.				Objectives and Policies
FS172.348	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons stated in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
S159.137	Horticulture New Zealand	HZ-O3	Support	The objective establishes the framework to ensure that land in the Horticulture zone is not compromised	Retain Objective HZ-O3		Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS151.303	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS172.47	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS570.299	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: 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
FS566.313	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS569.335	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
S506.006	Antony Egerton and Stefanie Egerton	HZ-O3	Support	As the owners of the property at 494A Kerikeri Road, Kerikeri, we are happy that FNDC has taken the initiative to protect high quality soils that are necessary for the continuation of orchards in Kerikeri. It shows FNDC support to 'care about food-growing abilities at our doorstep' for future generations to be fed from. It is consistent with the Northland Regional Policy Statement and the newly released National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land which aims to protect versatile soils for food production for New Zealanders.	Retain objectives		Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS172.349	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons stated in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
S340.006	Rosemorn Industries Limited	Policies	Oppose	The policies of the Horticulture Zone should be updated to provide clear direction on when, or under what	Amend, if Horticulture Zone is not deleted, include polices to provide clear direction on		Accept in part	HZ 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
				circumstances it is appropriate for existing commercial and industrial activities to be extended. Clear direction is required given the level of investment associated with purchasing properties and establishing the existing activities, and the implications that the PFNDP could have with respect to any future plans for those sites and activities.	when it is appropriate to extend existing commercial and/or industrial activities.			Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS172.113	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission and in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Allow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS354.261	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	Policy HZ-P2 provides direction that land uses that are incompatible with the purpose function and character of the zone are avoided. Industrial and commercial activities generally do not have a functional need to locate in the zone and are more appropriately located in another zone. Existing use rights will apply to those activities currently located in the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow	Disallow S340.006	Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
S427.035	Kapiro Residents Association	Policies	Support in part	Land that is regarded as highly productive (LUC Classes 1,2 and 3) is a strictly finite resource, essential for future food production for a growing population here and worldwide, and important for jobs and economic development. The recently issued National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land requires councils to protect LUC Class 1-3 land from fragmentation and loss (outside of identified urban zones) and allows councils to protect other types of productive land in similar manner.	Amend to include specific policies/rules to prevent fragmentation and loss of land in rural and horticulture zones [inferred].		Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS172.115	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ 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: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS354.262	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	The submitter supports the protection of highly productive land and HortNZ supports such a policy.	Allow	Allow S427.035	Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
S449.067	Kapiro Conservation Trust	Policies	Support in part	Land that is regarded as highly productive (LUC Classes 1,2 and 3) is a strictly finite resource, essential for future food production for a growing population here and worldwide, and important for jobs and economic development. The recently issued National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land requires councils to protect LUC Class 1-3 land from fragmentation and loss (outside of identified urban zones) and allows councils to protect other types of productive land in similar manner.	Amend to include specify policies/rules to prevent fragmentation and loss of land in rural and horticulture zones [inferred].		Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS172.117	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS354.263	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	The submitter supports the protection of highly productive land and HortNZ supports such a policy.	Allow	Allow S449.067	Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS569.1866	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Accept in part	HZ 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 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS570.1883	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
S455.003	Yvonne Steinemann	Policies	Oppose	<p>I do not support chemical horticulture taking precedence over home owners having the right to fresh air at all times. FNDC should have better zone planning so there is not this conflict between neighbouring zones. Organic and non-polluting methods should be incentivised.</p> <p>For example, we have a lot of problems in our local Taipa area with chemical horticulture situated right next to residential area and school, kindergarten, childcare centres etc. Kiwifruit chemicals are well known to interfere with human health and hormonal systems.</p>	Amend policies of horticulture special purpose zone to have clear parameters of operation that give residents top priority, and do not impact whatsoever on residents and nearby rural lifestyle folks.		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS172.120	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support in part	For the reasons set out in this primary submission and in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Allow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
S522.049	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	Policies	Support in part	Land that is regarded as highly productive (LUC Classes 1,2 and 3) is a strictly finite resource, essential for future food production for a growing population here and worldwide, and important for jobs and economic	Amend to include specific policies/rules to prevent fragmentation and loss of land in rural and horticulture zones [inferred].		Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: 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
				development. The recently issued National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land requires councils to protect LUC Class 1-3 land from fragmentation and loss (outside of identified urban zones) and allows councils to protect other types of productive land in similar manner.				Objectives and Policies
FS172.122	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS550.024	Lloyd Anderson		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, 	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: 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>and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). • Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. • Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site. There are alternative sites more 				

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>appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi& ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values. 				
FS333.009	Maree Hart		Support	<p>The submitter supports relief sought to prevent fragmentation or loss of productive land, to avoid urban/residential sprawl in rural areas and protect amenity values.</p> <p>Residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons. It would be contrary to the NPS-UD in enabling urban sprawl and not protecting rural land. Government</p>	Allow	Amend zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 to Horticulture zone or Rural Production zone; Amend Rural Production, Horticulture and Rural Lifestyle zone provisions to prevent urban sprawl, and protect productive soil, rural character and amenity values; Amend the District Plan to strengthen	Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: 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>reports have found that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided as it leads to permanent loss of productive capability. Residential development on Lot 1001 would also create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities in the area.</p> <p>Lot 1001 is one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil in the district which is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential providing food, local jobs and economic well-being. FNDC submission to MPI recognised that large areas of horticultural land in Kerikeri have been converted to residential and therefore it is vital to protect the remaining rural land that is highly productive.</p> <p>Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. There are alternative sites in the area which could provide a compact urban footprint and improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. Lot 1001 is also adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline which is a valuable economic asset for the area.</p> <p>Residential development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects. The surrounding rural environment lacks the appropriate infrastructure, school capacity and existing safety and traffic issues on Landing Road such as a one lane bridge. There would also be effects on at-risk native species, kiwi &</p>	<p>provisions for assessing and preventing cumulative and long-term adverse effects on productive areas, rural areas, areas visible from public land, ecological values and freshwater.</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
				ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.				
FS566.1788	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS549.024	Vanessa Anderson		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban / residential sprawl. • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. • Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large 	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: 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>areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. • Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. <p>Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. In legal terms, there is no 'functional need 'to build residential development on this particular site. There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10</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>Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi& ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values. 				
FS443.024	Peter O'Neil Donnellon		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from 	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	<p>HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies</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>inappropriate urban / residential sprawl.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. • Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). • Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the 				

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>essential natural resource at this site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site. There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. • Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. • Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water 				

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
				quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.				
FS390.024	Tracey Schubert		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban / residential sprawl. • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. • Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" 	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	<p>HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies</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>(FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. • Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site. There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. • Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would 				

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>create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi& ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values. 				
FS353.024	Al Panckhurst		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban / residential sprawl. Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the 	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	<p>HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1</p> <p>Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies</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>District. This is a strictly finite resource.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). • Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. • Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation 				

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>infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. In legal terms, there is no 'functional need 'to build residential development on this particular site. There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. • Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi& ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values. 				
FS352.024	Kathryn Panckhurst		Support	It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: 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
				<p>surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban / residential sprawl. • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. • Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). • Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be 				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>avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. • Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site. There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. • Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. • Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing 			

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>Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.</p>				
FS342.024	Chris Baker		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban / residential sprawl. • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. • Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, 	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	<p>HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies</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>and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). • Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. • Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site. There are alternative sites more 				

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>appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values. 				
FS338.024	Pearl Mahoney		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban 	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: 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>footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban / residential sprawl.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. • Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). • Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the 			

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>Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site. There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. • Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. • Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in 				

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
				Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.				
FS337.024	Kevin Mahoney		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban / residential sprawl. • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. • Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite 	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	<p>HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies</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>resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. • Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site. There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. 				

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"> Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values. 				
FS336.024	Roger Holman		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban / residential sprawl. Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks 	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	<p>HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies</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>of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). • Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. • Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on 				

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>Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. In legal terms, there is no 'functional need 'to build residential development on this particular site. There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. • Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values. 				
FS335.024	Craig and Mary Sawers		Support	It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	HZ 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
				<p>surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban / residential sprawl. • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. • Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). • Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be 				<p>Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies</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>avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. • Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site. There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. • Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. • Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing 			

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
				Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.				
FS334.024	Fiona Clarke		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban / residential sprawl. • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. • Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, 	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: 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>and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). • Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. • Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site. There are alternative sites more 				

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>appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. • Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values. 			
S529.159	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 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	Amend policies to protect a key natural resource - productive land - now and for future generations.	Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

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
				until the regional council has implemented the NPS-HPL.				
FS172.129	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS570.2047	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 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS566.2061	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 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS569.2083	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 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
S159.138	Horticulture New Zealand	HZ-P1	Support	The criteria for identifying the zone are supported	Retain Policy HZ-P1		Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: 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
FS151.304	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS172.48	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS570.300	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS566.314	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS569.336	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
S506.003	Antony Egerton and Stefanie Egerton	HZ-P1	Support	As the owners of the property at 494A Kerikeri Road, Kerikeri, we are happy that FNDC has taken the initiative to protect high quality soils that are necessary for the continuation of orchards in Kerikeri. It shows FNDC	Retain Policies as provided in the Proposed District Plan for the Horticulture Zone.		Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: 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
				support to 'care about food-growing abilities at our doorstep' for future generations to be fed from. It is consistent with the Northland Regional Policy Statement and the newly released National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land which aims to protect versatile soils for food production for New Zealanders.			Objectives and Policies
FS172.346	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons stated in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow	Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
S331.100	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	HZ-P2	Support in part	The submitter supports policy HZ-P2, as it avoids land use that is not appropriate in the Horticulture zone. However, the submitter considers educational facilities, such as horticultural training centres to have an operational need to be located in the Horticulture zone.	Amend policy HZ-P2 as follows: Avoid land use that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. is incompatible with the purpose, function and character of the Horticulture Zone; b. will result in the loss of productive capacity of highly productive land; c. compromises the use of highly productive land for horticultural activities in the Horticulture Zone; and d. does not have a functional or operational need to be located in the Horticultural Zone and is more appropriately located in another zone. 	Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan Wide or Rural Wide Submissions
S159.139	Horticulture New Zealand	HZ-P2	Support in part	Potential for reverse sensitivity should be included.	Amend Policy HZ-P2 to include: e) has the potential to create reverse sensitivity effect	Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: 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
FS151.305	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS172.49	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS570.301	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS566.315	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS569.337	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
S527.028	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	HZ-P2	Support in part	We support HZ-P2 which avoids land use that will result in the loss of productive capacity and does not have a functional need in that zone. However,	Retain HZ-P2 as notified (inferred)		Accept in part	HZ 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
				that policy refers only to land use, not subdivision.				Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS172.124	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS566.1890	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
S529.153	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	HZ-P2	Support in part	We support HZ-P2 which avoids land use that will result in the loss of productive capacity and does not have a functional need in that zone. However, that policy refers only to land use, not subdivision.	Amend HZ-P2 to reference land use and subdivision (inferred)		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS172.127	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS570.2041	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: 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
FS566.2055	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS569.2077	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
S506.007	Antony Egerton and Stefanie Egerton	HZ-P2	Support	As the owners of the property at 494A Kerikeri Road, Kerikeri, we are happy that FNDC has taken the initiative to protect high quality soils that are necessary for the continuation of orchards in Kerikeri. It shows FNDC support to 'care about food-growing abilities at our doorstep' for future generations to be fed from. It is consistent with the Northland Regional Policy Statement and the newly released National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land which aims to protect versatile soils for food production for New Zealanders.	Retain policies		Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS172.350	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons stated in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
S182.037	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association	HZ-P3	Support in part	Ancillary activities for horticulture should include agricultural aviation	Amend HZ-P3 Enable horticulture and associated ancillary activities, including agricultural aviation,		Reject	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
					that support the function of the Horticulture zone, where...			Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Policy RPROS-P2
S331.101	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	HZ-P3	Support in part	The submitter supports in part policy HZ-P3, as it provides for ancillary activities that support the function of the Horticulture zone. However, the Ministry consider educational facilities, such as horticultural training centres to have an operational need to be located in the Horticulture zone.	Amend policy HZ-P3 as follows: Enable horticulture and associated ancillary activities that support the function and/or operation of the Horticulture zone, where: a. adverse effects are contained on site to the extent practicable; and b. they are able to be serviced by onsite infrastructure.		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions
S159.140	Horticulture New Zealand	HZ-P3	Support	Provision for ancillary activities is supported	Retain Policy HZ-P3		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS151.306	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS172.50	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS570.302	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	Reject	HZ 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
						inconsistent with our original submission		Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS566.316	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS569.338	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
S506.008	Antony Egerton and Stefanie Egerton	HZ-P3	Support	As the owners of the property at 494A Kerikeri Road, Kerikeri, we are happy that FNDC has taken the initiative to protect high quality soils that are necessary for the continuation of orchards in Kerikeri. It shows FNDC support to 'care about food-growing abilities at our doorstep' for future generations to be fed from. It is consistent with the Northland Regional Policy Statement and the newly released National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land which aims to protect versatile soils for food production for New Zealanders.	Retain policies		Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS172.351	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons stated in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: 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
S159.141	Horticulture New Zealand	HZ-P4	Support in part	Policy HZ-P4 provides for residential activities but should also include habitable buildings so that all buildings for a residential type of use are included in the policy	Amend Policy HZ-P4 as follows: Ensure residential activities and habitable buildings are designed and located to avoid, or otherwise mitigate, reverse sensitivity effects on horticulture activities, including adverse effects associated with dust, noise, spray drift and potable water collection.		Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS151.307	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS172.27	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS570.303	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS566.317	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS569.339	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: 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
S506.009	Antony Egerton and Stefanie Egerton	HZ-P4	Support	As the owners of the property at 494A Kerikeri Road, Kerikeri, we are happy that FNDC has taken the initiative to protect high quality soils that are necessary for the continuation of orchards in Kerikeri. It shows FNDC support to 'care about food-growing abilities at our doorstep' for future generations to be fed from. It is consistent with the Northland Regional Policy Statement and the newly released National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land which aims to protect versatile soils for food production for New Zealanders.	Retain policies		Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS172.352	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons stated in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
S159.142	Horticulture New Zealand	HZ-P5	Support	Subdivision of land in the Horticulture zone should not compromise the land for horticulture activities	Retain Policy HZ-P5		Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS151.308	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS172.26	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ 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: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS570.304	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS566.318	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS569.340	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
S527.029	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	HZ-P5	Oppose	Policy HZ-P5 only seeks to 'manage' subdivision in relation to the viability of productive land, but the policy should 'avoid' subdivision of such land.	Amend HZ-P5 to 'avoid' subdivision (inferred)		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS172.125	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS354.264	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	A policy of 'avoid' would be more consistent with the NPSHPL.	Allow	Allow S527.029	Accept	HZ 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 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS566.1891	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
S529.154	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	HZ-P5	Support	HZ-P5 only seeks to 'manage' subdivision in relation to the viability of productive land, but the policy should 'avoid' subdivision of such land.	Amend HZ-P5 to 'avoid' Manage Avoid the subdivision of land in the Horticulture zone to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. avoid fragmentation that results in loss of highly productive land for use by horticulture and other farming activities; 2. ensure the long-term viability of the highly productive land resource to undertake a range of horticulture uses; 3. enable a suitable ... 		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS172.128	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS570.2042	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: 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
FS566.2056	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS569.2078	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
S506.010	Antony Egerton and Stefanie Egerton	HZ-P5	Support	As the owners of the property at 494A Kerikeri Road, Kerikeri, we are happy that FNDC has taken the initiative to protect high quality soils that are necessary for the continuation of orchards in Kerikeri. It shows FNDC support to 'care about food-growing abilities at our doorstep' for future generations to be fed from. It is consistent with the Northland Regional Policy Statement and the newly released National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land which aims to protect versatile soils for food production for New Zealanders.	Retain policies		Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS172.353	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons stated in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
S506.011	Antony Egerton and Stefanie Egerton	HZ-P6	Support	As the owners of the property at 494A Kerikeri Road, Kerikeri, we are happy that FNDC has taken the initiative to protect high quality soils that are necessary for the continuation of	Retain policies		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: 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
				orchards in Kerikeri. It shows FNDC support to 'care about food-growing abilities at our doorstep' for future generations to be fed from. It is consistent with the Northland Regional Policy Statement and the newly released National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land which aims to protect versatile soils for food production for New Zealanders.				Objectives and Policies
FS172.354	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons stated in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
S159.143	Horticulture New Zealand	HZ-P7	Support	The matters for consideration are appropriate.	Retain Policy HZ-P7		Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS151.309	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS172.51	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS570.305	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	Accept in part	HZ 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
						inconsistent with our original submission		Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS566.319	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS569.341	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
S506.012	Antony Egerton and Stefanie Egerton	HZ-P7	Support	As the owners of the property at 494A Kerikeri Road, Kerikeri, we are happy that FNDC has taken the initiative to protect high quality soils that are necessary for the continuation of orchards in Kerikeri. It shows FNDC support to 'care about food-growing abilities at our doorstep' for future generations to be fed from. It is consistent with the Northland Regional Policy Statement and the newly released National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land which aims to protect versatile soils for food production for New Zealanders.	Retain policies		Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS172.355	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons stated in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: 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
S512.062	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. 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.</p> <p>Provisions within the rules of the district plan are therefore, the best way to facilitate the development of any new fire stations within the district as urban development progresses. Fire and Emergency request that emergency service facilities are included as a permitted activity in all zones. The draft Plan currently only includes emergency services facilities as an activity in some zones and with varying activity status. In addition, fire stations have specific requirements with relation to setback distances and vehicle crossings. Fire and Emergency request that emergency service facilities are exempt from these standards</p>	Insert new rule for Emergency service facilities included as a permitted activity Emergency service facilities are exempt from standards relating to setback distances, vehicle crossings	Reject	<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>
S338.035	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	Rules	Support	We support provisions that will prevent further land fragmentation, sprawling development, and loss of productive agricultural/horticultural land. We support the creation of Horticulture zones to protect the productive land and irrigation infrastructure assets in the district.	Retain the Horticulture zone	Accept	<p>Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report</p> <p>Section 5.2.1</p> <p>Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP</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
				The council has a responsibility under the RMA and Regional Policy Statement to protect highly versatile soils and prevent land fragmentation and sterilisation, including from reverse sensitivity. We consider that further residential development on productive land should be avoided.				
FS172.109	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS570.973	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS566.987	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS569.1009	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP

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
S340.004	Rosemorn Industries Limited	Rules	Oppose	<p>As an alternative to the relief sought under section 5.1 of this submission, that the provisions of the Horticulture Zone should be amended so that the extension of existing commercial and industrial activities are specifically provided for as a discretionary activity.</p> <p>Identified in section 3.7 of this submission, there are a range of industrial and commercial activities that have established within the surrounding environment under the provisions of the OFNDP. With respect to RIL, they have invested significantly in purchasing the site and lodging resource consent applications with the FNDC and NRC to facilitate the establishment of a self-storage facility. The provisions of the Horticulture Zone do not acknowledge the range of existing activities that have legally established, or provide for the extension of those activities.</p> <p>In accordance with the approach adopted under RPROZ-R27 and 28, the provisions of the Horticulture Zone should be amended so that the extension of existing commercial and industrial activities are specifically provided for as a discretionary activity.</p>	Amend, if Horticulture Zone is not deleted, provisions so that the extension of existing commercial or industrial activities are specifically provided for as a discretionary activity.		Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS172.111	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission and in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Allow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS354.265	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	If there is to be provision for extension of existing commercial or industrial activities, that are not rural industry, then the activity status should be non-complying as in HZ-R19 and HZ-R20,	Disallow	Disallow S340.004	Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: 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
S427.034	Kapiro Residents Association	Rules	Support in part	Land that is regarded as highly productive (LUC Classes 1,2 and 3) is a strictly finite resource, essential for future food production for a growing population here and worldwide, and important for jobs and economic development. The recently issued National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land requires councils to protect LUC Class 1-3 land from fragmentation and loss (outside of identified urban zones) and allows councils to protect other types of productive land in similar manner.	Amend to include specific policies/rules to prevent fragmentation and loss of land in rural and horticulture zones [inferred].		Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS172.114	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS354.266	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	The submitter supports the protection of highly productive land and HortNZ supports such an approach.	Allow	Allow S427.034	Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
S449.038	Kapiro Conservation Trust	Rules	Support	We support provisions that will prevent further land fragmentation, sprawling development, and loss of productive agricultural/horticultural land. We support the creation of Horticulture zones to protect the productive land and irrigation infrastructure assets in the district. The council has a responsibility under the RMA and Regional Policy Statement to protect highly versatile soils and	Retain the Horticulture zone		Accept	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP

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
				prevent land fragmentation and sterilisation, including from reverse sensitivity. We consider that further residential development on productive land should be avoided.				
FS172.116	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS350.034	Puketona Lodge Ltd		Oppose	<p>The reasons given in the primary submission of the submitter to delete the Horticulture Zone.</p> <p>The Horticulture Zone (HZ) is not an appropriate zone for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HZ does not achieve the purpose of the RMA insofar as it does not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources; • HZ fails to give effect to the National Planning Standards and the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL); • HZ Section 32 evaluation is incomplete and flawed (refer specifics in full submission) • PDP does not provide strategic direction or policy support for the suite of rural zones proposed, nor does it support the Horticultural Zone • HZ provisions are not sufficiently different from the Rural Production Zone (and in 	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP

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
				some instances are more permissive).				
FS441.029	Adrian and Sue Knight		Oppose	Retain the Horticulture zone	Disallow	Retain	Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS354.267	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	The submitter supports the protection of highly productive land and HortNZ supports such an approach.	Allow	Allow S449.038	Accept	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS569.1837	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Accept	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS570.1854	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Accept	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
S449.068	Kapiro Conservation Trust	Rules	Support in part	Land that is regarded as highly productive (LUC Classes 1,2 and 3) is a strictly finite resource, essential for future food production for a growing population here and worldwide, and important for jobs and economic development. The recently issued	Amend to include specify policies/rules to prevent fragmentation and loss of land in rural and horticulture zones [inferred].		Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: 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
				National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land requires councils to protect LUC Class 1-3 land from fragmentation and loss (outside of identified urban zones) and allows councils to protect other types of productive land in similar manner.				
FS172.118	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS569.1867	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS570.1884	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
S522.024	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	Rules	Support	<p>We support provisions that will prevent further land fragmentation, sprawling development, and loss of productive agricultural/horticultural land. We support the creation of Horticulture zones to protect the productive land and irrigation infrastructure assets in the district.</p> <p>The council has a responsibility under the RMA and Regional Policy Statement to protect highly versatile soils and prevent land fragmentation and sterilisation, including from reverse sensitivity. We consider that further residential development on productive land should be avoided.</p>	Retain the Horticulture zone		Accept	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP

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
FS172.121	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS550.021	Lloyd Anderson		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban / residential sprawl. • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. • Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle 	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP

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>activities over the last 20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site. There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and 				

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>would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi& ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values. 				
FS350.035	Puketona Lodge Ltd		Oppose	<p>The reasons given in the primary submission of the submitter to delete the Horticulture Zone.</p> <p>The Horticulture Zone (HZ) is not an appropriate zone for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HZ does not achieve the purpose of the RMA insofar as it does not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources; HZ fails to give effect to the National Planning Standards and the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL); 	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Reject	<p>Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report</p> <p>Section 5.2.1</p> <p>Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP</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
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HZ Section 32 evaluation is incomplete and flawed (refer specifics in full submission) • PDP does not provide strategic direction or policy support for the suite of rural zones proposed, nor does it support the Horticultural Zone • HZ provisions are not sufficiently different from the Rural Production Zone (and in some instances are more permissive). 				
FS333.006	Maree Hart		Support	<p>The submitter supports relief sought to prevent fragmentation or loss of productive land, to avoid urban/residential sprawl in rural areas and protect amenity values.</p> <p>Residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons. It would be contrary to the NPS-UD in enabling urban sprawl and not protecting rural land. Government reports have found that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided as it leads to permanent loss of productive capability. Residential development on Lot 1001 would also create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities in the area.</p> <p>Lot 1001 is one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil in the district which is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential providing food, local jobs and economic well-being. FNDC submission to MPI recognised that large areas of horticultural land in Kerikeri have been converted to residential and therefore it is vital to</p>	Allow	Amend zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 to Horticulture zone or Rural Production zone; Amend Rural Production, Horticulture and Rural Lifestyle zone provisions to prevent urban sprawl, and protect productive soil, rural character and amenity values; Amend the District Plan to strengthen provisions for assessing and preventing cumulative and long-term adverse effects on productive areas, rural areas, areas visible from public land, ecological values and freshwater.	Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP

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>protect the remaining rural land that is highly productive.</p> <p>Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. There are alternative sites in the area which could provide a compact urban footprint and improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. Lot 1001 is also adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline which is a valuable economic asset for the area.</p> <p>Residential development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects. The surrounding rural environment lacks the appropriate infrastructure, school capacity and existing safety and traffic issues on Landing Road such as a one lane bridge. There would also be effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.</p>				
FS62.0010	Kapiro Conservation Trust 1		Support	<p>it is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns, such as Kerikeri, and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from 	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	<p>Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report</p> <p>Section 5.2.1</p> <p>Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP</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>inappropriate urban/residential sprawl.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1001 DP 532487 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. • Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: 'Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive' (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). • Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. • The farmland at Lot 1001 DP 532487 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production 				

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>zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. • In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site. There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. • Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on neighbouring properties and lawfully established activities. • Residential/urban development in this location would generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; one-lane bridge in Landing Road; large volumes of traffic; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water 			

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
				quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.				
FS441.030	Adrian and Sue Knight		Oppose	Retain the Horticulture zone	Disallow	Retain	Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS354.268	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	The submitter supports provisions that will prevent further land fragmentation, sprawling development, and loss of productive agricultural/horticultural land and support the creation of Horticulture zones to protect the productive land and irrigation infrastructure assets in the district. HortNZ concurs.	Allow	Allow S522.024	Accept	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS566.1763	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS549.021	Vanessa Anderson		Support	It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from 	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP

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>inappropriate urban/residential sprawl.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. • Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). • Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the 				

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>essential natural resource at this site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. • In legal terms, there is no 'functional need 'to build residential development on this particular site. There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. • Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water 				

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
				quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.				
FS443.021	Peter O'Neil Donnellon		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. • Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" 	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	<p>Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report</p> <p>Section 5.2.1</p> <p>Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP</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>(FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. • Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. • In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site. There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would 				

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>create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values. 				
FS390.021	Tracey Schubert		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the 	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	<p>Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report</p> <p>Section 5.2.1</p> <p>Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP</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>District. This is a strictly finite resource.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). • Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. • Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation 				

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>infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In legal terms, there is no 'functional need 'to build residential development on this particular site. There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi& ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values. 				
FS353.021	AI Panckhurst		Support	It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ 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
				<p>surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. • Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). • Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be 				<p>Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP</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>avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. • Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. • In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site. There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. • Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing 			

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
				Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.				
FS352.021	Kathryn Panckhurst		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. • Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, 	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	<p>Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report</p> <p>Section 5.2.1</p> <p>Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP</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>and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). • Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. • Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. • In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site. There are alternative sites more 				

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>appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri.</p> <p>Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi& ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values. 				
FS342.021	Chris Baker		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban 	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	<p>Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report</p> <p>Section 5.2.1</p> <p>Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP</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>footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. • Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). • Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the 				

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>Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. • In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site. There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. • Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in 				

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
				Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi& ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.				
FS338.021	Pearl Mahoney		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. • Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite 	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	<p>Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report</p> <p>Section 5.2.1</p> <p>Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP</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>resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. • Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. • In legal terms, there is no 'functional need 'to build residential development on this particular site. There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. 				

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>Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values. 				
FS337.021	Kevin Mahoney		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks 	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	<p>Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report</p> <p>Section 5.2.1</p> <p>Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP</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>of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). • Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. • Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on 				

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>Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In legal terms, there is no 'functional need 'to build residential development on this particular site. There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi& ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values. 				
FS336.021	Roger Holman		Support	It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the	Allow	Allow 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>surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. • Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). • Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be 				<p>Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP</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>avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. • Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. • In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site. There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. • Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing 			

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>Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.</p>				
<p>FS335.021</p>	<p>Craig and Mary Sawers</p>		<p>Support</p>	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. • Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, 	<p>Allow</p>	<p>Allow original submission</p>	<p>Accept in part</p>	<p>Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP</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>and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). • Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. • Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. • In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site. There are alternative sites more 				

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>appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri.</p> <p>Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi& ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values. 				
FS334.021	Fiona Clarke		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban 	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	<p>Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report</p> <p>Section 5.2.1</p> <p>Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP</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>footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. • Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). • Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the 				

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>Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. • In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site. There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. • Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in 				

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
				Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.				
S522.050	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	Rules	Support in part	Land that is regarded as highly productive (LUC Classes 1,2 and 3) is a strictly finite resource, essential for future food production for a growing population here and worldwide, and important for jobs and economic development. The recently issued National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land requires councils to protect LUC Class 1-3 land from fragmentation and loss (outside of identified urban zones) and allows councils to protect other types of productive land in similar manner.	Amend to include specific policies/rules to prevent fragmentation and loss of land in rural and horticulture zones [inferred].		Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS172.123	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS550.025	Lloyd Anderson		Support	It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. 	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: 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
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. • Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). • Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. 				

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"> • Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. • In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site. There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. • Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values. 				

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
FS333.0010	Maree Hart		Support	<p>The submitter supports relief sought to prevent fragmentation or loss of productive land, to avoid urban / residential sprawl in rural areas and protect amenity values.</p> <p>Residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons. It would be contrary to the NPS-UD in enabling urban sprawl and not protecting rural land. Government reports have found that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided as it leads to permanent loss of productive capability. Residential development on Lot 1001 would also create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities in the area.</p> <p>Lot 1001 is one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil in the district which is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential providing food, local jobs and economic well-being. FNDC submission to MPI recognised that large areas of horticultural land in Kerikeri have been converted to residential and therefore it is vital to protect the remaining rural land that is highly productive.</p> <p>Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. There are alternative sites in the area which could provide a compact urban footprint and improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. Lot 1001 is also adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline</p>	Allow	<p>Amend zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 to Horticulture zone or Rural Production zone; Amend Rural Production, Horticulture and Rural Lifestyle zone provisions to prevent urban sprawl, and protect productive soil, rural character and amenity values; Amend the District Plan to strengthen provisions for assessing and preventing cumulative and long-term adverse effects on productive areas, rural areas, areas visible from public land, ecological values and freshwater.</p>	Accept in part	<p>HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments</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>which is a valuable economic asset for the area</p> <p>Residential development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects. The surrounding rural environment lacks the appropriate infrastructure, school capacity and existing safety and traffic issues on Landing Road such as a one lane bridge. There would also be effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.</p>				
FS354.269	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	The submitter seeks to amend to include specific policies/rules to prevent fragmentation and loss of land in rural and horticulture zones, including HPL. Such an approach would give effect to the NPSHPL.	Allow	Allow S522.050	Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS566.1789	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS549.025	Vanessa Anderson		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from 	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: 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>inappropriate urban/residential sprawl.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. • Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). • Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the 				

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>essential natural resource at this site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. • In legal terms, there is no 'functional need 'to build residential development on this particular site. There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. • Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water 				

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
				quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.				
FS443.025	Peter O'Neil Donnellon		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. • Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" 	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: 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>(FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. • Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. • In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site. There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would 				

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>create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi& ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values. 				
FS390.025	Tracey Schubert		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the 	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	<p>HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments</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>District. This is a strictly finite resource.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). • Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. • Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation 				

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>infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In legal terms, there is no 'functional need 'to build residential development on this particular site. There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi& ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values. 				
FS353.025	AI Panckhurst		Support	It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: 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>surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. • Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). • Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be 				

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>avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. • Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. • In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site. There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. • Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing 			

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
				Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.				
FS352.025	Kathryn Panckhurst		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. • Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, 	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: 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 necessary for local jobs and economic well-being.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). • Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. • Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. • In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site. There are alternative sites more 				

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>appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri.</p> <p>Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values. 				
FS342.025	Chris Baker		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban 	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: 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>footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. • Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). • Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the 				

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>Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. • In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site. There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. • Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in 				

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
				Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi& ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.				
FS338.025	Pearl Mahoney		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. • Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite 	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	<p>HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments</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>resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. • Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. • In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site. There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. 				

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>Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values. 				
FS337.025	Kevin Mahoney		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks 	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: 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>of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). • Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. • Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on 				

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>Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site. There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values. 				
FS336.025	Roger Holman		Support	It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	HZ 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
				<p>surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. • Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). • Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be 				Key Issue 2: 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>avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. • Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. • In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site. There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. • Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing 			

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
				Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.				
FS335.025	Craig and Mary Sawers		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. • Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, 	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: 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 necessary for local jobs and economic well-being.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). • Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. • Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. • In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site. There are alternative sites more 				

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>appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri.</p> <p>Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values. 				
FS334.025	Fiona Clarke		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban 	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: 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>footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. • Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). • Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the 				

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>Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. • In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site. There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. • Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in 				

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
				Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.				
S529.037	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	Rules	Support	<p>We support provisions that will prevent further land fragmentation, sprawling development, and loss of productive agricultural/horticultural land. We support the creation of Horticulture zones to protect the productive land and irrigation infrastructure assets in the district.</p> <p>The council has a responsibility under the RMA and Regional Policy Statement to protect highly versatile soils and prevent land fragmentation and sterilisation, including from reverse sensitivity. We consider that further residential development on productive land should be avoided.</p>	Retain the Horticulture zone (inferred)		Accept	<p>Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report</p> <p>Section 5.2.1</p> <p>Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP</p>
FS172.126	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	<p>Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report</p> <p>Section 5.2.1</p> <p>Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP</p>
FS350.036	Puketona Lodge Ltd		Oppose	<p>The reasons given in the primary submission of the submitter to delete the Horticulture Zone.</p> <p>The Horticulture Zone (HZ) is not an appropriate zone for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HZ does not achieve the purpose of the RMA insofar as it does not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources; 	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Reject	<p>Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report</p> <p>Section 5.2.1</p> <p>Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP</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
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HZ fails to give effect to the National Planning Standards and the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL); • HZ Section 32 evaluation is incomplete and flawed (refer specifics in full submission) • PDP does not provide strategic direction or policy support for the suite of rural zones proposed, nor does it support the Horticultural Zone • HZ provisions are not sufficiently different from the Rural Production Zone (and in some instances are more permissive). 				
FS441.031	Adrian and Sue Knight		Oppose	Retain the Horticulture zone (inferred)	Disallow	Retain the Horticulture zone (inferred)	Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS570.1927	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS566.1941	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP

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
FS569.1963	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
S529.166	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS172.130	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS570.2054	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS566.2068	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS569.2090	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: 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
S368.032	Far North District Council	Notes	Support in part	Typo: Missing the word 'chapter' in NOTE 2	<p>Amend Notes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There may be other rules in Part 2-District-Wide Matters of the District Plan that apply to a proposed activity, in addition to the rules in this zone chapter, including the Transport, Hazardous Substances, Noise, Light and Signage chapters. These District-Wide rules may be more stringent than the rules in this chapter. Ensure that relevant District-Wide Matters chapters are also referred to in addition to this chapter, to determine whether resource consent is required under other rules in the District Plan. Refer to the how the plan works chapter to determine the activity status of a proposed activity where resource consent is required under multiple rules. 2. This zone chapter does not contain rules relating to setback to waterbodies for building and structures or setbacks to waterbodies for earthworks and indigenous vegetation clearance. The Natural Character chapter contains rules for activities within wetland, lake and river margins. The Natural Character chapter should be referred to in addition to this zone chapter. 	Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
S368.077	Far North District Council	HZ-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	<p>Amend HZ-R1</p> <p>" ... New buildings or structures, and extensions or alterations to existing buildings or structures</p> <p>Activity status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:</p>	Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Rule HZ-R1

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
				activity 'discretionary', which was not the intent if the activity itself is permitted, controlled or restricted discretionary ... the standards in PER-2 should apply.	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 ... "		
S512.111	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	HZ-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
S159.144	Horticulture New Zealand	HZ-R1	Support	Provision for buildings and structures for permitted activities is supported, subject to standards	Retain Rule HZ-R1		Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Rule HZ-R1
FS151.310	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Rule HZ-R1
FS172.52	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Rule HZ-R1
FS570.306	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Rule HZ-R1
FS566.320	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	HZ 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: Rule HZ-R1
FS569.342	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Rule HZ-R1
S317.002	Two M Investments Limited	HZ-R1	Support	The submitter considers that rule HZ-R1 is providing for the operation of existing and future horticultural activities without a potential of new activities disrupting or hindering horticultural activity.	Retain rule HZ-R1.		Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS172.77	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS566.923	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
S506.004	Antony Egerton and Stefanie Egerton	HZ-R1	Support	As the owners of the property at 494A Kerikeri Road, Kerikeri, we are happy that FNDC has taken the initiative to protect high quality soils that are necessary for the continuation of orchards in Kerikeri. It shows FNDC support to 'care about food-growing abilities at our doorstep' for future generations to be fed from. It is consistent with the Northland Regional Policy Statement and the newly released National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land which aims to protect versatile soils for food production for New Zealanders.	Retain Rules as provided in the Proposed District Plan for the Horticulture Zone.		Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS172.347	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons stated in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ 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: Rules – General Comments
S482.012	House Movers Section of New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc	HZ-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 HZ-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
FS23.159	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
S431.134	John Andrew Riddell	HZ-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
FS332.134	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

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
S269.003	Brad Hedger	HZ-R2	Support in part	<p>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.</p> <p>This is also supported from the work that NRC has done on river/stream catchments which show the effects from flooding increasing due to development and effects from climate change. The NRC assessment is limited to stream flows and flooding, the effects from development and overland flow paths to streams and rivers does not seem to be considered. In my opinion properties downstream of development will be receiving between 5-10% more stormwater flows over the next 10 years and 20% over the next 30 years.</p> <p>Currently impermeable surfaces coverage is linked to % of area, these areas can be quite large in rural areas i.e., 100ha orchard can have 15ha of impermeable surfaces before triggering a consent or using mitigation measures that may be located right on a boundary discharging to a downstream property or stream, it would be assumed that this may be spread out our there would be a buffer with permeable areas, but my observation is that commercial activity in these zones occurs at the boundary due</p>	<p>Amend PER-1 of HZ-R2: The impermeable surface coverage of any site is no more than 15% or 3000m2, whichever is the lesser.</p>	Reject	<p>HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Rule HZ-R2</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	
				to access obviously the runoff volume from the 15ha property will have a much larger effect on downstream properties.				
S481.012	Puketotara Lodge Ltd	HZ-R2	Not Stated	<p>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.</p> <p>There is no specific "stormwater management" rule in the Rural Production zone in the PDP, however there is a rule relating to impermeable surface coverage.</p> <p>It is submitted that additional matters should be added to the list of relevant matters for discretion in the impermeable coverage rule in all zones, in order to better control effects between sites or adjacent sites,</p>	<p>Amend point c of the matters of discretion as follows:</p> <p>c. the availability of land for disposal of effluent and stormwater on the site without adverse effects on adjoining adjacent waterbodies (including groundwater and aquifers) or on adjoining adjacent sites;</p> <p>Insert the following as additional matters of discretion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoiding nuisance or damage to adjacent or downstream properties; • The extent to which the diversion and discharge maintains pre-development stormwater run-off flows and volumes; • The extent to which the diversion and discharge mimics natural run-off patterns. 	Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan Wide or Rural Wide Submissions	
S317.003	Two M Investments Limited	HZ-R2	Support	The submitter considers that rule HZ-R2 is providing for the operation of existing and future horticultural activities without a potential of new activities disrupting or hindering horticultural activity.	Retain rule HZ-R2	Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments	
FS172.78	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow	Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments	
FS566.924	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent	Accept in part	HZ 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: Rules – General Comments
S67.012	Michael John Winch	HZ-R2	Oppose	<p>I oppose the permitted activity threshold of 15% impermeable surface coverage in the Horticulture zone.</p> <p>The impermeable surfaces permitted activity threshold of 15% for the Horticulture zones is excessive and would result in significant adverse effects on stormwater runoff if development were to occur at these levels.</p> <p>The Horticulture zone includes large areas of highly productive soils. The 15% permitted activity threshold for impermeable surfaces in the Horticulture zone is inconsistent with the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land 2022, the Northland Regional Policy Statement, all the objectives of the zone (HZ-O1, HZ-O2, HZ-O3) and Policies HZ-P2 and HZ-P7.</p> <p>The matters of discretion in Rule HZ-R2 do not include assessing adverse effects of impermeable surface coverage on the life-supporting capacity of the soil, even highly productive soils, as required by Policies HZ-P2 and HZ-P7. There are no other rules in the District Plan that protect the life-supporting capacity of the soil and highly productive soils from inappropriate use unless the land is being subdivided.</p> <p>The maximum impermeable surfaces permitted activity thresholds in the Horticulture zone should be reduced to 1%. This would permit some rural buildings, yards and access tracks while minimising cumulative adverse effects.</p>	<p>with our original submission</p> <p>Amend the permitted activity threshold for impermeable surfaces coverage in the Horticulture zone to 1%.</p>	Reject	<p>HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4</p> <p>Key Issue 4: Rule HZ-R2</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
FS172.131	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Rule HZ-R2
FS346.835	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Rule HZ-R2
FS566.061	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Rule HZ-R2
S67.013	Michael John Winch	HZ-R2	Oppose	The matters of discretion in Rule HZ-R2 do not include assessing adverse effects of impermeable surface coverage on the life-supporting capacity of the soil, even highly productive soils, as required by Policies HZ-P2 and HZ-P7. There are no other rules in the District Plan that protect the life-supporting capacity of the soil and highly productive soils from inappropriate use unless the land is being subdivided.	Insert a further matter of discretion: the adverse effects on the life-supporting capacity of soil and the protection of highly productive land.		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Rule HZ-R2
FS172.132	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Rule HZ-R2
FS346.836	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Rule HZ-R2

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
FS566.062	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Rule HZ-R2
S506.013	Antony Egerton and Stefanie Egerton	HZ-R2	Support	As the owners of the property at 494A Kerikeri Road, Kerikeri, we are happy that FNDC has taken the initiative to protect high quality soils that are necessary for the continuation of orchards in Kerikeri. It shows FNDC support to 'care about food-growing abilities at our doorstep' for future generations to be fed from. It is consistent with the Northland Regional Policy Statement and the newly released National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land which aims to protect versatile soils for food production for New Zealanders.	Retain rules		Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS172.356	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons stated in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
S215.055	Haigh Workman Limited	HZ-R2	Support in part	The impermeable surfaces permitted activity thresholds proposed in the Proposed District Plan can be summarised as follows: Zone Rule Impermeable Surfaces Permitted Activity Rural Production RPROZ-R2 15% (no area limit) Horticulture HZ-R2 15% (no area limit) Rural Lifestyle RLZ-R2 12.5% or 2500m2 which ever is the lesser. Rural Residential RRZ-R2 12.5% or 2500m2 which ever is the lesser. Rural Settlement RSZ-R2 35% or 600m2 which ever is the lesser	Amend HZ-R2 impermeable surfaces permitted activity thresholds from 15% to 5% of the site area		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Rule HZ-R2

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>General Residential GRZ-R2 50% (35% in Russell)</p> <p>Mixed Use MUZ-R1 / MUZ-S10 90%</p> <p>Light Industrial LIZ-R1/ LIZ-S8 90%</p> <p>Heavy Industrial (no rule) 100%</p> <p>The impermeable surfaces permitted activity thresholds of 15% for Rural Production and Horticulture zones are excessive and would result in significant adverse effects if development were to occur at these levels.</p> <p>A site developed with 15% impermeable surfaces will typically have 20% to 30% higher peak stormwater runoff compared with an undeveloped site, and will result in increased flooding and erosion downstream. As these zones comprise most of the District, cumulative adverse effects are also likely to be significant.</p> <p>Northland Regional Council flood hazard maps have been developed on the basis of impermeable coverage as permitted under District Plan rules for urban areas, whilst existing impermeable coverage has been adopted for rural areas.</p> <p>Development to the permitted activity coverage in rural areas has not been anticipated in the flood hazard mapping. The 15% permitted activity threshold for Rural Production and Horticulture zones is inconsistent with the objectives and policies of the zonings, for example Rural Production Objective RPROZ-O3 and Policies RPROZ-P2 and P5.</p> <p>We recommend that the maximum impermeable surfaces permitted activity thresholds in the Rural Production and Horticulture zones be reduced to 5% (500m² per hectare). This would permit normal rural buildings, yards, races and</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
				roads while minimising cumulative adverse effects.				
FS570.544	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Rule HZ-R2
FS566.558	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Rule HZ-R2
FS569.580	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Rule HZ-R2
S283.022	Trent Simpkin	HZ-R2	Oppose	<p>The impermeable surfaces rule is one of the most common rules breached when designing homes. The low thresholds means therefore means many homes will still require a resource consent for Impermeable surfaces. all RC's breaching impermeable surfaces require a TP10/Stormwater report from an engineer (already). This is a detailed design of the stormwater management onsite and shouldn't require FNDC to look at it and tick the box to say its acceptable.</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). This submission point applies to all zones.</p>	Amend to increase impermeable surface coverage maximum to be realistic based on the site of lots allowed for the zone and/or insert a PER-2 which says if a TP10 report is provided by an engineer, the activity is permitted (inferred)		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan Wide or Rural Wide Submissions
FS570.836	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	Accept	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
						inconsistent with our original submission		Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan Wide or Rural Wide Submissions
FS566.850	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
FS569.872	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
S159.145	Horticulture New Zealand	HZ-R3	Support in part	Rule HZ-R3 does not state the Standards that will apply. The standards relating to buildings should be included in the rule.	Amend Rule HZ-R3 to add: PER-2 The new building or structure, or extensions to an existing building or structure complies with standards: HZ-S1 Maximum height HZ-S2 Height in relation to boundary HZ-S3 Setback (excluding from MHWS or wetland, lake and river margins) HZ-S4 Setback from MHWS HZ-S5 Building or structure coverage HZ-S6 Buildings or structures used to house, milk or feed stock (excluding buildings used for an intensive indoor primary production activity)		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14 Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3

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
FS151.311	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14 Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS172.53	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14 Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS570.307	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14 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 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS566.321	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14 Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS569.343	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14 Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
S317.004	Two M Investments Limited	HZ-R3	Support	The submitter considers that rule HZ-R3 is providing for the operation of existing and future horticultural activities without a potential of new activities disrupting or hindering horticultural activity.	Retain rule HZ-R3.		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14

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
FS172.79	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14
FS566.925	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14
S506.014	Antony Egerton and Stefanie Egerton	HZ-R3	Support	As the owners of the property at 494A Kerikeri Road, Kerikeri, we are happy that FNDC has taken the initiative to protect high quality soils that are necessary for the continuation of orchards in Kerikeri. It shows FNDC support to 'care about food-growing abilities at our doorstep' for future generations to be fed from. It is consistent with the Northland Regional Policy Statement and the newly released National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land which aims to protect versatile soils for food production for New Zealanders.	Retain rules		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14
FS172.357	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons stated in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14
S425.061	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust	HZ-R4	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	Retain as notified		Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-

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
				activate the Trail and ensure that that the potential in terms of social and economic impact can be realised (noting the comments made in the Transport Chapter in regards to parking).				R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14
S317.005	Two M Investments Limited	HZ-R4	Support	The submitter considers that rule HZ-R4 is providing for the operation of existing and future horticultural activities without a potential of new activities disrupting or hindering horticultural activity.	Retain rule HZ-R4.		Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14
FS172.80	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14
FS566.926	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14
S506.015	Antony Egerton and Stefanie Egerton	HZ-R4	Support	As the owners of the property at 494A Kerikeri Road, Kerikeri, we are happy that FNDC has taken the initiative to protect high quality soils that are necessary for the continuation of orchards in Kerikeri. It shows FNDC support to 'care about food-growing abilities at our doorstep' for future generations to be fed from. It is consistent with the Northland Regional Policy Statement and the newly released National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land which aims to protect versatile soils for food production for New Zealanders.	Retain rules		Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14

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
FS172.358	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons stated in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14
S431.144	John Andrew Riddell	HZ-R4	Not Stated	The amendment is necessary in order to achieve the purpose of the Act.	Amend PER-4 of Rule HZ-R4 so that the hours of operation apply to when the business is open to the public		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14
FS332.144	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14
S317.006	Two M Investments Limited	HZ-R5	Support	The submitter considers that rule HZ-R5 is providing for the operation of existing and future horticultural activities without a potential of new activities disrupting or hindering horticultural activity.	Retain rule HZ-R5.		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS172.81	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS566.927	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
S506.016	Antony Egerton and Stefanie Egerton	HZ-R5	Support	As the owners of the property at 494A Kerikeri Road, Kerikeri, we are happy that FNDC has taken the initiative to protect high quality soils that are	Retain rules		Accept	HZ 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
				necessary for the continuation of orchards in Kerikeri. It shows FNDC support to 'care about food-growing abilities at our doorstep' for future generations to be fed from. It is consistent with the Northland Regional Policy Statement and the newly released National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land which aims to protect versatile soils for food production for New Zealanders.				Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS172.359	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons stated in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
S283.035	Trent Simpkin	HZ-R5	Oppose	This submission applies to all Building Coverage rules within all zones. Amend to be larger, considering the size of allotments allowed for in the zone.	Amend the maximum building or structure coverage to be larger or offer an alternative pathway around this rule, by inserting a PER-2 which says if a building is above the maximum, it is permitted if a visual assessment and landscape plan is provided as part of the building consent.		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Standards HZ-S1, S2, S3 and S5
FS570.849	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Standards HZ-S1, S2, S3 and S5
FS566.863	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Standards HZ-S1, S2, S3 and S5
FS569.885	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	HZ 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: Standards HZ-S1, S2, S3 and S5
S317.007	Two M Investments Limited	HZ-R6	Support	The submitter considers that rule HZ-R6 is providing for the operation of existing and future horticultural activities without a potential of new activities disrupting or hindering horticultural activity.	Retain rule HZ-R6.		Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS172.82	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS566.928	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
S506.017	Antony Egerton and Stefanie Egerton	HZ-R6	Support	As the owners of the property at 494A Kerikeri Road, Kerikeri, we are happy that FNDC has taken the initiative to protect high quality soils that are necessary for the continuation of orchards in Kerikeri. It shows FNDC support to 'care about food-growing abilities at our doorstep' for future generations to be fed from. It is consistent with the Northland Regional Policy Statement and the newly released National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land which aims to protect versatile soils for food production for New Zealanders.	Retain rules		Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS172.360	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons stated in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: 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
S159.152	Horticulture New Zealand	HZ-R7	Oppose	Rural industry supports horticulture production and a discretionary activity status for all rural industry may prevent activities which support horticulture activities. Rural manufacturing is part of rural industry so should be included	Amend Rule HZ-R7 to apply to all rural industry		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14
FS151.321	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14
FS172.60	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14
FS570.314	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14
FS566.328	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14
FS569.350	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-

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
								R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14
S317.008	Two M Investments Limited	HZ-R7	Support	The submitter considers that rule HZ-R7 is providing for the operation of existing and future horticultural activities without a potential of new activities disrupting or hindering horticultural activity.	Retain rule HZ-R7.		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14
FS172.83	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14
FS566.929	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14
S506.018	Antony Egerton and Stefanie Egerton	HZ-R7	Support	As the owners of the property at 494A Kerikeri Road, Kerikeri, we are happy that FNDC has taken the initiative to protect high quality soils that are necessary for the continuation of orchards in Kerikeri. It shows FNDC support to 'care about food-growing abilities at our doorstep' for future generations to be fed from. It is consistent with the Northland Regional Policy Statement and the newly released National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land which aims to protect versatile soils for food production for New Zealanders.	Retain rules		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14
FS172.361	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons stated in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ 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: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14
S317.009	Two M Investments Limited	HZ-R8	Support	The submitter considers that rule HZ-R8 is providing for the operation of existing and future horticultural activities without a potential of new activities disrupting or hindering horticultural activity.	Retain rule HZ-R8.		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS172.84	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS566.930	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
S506.019	Antony Egerton and Stefanie Egerton	HZ-R8	Support	As the owners of the property at 494A Kerikeri Road, Kerikeri, we are happy that FNDC has taken the initiative to protect high quality soils that are necessary for the continuation of orchards in Kerikeri. It shows FNDC support to 'care about food-growing abilities at our doorstep' for future generations to be fed from. It is consistent with the Northland Regional Policy Statement and the newly released National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land which aims to protect versatile soils for food production for New Zealanders.	Retain rules		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS172.362	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons stated in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: 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
S317.010	Two M Investments Limited	HZ-R9	Support	The submitter considers that rule HZ-R9 is providing for the operation of existing and future horticultural activities without a potential of new activities disrupting or hindering horticultural activity.	Retain rule HZ-R9.		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS172.85	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS566.931	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
S506.020	Antony Egerton and Stefanie Egerton	HZ-R9	Support	As the owners of the property at 494A Kerikeri Road, Kerikeri, we are happy that FNDC has taken the initiative to protect high quality soils that are necessary for the continuation of orchards in Kerikeri. It shows FNDC support to 'care about food-growing abilities at our doorstep' for future generations to be fed from. It is consistent with the Northland Regional Policy Statement and the newly released National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land which aims to protect versatile soils for food production for New Zealanders.	Retain rules		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS172.363	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons stated in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
S159.146	Horticulture New Zealand	HZ-R10	Support	Provision for research for the horticulture sector is important	Retain Rule HZ-R10		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: 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
FS151.312	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS151.316	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS172.54	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS570.308	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS566.322	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS569.344	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
S317.011	Two M Investments Limited	HZ-R10	Support	The submitter considers that rule HZ-R10 is providing for the operation of existing and future horticultural activities without a potential of new activities disrupting or hindering horticultural activity.	Retain rule HZ-R10.		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS172.86	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ 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: Rules – General Comments
FS566.932	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
S506.021	Antony Egerton and Stefanie Egerton	HZ-R10	Support	As the owners of the property at 494A Kerikeri Road, Kerikeri, we are happy that FNDC has taken the initiative to protect high quality soils that are necessary for the continuation of orchards in Kerikeri. It shows FNDC support to 'care about food-growing abilities at our doorstep' for future generations to be fed from. It is consistent with the Northland Regional Policy Statement and the newly released National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land which aims to protect versatile soils for food production for New Zealanders.	Retain rules		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS172.364	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons stated in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
S148.051	Summit Forests New Zealand Limited	HZ-R11	Oppose	SFNZ opposes the requirement that plantation forestry and plantation forestry activities do not occur on versatile soils. There are no provisions within the NES-PF that would allow Council to apply a more stringent rule in this regard. Specifically, "An NES prevails over district or regional plan rules except where the NES-PF specifically allows more stringent plan rules". The National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land does not support such an approach	Amend HZR11 by deleting PER-1 "It is not located on versatile soils" and change "Activity status where compliance not achieved" to "Not Applicable".		Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14

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
FS85.47	PF Olsen Ltd		Support	<p>PF Olsen supports SFNZL's submission to delete PER-1, as this does not take into account Policy 4 of the National Policy Statement of Highly Productive Land. According to NPS-HPL, land-based primary production means production, from agricultural, pastoral, horticultural, or forestry activities. There is no reason for forestry activity not to be allowed on LUC 1, 2, or 3 land (versatile soil). This should be open to the decision of the landowner. Council interference here seems unreasonable and inconsistent with the national policy.</p> <p>Further, this rule is out of the scope of Regulation 6 of the NES-PF. which sets specifically the topics and situations where Councils can impose more stringent rules.</p>	Allow		Accept in part	<p>HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5</p> <p>Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14</p>
FS346.557	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	<p>The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS. Loss of natural character, coastal environment values and the values of outstanding landscapes could also result.</p>	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	<p>HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5</p> <p>Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14</p>
FS566.163	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	<p>Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission</p>	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	<p>HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5</p> <p>Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14</p>
S317.012	Two M Investments Limited	HZ-R11	Support	<p>The submitter considers that rule HZ-R11 is providing for the operation of existing and future horticultural activities without a potential of new activities</p>	Retain rule HZ-R11.		Accept in part	<p>HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2</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
				disrupting or hindering horticultural activity.				Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS85.48	PF Olsen Ltd		Oppose	<p>PF Olsen opposes maintaining rule RLZ-R10 as is. PER-1 does not take into account Policy 4 of the National Policy Statement of Highly Productive Land. According to NPS-HPL, land-based primary production means production, from agricultural, pastoral, horticultural, or forestry activities. There is no reason for forestry activity not to be allowed on LUC 1, 2, or 3 land (versatile soil). This should be open to the decision of the landowner. Council interference here seems unreasonable and inconsistent with the national policy.</p> <p>Further, this rule is out of the scope of Regulation 6 of the NES-PF, which sets specifically the topics and situations where Councils can impose more stringent rules.</p>	Disallow		Accept in part	<p>HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2</p> <p>Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments</p>
FS172.87	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	<p>HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2</p> <p>Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments</p>
FS566.933	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	<p>HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2</p> <p>Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments</p>
S506.022	Antony Egerton and Stefanie Egerton	HZ-R11	Support	As the owners of the property at 494A Kerikeri Road, Kerikeri, we are happy that FNDC has taken the initiative to protect high quality soils that are necessary for the continuation of orchards in Kerikeri. It shows FNDC support to 'care about food-growing abilities at our doorstep' for future generations to be fed from. It is consistent with the Northland Regional	Retain rules		Accept in part	<p>HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2</p> <p>Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments</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
				Policy Statement and the newly released National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land which aims to protect versatile soils for food production for New Zealanders.				
FS85.49	PF Olsen Ltd		Oppose	PF Olsen opposes maintaining rule RLZ-R10 as is. PER-1 does not take into account Policy 4 of the National Policy Statement of Highly Productive Land. According to NPS-HPL, land-based primary production means production, from agricultural, pastoral, horticultural, or forestry activities. There is no reason for forestry activity not to be allowed on LUC 1, 2, or 3 land (versatile soil). This should be open to the decision of the landowner. Council interference here seems unreasonable and inconsistent with the national policy. Further, this rule is out of the scope of Regulation 6 of the NES-PF, which sets specifically the topics and situations where Councils can impose more stringent rules.	Disallow		Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS172.365	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons stated in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
S159.147	Horticulture New Zealand	HZ-R11	Support in part	Update of terminology	Amend Rule HZ-R11 to delete reference to 'versatile soils' and replace with 'highly productive land'		Accept	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS- HPL HZ 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: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14
FS151.313	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14
FS151.314	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14
FS172.55	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	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 HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14
FS570.309	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	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14
FS566.323	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	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-

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
								R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14
FS569.345	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	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14
S91.023	PF Olsen Limited	HZ-R11	Oppose	Regulation 6 of the National Environmental Standards for Plantation Forestry establishes where councils may have more stringent rules than the National Environmental Standard. There is no provision for the plan to contain rule HZ-R11. Also refer to reasons in this submission for RPORZ-R15	Amend rule HZ-R11 deleting PER-1		Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14
FS566.112	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14
S159.148	Horticulture New Zealand	HZ-R12	Support	A discretionary activity status for visitor accommodation is supported.	Amend Rule HZ-R12 to change all activities with permitted activity status to a discretionary status		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: 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
FS151.315	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS151.317	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS172.56	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS172.411	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	Support enabling visitor accommodation.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS570.310	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS566.324	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS569.346	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
S317.013	Two M Investments Limited	HZ-R12	Support	The submitter considers that rule HZ-R12 is providing for the operation of existing and future horticultural activities without a potential of new activities	Retain rule HZ-R12.		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: 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
				disrupting or hindering horticultural activity.				
FS172.88	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS566.934	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
S506.023	Antony Egerton and Stefanie Egerton	HZ-R12	Support	As the owners of the property at 494A Kerikeri Road, Kerikeri, we are happy that FNDC has taken the initiative to protect high quality soils that are necessary for the continuation of orchards in Kerikeri. It shows FNDC support to 'care about food-growing abilities at our doorstep' for future generations to be fed from. It is consistent with the Northland Regional Policy Statement and the newly released National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land which aims to protect versatile soils for food production for New Zealanders.	Retain rules		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS172.366	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons stated in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
S214.012	Airbnb	HZ-R12	Support in part	The proposed district plan allows for visitor accommodation as a permitted activity for less than or equal to 6-10 guests on site. If these conditions are not met, the activity is discretionary except in the settlement zone where it is restricted discretionary. Airbnb supports the overall approach to allow visitor accommodation to occur in	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 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
				<p>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>				
FS23.074	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

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
FS354.270	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	The submitter seeks permitted visitor accommodation for up to 10 guests. This is not effects based in the horticultural zone.	Disallow	Disallow S214.012	Accept	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan Wide or Rural Wide Submissions
S159.149	Horticulture New Zealand	HZ-R13	Support in part	A discretionary activity status for education facility is supported.	Amend Rule HZ-R13 to change all activities with permitted activity status to a discretionary status		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14
FS151.318	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14
FS172.57	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14
FS570.311	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14
FS566.325	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-

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
								R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14
FS569.347	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14
S159.150	Horticulture New Zealand	HZ-R13	Support in part	A setback should apply	Amend Rule HZ-R13 to include: DIS-4 A setback of 20m applies		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14
FS151.319	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14
FS172.58	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14
FS570.312	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14
FS566.326	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	HZ 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: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14
FS569.348	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14
S317.014	Two M Investments Limited	HZ-R13	Support	The submitter considers that rule HZ-R13 is providing for the operation of existing and future horticultural activities without a potential of new activities disrupting or hindering horticultural activity.	Retain rule HZ-R13.		Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14
FS172.89	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14
FS566.935	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14
S506.024	Antony Egerton and Stefanie Egerton	HZ-R13	Support	As the owners of the property at 494A Kerikeri Road, Kerikeri, we are happy that FNDC has taken the initiative to protect high quality soils that are necessary for the continuation of orchards in Kerikeri. It shows FNDC support to 'care about food-growing abilities at our doorstep' for future generations to be fed from. It is	Retain rules		Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14

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
				consistent with the Northland Regional Policy Statement and the newly released National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land which aims to protect versatile soils for food production for New Zealanders.			
FS172.367	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons stated in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow	Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14
S331.102	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	HZ-R13	Support in part	The submitter supports in part rule HZ-R13 Educational facility, it supports the permitted activity standards to provide for small scale educational facilities in the Horticulture zone. However, educational facilities with student attendance higher than 4 may be required to support this environment and suggest student attendance not exceeding 12 to align with an economic sized class for a horticultural qualification.	Amend rule HZ-R13 Educational facility, as follows: Education facility Activity status: Discretionary Permitted Where: PER-1 The education facility is undertaken within ancillary to an established residential and/or horticultural activity. a residential unit. PER-2 Hours of operation are between: 7am-8pm Monday to Friday. 8am-8pm Weekends and public holidays. PER-3 The number of students attending at one time does not exceed 12 four , excluding those who reside onsite. Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-1, PER-2 or PER-3: Non-complying Discretionary	Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14 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
FS354.271	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	The submitter seeks a permitted activity rule for educational facilities ancillary to an established residential and/or horticultural activity for up to 12 students. HortNZ does not support permitted activity status for educational facilities as it does not enable an assessment of the effects of the activity.	Disallow	Disallow S331.102	Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14 Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan Wide or Rural Wide Submissions
S159.151	Horticulture New Zealand	HZ-R14	Oppose	Rural industry supports horticulture production and a discretionary activity status for all rural industry may prevent activities which support horticulture activities. Rural manufacturing is part of rural industry so should be included	Delete Rule HZ-R14		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14
FS151.320	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14
FS172.59	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Allow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14
FS570.313	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	Accept	HZ 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
						inconsistent with our original submission		Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14
FS566.327	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14
FS569.349	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14
S317.015	Two M Investments Limited	HZ-R14	Support	The submitter considers that rule HZ-R14 is providing for the operation of existing and future horticultural activities without a potential of new activities disrupting or hindering horticultural activity.	Retain rule HZ-R14		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14
FS172.90	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14
FS566.936	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14

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
S506.025	Antony Egerton and Stefanie Egerton	HZ-R14	Support	As the owners of the property at 494A Kerikeri Road, Kerikeri, we are happy that FNDC has taken the initiative to protect high quality soils that are necessary for the continuation of orchards in Kerikeri. It shows FNDC support to 'care about food-growing abilities at our doorstep' for future generations to be fed from. It is consistent with the Northland Regional Policy Statement and the newly released National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land which aims to protect versatile soils for food production for New Zealanders.	Retain rules		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14
FS172.368	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons stated in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Rules HZ-R3, HZ-R4, HZ-R7, HZ-R11, HZ-R13 and HZ-R14
S159.153	Horticulture New Zealand	HZ-R15	Support	Discretionary activity or non-complying status for activities that are generally not anticipated in the Horticulture zone is supported.	Retain activity status for Rule HZ-R15		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS151.322	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS151.323	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS172.61	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ 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: Rules – General Comments
FS570.315	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS566.329	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS569.351	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
S317.016	Two M Investments Limited	HZ-R15	Support	The submitter considers that rule HZ-R15 is providing for the operation of existing and future horticultural activities without a potential of new activities disrupting or hindering horticultural activity.	Retain rule HZ-R15		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS172.91	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS566.937	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
S506.026	Antony Egerton and Stefanie Egerton	HZ-R15	Support	As the owners of the property at 494A Kerikeri Road, Kerikeri, we are happy that FNDC has taken the initiative to protect high quality soils that are necessary for the continuation of orchards in Kerikeri. It shows FNDC support to 'care about food-growing	Retain rules		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: 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
				abilities at our doorstep' for future generations to be fed from. It is consistent with the Northland Regional Policy Statement and the newly released National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land which aims to protect versatile soils for food production for New Zealanders.				
FS172.369	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons stated in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
S159.154	Horticulture New Zealand	HZ-R16	Support	Discretionary activity or non-complying status for activities that are generally not anticipated in the Horticulture zone is supported.	Retain activity status for Rule HZ-R16		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS151.324	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS172.62	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS570.316	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS566.330	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: 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
FS569.352	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
S317.017	Two M Investments Limited	HZ-R16	Support	The submitter considers that rule HZ-R16 is providing for the operation of existing and future horticultural activities without a potential of new activities disrupting or hindering horticultural activity.	Retain rule HZ-R16		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS172.92	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS566.938	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
S506.027	Antony Egerton and Stefanie Egerton	HZ-R16	Support	As the owners of the property at 494A Kerikeri Road, Kerikeri, we are happy that FNDC has taken the initiative to protect high quality soils that are necessary for the continuation of orchards in Kerikeri. It shows FNDC support to 'care about food-growing abilities at our doorstep' for future generations to be fed from. It is consistent with the Northland Regional Policy Statement and the newly released National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land which aims to protect versatile soils for food production for New Zealanders.	Retain rules		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS172.370	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons stated in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: 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
S159.155	Horticulture New Zealand	HZ-R17	Support	Discretionary activity or non-complying status for activities that are generally not anticipated in the Horticulture zone is supported.	Retain activity status for Rule HZ-R17		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS151.325	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS172.63	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS570.317	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS566.331	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS569.353	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
S317.018	Two M Investments Limited	HZ-R17	Support	The submitter considers that rule HZ-R17 is providing for the operation of existing and future horticultural activities without a potential of new activities disrupting or hindering horticultural activity.	Retain rule HZ-R17		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS172.93	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ 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: Rules – General Comments
FS566.939	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
S506.028	Antony Egerton and Stefanie Egerton	HZ-R17	Support	As the owners of the property at 494A Kerikeri Road, Kerikeri, we are happy that FNDC has taken the initiative to protect high quality soils that are necessary for the continuation of orchards in Kerikeri. It shows FNDC support to 'care about food-growing abilities at our doorstep' for future generations to be fed from. It is consistent with the Northland Regional Policy Statement and the newly released National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land which aims to protect versatile soils for food production for New Zealanders.	Retain rules		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS172.371	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons stated in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
S159.156	Horticulture New Zealand	HZ-R18	Support	Discretionary activity or non-complying status for activities that are generally not anticipated in the Horticulture zone is supported.	Retain activity status for Rule HZ-R18		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS151.1	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS172.64	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ 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: Rules – General Comments
FS570.318	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS566.332	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS569.354	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
S317.019	Two M Investments Limited	HZ-R18	Support	The submitter considers that rule HZ-R18 is providing for the operation of existing and future horticultural activities without a potential of new activities disrupting or hindering horticultural activity.	Retain rule HZ-R18.		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS172.94	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS566.940	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
S506.029	Antony Egerton and Stefanie Egerton	HZ-R18	Support	As the owners of the property at 494A Kerikeri Road, Kerikeri, we are happy that FNDC has taken the initiative to protect high quality soils that are necessary for the continuation of orchards in Kerikeri. It shows FNDC support to 'care about food-growing	Retain rules		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: 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
				abilities at our doorstep' for future generations to be fed from. It is consistent with the Northland Regional Policy Statement and the newly released National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land which aims to protect versatile soils for food production for New Zealanders.				
FS172.372	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons stated in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
S159.157	Horticulture New Zealand	HZ-R19	Support	Discretionary activity or non-complying status for activities that are generally not anticipated in the Horticulture zone is supported.	Retain activity status for Rule HZ-R19		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS151.2	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS172.65	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS570.319	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS566.333	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: 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
FS569.355	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
S317.020	Two M Investments Limited	HZ-R19	Support	The submitter considers that rule HZ-R19 is providing for the operation of existing and future horticultural activities without a potential of new activities disrupting or hindering horticultural activity.	Retain rule HZ-R19		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS172.95	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS566.941	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
S506.030	Antony Egerton and Stefanie Egerton	HZ-R19	Support	As the owners of the property at 494A Kerikeri Road, Kerikeri, we are happy that FNDC has taken the initiative to protect high quality soils that are necessary for the continuation of orchards in Kerikeri. It shows FNDC support to 'care about food-growing abilities at our doorstep' for future generations to be fed from. It is consistent with the Northland Regional Policy Statement and the newly released National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land which aims to protect versatile soils for food production for New Zealanders.	Retain rules		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS172.373	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons stated in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: 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
S159.158	Horticulture New Zealand	HZ-R20	Support	Discretionary activity or non-complying status for activities that are generally not anticipated in the Horticulture zone is supported.	Retain activity status for Rule HZ-R20		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS172.66	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS570.320	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS566.334	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS569.356	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
S317.021	Two M Investments Limited	HZ-R20	Support	The submitter considers that rule HZ-R20 is providing for the operation of existing and future horticultural activities without a potential of new activities disrupting or hindering horticultural activity.	Retain rule HZ-R20		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS172.96	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS566.942	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept	HZ 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: Rules – General Comments
S506.031	Antony Egerton and Stefanie Egerton	HZ-R20	Support	As the owners of the property at 494A Kerikeri Road, Kerikeri, we are happy that FNDC has taken the initiative to protect high quality soils that are necessary for the continuation of orchards in Kerikeri. It shows FNDC support to 'care about food-growing abilities at our doorstep' for future generations to be fed from. It is consistent with the Northland Regional Policy Statement and the newly released National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land which aims to protect versatile soils for food production for New Zealanders.	Retain rules		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS172.374	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons stated in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
S159.159	Horticulture New Zealand	HZ-R21	Support	Discretionary activity or non-complying status for activities that are generally not anticipated in the Horticulture zone is supported.	Retain activity status for Rule HZ-R21		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS151.3	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS172.67	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS570.321	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	Reject	HZ 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
						inconsistent with our original submission		Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS566.335	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS569.357	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
S317.022	Two M Investments Limited	HZ-R21	Support	The submitter considers that rule HZ-R20 is providing for the operation of existing and future horticultural activities without a potential of new activities disrupting or hindering horticultural activity.	Retain rule HZ-R21		Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS172.97	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS566.943	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
S506.032	Antony Egerton and Stefanie Egerton	HZ-R21	Support	As the owners of the property at 494A Kerikeri Road, Kerikeri, we are happy that FNDC has taken the initiative to protect high quality soils that are necessary for the continuation of orchards in Kerikeri. It shows FNDC support to 'care about food-growing abilities at our doorstep' for future generations to be fed from. It is consistent with the Northland Regional Policy Statement and the newly released National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land which aims to protect	Retain rules		Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: 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
				versatile soils for food production for New Zealanders.				
FS172.375	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons stated in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
S159.160	Horticulture New Zealand	HZ-R22	Support	Discretionary activity or non-complying status for activities that are generally not anticipated in the Horticulture zone is supported.	Retain activity status for Rule HZ-R22		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS151.4	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS172.68	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS570.322	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS566.336	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS569.358	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
S317.023	Two M Investments Limited	HZ-R22	Support	The submitter considers that rule HZ-R22 is providing for the operation of existing and future horticultural activities	Retain rule HZ-R22		Accept	HZ 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
				without a potential of new activities disrupting or hindering horticultural activity.				Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS172.98	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS566.944	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
S506.033	Antony Egerton and Stefanie Egerton	HZ-R22	Support	As the owners of the property at 494A Kerikeri Road, Kerikeri, we are happy that FNDC has taken the initiative to protect high quality soils that are necessary for the continuation of orchards in Kerikeri. It shows FNDC support to 'care about food-growing abilities at our doorstep' for future generations to be fed from. It is consistent with the Northland Regional Policy Statement and the newly released National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land which aims to protect versatile soils for food production for New Zealanders.	Retain rules		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS172.376	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons stated in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
S159.161	Horticulture New Zealand	HZ-R23	Support	Discretionary activity or non-complying status for activities that are generally not anticipated in the Horticulture zone is supported.	Retain activity status for Rule HZ-R23		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: 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
FS172.69	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS570.323	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS566.337	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS569.359	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
S317.024	Two M Investments Limited	HZ-R23	Support	The submitter considers that rule HZ-R23 is providing for the operation of existing and future horticultural activities without a potential of new activities disrupting or hindering horticultural activity.	Retain rule HZ-R23		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS172.99	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS566.945	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
S506.034	Antony Egerton and Stefanie Egerton	HZ-R23	Support	As the owners of the property at 494A Kerikeri Road, Kerikeri, we are happy that FNDC has taken the initiative to protect high quality soils that are	Retain rules		Accept	HZ 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
				necessary for the continuation of orchards in Kerikeri. It shows FNDC support to 'care about food-growing abilities at our doorstep' for future generations to be fed from. It is consistent with the Northland Regional Policy Statement and the newly released National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land which aims to protect versatile soils for food production for New Zealanders.				Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS172.377	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons stated in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
S159.162	Horticulture New Zealand	HZ-R24	Support	Discretionary activity or non-complying status for activities that are generally not anticipated in the Horticulture zone is supported.	Retain activity status for Rule HZ-R24		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS151.5	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS172.70	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS570.324	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS566.338	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: 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
FS569.360	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
S317.025	Two M Investments Limited	HZ-R24	Support	The submitter considers that rule HZ-R24 is providing for the operation of existing and future horticultural activities without a potential of new activities disrupting or hindering horticultural activity.	Retain rule HZ-R24		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS172.100	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS566.946	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
S506.035	Antony Egerton and Stefanie Egerton	HZ-R24	Support	As the owners of the property at 494A Kerikeri Road, Kerikeri, we are happy that FNDC has taken the initiative to protect high quality soils that are necessary for the continuation of orchards in Kerikeri. It shows FNDC support to 'care about food-growing abilities at our doorstep' for future generations to be fed from. It is consistent with the Northland Regional Policy Statement and the newly released National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land which aims to protect versatile soils for food production for New Zealanders.	Retain rules		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS172.378	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons stated in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: 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
S159.163	Horticulture New Zealand	HZ-R25	Support	Discretionary activity or non-complying status for activities that are generally not anticipated in the Horticulture zone is supported.	Retain activity status for Rule HZ-R25		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS172.71	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS570.325	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS566.339	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS569.361	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
S317.026	Two M Investments Limited	HZ-R25	Support	The submitter considers that rule HZ-R25 is providing for the operation of existing and future horticultural activities without a potential of new activities disrupting or hindering horticultural activity.	Retain rule HZ-R25		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS172.101	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS566.947	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept	HZ 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: Rules – General Comments
S506.036	Antony Egerton and Stefanie Egerton	HZ-R25	Support	As the owners of the property at 494A Kerikeri Road, Kerikeri, we are happy that FNDC has taken the initiative to protect high quality soils that are necessary for the continuation of orchards in Kerikeri. It shows FNDC support to 'care about food-growing abilities at our doorstep' for future generations to be fed from. It is consistent with the Northland Regional Policy Statement and the newly released National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land which aims to protect versatile soils for food production for New Zealanders.	Retain rules		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS172.379	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons stated in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
S159.164	Horticulture New Zealand	HZ-R26	Support	Discretionary activity or non-complying status for activities that are generally not anticipated in the Horticulture zone is supported.	Retain activity status for Rule HZ-R26		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS151.6	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS151.7	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS172.72	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ 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: Rules – General Comments
FS570.326	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS566.340	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS569.362	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
S317.027	Two M Investments Limited	HZ-R26	Support	The submitter considers that rule HZ-R26 is providing for the operation of existing and future horticultural activities without a potential of new activities disrupting or hindering horticultural activity.	Retain rule HZ-R26		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS172.102	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS566.948	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
S506.037	Antony Egerton and Stefanie Egerton	HZ-R26	Support	As the owners of the property at 494A Kerikeri Road, Kerikeri, we are happy that FNDC has taken the initiative to protect high quality soils that are necessary for the continuation of orchards in Kerikeri. It shows FNDC support to 'care about food-growing	Retain rules		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: 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
				abilities at our doorstep' for future generations to be fed from. It is consistent with the Northland Regional Policy Statement and the newly released National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land which aims to protect versatile soils for food production for New Zealanders.				
FS172.380	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons stated in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
S65.015	Imerys Performance Minerals Asia Pacific	Standards	Not Stated	Sufficient protection is required for new and existing quarrying and mining activities from new sensitive activities	Insert new standard (refer RPROZ-S7 Sensitive activities setback from boundaries of a Mineral Extraction Overlay		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Standards – General Comments
FS346.821	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	Forest & Bird agrees that there is some uncertainty created by the use of overlay vs zoning, as set out in paragraph 8 of its original submission. However, Forest & Bird opposes any relaxation of the rules/provisions relating to mineral extraction activities, particularly where that would lessen the protection afforded to areas of indigenous biodiversity, natural character or outstanding natural landscapes. Forest & Bird also opposes the extension of the MEO.	Disallow	Disallow in part the original submission	Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Standards – General Comments
S159.165	Horticulture New Zealand	HZ-S1	Not Stated	The standard provides for artificial crop protection structures up to 6m	Not stated		Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Standards HZ-S1, S2, S3 and S5
FS151.8	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part	HZ 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: Standards HZ-S1, S2, S3 and S5
FS172.73	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Standards HZ-S1, S2, S3 and S5
FS570.327	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Standards HZ-S1, S2, S3 and S5
FS566.341	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Standards HZ-S1, S2, S3 and S5
FS569.363	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Standards HZ-S1, S2, S3 and S5
S317.028	Two M Investments Limited	HZ-S1	Support	The submitter considers that standard HZ-S1 is providing for the operation of existing and future horticultural activities without a potential of new activities disrupting or hindering horticultural activity.	Retain standard HZ-S1.		Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Standards HZ-S1, S2, S3 and S5
FS172.103	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Standards HZ-S1, S2, S3 and S5

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
FS566.949	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Standards HZ-S1, S2, S3 and S5
S338.060	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	HZ-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 HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS354.272	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	The submitter seeks additional controls on artificial crop protection structures, including a non-complying rule. Artificial crop protection structures are critical to horticulture in the Far North and contribute to the economic and social wellbeing of the community.	Disallow	Disallow S338.060	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
								HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS570.998	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 HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS566.1012	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 HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS569.1034	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 HZ 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: Rules – General Comments
S427.046	Kapiro Residents Association	HZ-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 HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS354.273	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	The submitter seeks additional controls on artificial crop protection structures, including a non-complying rule. Artificial crop protection structures are critical to horticulture in the Far North and contribute to the economic and social wellbeing of the community.	Disallow	Disallow S427.046	Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: 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
S449.056	Kapiro Conservation Trust	HZ-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 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 HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS354.274	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	The submitter seeks additional controls on artificial crop protection structures, including a non-complying rule. Artificial crop protection structures are critical to horticulture in the Far North and contribute to the economic and social wellbeing of the community.	Disallow	Disallow S449.056	Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: 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
FS569.1855	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS570.1872	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 HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
S529.205	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	HZ-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 		Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: 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
					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. 			
FS570.2092	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 HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS566.2106	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 HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS569.2128	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
								Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
S431.193	John Andrew Riddell	HZ-S2	Not Stated	Not stated	Retain the approach varying the required height to boundary depending on the orientation of the relevant boundary.		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Standards HZ-S1, S2, S3 and S5
S159.166	Horticulture New Zealand	HZ-S2	Oppose	The standard should not apply to artificial crop protection structures as they are open in nature and let light through.	Amend Standard HZ-S2 by adding: This Standard does not apply to: v) Artificial crop protection structures		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Standards HZ-S1, S2, S3 and S5
FS151.9	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Standards HZ-S1, S2, S3 and S5
FS172.74	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Standards HZ-S1, S2, S3 and S5
FS570.328	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Standards HZ-S1, S2, S3 and S5

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
FS566.342	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Standards HZ-S1, S2, S3 and S5
FS569.364	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Standards HZ-S1, S2, S3 and S5
S317.029	Two M Investments Limited	HZ-S2	Support	The submitter considers that standard HZ-S2 is providing for the operation of existing and future horticultural activities without a potential of new activities disrupting or hindering horticultural activity.	Retain standard HZ-S2		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Standards – General Comments
FS172.104	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Standards – General Comments
FS566.950	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Standards – General Comments
S37.002	Jono Corskie	HZ-S3	Oppose	The removal of the provision for 3m offset from sections under 5000sqm ((from the Operative District Plan (inferred)) creates a large amount of parcels of land that have been created assuming a 3m setback to create a building platform. This approach creates additional resource consent requirements for someone who simply wants to add a shed, greenhouse, office or a building consent exempt structure to	Retain the 3m setback for spray shelters, amend the standard so that the 10m setback from site boundaries only applies to dwellings, 3m setback applies for all other structures for sections under 5000m2, and consider 3m setback for all other structures for sections over 5000m2.		Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Standards HZ-S1, S2, S3 and S5

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>a parcel that has been created under the previous plan under 5000sqm rules. It also will lead to under utilisation of smaller land parcels, when the plan states it is important to protect this finite resource from inappropriate land use and subdivision to ensure it can be used for its primary purpose.</p> <p>Habitable dwellings adjacent to boundaries have a potential for reverse sensitivity which I assume is the main aim of this rule. With other structures the effect is negligible. Limiting the setback of dwellings to 10m, for sections under 5000sqm the effects of horticultural or rural activities is addressed. All other structures should be able to be built up to 3m setback as per previous plan to avoid unnecessary costs incurred for building and under utilisation of land. The subdivision rules prevent the creation of any more sections where this rule applies going forward, some transition is necessary or 26% of parcels will have significant under utilisation effects.</p>			
S512.085	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	HZ-S3	Support in part	<p>Setbacks play a role in reducing spread of fire as well as ensuring Fire and Emergency personnel can get to a fire source or other emergency.</p> <p>An advice note is recommended to raise to plan users (e.g. developers) early on in the resource consent process that there is further control of building setbacks and firefighting access through the New Zealand Building Code (NZBC).</p>	<p>Insert advice note to setback standard</p> <p>Building setback requirements are further controlled by the Building Code. This includes the provision for firefighter access to buildings and egress from buildings. Plan users should refer to the applicable controls within the Building Code to ensure compliance can be achieved at the building consent stage. Issuance of a resource consent does not imply that waivers of Building Code requirements will be considered/granted</p>	Reject	<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
S159.167	Horticulture New Zealand	HZ-S3	Support in part	Standard HZ-S3 provides for artificial crop protection structures with a 3m setback. The setbacks only provide for a 10m setback of habitable buildings from boundaries which is considered insufficient to address potential reverse sensitivity effects	Amend Standard HZ-S3 as follows: The building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure must be setback at least 10m from all site boundaries, except <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. habitable buildings are setback at least 30m from the boundary of an unsealed road and 20m from side and rear boundaries; and 2. artificial crop protection and support structures are setback at least 3m 1m from all site boundaries 	Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Standards HZ-S1, S2, S3 and S5
FS33.1	Jonathan Corskie		Oppose	<p>20m setback of buildings results in sterilization of land for no particular reason. Land will not be optimally utilized if buildings must be 20m off boundaries, which does not achieve the desired outcomes from the National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land. In highly productive land small parcels can be productive and large setbacks negatively impact these parcels (of which a large proportion are under 5000sqm).</p> <p>Reverse sensitivity has been addressed in the changes in subdivision rules increasing the section size in line with National Policy.</p> <p>Regulation exists preventing horticultural activities impacting adjacent properties over the boundary, setbacks are a factor of safety above and beyond this. Many dwellings exist adjacent to horticultural activities and these activities coexist currently. 10m setback should be retained, and 3m setback for non-habitable buildings/structures.</p>	Disallow in part	Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Standards HZ-S1, S2, S3 and S5

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
FS151.10	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Standards HZ-S1, S2, S3 and S5
FS172.75	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Standards HZ-S1, S2, S3 and S5
FS570.329	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Standards HZ-S1, S2, S3 and S5
FS566.343	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Standards HZ-S1, S2, S3 and S5
FS569.365	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Standards HZ-S1, S2, S3 and S5
S317.030	Two M Investments Limited	HZ-S3	Support	The submitter considers that standard HZ-S3 is providing for the operation of existing and future horticultural activities without a potential of new activities disrupting or hindering horticultural activity.	Retain standard HZ-S3.		Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Standards – General Comments
FS172.105	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.6

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 6: Standards – General Comments
FS566.951	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Standards – General Comments
S338.061	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	HZ-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 HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS354.275	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	The submitter seeks additional controls on artificial crop protection structures, including a non-complying rule. Artificial crop protection structures are critical to horticulture in the Far North and	Disallow	Disallow S338.061	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
				contribute to the economic and social wellbeing of the community.				Key Issue 5: Definitions HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS570.999	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 HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS566.1013	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 HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS569.1035	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

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
								HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
S427.047	Kapiro Residents Association	HZ-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 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 HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS354.276	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	The submitter seeks additional controls on artificial crop protection structures, including a non-complying rule. Artificial crop protection structures are critical to horticulture in the Far North and contribute to the economic and social wellbeing of the community.	Disallow	Disallow S427.047	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
								HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
S449.057	Kapiro Conservation Trust	HZ-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.	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 HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS354.277	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	The submitter seeks additional controls on artificial crop protection structures, including a non-complying rule. Artificial crop protection structures are critical to horticulture in the Far North and contribute to the economic and social wellbeing of the community.	Disallow	Disallow S449.057	Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions HZ 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: Rules – General Comments
FS569.1856	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS570.1873	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 HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: 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
S529.206	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	HZ-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 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 HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS570.2093	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 HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: 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
FS566.2107	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 HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
FS569.2129	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 HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Rules – General Comments
S159.168	Horticulture New Zealand	HZ-S5	Support in part	Standard HZ-S5 provides for 12.5% site coverage by buildings or structures but excludes crop protection structures and tunnel and glasshouses.	Amend Standard HZ-S5 to delete reference to 'glass houses' and replace with 'greenhouses'		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Standards HZ-S1, S2, S3 and S5
FS151.11	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Standards HZ-S1, S2, S3 and S5
FS172.76	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ 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: Standards HZ-S1, S2, S3 and S5
FS570.330	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Standards HZ-S1, S2, S3 and S5
FS566.344	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Standards HZ-S1, S2, S3 and S5
FS569.366	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	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Standards HZ-S1, S2, S3 and S5
S317.032	Two M Investments Limited	HZ-S5	Support	The submitter considers that standard HZ-S5 is providing for the operation of existing and future horticultural activities without a potential of new activities disrupting or hindering horticultural activity.	Retain standard HZ-S5		Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Standards – General Comments
FS172.107	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Standards – General Comments
FS566.953	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Standards – 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
S317.033	Two M Investments Limited	HZ-S6	Support	The submitter considers that standard HZ-S6 is providing for the operation of existing and future horticultural activities without a potential of new activities disrupting or hindering horticultural activity.	Retain standard HZ-S6		Accept in part	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Standards – General Comments
FS172.108	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Reject	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Standards – General Comments
FS566.954	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept	HZ S42A Report Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Standards – General Comments
S288.001	Tristan Simpkin	Horticulture Zone	Oppose	<p>Kerikeri Horticulture Zone is too large and broad. The new Horticulture zone around Kerikeri is approximately 70-75 square kilometres.</p> <p>Submitter has two objections: 1) It's based upon info at a large scale (soil versatility maps) which aren't correct in a number of places such that its application is not suitable. 2) Many of the properties it has been placed upon (for example - Blue Gum Lane) is now used for other purposes i.e. rural residential. It is not a worthwhile zone to be plastering around the outskirts of Kerikeri on sites that will never be used for horticulture again. The reason these two points matter is that the zone rules themselves are restrictive; no minor residential units, no air bnb renting out without consent, and commercial / industrial activities are all non-complying.</p>	Amend the entire application of the zoning of Horticulture Zone surrounding Kerikeri (some 70-75 square kilometers) to look at areas more closely and tailor the zoning to the landuse. Rezone land used for residential activities within the proposed Horticulture Zone (e.g. Blue Gum Lane) from Horticulture Zone to Rural Residential Zone. A broad-brush approach based on soil versatility maps should not be used (see map attached to original submission).		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP

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
FS44.2	Northland Planning & Development 2020 Ltd		Support in part	Agree that the soil versatility maps do not accurately reflect what soils are actually within some sites. NZLRI Maps indicate versatile soils across a lot of sites which do not in fact contain highly versatile soils. The NZLRI maps are unreliable when dealing with parcels of land less than 10 hectares. Many lots reflect rural-residential lot sizes and the landuse activities on site reflect this. Sites which do not contain highly versatile soils cannot meet criteria (a) in HZ-P1. The way in which the policy is worded is that in order to be zoned horticultural you need to comply with (a), (b) and (c). As the allotments in this area are unable to comply, these sites should not be zoned horticultural. Given the size of these allotments no productive activity could be established, and if one was attempted it is likely that there would be reverse sensitivity issues	Allow		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS29.29	Trent Simpkin		Support	Agree fully that the horticulture zone needs to be relooked at, the areas where it has been applied. So many 'rural residential' areas have been zoned horticulture, where in fact they have homes on them and will never have horticulture activity on them again, so council should be thinking how can we densify these areas that have already been changed to residential use to make the best use of the land. Relook at the maps and zone rural residential areas to that zone, instead of Horticulture zone.	Allow		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS172.137	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission and in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone and support reconsideration of inconsistent zoning.	Allow		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ 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: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS350.041	Puketona Lodge Ltd		Support in part	<p>The reasons given in the original submission and primary submission of the submitter to delete the Horticulture Zone and support reconsideration of inconsistent zoning.</p> <p>The Horticulture Zone (HZ) is not an appropriate zone for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HZ does not achieve the purpose of the RMA insofar as it does not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources; • HZ fails to give effect to the National Planning Standards and the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL); • HZ Section 32 evaluation is incomplete and flawed (refer specifics in full submission) • PDP does not provide strategic direction or policy support for the suite of rural zones proposed, nor does it support the Horticultural Zone • HZ provisions are not sufficiently different from the Rural Production Zone (and in some instances are more permissive). 	Allow in part	Allow the original submission in part	Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS282.1	Breakwater Trust		Support in part	Agree that the Horticulture zone should not be applied to all land around Kerikeri/Waipapa. Land which is classified as highly versatile land on the NZLRI database may not be highly versatile land. The NZLRI maps are	Allow in part		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ 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
				<p>unreliable when dealing with parcels of land less than 10 hectares. Many lots reflect rural-residential lot sizes and the landuse activities on site reflect this. Sites which do not contain highly versatile soils cannot meet criteria (a) in HZ-P1.</p> <p>The way in which the policy is worded is that in order to be zoned horticultural you need to comply with (a), (b) and (c). As the allotments in this area are unable to comply, these sites should not be zoned horticultural. Given the size of these allotments no productive activity could be established, and if one was attempted it is likely that there would be reverse sensitivity issues</p>				Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS441.037	Adrian and Sue Knight		Support in part	For the reasons set out in this primary submission and in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone and support reconsideration of inconsistent zoning.	Allow in part	Amend	Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS570.881	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 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS566.895	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 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP

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
FS569.917	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 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
S366.001	Blair and Deanne Rogers	Horticulture Zone	Oppose	<p>The area identified in the submission has been recently subdivided into smaller lots and is the location of existing and proposed concentrated rural-residential activities. The area is adjacent to an existing enclave of rural-residential properties further south on Arthur Taylor Place and on the eastern side of Waimate North Road. Lot 5 DP 540206 has subdivision approval for a further eight rural lifestyle lots.</p> <p>The development of this land for horticulture activities other than the existing site at Lot 1 DP 525899 at the corner of Wiroa Road and Waimate North Road, is unlikely due to the presence of rural-residential activities and the potential for reverse sensitivity effects.</p> <p>It is not clear if there is irrigation water supply available to these properties. The class type of soil has not been determined. The alternative proposed Rural Production zone would enable ongoing existing horticulture activities in this location and would not restrict future horticulture activity.</p> <p>The alternative Rural Production Zone would restrict further fragmentation of land to below 4 hectares, which would be a non-complying activity.</p>	Amend and rezone the area identified in the submission as Rural Production zone; or In the alternative, delete the proposed 'Horticulture Zone' in its entirety, as a planning method that has been applied inconsistently and inappropriately across the Far North District.		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP

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
FS44.57	Northland Planning & Development 2020 Ltd		Support		Allow		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS172.140	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support in part	Support deletion of the Horticulture Zone and reconsideration of inconsistent zoning.	Allow		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS350.039	Puketona Lodge Ltd		Support in part	Support deletion of the Horticulture Zone and reconsideration of inconsistent zoning.	Allow in part	Allow the original submission in part.	Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS566.001	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is consistent 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 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP

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
FS569.001	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS570.001	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS441.034	Adrian and Sue Knight		Support in part	Support deletion of the Horticulture Zone and reconsideration of inconsistent zoning.	Allow in part	Amend	Accept	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
S535.002	John and Rose Whitehead	Horticulture Zone	Oppose	The Horticulture zone is not an appropriate zone for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The Horticulture zone does not achieve the purpose of the RMA insofar as it does not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources; b. The Horticulture zone fails to give effect to the National Planning Standards and the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL); c. The Horticulture Zone section 32 evaluation is incomplete and flawed: 	Delete the proposed Horticulture zone in its entirety, rezoning areas Rural Production, General Rural, Commercial or Rural Residential as appropriate.		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP

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"> i. The evaluation does not provide sufficient level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance of creating a special purpose zone; ii. The evaluation fails to consider the full range of zoning options and identify reasonably practicable options to achieve objectives; iii. The evaluation fails to evaluate appropriate zone criteria and boundaries; d. The PDP does not provide strategic direction or policy support for the suite of rural zones proposed, nor does it support the Horticultural Zone; e. The Horticulture zone has only been proposed within the Kerikeri area; and f. The Horticulture zone provisions are not sufficiently different from the Rural Production Zone (and in some instances are more permissive). 				
FS24.62	Lynley Newport		Support	<p>The Council needs to re-visit its zoning approach for all rural land in the district, especially since the NPS for HPL (with all its flaws) is now in place. This will be a major exercise that cannot be done simply in response to submissions. A re-write and re-notification will be required. Note - this further submission is focused on process rather than suggesting what zoning should apply where.</p>	Allow in part		Reject	<p>Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP</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
FS99.4	Frederick Laurence & Ellen June Voigt		Support in part	<p>We recognise the importance of protecting productive soils for food production in Northland and as such, submit that the Horticulture Zone applied only to Kerikeri has incorrectly identified suitable soils and neglected to acknowledge land already lost.</p> <p>If the objective is to protect productive soils, there is much soil outside of the Kerikeri area that must be zoned Horticulture to avoid the land fragmentation that has already occurred in Kerikeri. It is noted there doesn't appear to be any horticulture Zoning outside of this immediate Kerikeri area.</p> <p>If the Horticulture zone was applied as per Kerikeri Irrigation Scheme, we note that our drystock farm is not connected to the scheme, but has proposed Horticulture Zoning. This is in addition to being land highly unsuitable for Horticulture production due to difficult clay soil, significant wet areas, steepness of terrain, lack of water supply, difficulty of access, and areas of significant rock.</p> <p>The current Rural Production Zoning fits the nature of this area (Riddell Rd - Bills Lane) much better than the proposed Horticulture zone.</p> <p>Careful soil mapping would need to be carried out to determine where Horticulture Zoning would truly be necessary, if Rural Production does not suffice for protecting these areas.</p>	Allow in part		Reject	<p>Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report</p> <p>Section 5.2.1</p> <p>Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP</p>
FS172.17	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	<p>The reasons given in this primary submission and in my primary submission.</p>	Allow		Reject	<p>Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report</p> <p>Section 5.2.1</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 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS566.003	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 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
S449.039	Kapiro Conservation Trust	Horticulture Zone	Oppose	We consider that clusters of existing residential lifestyle properties in the Horticulture zone could be zoned as Rural Lifestyle. In effect this would create several islands of Rural Lifestyle zone within the Horticulture zone. The PDP policies/rules relating to Rural Living zone should retain the potential for some of this land to be returned to agricultural production at a future date, if owners wish, so further residential development on productive land in existing residential areas of the Horticulture zone is undesirable. Satellite property maps can be used to identify clusters of existing residential lifestyle properties in the Horticulture zone. Clusters of existing small residential lifestyle properties lying within the area proposed as Horticulture zone could be classed as Rural Lifestyle zone in cases where they meet specific criteria.	Delete the zoning of some properties within the Horticulture zone, and rezone Rural Lifestyle where they meet specific criteria, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing small residential lifestyle property less than 2.5 ha, and Without commercial agricultural/horticultural production, and Part of an existing cluster of at least 8 or so residential lifestyle properties clustered around a road or access lane. A secondary dwelling on existing larger residential lifestyle properties could be allowed in the Horticulture zone as a discretionary activity, but not within productive horticultural areas	Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP	
FS185.1	Justin & Vicki McIlroy		Support	Existing residential properties should not be in this blanket zone of horticulture as they will never be used for the activity of horticulture.	Allow		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ 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: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS172.408	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support in part	Support deletion of the Horticulture Zone and reconsideration of inconsistent zoning.	Allow		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS76.003	Jo Lumkong		Support	The submitter is the owner of a small lot with poor quality soil adjoining four other properties and feels it is appropriate to offer clusters of previously subdivided rural production properties protection from horticultural zoning, in particular from health aspects such as sprays. The submitter also wishes to maintain more permissive rules to dwellings and home businesses than in the Rural Production zone. The proposed re-zoning is also aligned with the FNDP objectives for horticultural activities.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS76.005	Jo Lumkong		Support	The submitter is the owner of a small lot with poor quality soil adjoining four other properties and feels it is appropriate to offer clusters of previously subdivided rural production properties protection from horticultural zoning, in particular from health aspects such as sprays. The submitter also wishes to maintain more permissive rules to dwellings and home businesses than in the Rural Production zone. The proposed re-zoning is also aligned with the FNDP objectives for horticultural activities.	Allow	Allow the original submission (inferred).	Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS539.001	Helen Morris		Support	The beginning of Purerua Road Lot 1-8 was subdivided into residential small lifestyle properties as the soil on this land isn't good for growing.	Allow	Allow the original submission (inferred).	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
								Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS354.284	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	The submitter seeks rezoning of some properties in the Horticulture Zone based on criteria. Such an approach would mean that there will not be a contiguous zone and would not be able to meet the objectives and policies for the zone.	Disallow	Disallow S449.039	Accept	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS569.1838	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS570.1855	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
S338.036	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	Horticulture Zone	Not Stated	We consider that clusters of existing residential lifestyle properties in the Horticulture zone could be zoned as Rural Lifestyle. In effect this would create several islands of Rural Lifestyle zone within the Horticulture zone. The PDP policies/rules relating to Rural Living zone should retain the potential for some of this land to be returned to agricultural production at a future date, if owners wish, so further residential development on productive land in existing residential areas of the	Delete the zoning of some properties within the Horticulture zone, and rezone Rural Lifestyle where they meet specific criteria, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing small residential lifestyle property less than 2.5 ha, and Without commercial agricultural/horticultural production, and Part of an existing cluster of at least 8 or so residential lifestyle properties clustered around a road or access lane. 		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP

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>Horticulture zone is undesirable. Satellite property maps can be used to identify clusters of existing residential lifestyle properties in the Horticulture zone.</p> <p>Clusters of existing small residential lifestyle properties lying within the area proposed as Horticulture zone could be classed as Rural Lifestyle zone in cases where they meet specific criteria.</p>	A secondary dwelling on existing larger residential lifestyle properties could be allowed in the Horticulture zone as a discretionary activity, but not within productive horticultural areas			
FS185.2	Justin & Vicki Mclroy		Support	This blanket rezone to horticulture is unfair to existing residential properties that will never be involved in commercial horticulture activities.	Allow		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS185.5	Justin & Vicki Mclroy		Support	Existing residential lifestyle properties less than 2.5Ha will not be operating as commercial horticulture units. Also health issues of horticulture activities in amongst residential properties needs to be addressed.	Allow		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS172.406	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support in part	Support deletion of the Horticulture Zone and reconsideration of inconsistent zoning.	Allow		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS76.001	Jo Lumkong		Support	The submitter is the owner of a small lot with poor quality soil adjoining four other properties and feels it is appropriate to offer clusters of previously subdivided rural production properties protection from horticultural zoning, in particular from health aspects such as sprays. The	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ 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
				submitter also wishes to maintain more permissive rules to dwellings and home businesses than in the Rural Production zone. The proposed re-zoning is also aligned with the FNDP objectives for horticultural activities.				Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS539.002	Helen Morris		Support	The beginning of Purerua Road Lot 1-8 was subdivided into residential small lifestyle properties as the soil on this land isn't good for growing.	Allow	Allow the original submission (inferred).	Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS354.282	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	The submitter seeks rezoning of some properties in the Horticulture Zone based on criteria. Such an approach would mean that there will not be a contiguous zone and would not be able to meet the objectives and policies for the zone.	Disallow	Disallow S338.036	Accept	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS570.974	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS566.988	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS569.1010	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	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
								Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
S522.025	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	Horticulture Zone	Oppose	<p>We consider that clusters of existing residential lifestyle properties in the Horticulture zone could be zoned as Rural Lifestyle. In effect this would create several islands of Rural Lifestyle zone within the Horticulture zone.</p> <p>The PDP policies/rules relating to Rural Living zone should retain the potential for some of this land to be returned to agricultural production at a future date, if owners wish, so further residential development on productive land in existing residential areas of the Horticulture zone is undesirable.</p> <p>Satellite property maps can be used to identify clusters of existing residential lifestyle properties in the Horticulture zone.</p> <p>Clusters of existing small residential lifestyle properties lying within the area proposed as Horticulture zone could be classed as Rural Lifestyle zone in cases where they meet specific criteria.</p>			Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS185.3	Justin & Vicki Mclroy		Support	Existing residential properties should not be rezoned horticulture when they will never be commercial horticulture entities.	Allow		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS172.409	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support in part	Support deletion of the Horticulture Zone and reconsideration of inconsistent zoning.	Allow		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ 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: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS442.001	Jacqueline Louise Sanders		Support	I support the submission by Vision Kerikeri in full. In particular the part of the submission related to residential lifestyle properties within the Horticulture Zone being zoned as Rural Lifestyle.	Allow	rezone residential lifestyle properties within the horticulture zone to zoned rural lifestyle	Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS539.004	Helen Morris		Support	The beginning of Purerua Road Lot 1-8 was subdivided into residential small lifestyle properties as the soil on this land isn't good for growing. We consider that clusters of existing residential lifestyle properties in the Horticulture zone could be zoned as Rural Lifestyle. In effect this would create several islands of Rural Lifestyle zone within the Horticulture zone.	Allow	Amend zoning of the beginning of Purerua Road, Lot 1-8 before the bridge to Rural Lifestyle zone.	Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS566.1764	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
S529.038	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	Horticulture Zone	Oppose	We consider that clusters of existing residential lifestyle properties in the Horticulture zone could be zoned as Rural Lifestyle. In effect this would create several islands of Rural Lifestyle zone within the Horticulture zone. The PDP policies/rules relating to Rural Living zone should retain the potential for some of this land to be returned to agricultural production at a future date, if owners wish, so further residential	Delete the zoning of some properties within the Horticulture zone, and rezone Rural Lifestyle where they meet specific criteria, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing small residential lifestyle property less than 2.5 ha, and Without commercial agricultural/horticultural production, and Part of an existing cluster of at least 8 or so residential lifestyle properties 		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP

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
				development on productive land in existing residential areas of the Horticulture zone is undesirable. Satellite property maps can be used to identify clusters of existing residential lifestyle properties in the Horticulture zone. Clusters of existing small residential lifestyle properties lying within the area proposed as Horticulture zone could be classed as Rural Lifestyle zone in cases where they meet specific criteria.	clustered around a road or access lane. A secondary dwelling on existing larger residential lifestyle properties could be allowed in the Horticulture zone as a discretionary activity, but not within productive horticultural areas			
FS185.4	Justin & Vicki McIlroy		Support	Existing residential properties will be adversely affected by the change to horticulture zoning. The will never be commercial horticulture entities.	Allow		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS172.410	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support in part	Support deletion of the Horticulture Zone and reconsideration of inconsistent zoning.	Allow		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS76.004	Jo Lumkong		Support	The submitter is the owner of a small lot with poor quality soil adjoining four other properties and feels it is appropriate to offer clusters of previously subdivided rural production properties protection from horticultural zoning, in particular from health aspects such as sprays. The submitter also wishes to maintain more permissive rules to dwellings and home businesses than in the Rural Production zone. The proposed re-zoning is also aligned with the FNDP objectives for horticultural activities.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP

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
FS570.1928	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS566.1942	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS569.1964	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
S284.001	Trent Simpkin	Horticulture Zone	Oppose	<p>Kerikeri Horticulture Zone is too large and broad. The new Horticulture zone around Kerikeri is approximately 70-75 square kilometres.</p> <p>Submitter has two objections:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) It's based upon info at a large scale (soil versatility maps) which aren't correct in a number of places such that its application is not suitable. 2) Many of the properties it has been placed upon (for example - Blue Gum Lane) is now used for other purposes i.e. rural residential. It is not a worthwhile zone to be plastering around the outskirts of Kerikeri on sites that will never be used for horticulture again. 	Amend the entire application of the zoning of Horticulture Zone surrounding Kerikeri (some 70-75 square kilometers) to look at areas more closely and tailor the zoning to the landuse. Rezone land used for residential activities within the proposed Horticulture Zone (e.g. Blue Gum Lane) from Horticulture Zone to Rural Residential Zone. A broad-brush approach based on soil versatility maps should not be used (see map attached to original submission).		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP

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 reason these two points matter is that the zone rules themselves are restrictive; no minor residential units, no air bnb renting out without consent, and commercial/industrial activities are all non complying.				
FS45.22	Tristan Simpkin		Support	Support as per Reasons given in submission	Allow		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS172.136	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission and in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone and support reconsideration of inconsistent zoning.	Allow		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS36.081	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency		Oppose	Opposes the proposed rezoning/ intensification of the submitters land until there is a clearer understanding on how the proposal affects the safety, efficiency, and effectiveness of the land transport system. There needs to be clear documentation of what transport infrastructure/ upgrades/mitigation measures are needed to avoid, remedy or mitigate effects on the transport system, triggers for necessary infrastructure development and how the infrastructure will be funded. The proposed rezoning needs to ensure that it includes details as to how the proposed transport network will provide active modes and support the longer term development of public transport.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission until appropriate analysis and information has been provided for each of the proposed rezonings.	Accept	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP

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
FS350.040	Puketona Lodge Ltd		Support in part	<p>The reasons given in the original submission and primary submission of the submitter to delete the Horticulture Zone and support reconsideration of inconsistent zoning.</p> <p>The Horticulture Zone (HZ) is not an appropriate zone for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HZ does not achieve the purpose of the RMA insofar as it does not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources; • HZ fails to give effect to the National Planning Standards and the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL); • HZ Section 32 evaluation is incomplete and flawed (refer specifics in full submission) • PDP does not provide strategic direction or policy support for the suite of rural zones proposed, nor does it support the Horticultural Zone • HZ provisions are not sufficiently different from the Rural Production Zone (and in some instances are more permissive). 	Allow	Allow the original submission in part.	Reject	<p>Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report</p> <p>Section 5.2.1</p> <p>Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP</p>
FS441.035	Adrian and Sue Knight		Support in part	<p>For the reasons set out in this primary submission and in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone and support reconsideration of inconsistent zoning.</p>	Allow in part	Amend	Reject	<p>Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report</p> <p>Section 5.2.1</p> <p>Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP</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
FS570.855	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 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS566.869	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 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS569.891	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 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
S475.001	Robert Keith Beale	Horticulture Zone	Oppose	<p>The Horticulture Zone (HZ) is not an appropriate zone for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HZ does not achieve the purpose of the RMA insofar as it does not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources; • HZ fails to give effect to the National Planning Standards and the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL); • HZ Section 32 evaluation is incomplete and flawed (refer specifics in full submission) 	Delete the proposed Horticulture Zone in its entirety, rezoning areas Rural Production, General Rural, Commercial or Rural Residential Zones as appropriate.		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP

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"> PDP does not provide strategic direction or policy support for the suite of rural zones proposed, nor does it support the Horticultural Zone HZ provisions are not sufficiently different from the Rural Production Zone (and in some instances are more permissive). 				
FS172.2	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	The reasons given in this primary submission and in my primary submission.	Allow		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS350.008	Puketona Lodge Ltd		Support	<p>The reasons given in the original submission and primary submission of the submitter.</p> <p>The Horticulture zone is not an appropriate zone for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Horticulture zone does not achieve the purpose of the RMA insofar as it does not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources; The Horticulture zone fails to give effect to the National Planning Standards and the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL); The Horticulture Zone section 32 evaluation is incomplete and flawed: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The evaluation does not provide sufficient level of detail that corresponds to the scale and 	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP

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"> ii. The evaluation fails to consider the full range of zoning options and identify reasonably practicable options to achieve objectives; iii. The evaluation fails to evaluate appropriate zone criteria and boundaries; d. The PDP does not provide strategic direction or policy support for the suite of rural zones proposed, nor does it support the Horticultural Zone; e. The Horticulture zone has only been proposed within the Kerikeri area; and f. The Horticulture zone provisions are not sufficiently different from the Rural Production Zone (and in some instances are more permissive). 				
FS243.233	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose	Kāinga Ora is interested in the proposed change from rural production to an urban zone. Kāinga Ora wishes to see further details to the proposed change and how the proposed change will fit with the district's planned and future growth. Kāinga Ora is interested in understanding the balance of enabling urban development while maintaining productive rural environments.	Disallow in part	Amend the Mixed Use zone boundary around the Kerikeri town centre and	Accept	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS441.008	Adrian and Sue Knight		Support	Delete the proposed Horticulture Zone in its entirety, rezoning areas Rural Production, General Rural, Commercial or Rural Residential Zones as appropriate	Allow	Delete	Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ 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: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
S325.001	Adrian and Sue Knight	Horticulture Zone	Oppose	The Horticulture Zone does not achieve the purpose of the RMA and fails to give effect to the National Planning Standards and the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land. The Horticulture Zone section 32 evaluation is incomplete and flawed. The PDP does not provide strategic direction or policy support for the suite of rural zones proposed, nor does it support the Horticultural Zone. The Horticulture Zone has only been proposed within the Kerikeri area and the provisions are not sufficiently different from the Rural Production Zone (and in some instances are more permissive).	Delete the proposed Horticulture Zone in its entirety, rezoning areas Rural Production, General Rural, Commercial or Rural Residential zones as appropriate.		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS172.6	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	The reasons given in this primary submission and in my primary submission.	Allow		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS350.048	Puketona Lodge Ltd		Support	The reasons given in the original submission and primary submission of the submitter. The Horticulture Zone does not achieve the purpose of the RMA and fails to give effect to the National Planning Standards and the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land. The Horticulture Zone section 32 evaluation is incomplete and flawed. The PDP does not provide strategic direction or policy support for the suite of rural zones proposed, nor does it	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP

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
				support the Horticultural Zone. The Horticulture Zone has only been proposed within the Kerikeri area and the provisions are not sufficiently different from the Rural Production Zone (and in some instances are more permissive).			
S534.001	Roger Atkinson	Horticulture Zone	Oppose	<p>The Horticulture zone is not an appropriate zone for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The Horticulture zone does not achieve the purpose of the RMA insofar as it does not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources; b. The Horticulture zone fails to give effect to the National Planning Standards and the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL); c. The Horticulture Zone section 32 evaluation is incomplete and flawed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The evaluation does not provide sufficient level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance of creating a special purpose zone; ii. The evaluation fails to consider the full range of zoning options and identify reasonably practicable options to achieve objectives; iii. The evaluation fails to evaluate appropriate zone criteria and boundaries; 	Delete the proposed Horticulture zone in its entirety, rezoning areas Rural Production, General Rural, Commercial or Rural Residential as appropriate.	Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP

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"> d. The PDP does not provide strategic direction or policy support for the suite of rural zones proposed, nor does it support the Horticultural Zone; e. The Horticulture zone has only been proposed within the Kerikeri area; and f. The Horticulture zone provisions are not sufficiently different from the Rural Production Zone (and in some instances are more permissive). 				
FS172.12	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	The reasons given in this primary submission and in my primary submission.	Allow		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS350.001	Puketona Lodge Ltd		Support	<p>The reasons given in the original submission and primary submission of the submitter.</p> <p>The Horticulture zone is not an appropriate zone for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The Horticulture zone does not achieve the purpose of the RMA insofar as it does not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources; b. The Horticulture zone fails to give effect to the National Planning Standards and the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL); 	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP

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"> c. The Horticulture Zone section 32 evaluation is incomplete and flawed: iv. The evaluation does not provide sufficient level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance of creating a special purpose zone; v. The evaluation fails to consider the full range of zoning options and identify reasonably practicable options to achieve objectives; vi. The evaluation fails to evaluate appropriate zone criteria and boundaries; d. The PDP does not provide strategic direction or policy support for the suite of rural zones proposed, nor does it support the Horticultural Zone; e. The Horticulture zone has only been proposed within the Kerikeri area; and f. The Horticulture zone provisions are not sufficiently different from the Rural Production Zone (and in some instances are more permissive). 				
FS566.002	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 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP

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
FS441.001	Adrian and Sue Knight		Support	Delete the proposed Horticulture zone in its entirety, rezoning areas Rural Production, General Rural, Commercial or Rural Residential as appropriate.	Allow	Delete	Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
S393.001	C Otway Ltd	Horticulture Zone	Oppose	<p>The Horticulture zone is not an appropriate zone for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The Horticulture zone does not achieve the purpose of the RMA insofar as it does not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources; b. The Horticulture zone fails to give effect to the National Planning Standards and the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL); c. The Horticulture Zone section 32 evaluation is incomplete and flawed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The evaluation does not provide sufficient level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance of creating a special purpose zone; ii. The evaluation fails to consider the full range of zoning options and identify reasonably practicable options to achieve objectives; iii. The evaluation fails to evaluate appropriate 	Delete the proposed Horticulture Zone in its entirety, amending zoned areas to Rural Production, General Rural, Commercial or Rural Residential as appropriate.		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP

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 style="text-align: center;">zone criteria and boundaries;</p> <p>d. The PDP does not provide strategic direction or policy support for the suite of rural zones proposed, nor does it support the Horticultural Zone;</p> <p>e. The Horticulture zone has only been proposed within the Kerikeri area; and</p> <p>The Horticulture zone provisions are not sufficiently different from the Rural Production Zone (and in some instances are more permissive). The proposed Horticulture Zone fails to give effect to the National Planning Standards and does not comply with the zone framework standard 8, mandatory direction 3. While FNDC have proposed the Horticulture Zone as a "special purpose zone", the proposed Horticulture Zone does not comply with all of the special purpose zone criteria as required under mandatory direction 3:</p> <p>a. Are significant to the district, region or country Comment: The proposed Horticulture Zone has been applied selectively to the Kerikeri area and has not been mapped throughout the district despite there being other areas of current or future intensive horticulture.</p> <p>b. Are impracticable to be managed through another zone Comment: Horticultural land could be managed via both the Rural</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>Production zone or the General Rural Zone. The purpose of the Rural Production Zone is to provide for areas predominantly used for primary production activities, whilst the General Rural Zone is to provide for primary production activities and a range of activities that support primary production. Council has not utilised the General Rural Zone, nor has section 32 evaluation been undertaken to consider this option.</p> <p>c. Are impractical to be managed through a combination of spatial layers.</p> <p>Comment: A review of the proposed Rural Production Zone and Horticulture Zone provisions has confirmed that there is very little difference between the provisions of the two zones, therefore it is entirely possible to manage horticultural land by way of a zone (and a spatial layer if there is section 32 justification for a spatial response).</p> <p>FNDC have established zone criteria to support the mapping and identification of the Horticulture Zones including that the land must be located within the Kerikeri Waipapa area. This criterion is contrary to the NPS-HPL. Whilst it is acknowledged that the NPS-HPL was released following the PDP notification for submission, Council must give effect to the NPS-HPL and this policy</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>statement sufficiently provides for the protection of highly productive land, rendering the Horticulture Zone defunct.</p> <p>Under the National Planning Standards, the strategic direction provisions are key to understand the balance and trade-offs between often conflicting matters of national, regional and local importance. The proposed Strategic Direction objectives and policies are silent with respect to the proposed rural zones. The Overview Section 32 evaluation does not include any evaluation of the proposed objectives. The National Planning Standards provide a number of rural zone options which have not been evaluated within the Rural Environment section 32. In the absence of complete section 32 evaluation, it is not possible to understand why Council have chosen the suite of zones proposed.</p> <p>The purpose of the Horticulture Zone is to manage land fragmentation and reverse sensitivity effects and achieve greater protection of highly productive land. The proposed Horticulture Zone (particularly that west of Kerikeri Road) is already fragmented not only by existing residential and commercial activities, but by smaller allotments. The Horticulture Zone includes land that is not viable for horticulture due to factors such as soil type, lot sizes, and proximity of rural residential neighbours restricting the ability to spray (reverse sensitivity).</p>				
FS172.23	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	The reasons given in this primary submission and in my primary submission.	Allow		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ 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: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS350.012	Puketona Lodge Ltd		Support	<p>The reasons given in the original submission and primary submission of the submitter.</p> <p>The Horticulture zone is not an appropriate zone for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The Horticulture zone does not achieve the purpose of the RMA insofar as it does not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources; b. The Horticulture zone fails to give effect to the National Planning Standards and the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL); c. The Horticulture Zone section 32 evaluation is incomplete and flawed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The evaluation does not provide sufficient level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance of creating a special purpose zone; ii. The evaluation fails to consider the full range of zoning options and identify reasonably practicable options to achieve objectives; iii. The evaluation fails to evaluate appropriate zone criteria and boundaries; 	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP

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>d. The PDP does not provide strategic direction or policy support for the suite of rural zones proposed, nor does it support the Horticultural Zone;</p> <p>e. The Horticulture zone has only been proposed within the Kerikeri area; and</p> <p>f. The Horticulture zone provisions are not sufficiently different from the Rural Production Zone (and in some instances are more permissive).</p>				
FS441.012	Adrian and Sue Knight		Support	Delete the proposed Horticulture Zone in its entirety, amending zoned areas to Rural Production, General Rural, Commercial or Rural Residential as appropriate.	Allow	Delete	Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
S471.001	Karen and Graeme Laurie	Horticulture Zone	Oppose	<p>The Horticulture Zone (HZ) is not an appropriate zone for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HZ does not achieve the purpose of the RMA insofar as it does not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources; • HZ fails to give effect to the National Planning Standards and the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL); • HZ Section 32 evaluation is incomplete and flawed (refer specifics in full submission) • PDP does not provide strategic direction or policy support for the suite of rural 	Delete the proposed Horticulture Zone in its entirety, rezoning areas Rural Production, General Rural, Commercial or Rural Residential Zones as appropriate.	Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP	

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>zones proposed, nor does it support the Horticultural Zone</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HZ provisions are not sufficiently different from the Rural Production Zone (and in some instances are more permissive). 				
FS172.29	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	The reasons given in this primary submission and in my primary submission.	Allow		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS350.052	Puketona Lodge Ltd		Support	<p>The reasons given in the original submission and primary submission of the submitter.</p> <p>The Horticulture Zone (HZ) is not an appropriate zone for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HZ does not achieve the purpose of the RMA insofar as it does not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources; • HZ fails to give effect to the National Planning Standards and the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL); • HZ Section 32 evaluation is incomplete and flawed (refer specifics in full submission) • PDP does not provide strategic direction or policy support for the suite of rural zones proposed, nor does it support the Horticultural Zone 	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP

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"> • HZ provisions are not sufficiently different from the Rural Production Zone (and in some instances are more permissive). 				
FS441.043	Adrian and Sue Knight		Support	The reasons given in this primary submission and in my primary submission.	Allow	Delete	Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
S252.001	Hall Nominees Ltd	Horticulture Zone	Oppose	<p>The Horticulture zone is not an appropriate zone for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The Horticulture zone does not achieve the purpose of the RMA insofar as it does not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources; b. The Horticulture zone fails to give effect to the National Planning Standards and the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL); c. The Horticulture Zone section 32 evaluation is incomplete and flawed: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. The evaluation does not provide sufficient level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance of creating a special purpose zone; ii. The evaluation fails to consider the full range of zoning options and identify reasonably 	Delete the proposed Horticulture zone in its entirety, rezoning areas Rural Production, General Rural, Commercial or Rural Residential zones as appropriate.		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP

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>practicable options to achieve objectives;</p> <p>iii. The evaluation fails to evaluate appropriate zone criteria and boundaries;</p> <p>d. The PDP does not provide strategic direction or policy support for the suite of rural zones proposed, nor does it support the Horticultural Zone;</p> <p>e. The Horticulture zone has only been proposed within the Kerikeri area; and</p> <p>The Horticulture zone provisions are not sufficiently different from the Rural Production Zone (and in some instances are more permissive). The proposed Horticulture Zone fails to give effect to the National Planning Standards and does not comply with the zone framework standard 8, mandatory direction 3. While FNDC have proposed the Horticulture Zone as a "special purpose zone", the proposed Horticulture Zone does not comply with all of the special purpose zone criteria as required under mandatory direction 3:</p> <p>a. Are significant to the district, region or country Comment: The proposed Horticulture Zone has been applied selectively to the Kerikeri area and has not been mapped throughout the district despite there being other areas of current or future intensive horticulture.</p> <p>b. Are impracticable to be managed through another zone</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>Comment: Horticultural land could be managed via both the Rural Production zone or the General Rural Zone. The purpose of the Rural Production Zone is to provide for areas predominantly used for primary production activities, whilst the General Rural Zone is to provide for primary production activities and a range of activities that support primary production. Council has not utilised the General Rural Zone, nor has section 32 evaluation been undertaken to consider this option.</p> <p>c. Are impractical to be managed through a combination of spatial layers.</p> <p>Comment: A review of the proposed Rural Production Zone and Horticulture Zone provisions has confirmed that there is very little difference between the provisions of the two zones, therefore it is entirely possible to manage horticultural land by way of a zone (and a spatial layer if there is section 32 justification for a spatial response).</p> <p>FNDC have established zone criteria to support the mapping and identification of the Horticulture Zones including that the land must be located within the Kerikeri Waipapa area. This criterion is contrary to the NPS-HPL. Whilst it is acknowledged that the NPS-HPL was</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>released following the PDP notification for submission, Council must give effect to the NPS-HPL and this policy statement sufficiently provides for the protection of highly productive land, rendering the Horticulture Zone defunct.</p> <p>Under the National Planning Standards, the strategic direction provisions are key to understand the balance and trade-offs between often conflicting matters of national, regional and local importance. The proposed Strategic Direction objectives and policies are silent with respect to the proposed rural zones. The Overview Section 32 evaluation does not include any evaluation of the proposed objectives. The National Planning Standards provide a number of rural zone options which have not been evaluated within the Rural Environment section 32. In the absence of complete section 32 evaluation, it is not possible to understand why Council have chosen the suite of zones proposed.</p> <p>The purpose of the Horticulture Zone is to manage land fragmentation and reverse sensitivity effects and achieve greater protection of highly productive land. The proposed Horticulture Zone (particularly that west of Kerikeri Road) is already fragmented not only by existing residential and commercial activities, but by smaller allotments. The Horticulture Zone includes land that is not viable for horticulture due to factors such as soil type, lot sizes, and proximity of rural residential neighbours restricting the ability to spray (reverse sensitivity).</p>				
FS172.38	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	The reasons given in this primary submission and in my primary submission.	Allow		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
								Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS36.0100	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency		Oppose	Opposes the proposed rezoning/ intensification of the submitters land until there is a clearer understanding on how the proposal affects the safety, efficiency, and effectiveness of the land transport system. There needs to be clear documentation of what transport infrastructure/ upgrades/mitigation measures are needed to avoid, remedy or mitigate effects on the transport system, triggers for necessary infrastructure development and how the infrastructure will be funded. The proposed rezoning needs to ensure that it includes details as to how the proposed transport network will provide active modes and support the longer term development of public transport.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission until appropriate analysis and information has been provided for the proposed rezoning.	Accept	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS350.027	Puketona Lodge Ltd		Support	The reasons given in the original submission and primary submission of the submitter. The Horticulture zone is not an appropriate zone for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The Horticulture zone does not achieve the purpose of the RMA insofar as it does not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources; b. The Horticulture zone fails to give effect to the National Planning Standards and the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL); 	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP

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"> c. The Horticulture zone section 32 evaluation is incomplete and flawed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The evaluation does not provide sufficient level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance of creating a special purpose zone; ii. The evaluation fails to consider the full range of zoning options and identify reasonably practicable options to achieve objectives; iii. The evaluation fails to evaluate appropriate zone criteria and boundaries; d. The PDP does not provide strategic direction or policy support for the suite of rural zones proposed, nor does it support the Horticultural Zone; e. The Horticulture zone has only been proposed within the Kerikeri area; and f. The Horticulture zone provisions are not sufficiently different from the Rural Production zone (and in some instances are more permissive). 				
FS441.022	Adrian and Sue Knight		Support	Delete the proposed Horticulture zone in its entirety, rezoning areas Rural Production, General Rural, Commercial or Rural Residential zones as appropriate.	Allow	Delete	Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP

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
FS354.280	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	The submitter seeks the deletion of the Horticulture Zone and all the maps. HortNZ supports the Horticulture Zone and the mapped areas as in the Proposed Plan.	Disallow	Disallow S252.001	Accept	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS570.718	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 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS566.732	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 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS569.754	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 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
S188.001	Puketotara Lodge Ltd	Horticulture Zone	Oppose	The Horticulture Zone (HZ) is not an appropriate zone for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HZ does not achieve the purpose of the RMA insofar as it does not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources; 	Delete the proposed Horticulture Zone in its entirety, rezoning areas Rural Production, General Rural, Commercial or Rural Residential Zones as appropriate.		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP

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"> • HZ fails to give effect to the National Planning Standards and the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL); • HZ Section 32 evaluation is incomplete and flawed (refer specifics in full submission) • PDP does not provide strategic direction or policy support for the suite of rural zones proposed, nor does it support the Horticultural Zone • HZ provisions are not sufficiently different from the Rural Production Zone (and in some instances are more permissive). 				
FS172.133	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission and in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Allow		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS115.002	Glen and Sheryl Moore		Support	Submitter agrees that the proposed Horticulture zone should be removed from Puketotara Road area.	Allow	Delete the Horticulture Zone from the Proposed District Plan.	Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS350.061	Puketona Lodge Ltd		Support	The reasons given in the original submission and primary submission of the submitter to delete the Horticulture Zone. The Horticulture Zone (HZ) is not an	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP

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>appropriate zone for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HZ does not achieve the purpose of the RMA insofar as it does not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources; • HZ fails to give effect to the National Planning Standards and the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL); • HZ Section 32 evaluation is incomplete and flawed (refer specifics in full submission) • PDP does not provide strategic direction or policy support for the suite of rural zones proposed, nor does it support the Horticultural Zone • HZ provisions are not sufficiently different from the Rural Production Zone (and in some instances are more permissive). 				
FS441.052	Adrian and Sue Knight		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission and in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Allow	Delete	Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS354.279	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	The submitter seeks the deletion of the Horticulture Zone and all the maps. HortNZ supports the Horticulture Zone and the mapped areas as in the Proposed Plan.	Disallow	Disallow S188.001	Accept	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP

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
S260.001	Anton Kusanic	Horticulture Zone	Oppose	<p>The proposed rezoning of the current Rural Production Zone to horticulture appears to have been made in haste and without ground truthing. Little or no consideration appears to have been given to protecting areas that meet the soil profiles and water requirements for horticulture practice outside of Kerikeri.</p> <p>There are other areas where opportunity lies that won't have the residential intensity issues that are going to be created by the proposed changes in the Kerikeri District. For areas in the Kerikeri District that have been proposed for change from Rural Production to Horticulture I wish to raise the following points:</p> <p>Water: the current proposed horticulture zones appear to have been identified based on the ability to assess water from current supplies, i.e., follow the Kerikeri Irrigation scheme line. this water supply from our experience is not readily available in commercial quantities and in terms of a water source for vulnerable crops during the summer months is not reliable.</p> <p>Land suitability: the proposed maps identifying the proposed horticulture zones take a very broad brush approach, zones of hilly, scrubby, south facing, poor quality soils have been included. Has soil quality/type been considered in the identification of the proposed zone changes?</p> <p>Housing densities: Areas proposed for horticulture have already been developed, in some places smaller blocks already exist as a result of resource consent being granted by FNDC. Encouraging horticulture, through inhibiting other use of the land,</p>	Amend the proposed Horticulture Zoning considering the bigger long-term picture. In particular rezone all Horticulture Zoned land along Onekura Road, Pungaere and offshoots from proposed Horticulture Zone to Rural Lifestyle Zone.	Reject	<p>Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report</p> <p>Section 5.2.1</p> <p>Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP</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
				in these areas will have an impact on residential properties that have already been approved by Council. Impact on SNAs, PNAs and Conservation areas: The proposed maps have identified areas of natural importance as being in the horticulture zone, how does the Council propose to maintain protection of these sites?				
FS172.135	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support in part	Support deletion of the Horticulture Zone and reconsideration of inconsistent zoning.	Allow		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
S417.002	Kathleen Jones	Horticulture Zone	Oppose	Some land rezoned from Rural Residential zone to Horticulture zone is not suitable for horticulture and in some instances is creating a toxic environment for current residents.	Amend Horticulture zoning to revert residential land not suitable for horticulture back to Rural Residential zone (inferred).		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS172.141	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support in part	Support deletion of the Horticulture Zone and reconsideration of inconsistent zoning.	Allow		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS350.042	Puketona Lodge Ltd		Support in part	Support deletion of the Horticulture Zone and reconsideration of inconsistent zoning.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP

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
FS441.036	Adrian and Sue Knight		Support in part	Support deletion of the Horticulture Zone and reconsideration of inconsistent zoning.	Allow in part	Amend	Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
S427.026	Kapiro Residents Association	Horticulture Zone	Support in part	<p>The following roads have existing residential lifestyle properties that do not have commercial-scale orchards or visible agricultural production, clustered around a road or access lane - these could be zoned as Rural Living islands within the Horticulture zone:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Blue Gum Lane - Conifer Lane - Equestrian Drive, east side & northern area - Ironbark Road, west & northern area - McCaughan Road, southern area - Ness Road, several clusters 	<p>Amend zoning for clusters of existing small residential lifestyle properties from Horticulture Zone to Rural Lifestyle Zone where they meet the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing small residential lifestyle property less than 2.5ha, and • Without commercial agricultural/horticultural production, • Part of an existing cluster of at least 8 or so residential lifestyle properties clustered around a road or access lane [inferred]. 		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS172.407	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support in part	Support deletion of Horticulture Zone and reconsideration of inconsistent zoning.	Allow		Awaiting recommendation	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS76.002	Jo Lumkong		Support	The submitter is the owner of a small lot with poor quality soil adjoining four other properties and feels it is appropriate to offer clusters of previously subdivided rural production properties protection from horticultural zoning, in particular from health aspects such as sprays. The submitter also wishes to maintain more permissive rules to dwellings and home	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Awaiting recommendation	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP

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
				businesses than in the Rural Production zone. The proposed re-zoning is also aligned with the FNDP objectives for horticultural activities.				
FS153.1	James Brooks		Support	<p>I am a property owner and resident of Mccaughan road, which is the location to which this original submission refers. I strongly agree with all the points raised in the submission, and note also that there are similar submissions from numerous property owners throughout the area that has been proposed for new rezoning as horticultural.</p> <p>In addition to my support of the points already raised in the original submission, I would add further comment in opposition to the new horticultural zoning for Mccaughan road as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I purchased my property on Mccaughan road in 2006, a decision which took into account the nature and characteristics of the surrounding residential properties, and also the then current land zoning status. While being close to horticultural activity along Kapiro road, the Mccaughan road development provides a rural residential setting and character, as was intended under the subdivision resource consent granted in the 1990's. The current proposal to change land zoning to horticultural has potential to negatively impact on future valuation of properties located on Mccaughan road, where future buyers may be influenced in viewing the zone as less desirable for residential living. 	Allow		Awaiting recommendation	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP

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>2. The majority of residential properties along Mccaughan road are located on land adjacent to and on the north side of the Waipapa Stream and smaller tributaries. As such the land has steeper south facing slopes that are very unlikely to be suitable for horticultural purposes.</p> <p>3. Similar land characteristics exist on the south side of the Waipapa Stream, where residential properties are located in a similar environ to those on Mccaughan road. However, land on the south side remains zoned as Rural residential, suggesting that Mccaughan road should also be considered using similar logic.</p> <p>4. In view of the long established residential development that currently exists on Mccaughan road, and taking into account the non productive nature of the land, it is highly unlikely that any future horticultural activity on these properties would occur. However, any proposals, although unlikely, would significantly increase reverse sensitivity issues for neighbouring property owners, and negatively impact on property market valuation.</p> <p>For these reasons I support the original submission to oppose the new horticultural zoning proposal for of all properties on Mccaughan road.</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
FS331.001	Cheryl Silich		Support	I oppose as my property is residential and not appropriate for horticulture (inferred).	Allow	Allow the original submission	Awaiting recommendation	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS539.003	Helen Morris		Support	The beginning of Purerua Road Lot 1-8 was subdivided into residential small lifestyle properties as the soil on this land isn't good for growing.	Allow	Allow the original submission (inferred).	Awaiting recommendation	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS354.283	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	The submitter seeks rezoning of some properties in the Horticulture Zone based on criteria so there would be 'Rural Living' Islands within the Horticulture Zone. Such an approach would mean that there will not be a contiguous zone and would not be able to meet the objectives and policies for the zone.	Disallow	Disallow S427.026	Awaiting recommendation	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS218.1	Ian Wolstencroft		Oppose	<p>A significant cluster of sites surrounding 64 Ness Road, Waipapa (refer Goggle Earth attached) have existing residential lifestyles that do not have commercial-scale orchards or visible agricultural production.</p> <p>There are 20 properties surrounding 64 Ness Road, (11 on the North side: 9 South side).</p> <p>30% of these are 0.1Ha-0.6Ha 20% 0.7Ha-2.0Ha: 15% 2.1Ha-2.9Ha 35% representing 7 properties are 3.0-5.0Ha.</p> <p>All the above properties are to be re-zoned Horticulture from Rural Production with only two of the 20</p>	Allow in part		Awaiting recommendation	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP

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>properties likely meeting any definition of commercial horticulture production.</p> <p>Council is required by the government to give effect to higher policy documents, but also in its role under the Local Government Act it is to enable democratic local decision making and action by and on behalf of communities, so in essence it is also required to represent the needs and wants of ratepayers and the community back to the government.</p> <p>I oppose the wholesale re-zoning of this Cluster on the basis that most properties will never be commercially horticulturally productive and yet will suffer the restrictive conditions imposed in this re-zoning.</p>			
S209.001	Audrey Campbell-Frear	Horticulture Zone	Oppose	<p>The Horticulture Zone (HZ) is not an appropriate zone for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HZ does not achieve the purpose of the RMA insofar as it does not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources; • HZ fails to give effect to the National Planning Standards and the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL); • HZ Section 32 evaluation is incomplete and flawed (refer specifics in full submission) • PDP does not provide strategic direction or policy support for the suite of rural zones proposed, nor does it support the Horticultural Zone 	Delete the proposed Horticulture Zone in its entirety, rezoning areas Rural Production, General Rural, Commercial or Rural Residential Zones as appropriate.	Reject	<p>Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report</p> <p>Section 5.2.1</p> <p>Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP</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
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HZ has only been proposed within the Kerikeri area • HZ provisions are not sufficiently different from the Rural Production Zone (and in some instances are more permissive). 				
FS115.001	Glen and Sheryl Moore		Support	The submission has been prepared by an accredited Hearings Commissioner who has looked into the legality of the Proposed Horticulture Zone in Kerikeri and has requested FNDC to remove this zone.	Allow	Delete the Horticulture Zone from the Proposed District Plan.	Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS350.016	Puketona Lodge Ltd		Support	<p>The reasons given in the original submission and primary submission of the submitter.</p> <p>The Horticulture Zone (HZ) is not an appropriate zone for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HZ does not achieve the purpose of the RMA insofar as it does not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources; • HZ fails to give effect to the National Planning Standards and the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL); • HZ Section 32 evaluation is incomplete and flawed (refer specifics in full submission) • PDP does not provide strategic direction or policy support for the suite of rural zones proposed, nor does it support the Horticultural Zone 	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP

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"> • HZ has only been proposed within the Kerikeri area • HZ provisions are not sufficiently different from the Rural Production Zone (and in some instances are more permissive). 				
FS441.016	Adrian and Sue Knight		Support	Delete the proposed Horticulture Zone in its entirety, rezoning areas Rural Production, General Rural, Commercial or Rural Residential Zones as appropriate	Allow	Delete	Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS566.498	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 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
S35.001	Elaine Collinson	Horticulture Zone	Oppose	The areas off of Kapiro Road that have been suggested to be designated as Horticulture should either remain as Rural Production or convert to Rural Residential. A lot of the sections are smaller than 1ha and already have a house on them. These sections are unlikely to be reverted to horticultural use and are limiting the current home owners from pursuing avenues such as subdivision or additional building. Submitter lives down Conifer Lane and is wanting to put a granny flat.	Amend the zoning of the land off Kapiro Road, Kerikeri from Horticulture Zone, to Rural Production or Rural Residential, or alternatively limit what is going to be Horticultural Zone based on the size of the property (>5ha).		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS394.001	Michael Francis Toft, Robert George Vellenoweth and Colleen		Support	For the reasons given within the Original Submission	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ 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
	Wendy, Wardlaw, AJ Maloney Trustee Limited, Donald Frank Orr, Vivien Marie Coad, Deanna Lee MacDonald, Dianne Catherine Hamilton, Robert Hamilton, Timothy George Sopp, Mathew Robert Hill, Barry Charles Young, Joan Catherine Young, Campbell Family Trustee Limited							Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS243.244	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose	Kāinga Ora is interested in the proposed change from rural production to an urban zone. Kāinga Ora wishes to see further details to the proposed change and how the proposed change will fit with the district's planned and future growth. Kāinga Ora is interested in understanding the balance of enabling urban development while maintaining productive rural environments.	Disallow in part	Amend the zoning of the land off Kapiro Road, Kerikeri from Horticulture Zone, to Rural Production or Rural Residential, or alternatively limit what is going to be Horticultural Zone based on the size of the property (>5ha)	Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP