



Addendum to Rural Residential Zone section 42A report Hearing 9

1. This addendum has been prepared by Melissa Pearson as the reporting officer for Hearing 9 of the Proposed Far North District Plan (PDP). It has been prepared with respect to the section 42A report for the Rural Residential Zone, dated 4 November 2024.

1 Missed submission point from Horticulture New Zealand

1.1 Summary of submission

2. It was brought to my attention by Horticulture New Zealand that their submission point S159.186 relating to RRZ-S3 had not been responded to in the Rural Residential Zone section 42A report. After a review of the Summary of Submissions, I found that S159.186 had been incorrectly assigned to RLZ-S3 as opposed to RRZ-S3.
3. Horticulture New Zealand (S159.186) requests that minimum building setback in RRZ-S3 from the boundary of any Rural Production zone is at least 20m (as opposed to 10m) on the basis that 10m is not considered to be sufficient to mitigate potential reverse sensitivity effects.

1.2 Analysis

4. Although specific analysis of S159.186 was not undertaken in the section 42A report for the Rural Residential Zone, I recommended in paragraph 145 of that report that RRZ-S3 be amended to use more consistent, standard wording with respect to setbacks from Rural Production and Horticulture Zones. This was to ensure consistency between similar standards (e.g. RLZ-S3 and RRZ-S3) and manage the interface between productive rural zones and rural zones primarily for residential activities appropriately.
5. In Appendix 1 of the Rural Residential Zone section 42A report, the recommended wording of RRZ-S3 is as follows (my emphasis in red text):

RRZ-S3	Setback (excluding from MHWS or wetland, lake and river margins)	
Rural Residential zone	The building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure must be setback at least 3m from all site boundaries, except: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. no building is erected within 12m of any road boundary with Kerikeri Road on properties with a road frontage with Kerikeri Road between its intersection with SH10 and Cannon Drive; and 	Where the standard is not met, matters of discretion are restricted to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. the character and amenity of the surrounding area; b. screening, planting and landscaping on the site; c. the design and siting of the building or structure

	<p>2. minimum building setback from the boundary of any Rural Production zone is at least 10m, and from any boundary with the mineral extraction overlay the setback is at least 20m; <u>and</u></p> <p>3. <u>habitable buildings must be setback at least 20m from the boundary of an unsealed road;</u>¹</p> <p>4. <u>habitable buildings must be setback 30m from the boundary of a site containing a commercial forest;</u>² <u>and</u></p> <p>5. <u>buildings containing sensitive activities must be setback at least 20m from the boundary of a Rural Production Zone or a Horticulture Zone</u>³.</p> <p>This standard does not apply to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. fences or walls no more than 2m in height above ground level; or ii. uncovered decks less than 1m in height above ground level; or iii. underground wastewater infrastructure; or iv. water tanks less than 2.7m in height above ground level. 	<p>with respect to privacy and shading;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> d. natural hazard mitigation and site constraints; e. the effectiveness of the proposed method for controlling stormwater; f. the safety and efficiency of the current or future access, egress on site and the roading network; and g. the impacts on existing and planned public walkways, reserves and esplanades; h. <u>reverse sensitivity effects on primary production activities;</u>⁴ i. <u>the health and amenity impacts of dust from unsealed roads on habitable buildings;</u>⁵ j. <u>the location and design of the building as it relates to the ability to safely use, access and maintain buildings without requiring access on, above or over the rail corridor; and</u> k. <u>the safe and efficient operation of the rail network</u>⁶.
--	---	--

6. I consider that the recommended wording for RRZ-S3 addresses the missed submission point S159.186 from Horticulture New Zealand as it was made to achieve consistency with other similar requested amendments by Horticulture New Zealand in other rural zones (as per the footnote in red text below).

¹ Consequential amendment under clause 10(2)(b), Schedule 1, RMA resulting from LJ King Ltd (S464.040) and others

² Consequential amendment under clause 10(2)(b), Schedule 1, RMA resulting from Manulife Forest (S160.041) and others

³ Consequential amendment under clause 10(2)(b), Schedule 1, RMA resulting from Horticulture NZ (S159.181, S159.182 and S159.184)

⁴ Ibid

⁵ Consequential amendment under clause 10(2)(b), Schedule 1, RMA resulting from Ngai Tai Ora (S516.003)

⁶ Consequential amendment under clause 10(2)(b), Schedule 1, RMA resulting from KiwiRail (S416.058)



1.3 Recommendation

7. I do not recommend any additional changes to RRZ-S3 as I consider that the version of RRZ-S3 in the Rural Residential section 42A report already addresses the relief sought by Horticulture New Zealand.
8. In my Right of Reply I will confirm this outcome and update Appendix 2 to include a response to S159.186.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "James R Witham".

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

Date: 5 November 2024