

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S333.097	P S Yates Family Trust	Overview	Support in part	Land zoned Rural lifestyle is not necessarily close to urban areas and settlements as expressed in the overview. There are, for example, pockets of Rural lifestyle zoned land in the eastern Bay of Islands which are not close to urban areas and settlements.	Amend the Overview as follows: Given the proximity of <b>most of</b> this zone to urban areas and settlements, there is the potential for activities that are more typically associated with urban areas to seek to establish in this zone.		Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies
S168.105	Setar Thirty Six Limited	Overview	Support in part	Land zoned Rural lifestyle is not necessarily close to urban areas and settlements as expressed in the overview. There are, for example, pockets of Rural lifestyle zoned land in the eastern Bay of Islands which are not close to urban areas and settlements	Amend the Overview as follows: Given the proximity of <b>most of</b> this zone to urban areas and settlements, there is the potential for activities that are more typically associated with urban areas to seek to establish in this zone.		Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies
S187.090	The Shooting Box Limited	Overview	Support in part	Land zoned Rural lifestyle is not necessarily close to urban areas and settlements as expressed in the overview. There are, for example, pockets of Rural lifestyle zoned land in the eastern Bay of Islands which are not close to urban areas and settlements.	Amend the Overview as follows: Given the proximity of <b>most of</b> this zone to urban areas and settlements, there is the potential for activities that are more typically associated with urban areas to seek to establish in this zone.		Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies
S159.178	Horticulture New Zealand	Overview	Support	The inclusion of a Rural Lifestyle zone is consistent with the National Planning Standards	Retain the Overview		Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS151.23	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RLZ 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
<b>FS570.340</b>	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	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies
<b>FS566.354</b>	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	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies
<b>FS569.376</b>	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	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies
<b>S167.103</b>	Bentzen Farm Limited	Overview	Support in part	Land zoned Rural lifestyle is not necessarily close to urban areas and settlements as expressed in the overview. There are, for example, pockets of Rural lifestyle zoned land in the eastern Bay of Islands which are not close to urban areas and settlements, including at Parekura Bay.	Amend the Overview as follows: Given the proximity of <b>most of</b> this zone to urban areas and settlements, there is the potential for activities that are more typically associated with urban areas to seek to establish in this zone.		Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies
<b>FS566.465</b>	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	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RLZ 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
S454.110	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	Objectives	Not Stated	Objective RLZ-O1 sets out that the Rural Lifestyle Zone is used predominantly for low density residential activities and compatible small-scale farming activities. Due to its linear nature and the requirement to connect new electricity generation to the National Grid, regardless of where the new generation facilities are located, transmission lines may need to traverse any zone within the Far North District.  Critical infrastructure such as the National Grid sometimes has a functional need to locate in the Rural Lifestyle Zone and needs to be provided for. A new objective is required to address this.	Insert new objective RLZ-Ox as follows: <b>The Rural Lifestyle zone is used by compatible activities and infrastructure, that have a functional or operational need to locate in the zone.</b>		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions
FS243.157	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, as it is inconsistent with its primary submission. The amendment is unnecessary	Disallow	(similar relief sought to above submission - numerous points)	Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions
FS369.502	Top Energy		Support	Top Energy supports the objective to provide for infrastructure that has a functional or operational need to locate in the zone.	Allow		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions
S349.020	Neil Construction Limited	Objectives	Oppose	The broader Tubbs Farm land area has already been subject to significant rural residential subdivision and development in accordance with resource consents and the existing planning framework. This has involved substantial infrastructure investment in	Delete or amend objectives to provide for rural residential subdivision of 3,000m2 lots and delete references to rural character and amenity.		Reject	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Neil Construction Limited submission on the RLZ chapter

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				this land to date, and has created an emerging residential land use pattern that should be continued				
<b>FS62.054</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 1		Oppose	The broader Tubbs Farm land area has already been subject to significant rural residential subdivision and development in accordance with resource consents and the existing planning framework. This has involved substantial infrastructure investment in this land to date, and has created an emerging residential land use pattern that should be continued	Disallow	Re-zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland) in Rural Production or Horticulture zone etc.	Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Neil Construction Limited submission on the RLZ chapter
<b>FS333.041</b>	Maree Hart		Oppose	<p>These submissions seek inappropriate changes, such as re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, Spoonbill Drive and Kingfisher Drive from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential. Some points seek to weaken the policies and rules / standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural Lifestyle zone and Rural Residential zone, e.g. S349 seeks to delete references to 'rural character' and 'amenity' for the Rural Residential zone.</p> <p>The scale and intensity of urban / residential development sought by these submissions would create a new township in the rural areas at the northern end of Landing Road; this scale and density of development is not anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans.</p> <p>It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area that lacks relevant infrastructure and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town in future. Their proposed changes would generate a large number of</p>	Disallow	Re-zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland) in Rural Production or Horticulture zone etc.	Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Neil Construction Limited submission on the RLZ chapter

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				cumulative adverse effects, such as a large increase in traffic on Landing Road, one-lane bridge and other adverse effects noted under my Further Submission 1 above.				
<b>S333.098</b>	P S Yates Family Trust	RLZ-O1	Support	The objectives are the most appropriate to achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991 and give effect to higher order planning documents as required.	Retain Objective RLZ-O1		Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies
<b>S168.106</b>	Setar Thirty Six Limited	RLZ-O1	Support	The objective is the most appropriate to achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991 and give effect to higher order planning documents as required	Retain Objective RLZ-O1		Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies
<b>S187.091</b>	The Shooting Box Limited	RLZ-O1	Support	The objectives are the most appropriate to achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991 and give effect to higher order planning documents as required.	Retain Objectives RLZ-O1 - RLZ-O4		Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies
<b>S167.104</b>	Benzen Farm Limited	RLZ-O1	Support	The objectives are the most appropriate to achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991 and give effect to higher order planning documents as required.	Retain Objectives RLZ-O1 - RLZ-O4		Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies
<b>FS566.466</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow		Reject	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

<b>Submission Point</b>	<b>Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)</b>	<b>Provision</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Summary of Decision Requested</b>		<b>Officer recommendation</b>	<b>Relevant section of S42A Report</b>
<b>S333.099</b>	P S Yates Family Trust	RLZ-O2	Support	The objectives are the most appropriate to achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991 and give effect to higher order planning documents as required.	Retain Objective RLZ-O2		Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies
<b>S168.107</b>	Setar Thirty Six Limited	RLZ-O2	Support	The objective is the most appropriate to achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991 and give effect to higher order planning documents as required	Retain Objective RLZ-O2		Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies
<b>S187.108</b>	The Shooting Box Limited	RLZ-O2	Support	The objectives are the most appropriate to achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991 and give effect to higher order planning documents as required.	Retain Objectives RLZ-O1 - RLZ-O4		Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies
<b>S167.118</b>	Bentzen Farm Limited	RLZ-O2	Support	The objectives are the most appropriate to achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991 and give effect to higher order planning documents as required.	Retain Objectives RLZ-O1 - RLZ-O4		Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies
<b>FS566.479</b>	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	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies
<b>S333.100</b>	P S Yates Family Trust	RLZ-O3	Support	The objectives are the most appropriate to achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991 and give effect to higher order planning documents as required.	Retain Objective RLZ-O3		Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RLZ 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
<b>S168.108</b>	Setar Thirty Six Limited	RLZ-O3	Support	The objective is the most appropriate to achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991 and give effect to higher order planning documents as required	Retain Objective RLZ-O3		Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies
<b>S331.069</b>	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	RLZ-O3	Support	The submitter supports objective RLZ-O3 as it provides for activities compatible with the role, function, and predominant character and amenity of the Rural Lifestyle Zone, noting that childcare and education are an integral part of a rural lifestyle community and contributes to its overall sense of place.	Retain objective RLZ-O3 as proposed		Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies
<b>S187.109</b>	The Shooting Box Limited	RLZ-O3	Support	The objectives are the most appropriate to achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991 and give effect to higher order planning documents as required.	Retain Objectives RLZ-O1 - RLZ-O4		Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies
<b>S167.119</b>	Bentzen Farm Limited	RLZ-O3	Support	The objectives are the most appropriate to achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991 and give effect to higher order planning documents as required.	Retain Objectives RLZ-O1 - RLZ-O4		Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies
<b>FS566.480</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow		Reject	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies
<b>S333.101</b>	P S Yates Family Trust	RLZ-O4	Support	The objectives are the most appropriate to achieve the purpose of	Retain Objective RLZ-O4		Accept	RLZ 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
				the RMA 1991 and give effect to higher order planning documents as required.				Key Issue 2: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies
<b>S168.109</b>	Setar Thirty Six Limited	RLZ-O4	Support	The objective is the most appropriate to achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991 and give effect to higher order planning documents as required.	Retain Objective RLZ-O4		Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies
<b>S187.110</b>	The Shooting Box Limited	RLZ-O4	Support	The objectives are the most appropriate to achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991 and give effect to higher order planning documents as required.	Retain Objectives RLZ-O1 - RLZ-O4		Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies
<b>S159.179</b>	Horticulture New Zealand	RLZ-O4	Support	It is important that Rural Lifestyle zone activities do not compromise activities in the adjacent Rural Production zone	Retain Objective RLZ-O4		Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies
<b>FS570.341</b>	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	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies
<b>FS566.355</b>	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	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RLZ 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
FS569.377	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	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies
S167.120	Bentzen Farm Limited	RLZ-O4	Support	The objectives are the most appropriate to achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991 and give effect to higher order planning documents as required.	Retain Objectives RLZ-O1 - RLZ-O4		Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS566.481	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	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies
S454.111	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	Policies	Not Stated	RLZ-P1 sets out the activities that are to be enabled in the Rural Lifestyle zone. Transpower supports the intent of this policy, however critical infrastructure, such as the National Grid, is not clearly provided for. Due to its linear nature and the requirement to connect new electricity generation to the National Grid, regardless of where the new generation facilities are located, transmission lines may need to traverse any zone within the Far North District. A new policy is required to make it explicit that infrastructure such as the National Grid is enabled in the Rural Lifestyle zone.	Insert new policy RLZ-Px as follows: <b>Enable compatible activities and infrastructure, that have a functional or operational need to locate in the Rural Lifestyle zone.</b>		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions
FS243.168	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, as it is inconsistent with its primary submission. The amendment is unnecessary.	Disallow	(similar relief sought to above submission - numerous points)	Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.4

## Proposed Far North District Plan – 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
<b>FS369.503</b>	Top Energy		Support	Top Energy supports the objective to provide for infrastructure that has a functional or operational need to locate in the zone.	Allow		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions
<b>S529.156</b>	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 until the regional council has implemented the NPS-HPL.	Amend policies to have firm policy around protecting a key natural resource - productive land - now and for future generations.		Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
<b>FS570.2044</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies
<b>FS566.2058</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies
<b>FS569.2080</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	RLZ 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: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies
<b>S349.021</b>	Neil Construction Limited	Policies	Oppose	The broader Tubbs Farm land area has already been subject to significant rural residential subdivision and development in accordance with resource consents and the existing planning framework. This has involved substantial infrastructure investment in this land to date, and has created an emerging residential land use pattern that should be continued	Delete or amend policies to provide for rural residential subdivision of 3,000m2 lots and delete references to rural character and amenity.		Reject	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Neil Construction Limited submission on the RLZ chapter
<b>FS62.055</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 1		Oppose	The broader Tubbs Farm land area has already been subject to significant rural residential subdivision and development in accordance with resource consents and the existing planning framework. This has involved substantial infrastructure investment in this land to date, and has created an emerging residential land use pattern that should be continued	Disallow	Re-zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland) in Rural Production or Horticulture zone etc.	Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Neil Construction Limited submission on the RLZ chapter
<b>FS333.042</b>	Maree Hart		Oppose	These submissions seek inappropriate changes, such as re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, Spoonbill Drive and Kingfisher Drive from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential. Some points seek to weaken the policies and rules / standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural Lifestyle zone and Rural Residential zone, e.g. S349 seeks to delete references to 'rural character' and 'amenity' for the Rural Residential zone.  The scale and intensity of urban / residential development sought by these submissions would create a new	Disallow	Re-zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland) in Rural Production or Horticulture zone etc.	Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Neil Construction Limited submission on the RLZ chapter

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>township in the rural areas at the northern end of Landing Road; this scale and density of development is not anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans.</p> <p>It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area that lacks relevant infrastructure and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town in future. Their proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects, such as a large increase in traffic on Landing Road, one-lane bridge and other adverse effects noted under my Further Submission 1 above.</p>			
<b>S333.102</b>	P S Yates Family Trust	RLZ-P1	Support	The objectives are the most appropriate to achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991 and give effect to higher order planning documents as required.	Retain Policy RLZ-P1	Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies
<b>S168.110</b>	Setar Thirty Six Limited	RLZ-P1	Support	The policy is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Policy RLZ-P1	Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies
<b>S187.092</b>	The Shooting Box Limited	RLZ-P1	Support	The policies RLZ-P1- RLZ-P4 are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives.	Retain Policies RLZ-P1- RLZ-P3	Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies
<b>S331.070</b>	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	RLZ-P1	Support in part	The submitter supports in part policy RLZ-P1 as it provides for activities compatible with the role, function and predominant character and amenity of	Amend policy RLZ-P1 as follows: Enable activities that will not compromise the role, function and predominant character and amenity of the Rural Lifestyle Zone, while	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
				the Rural Lifestyle zone. However, educational facilities with student attendance higher than 4 may be required to support the rural environment and could be considered compatible with the role, function and predominant character and amenity.	ensuring their design, scale and intensity is appropriate to manage adverse effects in the zone, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. low density residential activities;</li> <li>b. small scale farming activities;</li> <li>c. home business activities;</li> <li>d. visitor accommodation; and</li> <li>e. <del>small scale</del> educational facilities.</li> </ul>			Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions
<b>S167.105</b>	Bentzen Farm Limited	RLZ-P1	Support	The policies RLZ-P1- RLZ-P4 are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives.	Retain Policies RLZ-P1- RLZ-P3 (policy RLZ-P4 also inferred)		Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies
<b>FS566.467</b>	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	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies
<b>S333.103</b>	P S Yates Family Trust	RLZ-P2	Support	The policies RLZ-P1- RLZ-P4 are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Policy RLZ-P2		Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies
<b>S168.111</b>	Setar Thirty Six Limited	RLZ-P2	Support	The policy is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Policy RLZ-P2		Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies
<b>S187.111</b>	The Shooting Box Limited	RLZ-P2	Support	The objectives are the most appropriate to achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991 and give effect to higher order planning documents as required.	Retain Policies RLZ-P1 - RLZP3		Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RLZ 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
<b>S167.121</b>	Bentzen Farm Limited	RLZ-P2	Support	The policies RLZ-P1- RLZ-P4 are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives.	Retain Policies RLZ-P1- RLZ-P3 (policy RLZ-P4 also inferred)	Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies
<b>FS566.482</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow	Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies
<b>S333.104</b>	P S Yates Family Trust	RLZ-P3	Support	The policies RLZ-P1- RLZ-P4 are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Policy RLZ-P3	Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies
<b>S168.112</b>	Setar Thirty Six Limited	RLZ-P3	Support	The policy is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Policy RLZ-P3	Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies
<b>S187.112</b>	The Shooting Box Limited	RLZ-P3	Support	The objectives are the most appropriate to achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991 and give effect to higher order planning documents as required.	Retain Policies RLZ-P1 - RLZ-P3	Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies
<b>S159.180</b>	Horticulture New Zealand	RLZ-P3	Support	It is important that Rural Lifestyle zone activities do not compromise activities in the adjacent Rural Production zone.	Retain Policy RLZ-P3	Accept	RLZ 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: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies
<b>FS151.24</b>	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies
<b>FS570.342</b>	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	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies
<b>FS566.356</b>	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	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies
<b>FS569.378</b>	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	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies
<b>S167.122</b>	Bentzen Farm Limited	RLZ-P3	Support	The policies RLZ-P1- RLZ-P4 are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives.	Retain Policies RLZ-P1- RLZ-P3 (policy RLZ-P4 also inferred).		Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RLZ 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
FS566.483	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	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies
S333.105	P S Yates Family Trust	RLZ-P4	Support	The policies RLZ-P1- RLZ-P4 are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Policy RLZ-P4		Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies
S168.113	Setar Thirty Six Limited	RLZ-P4	Support	The policy is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Policy RLZ-P4		Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies
S187.118	The Shooting Box Limited	RLZ-P4	Support	The policies RLZ-P1- RLZ-P4 are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives.	Retain Policies RLZ-P1- RLZ-P3 (policy RLZ-P4 also inferred)		Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies
S159.181	Horticulture New Zealand	RLZ-P4	Support in part	Visitor accommodation should be set back from the adjacent Rural Production zone.	Not stated		Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies
FS151.25	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow	Accept in part	Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RLZ 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
<b>FS570.343</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Accept in part	Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies
<b>FS566.357</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Accept in part	Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies
<b>FS569.379</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Accept in part	Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies
<b>S416.049</b>	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	RLZ-P4	Support in part	Policies in each zone provide for managing land use and subdivision to address the effects of the activity at zone interfaces by requiring the provision of 'setbacks, fencing, screening or landscaping required to address potential conflicts'. KiwiRail seeks an amendment to provide for the consideration of setbacks to the railway corridor or transport network, thus supporting safety and the railway setback rule sought	Insert additional matter as follows: <b>the location and design of buildings adjacent to the railway corridor</b>		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions
<b>FS243.135</b>	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the requested 5m setback; a considerably reduced set back would provide adequate space for maintenance activities within sites adjacent to the rail network. In doing so, it will continue to protect the safe,	Disallow	Insert additional matter as follows: the location and design of buildings adjacent to the railway corridor	Accept	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				efficient, and effective operation of the rail infrastructure while balancing the cost on landowners. The amendments are unnecessary.				Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions
<b>S67.014</b>	Michael John Winch	RLZ-P4	Oppose	<p>I oppose the lack of protection for the life-supporting capacity of the soil and highly productive soils in the Rural Lifestyle Zone Policies.</p> <p>The Rural Lifestyle zone is a Rural zone with a greater residential intensity than the Rural Production zone, while still enabling people to undertake primary production activities such as growing food and grazing livestock. As such, protection of the productive value of soil is important.</p>	Insert to Policy RLZ-P4: managing adverse effects on the life-supporting capacity of soil and the protection of highly productive land.		Accept in part	<p>RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2</p> <p>Key Issue 2: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies</p>
<b>FS346.837</b>	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 in part	<p>RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2</p> <p>Key Issue 2: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies</p>
<b>FS566.063</b>	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	<p>RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2</p> <p>Key Issue 2: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies</p>
<b>S167.130</b>	Bentzen Farm Limited	RLZ-P4	Support	The policies RLZ-P1- RLZ-P4 are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives.	Retain Policies RLZ-P1- RLZ-P3 (policy RLZ-P4 also inferred).		Accept in part	<p>RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2</p> <p>Key Issue 2: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies</p>
<b>FS566.489</b>	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	Accept in part	<p>RLZ 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
							Key Issue 2: RLZ Overview, Objectives and Policies
							inconsistent with our original submission
<b>S333.106</b>	P S Yates Family Trust	Rules	Support	The rules are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Rules RLZ-R1 - RLZ-R28	Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments
<b>S438.011</b>	New Zealand Motor Caravan Association	Rules	Support in part	The NZMCA operates a number of campgrounds and park over properties that are present in a variety of zones. Allowing for more permissive rules around the establishment of campgrounds will make it easier to establish sites for self-contained vehicle-based camping in the Far North District. This will also create positive social and economic benefits for the community.	Amend Rural Lifestyle Zone rules to provide for camping sites of 10 guests and under as a permitted activity and require a consent for camping sites over 10 guests and under 20 guests (inferred).	Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments
<b>S187.093</b>	The Shooting Box Limited	Rules	Support	The rules are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives.	Retain Rules RLZ-R1 - RLZ-R28.	Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments
<b>S149.001</b>	Robert Adams	Rules	Support in part	<p>The Rural Lifestyle zone applies to rear sites along the length of Long Beach Road at Long Beach. These sites are connected to the sewerage system, are very narrow and very deep with many (but not all) running either to the top of the ridge of half way up.</p> <p>The problem with having the Rural Lifestyle zoning for the developed part of the site at the bottom of the cliffs is that the site coverage and impermeable rules are unnecessarily restrictive at 12.5 % because those limits are designed for sites of 2</p>	<p>Amend rules to add an additional clause as follows:</p> <p><b>For lots under 2 ha and/or with access lots site impermeability is calculated on the net site area and for lots under 2 ha and/or with access lots, building coverage is calculated on the net site area.</b></p>	Reject	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 4: RLZ - R2 – Impermeable Surface coverage

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>hectares plus. At a guess most of the houses already built would be well over the 12.5 limits now.</p> <p>Clearly this is too restrictive and not equitable when front lots onto Long Beach road do not lose impermeability and site coverage allowances to a long driveway.</p>				
<b>FS332.248</b>	Russell Protection Society		Oppose	The rear sites at Long Beach are elevated and highly visible in this iconic landscape and hence are more appropriately zoned Rural Lifestyle.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept in part	<p>RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3</p> <p>Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments</p>
<b>S167.106</b>	Bentzen Farm Limited	Rules	Support	The rules are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Rules RLZ-R1 - RLZ-R28		Accept in part	<p>RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3</p> <p>Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments</p>
<b>FS566.468</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow		Accept in part	<p>RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3</p> <p>Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments</p>
<b>S512.051</b>	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.</p> <p>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</p>	<p>Insert new rule for Emergency service facilities included as a permitted activity</p> <p>Emergency service facilities are exempt from standards relating to setback distances, vehicle crossings</p>		Reject	<p>Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4</p> <p>Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions</p>

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>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.</p> <p>The draft Plan currently only includes emergency services facilities as an activity in some zones and with varying activity status. In addition, fire stations have specific requirements with relation to setback distances and vehicle crossings. Fire and Emergency request that emergency service facilities are exempt from these standards.</p>			
<b>S338.055</b>	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	Rules	Not Stated	<p>The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.</p>	<p>Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>	Accept in part	<p>Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions</p> <p>RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards</p>

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>			
<b>FS354.241</b>	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 S338.055	Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions  RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>FS570.993</b>	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  RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS566.1007	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  RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
FS569.1029	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  RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>S427.064</b>	Kapiro Residents Association	Rules	Support in part	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>		Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions  RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>FS354.242</b>	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 S427.064	Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions  RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
								Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>S449.051</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust	Rules	Support	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>		Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions  RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>FS354.243</b>	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 S449.051	Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions  RLZ 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: RLZ General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
FS569.1850	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions  RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
FS570.1867	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  RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>S529.162</b>	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	Rules	Not Stated	We consider that all zones, except urban zones, need to be covered by firm PDP policies and rules to protect a key natural resource - productive land - now and for future generations. This means preventing fragmentation and loss of productive land from productive use, especially LUC Class 1-3 land and productive types of soil/land suitable for horticulture. It is not necessary to wait until the regional council has implemented the NPS-HPL.	Amend rules to protect a key natural resource - productive land - now and for future generations.		Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
<b>FS354.244</b>	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	Protection of highly productive land is supported	Allow	Allow S529.162	Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
<b>FS570.2050</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
<b>FS566.2064</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
<b>FS569.2086</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
								Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
<b>S529.163</b>	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	Rules	Not Stated	We consider that all zones, except urban zones, need to be covered by firm PDP policies and rules to protect a key natural resource - productive land - now and for future generations. This means preventing fragmentation and loss of productive land from productive use, especially LUC Class 1-3 land and productive types of soil/land suitable for horticulture. It is not necessary to wait until the regional council has implemented the NPS-HPL.	Amend rules to protect a key natural resource - productive land - now and for future generations.		Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
<b>FS570.2051</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
<b>FS566.2065</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
<b>FS569.2087</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>S529.212</b>	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	Rules	Support in part	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>		Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions  RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>FS570.2099</b>	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  RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
								Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>FS566.2113</b>	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  RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>FS569.2135</b>	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  RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>S368.044</b>	Far North District Council	Notes	Support in part	Missing the word 'chapter' in NOTE 2	Amend notes		Accept in part	RLZ 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
					<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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. 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</li> <li>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 <b>chapter</b> contains rules for activities within wetland, lake and river margins. The Natural Character chapter should be referred to in addition to this zone chapter.</li> </ol>		Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments
S368.068	Far North District Council	RLZ-R1	Support in part	The 'New buildings or structures, and extensions or alterations to existing buildings or structures' rule in each zone needs to be amended to include activities that are permitted, controlled and restricted discretionary, where applicable within the zone. As currently drafted a breach of this rule makes the activity 'discretionary', which was not the intent if the activity itself is permitted, controlled or restricted	Amend RLZ-R1 " ... New buildings or structures, and extensions or alterations to existing buildings or structures Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The new building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure, will accommodate a permitted	Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: 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
				discretionary ... the standards in PER-2 should apply.	(where applicable, words to the effect...'or controlled, or restricted discretionary') activity ... "		
<b>S168.114</b>	Setar Thirty Six Limited	RLZ-R1	Support	The rule is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Rule RLZ-R1	Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments
<b>S512.098</b>	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	RLZ-R1	Not Stated	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
<b>S482.003</b>	House Movers Section of New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc	RLZ-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 RLZ-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

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS23.149	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
S431.124	John Andrew Riddell	RLZ-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
FS332.124	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan Wide or Rural Wide Submissions
S338.053	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	RLZ-R1	Not Stated	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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</li> </ul>		Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions  RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					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"> <li>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.</li> </ul>			
<b>FS354.245</b>	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 S338.053	Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions  RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>FS570.991</b>	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  RLZ 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: RLZ General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>FS566.1005</b>	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  RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>FS569.1027</b>	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  RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>S427.061</b>	Kapiro Residents Association	RLZ-R1	Support in part	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>		Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions  RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>FS354.246</b>	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 S427.061	Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions  RLZ 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: RLZ General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>S449.049</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust	RLZ-R1	Support	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>		Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions  RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>FS354.247</b>	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	Disallow	Disallow S449.049	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
				and contribute to the economic and social wellbeing of the community.				Key Issue 5: Definitions  RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>FS569.1848</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions  RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>FS570.1865</b>	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  RLZ 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: RLZ General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>S529.209</b>	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	RLZ-R1	Support in part	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>		Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions  RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>FS570.2096</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
								Key Issue 5: Definitions  RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>FS566.2110</b>	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  RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>FS569.2132</b>	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  RLZ 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: RLZ General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>S168.115</b>	Setar Thirty Six Limited	RLZ-R2	Support	The rule is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Rule RLZ-R2	Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: RLZ-R2 Impermeable Surface Coverage
<b>S481.004</b>	Puketotara Lodge Ltd	RLZ-R2	Not Stated	<p>The submitter seeks to ensure that the PDP adequately controls effects from stormwater discharge, particularly between sites or adjacent sites.</p> <p>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 <b>adjacent</b> waterbodies (including groundwater and aquifers) or on adjoining <b>adjacent</b> sites; Insert the following as additional matters of discretion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Avoiding nuisance or damage to adjacent or downstream properties;</b></li> <li>• <b>The extent to which the diversion and discharge maintains pre-development stormwater run-off flows and volumes;</b></li> <li>• <b>The extent to which the diversion and discharge mimics natural run-off patterns.</b></li> </ul>	Accept in part	<p>RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4</p> <p>Key Issue 4: RLZ-R2 Impermeable Surface Coverage</p> <p>Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4</p> <p>Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions</p>
<b>S283.015</b>	Trent Simpkin	RLZ-R2	Oppose	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	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	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: RLZ-R2 Impermeable Surface Coverage

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>RC's breaching impermeable surfaces require a TP10/Stormwater report from an engineer (already).</p> <p>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. 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>				<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>
<b>FS570.829</b>	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	<p>RLZ S42A Report</p> <p>Section 5.2.4</p> <p>Key Issue 4: RLZ-R2 Impermeable Surface Coverage</p> <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>
<b>FS566.843</b>	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	<p>RLZ S42A Report</p> <p>Section 5.2.4</p> <p>Key Issue 4: RLZ-R2 Impermeable Surface Coverage</p> <p>Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report</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
								Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions
<b>FS569.865</b>	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	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: RLZ-R2 Impermeable Surface Coverage  Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions
<b>S349.022</b>	Neil Construction Limited	RLZ-R2	Oppose	The broader Tubbs Farm land area has already been subject to significant rural residential subdivision and development in accordance with resource consents and the existing planning framework. This has involved substantial infrastructure investment in this land to date, and has created an emerging residential land use pattern that should be continued	Amend RLZ-R2 by replacing "lesser" with "greater" to enable reasonable impermeable surface area		Reject	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Neil Construction Limited submission on the RLZ chapter
<b>FS62.056</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 1		Oppose	The broader Tubbs Farm land area has already been subject to significant rural residential subdivision and development in accordance with resource consents and the existing planning framework. This has involved substantial infrastructure investment in this land to date, and has created an emerging residential land use pattern that should be continued	Disallow	Re-zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland) in Rural Production or Horticulture zone etc.	Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Neil Construction Limited submission on the RLZ chapter

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS333.043	Maree Hart		Oppose	<p>These submissions seek inappropriate changes, such as re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, Spoonbill Drive and Kingfisher Drive from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential. Some points seek to weaken the policies and rules / standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural Lifestyle zone and Rural Residential zone, e.g. S349 seeks to delete references to 'rural character' and 'amenity' for the Rural Residential zone.</p> <p>The scale and intensity of urban / residential development sought by these submissions would create a new township in the rural areas at the northern end of Landing Road; this scale and density of development is not anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans. It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area that lacks relevant infrastructure and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town in future.</p> <p>Their proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects, such as a large increase in traffic on Landing Road, one-lane bridge and other adverse effects noted under my Further Submission 1 above.</p>	Disallow	Re-zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland) in Rural Production or Horticulture zone etc.	Accept	<p>RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1</p> <p>Key Issue 1: Neil Construction Limited submission on the RLZ chapter</p>
S67.015	Michael John Winch	RLZ-R2	Support	I support the impermeable surfaces permitted activity thresholds of 12.5% / 2500m <sup>2</sup> in the Rural Lifestyle zone	Retain the impermeable surfaces permitted activity thresholds of 12.5% / 2500m <sup>2</sup> in the Rural Lifestyle zone,		Accept in part	<p>RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4</p> <p>Key Issue 4: RLZ-R2 Impermeable Surface Coverage</p>
FS346.838	Royal Forest and Bird		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	RLZ 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
	Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.			RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.				Key Issue 4: RLZ-R2 Impermeable Surface Coverage
<b>FS566.064</b>	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	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: RLZ-R2 Impermeable Surface Coverage
<b>S67.016</b>	Michael John Winch	RLZ-R2	Oppose	oppose the lack of protection for the life-supporting capacity of the soil and highly productive soils. The Rural Lifestyle zone contains smaller lots and covers a relatively small total area of the Far North District. The permitted activity thresholds are appropriate for managing stormwater effects in this zone.  As discussed above for the Rural Production and Horticulture zones, 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.		Reject	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: RLZ-R2 Impermeable Surface Coverage
<b>FS346.839</b>	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	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: RLZ-R2 Impermeable Surface Coverage
<b>FS566.065</b>	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	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: RLZ-R2 Impermeable Surface Coverage

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>S168.116</b>	Setar Thirty Six Limited	RLZ-R3	Support	The rule is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Rule RLZ-R3	Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Rules – General Comments Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: RLZ-R3 Residential Activity
<b>S368.081</b>	Far North District Council	RLZ-R3	Support in part	The 'Residential activity' rule in zones that provide for a minor residential unit need to provide an exclusion for a 'minor residential unit'. The intent of the rule is to provide for a minor residential unit in addition to a principal residential unit on a site, it is not meant to be captured by PER-1 within the rule	Amend RLZ-R3 Make the following amendments (the area <sup>2</sup> will be relative to the zone) to the 'Residential activity' rule within the Rural Production zone, Rural Lifestyle zone, Rural Residential zone and the Settlement zone in the PDP. PER-1 The site area per residential unit is at least xxxm <sup>2</sup> . PER-1 does not apply to: i. a single residential unit located on a site less than xxxm <sup>2</sup> . ii. A minor residential unit constructed in accordance with rule Rxx-Rxx	Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: RLZ-R3 Residential Activity
<b>FS221.1</b>	Grant Whiteley		Support in part	More flexibility is required for a minor residential unit. I am already limited by the amount of area that can be built on and the distance to the boundaries. I have a 3450m <sup>2</sup> flat square site with a 103 sqm 1/2 garage and 1/2 accommodation which is set back on the 10mtr boundary. As it stands, I will not be able to build a modest size house on the remainder of the land.	Allow	Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: RLZ-R3 Residential Activity
<b>S250.026</b>	Willowridge Developments Limited	RLZ-R3	Support in part	Generally supportive of the PDP approach to recognise and provide for rural lifestyle living activities, and the intentions of the density control.	Amend RLZ-R3-PER to provide for residential intensity of one residential unit per 5,000m <sup>2</sup> as a permitted activity.	Accept in part	RLZ 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
				It is considered that rural lifestyle living could be easily accommodated on a range of allotment sizes ranging from 5,000m <sup>2</sup> to 2ha as provided in the ODP Coastal Living Zone.				Key Issue 5: RLZ-R3 Residential Activity
<b>FS570.712</b>	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	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: RLZ-R3 Residential Activity
<b>FS566.726</b>	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	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: RLZ-R3 Residential Activity
<b>FS569.748</b>	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	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: RLZ-R3 Residential Activity
<b>S349.023</b>	Neil Construction Limited	RLZ-R3	Oppose	The broader Tubbs Farm land area has already been subject to significant rural residential subdivision and development in accordance with resource consents and the existing planning framework. This has involved substantial infrastructure investment in this land to date and has created an emerging residential land use pattern that should be continued.	Amend RLZ-R3 to provide for the site area per residential unit to be at least 3,000m <sup>2</sup> .		Reject	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Neil Construction Limited submission on the RLZ chapter
<b>FS62.057</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 1		Oppose	The broader Tubbs Farm land area has already been subject to significant rural residential subdivision and development in accordance with resource consents and the existing planning framework. This has involved substantial infrastructure investment in this land to date, and has created an	Disallow	Re-zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland) in Rural Production or Horticulture zone etc.	Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Neil Construction Limited submission on the RLZ chapter

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				emerging residential land use pattern that should be continued				
<b>FS333.044</b>	Maree Hart		Oppose	<p>These submissions seek inappropriate changes, such as re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, Spoonbill Drive and Kingfisher Drive from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential. Some points seek to weaken the policies and rules / standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural Lifestyle zone and Rural Residential zone, e.g. S349 seeks to delete references to 'rural character' and 'amenity' for the Rural Residential zone.</p> <p>The scale and intensity of urban / residential development sought by these submissions would create a new township in the rural areas at the northern end of Landing Road; this scale and density of development is not anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans.</p> <p>It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area that lacks relevant infrastructure and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town in future. Their proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects, such as a large increase in traffic on Landing Road, one-lane bridge and other adverse effects noted under my Further Submission 1 above.</p>	Disallow	Re-zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland) in Rural Production or Horticulture zone etc.	Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Neil Construction Limited submission on the RLZ chapter
<b>S168.117</b>	Setar Thirty Six Limited	RLZ-R4	Support	The rule is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Rule RLZ-R4		Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: 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
S386.026	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew	RLZ-R4	Support	Ballantyne & Agnew are supportive of the provision of small-scale visitor accommodation in this zone.	Retain as notified.	Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Rules – General Comments
S214.003	Airbnb	RLZ-R4	Support in part	<p>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.</p> <p>Airbnb supports the overall approach to allow visitor accommodation to occur in all zones and commends the Council's leadership in this space. We would, however, recommend that restrictions around the number of guests be standardised to 10 across the district to account for the range of families that tend to stay in this type of accommodation and would also recommend that properties that do not meet permitted status default to restricted discretionary as opposed to discretionary.</p> <p>This would increase certainty for our Hosts and unlock the full potential of residential visitor accommodation in the district. 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.</p> <p>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</p>	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
				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).				
<b>FS23.065</b>	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
<b>S425.053</b>	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust	RLZ-R4	Support in part	<p>PHTTCCT support the provision for visitor accommodation in zones. It is considered that providing for this activity, particularly throughout the Zones that adjoin the Trail as a permitted activity will help activate the Trail and ensure that that the potential in terms of social and economic impact can be realised (noting the comments made in the Transport Chapter in regard to parking).</p> <p>PHTTCCT acknowledged the rationale behind the inclusion of PER-1 in the Rural Production, Rural Residential, Rural Living and Settlement Zone but considers that this is too blunt given the number of shared access ways within the District and has suggested wording that uses a setback to manage any likely noise or dust effects that could be experienced as a result of sharing an access.</p>	<p>Amend , RLZ-R4, as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The visitor accommodation is within a residential unit, accessory building or minor residential unit. PER-2 The occupancy does not exceed 10 guests per night. PER-3 <del>The site does not share access with another site. Where the site shares access with a</del><b>The access to the site is set back more than 20m from any residential unit, or minor residential unit on any site that shares the access.</b></p>		Reject	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions
<b>FS548.127</b>	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	The setback sought is unnecessary and not realistic. It should be expected that there will be noise and potentially dust in the rural environment. It should be up to the providers of visitors' accommodation to ensure their	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Accept	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
				facilities are able to cope with the elements that make up the rural environment.				Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions
<b>S155.001</b>	Robert Adams	RLZ-R4	Oppose	<p>Please clarify share access with another site. Particularly if a common concrete drive exists for two separate legal properties who each have their own legal access lot of 3.3m wide each and each have ROW access over the others access lot. The concrete driveway is 3.0 m wide with half on each access lot. Both sites want to have visitor accommodation so want to continue sharing the access over the common driveway.</p> <p>Having two driveways makes no sense from permeability, waste of resources and site coverage on a Rural lifestyle zone. Also decreases the landscaping. The rule is one dimensional, poorly drafted and needs justification to be allowed to continue in the district plan.</p>	Delete standard PER-3 (shared access) from rule or amend it so that having shared access over common driveways does not prevent permitted visitor accommodation (inferred).		Reject	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Rules – General Comments
<b>FS332.250</b>	Russell Protection Society		Oppose	Visitor accommodation is a commercial activity that requires separate access.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept in part.	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Rules – General Comments
<b>S250.027</b>	Willowridge Developments Limited	RLZ-R4	Support	Supportive of the provision of small-scale visitor accommodation in this zone	Retain as notified.		Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Rules – General Comments
<b>FS570.713</b>	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	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: 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
<b>FS566.727</b>	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	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Rules – General Comments
<b>FS569.749</b>	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	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Rules – General Comments
<b>S168.118</b>	Setar Thirty Six Limited	RLZ-R5	Support	The rule is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Rule RLZ-R5		Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Rules – General Comments
<b>S425.058</b>	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust	RLZ-R5	Support	PHTTCCT support the provision for home business in zones. It is considered that providing for this activity as a permitted activity, particularly throughout the zones that adjoin the Trail, will help activate the Trail and ensure that that the potential in terms of social and economic impact can be realised (noting the comments made in the Transport Chapter in regard to parking).	Retain as notified		Accept	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions
<b>S283.031</b>	Trent Simpkin	RLZ-S5	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 from 12.5% to 20% or offer an alternative pathway around this rule, by inserting a PER-2 which says if a building is above 20% or 2500m2, it is permitted if a visual assessment and landscape plan is provided as part of the building consent.		Reject	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>FS45.19</b>	Tristan Simpkin		Support	Support as per Reasons given in submission	Allow		Reject	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS570.845	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	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
FS566.859	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	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
FS569.881	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	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
S502.053	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	RLZ-R5	Support in part	A home business could be utilizing an existing farm shed on site which may be larger than 40m2. A business may only utilize a portion of a building where the rest is set aside as private space. Utilizing an existing building which exceeds 40m2 should not be a trigger for consent. Moreover, even if a business was utilizing a space greater than 40m2 other standards such as PER-2 & 3 are in place to control the effects such that the effects will be no more than minor on the surrounding environment.	Amend RLZ-R5 PER-1 The home business is undertaken within: 1. a residential unit; or 2. an accessory building that does not exceed 40m2 GFA; or 3. a minor residential unit.		Reject	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: RLZ-R5 – Home Business
FS172.220	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: RLZ-R5 – Home Business
S431.141	John Andrew Riddell	RLZ-R5	Not Stated	The amendment is necessary in order to achieve the purpose of the Act.	Amend PER-4 of Rule RLZ-R5 so that the hours of operation apply to when the business is open to the public		Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: RLZ-R5 – Home Business

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>FS332.141</b>	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 in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: RLZ-R5 – Home Business
<b>S168.119</b>	Setar Thirty Six Limited	RLZ-R6	Support	The rule is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Rule RLZ-R6		Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Rules – General Comments  Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions
<b>S331.071</b>	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	RLZ-R6	Support in part	<p>The submitter supports in part rule RLZ-R6 Educational facility, however, recommends the inclusion of a new provision (see submission #S331.017) to provide for educational facilities as a permitted activity in the Rural Lifestyle zone in the Infrastructure Chapter. In conjunction with this relief, the Ministry seeks the removal of this rule from the Rural Lifestyle zone to limit rule duplication.</p> <p>However, if this relief is not granted, the submitter supports the permitted activity standards to provide for small scale educational facilities in the Rural Lifestyle Zone. However, educational facilities with student attendance higher than 4 will likely be required to support the rural environment and suggest</p>	<p>Delete rule RLZ-R6 Educational Facility or Amend rule RLZ-R6 Educational Facility, as follows:</p> <p>Educational facility Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The educational facility is within a residential unit, accessory building or minor residential unit. PER-2 Hours of operation are between; 1. 7am-8pm Monday to Friday. 2. 8am-8pm Weekends and public holidays. PER-3</p>		Accept in part	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>student attendance not exceeding 30 to align with Ministry pre-school licenses.</p> <p>The Ministry requests that all educational facilities are enabled in the Rural Lifestyle zone to serve the education needs of the rural community and suggest a restricted discretionary activity status where compliance with the permitted standards cannot be achieved, and the following matters of discretion.</p>	<p>The number of students attending at one time does not exceed 30 <del>four</del>, excluding those who reside onsite.</p> <p>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-1, PER-2 or PER-3:  <b>Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <b>Design and layout.</b></li> <li>b. <b>Transport safety and efficiency.</b></li> <li>c. <b>Scale of activity and hours of operation.</b></li> <li>d. <b>Infrastructure servicing.</b></li> <li>e. <b>Potential reverse sensitivity effects.</b></li> </ul>		
S502.054	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	RLZ-R6	Support in part	<p>It appears that a museum, marae, town hall, or community center would not fall under the definition of an accessory building. Buildings of this nature host educational programs often and should be allowed to continue to do so without triggering consent. We seek relief that provision is made such that a museums, maraes and other similar buildings to accommodate an educational facility.</p>	<p>Amend RLZ-R6</p> <p>PER-1                      The educational facility is within a residential unit, accessory building or minor residential unit- <b>Museum, marae or other similar facility.</b></p> <p>PER-2                      Hours of operation are between;                      1. 7am-8pm Monday to Friday.                      2. 8am-8pm Weekends and public holidays.</p> <p>PER-3                      The number of students attending at one time does not exceed four <b>within a residential unit, accessory building or minor residential unit</b>, excluding those who reside onsite.</p> <p><b>PER-4</b>  <b>The number of students attending at one time does not exceed the number of people for which a museum, marae or other similar facility has been designed for.</b></p>	Reject	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: 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
<b>S159.183</b>	Horticulture New Zealand	RLZ-R6	Support in part	Educational facilities should be set back from the adjacent Rural Production zone	Amend Rule PLZ-R6 to include a requirement that: <b>educational facilities buildings must be set back at least 20m from the Rural Production zone boundary</b>		Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Rules – General Comments
<b>FS151.28</b>	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Rules – General Comments
<b>FS570.345</b>	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	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Rules – General Comments
<b>FS566.359</b>	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	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Rules – General Comments
<b>FS569.381</b>	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	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Rules – General Comments
<b>S168.120</b>	Setar Thirty Six Limited	RLZ-R7	Support	The rule is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Rule RLZ-R7		Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Rules – General Comments
<b>S168.121</b>	Setar Thirty Six Limited	RLZ-R8	Support	The rule is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Rule RLZ-R8		Accept	RLZ 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: Rules – General Comments
<b>S368.045</b>	Far North District Council	RLZ-R9	Support in part	Drafting error: Missing reference to PER-2 in column 3	Amend RLZ-R9 Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-1 or PER-2:		Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Rules – General Comments
<b>S168.122</b>	Setar Thirty Six Limited	RLZ-R9	Support	The rule is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Rule RLZ-R9		Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Rules – General Comments
<b>S148.050</b>	Summit Forests New Zealand Limited	RLZ-R10	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 RLZ-R10 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	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Rules – General Comments  Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions
<b>FS85.45</b>	PF Olsen Ltd		Support	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. This should be a	Allow		Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Rules – General Comments  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
				decision of the landowner, not the Council.				Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions
<b>FS346.556</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	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.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Rules – General Comments  Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions
<b>FS566.162</b>	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	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Rules – General Comments  Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions
<b>S168.123</b>	Setar Thirty Six Limited	RLZ-R10	Support	The rule is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Rule RLZ-R10		Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: 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
								Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions
<b>FS85.46</b>	PF Olsen Ltd		Oppose	This submission should be disallowed because PER-1 is inconsistent with 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. This should be a decision of the landowner, not the Council.	Disallow		Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Rules – General Comments  Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions
<b>S91.022</b>	PF Olsen Limited	RLZ-R10	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 RLZ-R10. Also refer to reasons in this submission for RPORZ-R15.	Amend rule RLZ-R10 by deleting PER-1.		Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Rules – General Comments  Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions
<b>FS566.111</b>	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	Accept in part	RLZ 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: Rules – General Comments  Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions
S99.001	Lynley Newport	RLZ-R11	Support in part	Whole heartedly support the introduction of this rule into zones other than the Rural Production zone. However, the separation distance is too restrictive and should be extended to 30m. This provides space for shared landscaping and gardening and for shared parking and maneuvering areas. Also, the minimum sizes property required by PER-2 is too large when considering the likely size of lots in the zone.	Amend RLZ-R11 PER-4 to read: The separation distance between the minor residential unit and the principal residential unit does not exceed <del>15m</del> <b>30m</b>  Amend PER-2 to read: The site area per minor residential unit is at least <del>one hectare</del> <b>5000m<sup>2</sup></b>	Reject	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Rules – General Comments
S168.124	Setar Thirty Six Limited	RLZ-R11	Support	The rule is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Rule RLZ-R11	Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Rules – General Comments
S386.027	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew	RLZ-R11	Support in part	Ballantyne & Agnew are supportive of the intention of this rule, particularly recognising the need and providing for minor residential units as a permitted activity. However, Ballantyne & Agnew considers that either a controlled or restricted discretionary activity control should be considered where compliance cannot be achieved with clauses PER-1 to 4. Particularly, PER-4 where there may be a functional	Amend RLZ-R11 as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove PER-2, alternatively, provide justification as to why this density control is necessary;</li> <li>Introduce a controlled or restricted discretionary activity with targeted matters/limits to manage the effects of clauses PER-1-3.</li> <li>Delete PER-4.</li> </ul>	Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: 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
				purpose or physical constraints that requires a larger separation distance. Further, the justification for requiring a minimum of 1ha to make use of this provision is unclear. In Ballantyne & Agnew's view, this clause should be removed.				
<b>S250.028</b>	Willowridge Developments Limited	RLZ-R11	Support in part	Consider that either a controlled or restricted discretionary activity control should be considered where compliance cannot be achieved with clauses PER-1 to 4. The justification for requiring a minimum of 1ha to make use of this provision is unclear.	Amend RLZ-R11  Remove PER-2, alternatively, provide justification as to why this density control is necessary; Amend to introduce a controlled or restricted discretionary activity with targeted matters/limits to manage the effects of clauses PER-1-4.		Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Rules – General Comments
<b>FS570.714</b>	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	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Rules – General Comments
<b>FS566.728</b>	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	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Rules – General Comments
<b>FS569.750</b>	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	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Rules – General Comments
<b>S168.125</b>	Setar Thirty Six Limited	RLZ-R12	Support	The rule is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Rule RLZ-R12		Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: 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
<b>S438.010</b>	New Zealand Motor Caravan Association	RLZ-R13	Oppose	The NZMCA operates a number of campgrounds and park over properties that are present in a variety of zones. Allowing for more permissive rules around the establishment of campgrounds will make it easier to establish sites for self-contained vehicle-based camping in the Far North District. This will also create positive social and economic benefits for the community.	Amend RLZ-R13 to restricted discretionary activity status and include criteria which subjects applications to conditions around traffic and visual impacts.	Reject	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Rules – General Comments
<b>S168.126</b>	Setar Thirty Six Limited	RLZ-R13	Support	The rule is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Rule RLZ-R13	Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Rules – General Comments
<b>S168.127</b>	Setar Thirty Six Limited	RLZ-R14	Support	The rule is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Rule RLZ-R14	Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Rules – General Comments
<b>S168.128</b>	Setar Thirty Six Limited	RLZ-R15	Support	The rule is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Rule RLZ-R15	Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Rules – General Comments
<b>S168.129</b>	Setar Thirty Six Limited	RLZ-R16	Support	The rule is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Rule RLZ-R16	Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Rules – General Comments
<b>S168.130</b>	Setar Thirty Six Limited	RLZ-R17	Support	The rule is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Rule RLZ-R17	Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: 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
S168.131	Setar Thirty Six Limited	RLZ-R18	Support	The rule is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Rule RLZ-R18	Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Rules – General Comments
S168.132	Setar Thirty Six Limited	RLZ-R19	Support	The rule is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Rule RLZ-R19	Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Rules – General Comments
S168.133	Setar Thirty Six Limited	RLZ-R20	Support	The rule is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Rule RLZ-R20	Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Rules – General Comments
S168.134	Setar Thirty Six Limited	RLZ-R21	Support	The rule is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Rule RLZ-R21	Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Rules – General Comments
S168.135	Setar Thirty Six Limited	RLZ-R22	Support	The rule is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Rule RLZ-R22	Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Rules – General Comments
S168.136	Setar Thirty Six Limited	RLZ-R23	Support	The rule is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Rule RLZ-R23	Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Rules – General Comments
S168.137	Setar Thirty Six Limited	RLZ-R24	Support	The rule is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Rule RLZ-R24	Accept	RLZ 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: Rules – General Comments
<b>S168.138</b>	Setar Thirty Six Limited	RLZ-R25	Support	The rule is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Rule RLZ-R25	Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Rules – General Comments
<b>S168.139</b>	Setar Thirty Six Limited	RLZ-R26	Support	The rule is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Rule RLZ-R26	Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Rules – General Comments
<b>S168.140</b>	Setar Thirty Six Limited	RLZ-R27	Support	The rule is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Rule RLZ-R27	Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Rules – General Comments
<b>S168.141</b>	Setar Thirty Six Limited	RLZ-R28	Support	The rule is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Rule RLZ-R28	Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Rules – General Comments
<b>S333.107</b>	P S Yates Family Trust	Standards	Support	The standards are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Standards RLZ-S1- RLZ-S6	Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>S338.066</b>	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	Standards	Not Stated	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	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"> <li>In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures</li> </ul>	Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					<p>more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>			<p>RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards</p>
<b>FS354.248</b>	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 S338.066	Accept in part	<p>Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions</p> <p>RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards</p>
<b>FS570.1004</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	<p>Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5</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 5: Definitions  RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>FS566.1018</b>	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  RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>FS569.1040</b>	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  RLZ 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: RLZ General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>S427.067</b>	Kapiro Residents Association	Standards	Support in part	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>		Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions  RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>FS354.249</b>	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 S427.067	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
								RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>S449.062</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust	Standards	Support	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>		Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions  RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>FS354.250</b>	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	The submitter seeks additional controls on artificial crop protection structures, including a non-complying rule.	Disallow	Disallow S449.062	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
				Artificial crop protection structures are critical to horticulture in the Far North and contribute to the economic and social wellbeing of the community.				Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions  RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>FS569.1861</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions  RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>FS570.1878</b>	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  RLZ S42A Report

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
								Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>S529.215</b>	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	Standards	Support in part	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	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"> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>		Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions  RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>FS570.2102</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
								Key Issue 5: Definitions  RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>FS566.2116</b>	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  RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>FS569.2138</b>	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  RLZ 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: RLZ Section 5.2.3 General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>S65.014</b>	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 (refer RPROZ-S7) sensitive activities setback from boundaries of a Mineral Extraction Overlay		Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>FS346.820</b>	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 in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>S168.142</b>	Setar Thirty Six Limited	RLZ-S1	Support	The standard is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Standard RLZ-S1		Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>S187.094</b>	The Shooting Box Limited	RLZ-S1	Support	The standards are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives.	Retain Standards RLZ-S1- RLZ-S6		Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>S338.054</b>	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	RLZ-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	Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site		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
				strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>			Key Issue 5: Definitions  RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ Section 5.2.3 General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>FS354.251</b>	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 S338.054	Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions  RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ Section 5.2.3 General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
								Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>FS570.992</b>	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  RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ Section 5.2.3 General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>FS566.1006</b>	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  RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ Section 5.2.3 General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS569.1028	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  RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ Section 5.2.3 General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
S427.042	Kapiro Residents Association	RLZ-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"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures</li> </ul>		Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions  RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ Section 5.2.3 General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					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.			
<b>FS354.252</b>	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 S427.042	Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions  RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ Section 5.2.3 General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>S449.050</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust	RLZ-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"> <li>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</li> </ul>		Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions  RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ Section 5.2.3 General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>			Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>FS354.253</b>	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 S449.050	Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions  RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ Section 5.2.3 General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>FS569.1849</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions  RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
								Section 5.2.3 General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>FS570.1866</b>	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  RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ Section 5.2.3 General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>S529.201</b>	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	RLZ-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"> <li>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</li> </ul>		Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions  RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ Section 5.2.3 General 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
						vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>		Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>FS570.2088</b>	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  RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ Section 5.2.3 General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>FS566.2102</b>	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  RLZ S42A Report

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
								Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ Section 5.2.3 General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>FS569.2124</b>	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  RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ Section 5.2.3 General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>S167.107</b>	Bentzen Farm Limited	RLZ-S1	Support	The standards are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Standards RLZ-S1- RLZ-S6		Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>FS566.469</b>	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	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>S168.143</b>	Setar Thirty Six Limited	RLZ-S2	Support	The standard is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Standard RLZ-S2		Accept	RLZ 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: RLZ Standards
S187.113	The Shooting Box Limited	RLZ-S2	Support	The standards are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives.	Retain Standards RLZ-S1- RLZ-S6.	Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
S431.183	John Andrew Riddell	RLZ-S2	Not Stated	Not stated	Retain the approach varying the required height to boundary depending on the orientation of the relevant boundary.	Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
S167.125	Bentzen Farm Limited	RLZ-S2	Support	The standards are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Standards RLZ-S1- RLZ-S6.	Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
FS566.484	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow	Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
S168.144	Setar Thirty Six Limited	RLZ-S3	Support	The standard is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Standard RLZ-S3	Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
S512.074	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	RLZ-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>	Insert advice note to setback standard <b>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</b>	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
S187.114	The Shooting Box Limited	RLZ-S3	Support	The standards are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives.	Retain Standards RLZ-S1- RLZ-S6.		Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
S159.182	Horticulture New Zealand	RLZ-S3	Support in part	Visitor accommodation should be set back from the adjacent Rural Production zone	Amend Standard RLZ-S3 to include a requirement that: <b>habitable buildings must be set back at least 20m from the Rural Production zone boundary</b>		Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ Rules – General Comments
FS151.26	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ Rules – General Comments
FS151.27	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ Rules – General Comments
FS172.412	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	Support enabling visitor accommodation.	Disallow		Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ Rules – General Comments
FS570.344	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	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ Rules – General Comments
FS566.358	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	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ 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
<b>S159.184</b>	Horticulture New Zealand	RLZ-S3	Oppose	To implement Objective RLZ-O4 there should be greater setbacks from the Rural Production zone boundary	Amend part 3 of Standard RLZ-S3 as follows: habitable buildings must be setback at least 30m from the boundary of an unsealed road <b>and 20m from the boundary of the Rural Production zone or the Horticulture zone</b> Amend Standard RLZ-S3 to include: <b>4) Educational facilities should be setback 20m from the boundary of the Rural Production Zone or the Horticulture Zone.</b>		Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ Rules – General Comments
<b>FS151.29</b>	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ Rules – General Comments
<b>FS405.091</b>	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Oppose	Ballantyne & Agnew opposes the requested amendments sought in this submission point, in relation to a habitable building being at least 20m from the boundary of the Rural Production zone as this is overly conservative.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ Rules – General Comments
<b>FS361.074</b>	Willowridge Developments Limited		Oppose	Willowridge Developments Limited opposes the requested amendments sought in this submission point, in relation to a habitable building being at least 20m from the boundary of the Rural Production zone as this is overly conservative.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ Rules – General Comments
<b>FS570.346</b>	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	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ 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
FS566.360	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	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ Rules – General Comments
S159.186	Horticulture New Zealand	RLZ-S3	Oppose	The setback provides for a 10m setback from the Rural Production zone. This is not considered to be sufficient to mitigate potential reverse sensitivity effects	Amend part 2 of Standard RLZ-S3 as follows: minimum building setback from the boundary of any Rural Production zone is at least <del>10m</del> <b>20m</b> , and from any boundary with the mineral extraction overlay the setback is at least 20m.		Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ Rules – General Comments
FS151.31	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ Rules – General Comments
FS570.348	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	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ Rules – General Comments
FS566.362	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	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ Rules – General Comments
S416.059	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	RLZ-S3	Support in part	For health and safety reasons, KiwiRail seek a setback for structures from the rail corridor boundary. While KiwiRail do not oppose development on adjacent sites, ensuring the ability to access and maintain structures without	Insert a railway setback (refer to submission for examples) and the following matters of discretion into the standard: <b>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</b>		Accept	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.4

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>requiring access to rail land is important.</p> <p>Parts of the KiwiRail network adjoin commercial, mixed use, industrial and open space zones. These zone chapters do not currently include provision for boundary setbacks for buildings and structures.</p> <p>KiwiRail seek a boundary setback of 5m from the rail corridor for all buildings and structures. KiwiRail considers that a matter of discretion directing consideration of impacts on the safety and efficiency of the rail corridor is appropriate in situations where the 5m setback standard is not complied with in all zones adjacent to the railway corridor.</p> <p>Building setbacks are essential to address significant safety hazards associated with the operational rail corridor. The Proposed Plan enables a 1m setback from side and rear boundaries shared with the rail corridor, increasing the risk that poles, ladders, or even ropes for abseiling equipment, could protrude into the rail corridor and increasing the risk of collision with a train or electrified overhead lines. Further, there is a 600mm eave allowance within side and rear yards which restricts potential access to roofs from of buildings even further and results in an effective yard setback of 400mm.</p> <p>KiwiRail consider that a 5m setback is appropriate in providing for vehicular access to the rear of buildings (e.g. a cherry picker) and allowing for scaffolding to be erected safely. This setback provides for the unhindered operation of buildings, including higher</p>	<p><b>rail corridor the safe and efficient operation of the rail network</b></p>		<p>Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions</p>

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>rise structures and for the safer use of outdoor deck areas at height. This in turn fosters visual amenity, as lineside properties can be regularly maintained. One option is a cross-reference between the standards of each zone to avoid repetition, or to create a standard rail corridor setback rule and replicate it in each zone.</p> <p>The provision of a setback can ensure that all buildings on a site can be accessed and maintained for the life of that structure, without the requirement to gain access to rail land, including by aspects such as ladders, poles or abseil ropes. This ensures that a safe amenity is provided on the adjacent sites for the occupants, in line with delivery policy direction such as GRZ-O2, clause 4 whereby safety is a specific objective for achieving zone appropriate character and amenity values.</p> <p>It is noted that some zones (Heavy Industrial, Rural production)) have wider yards than sought by KiwiRail. This is supported, but the yard purpose is not linked to safety matters relating to a site's proximity to the railway and therefore any applications for reductions may not consider this requirement.</p>				
FS243.145	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose	<p>Kāinga Ora opposes the requested 5m setback; a considerably reduced set back would provide adequate space for maintenance activities within sites adjacent to the rail network. In doing so, it will continue to protect the safe, efficient, and effective operation of the rail infrastructure while balancing the cost on landowners. The amendments are unnecessary.</p>	Disallow	<p>Insert a railway setback (refer to submission for examples) Insert the following matters of discretion into the standard:</p>	Reject	<p>Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ s42A Report Section 5.2.4 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
S338.057	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	RLZ-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"> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>		Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions  RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
FS354.254	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 S338.057	Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions  RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
								Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>FS570.995</b>	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  RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>S427.043</b>	Kapiro Residents Association	RLZ-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"> <li>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.</li> </ul>		Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions  RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>			
<b>FS354.255</b>	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 S427.043	Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions  RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>S449.053</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust	RLZ-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"> <li>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</li> </ul>		Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions  RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					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"> <li>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.</li> </ul>			
<b>FS354.256</b>	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 S449.053	Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions  RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>S250.029</b>	Willowridge Developments Limited	RLZ-S3	Support in part	It is unclear why a tiered setback approach has been taken in this instance for sites that are 5,000m <sup>2</sup> or less vs larger sites.	Amend RLZ-S3 to have one setback standard for side boundaries.		Reject	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>FS570.715</b>	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	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>S529.202</b>	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	RLZ-S3	Support in part	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop	Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site		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
				protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>			Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions  RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>FS570.2089</b>	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  RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>S529.204</b>	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	RLZ-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"> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>		Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions  RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>FS570.2091</b>	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  RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
								Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>S349.024</b>	Neil Construction Limited	RLZ-S3	Oppose	The broader Tubbs Farm land area has already been subject to significant rural residential subdivision and development in accordance with resource consents and the existing planning framework. This has involved substantial infrastructure investment in this land to date, and has created an emerging residential land use pattern that should be continued	Amend RLZ-S3 to delete 10m yard setback for lots greater than 5,000m2.		Reject	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Neil Construction Limited submission on the RLZ chapter
<b>FS62.058</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 1		Oppose	The broader Tubbs Farm land area has already been subject to significant rural residential subdivision and development in accordance with resource consents and the existing planning framework. This has involved substantial infrastructure investment in this land to date, and has created an emerging residential land use pattern that should be continued	Disallow	Re-zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland) in Rural Production or Horticulture zone etc.	Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Neil Construction Limited submission on the RLZ chapter
<b>FS333.045</b>	Maree Hart		Oppose	These submissions seek inappropriate changes, such as re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, Spoonbill Drive and Kingfisher Drive from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential. Some points seek to weaken the policies and rules / standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural Lifestyle zone and Rural Residential zone, e.g. S349 seeks to delete references to 'rural character' and 'amenity' for the Rural Residential zone.  The scale and intensity of urban / residential development sought by these submissions would create a new township in the rural areas at the	Disallow	Re-zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland) in Rural Production or Horticulture zone etc.	Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Neil Construction Limited submission on the RLZ chapter

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>northern end of Landing Road; this scale and density of development is not anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans.</p> <p>It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area that lacks relevant infrastructure and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town in future. Their proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects, such as a large increase in traffic on Landing Road, one-lane bridge and other adverse effects noted under my Further Submission 1 above.</p>				
<b>S167.126</b>	Benzen Farm Limited	RLZ-S3	Support	The standards are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives.	Retain Standards RLZ-S1- RLZ-S6		Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>FS566.485</b>	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	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>S529.202</b>	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	RLZ-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.	<p>Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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</li> </ul>		Accept in part	<p>Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions</p> <p>RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7</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>between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>		Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>FS566.2103</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	<p>Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report</p> <p>Section 5.2.5</p> <p>Key Issue 5: Definitions</p> <p>RLZ S42A Report</p> <p>Section 5.2.3</p> <p>Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments</p> <p>Section 5.2.7</p> <p>Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards</p>
<b>FS569.2125</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	<p>Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report</p> <p>Section 5.2.5</p> <p>Key Issue 5: Definitions</p> <p>RLZ S42A Report</p> <p>Section 5.2.3</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 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>S529.204</b>	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	RLZ-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"> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>		Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions  RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>FS566.2105</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
								RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
FS569.2127	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  RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
S159.182	Horticulture New Zealand	RLZ-S3	Support in part	Visitor accommodation should be set back from the adjacent Rural Production zone	Amend Standard RLZ-S3 to include a requirement that: <b>habitable buildings must be set back at least 20m from the Rural Production zone boundary</b>		Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ Rules – General Comments
FS569.380	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	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ 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
<b>S159.184</b>	Horticulture New Zealand	RLZ-S3	Oppose	To implement Objective RLZ-O4 there should be greater setbacks from the Rural Production zone boundary	Amend part 3 of Standard RLZ-S3 as follows: habitable buildings must be setback at least 30m from the boundary of an unsealed road <b>and 20m from the boundary of the Rural Production zone or the Horticulture zone</b> Amend Standard RLZ-S3 to include: <b>4) Educational facilities should be setback 20m from the boundary of the Rural Production Zone or the Horticulture Zone.</b>		Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ Rules – General Comments
<b>FS569.382</b>	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	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ Rules – General Comments
<b>S159.186</b>	Horticulture New Zealand	RLZ-S3	Oppose	The setback provides for a 10m setback from the Rural Production zone. This is not considered to be sufficient to mitigate potential reverse sensitivity effects	Amend part 2 of Standard RLZ-S3 as follows: minimum building setback from the boundary of any Rural Production zone is at least <del>10m</del> <b>20m</b> , and from any boundary with the mineral extraction overlay the setback is at least 20m.		Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ Rules – General Comments
<b>FS569.384</b>	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	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ Rules – General Comments
<b>S250.029</b>	Willowridge Developments Limited	RLZ-S3	Support in part	It is unclear why a tiered setback approach has been taken in this instance for sites that are 5,000m <sup>2</sup> or less vs larger sites.	Amend RLZ-S3 to have one setback standard for side boundaries.		Reject	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>FS569.751</b>	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	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S338.057	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	RLZ-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"> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>		Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions  RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
FS569.1031	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  RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
							Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>S449.053</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust	RLZ-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"> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>	Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions  RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>FS569.1852</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Accept in part	Rural Wide Issues and RPROZ S42A Report Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions  RLZ 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: RLZ General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>FS570.1869</b>	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  RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: RLZ Standards
<b>S168.146</b>	Setar Thirty Six Limited	RLZ-S5	Support	The standard is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Standard RLZ-S5		Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments
<b>S187.116</b>	The Shooting Box Limited	RLZ-S5	Support	The standards are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives.	Retain Standards RLZ-S1- RLZ-S6		Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments
<b>S167.128</b>	Bentzen Farm Limited	RLZ-S5	Support	The standards are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives.	Retain Standards RLZ-S1- RLZ-S6		Accept in part	RLZ 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: RLZ General Rules – General comments
<b>FS566.487</b>	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	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments
<b>S168.147</b>	Setar Thirty Six Limited	RLZ-S6	Support	The standard is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Standard RLZ-S6		Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments
<b>S187.117</b>	The Shooting Box Limited	RLZ-S6	Support	The standards are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives.	Retain Standards RLZ-S1- RLZ-S6		Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments
<b>S167.129</b>	Bentzen Farm Limited	RLZ-S6	Support	The standards are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives.	Retain Standards RLZ-S1- RLZ-S6		Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments
<b>FS566.488</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow	Accept in part	Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: RLZ General Rules – General comments
<b>S386.018</b>	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew	SUB-S1	Support in part	While Ballantyne & Agnew recognise the importance and purpose of the RPROZ, particularly the need to protect highly versatile soils, manage the fragmentation of land for productive purposes, and avoid reverse sensitivity effects arising, it is considered that all	Review and amend minimum lot sizes, in particular the provision of a 20ha minimum lot size in the RPROZ as a controlled activity, to ensure regional consistency. Amend the minimum lot size of the RLZ to align with the residential intensity control of the RLZ Chapter.		Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Lifestyle 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
				<p>of these matters can be achieved at lot sizes smaller than 40ha.</p> <p>At a minimum, FNDC should consider alignment neighbouring Council's (i.e. the Whangārei District Plan RPROZ provisions) to achieve region wide consistency under the RPS. Finally, with respect to the RLZ, it is unclear why the proposed minimum lot size for controlled activity subdivision has been selected. 4ha controlled activity subdivision is inconsistent with the residential density control provided in the RLZ Chapter.</p> <p>It is common practice to align these controls to provide consistent outcomes across land use and subdivision controls.</p>			<p><i>Note: This submission point is duplicated in Appendix 2 of other relevant rural section 42A reports with respect to SUB-S1 amendments for those rural zones.</i></p>
<b>S24.002</b>	Trent Simpkin	SUB-S1	Oppose	<p>Nearly all of the land that was zoned Coastal Living (minimum discretionary lot size 5000m<sup>2</sup>) has been changed to Rural Lifestyle (minimum discretionary lot size 2ha which is 4x the size). All this land that could be subdivided down into 5,000m<sup>2</sup> lots (under the Operative District Plan (inferred)), with the new Rural Lifestyle zone can only be as small as 20,000m<sup>2</sup>.</p> <p>The Far North needs to be growing, not shrinking, so we need to provide more properties for people to live on. New developments and parcels of land mean more rates for FNDC, increasing income and making our district a better, more vibrant place.</p> <p>See attachment examples - Taipa, Kerikeri Inlet, Rangitane River Park, Paihia, Orongo Bay, Opua and Ahipara</p>	<p>Amend all Rural Lifestyle zoned land to Rural Residential (and let the coastal environment rules cover coastal issues);</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Reduce the Rural Lifestyle Zone Discretionary minimum lot size to 5,000m<sup>2</sup> (see attachments to original submission as examples).</p>	Accept in part	<p>RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8</p> <p>Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Lifestyle Zone</p>
<b>FS44.9</b>	Northland Planning &		Support in part	<p>Allowance should be provided for smaller lots in the rural-lifestyle zone. Providing lots of these sizes will</p>	Allow	Accept in part	<p>RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8</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
	Development 2020 Ltd			maintain and enhance the rural amenity of the zone, while providing sites which are able to be effectively managed by the owners as a small productive/lifestyle lot.				Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Lifestyle Zone
<b>FS45.7</b>	Tristan Simpkin		Support	Support. The proposed blanket zoning change across most of the current Coastal Living zoned land is a backward move. This land has already been partially developed over the past years so does not make any sense to drastically increase the minimum permitted lot size now.	Allow		Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Lifestyle Zone
<b>FS550.035</b>	Lloyd Anderson		Oppose	These submissions seek inappropriate changes, such as re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, Spoonbill Drive and Kingfisher Drive from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential. Some points seek to weaken the policies and rules / standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural Lifestyle zone and Rural Residential zone, e.g. S349 seeks to delete references to 'rural character' and 'amenity' for the Rural Residential zone.  The scale and intensity of urban / residential development sought by these submissions would create a new township in the rural areas at the northern end of Landing Road; this scale and density of development is not anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans. It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area that lacks relevant infrastructure and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town in future.	Disallow	amend zoning	Reject	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Neil Construction Limited submission on the RLZ chapter Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Lifestyle 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
				<p>Their proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects, such as a large increase in traffic on Landing Road, one-lane bridge and other adverse effects noted under my Further Submission 1 above.</p>				
<p><b>FS405.044</b></p>	<p>Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew</p>		<p>Support in part</p>	<p>Ballantyne &amp; Agnew supports in part the requested amendment to reconsider the RLZ area. It is noted that in the original submission, Ballantyne &amp; Agnew submitted that the allotment sizes of the RLZ should align with the minimum lot size of the RLZ Chapter.</p>	<p>Allow in part</p>	<p>allow in part the original submission</p>	<p>Accept in part</p>	<p>RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Lifestyle Zone</p>
<p><b>FS333.019</b></p>	<p>Maree Hart</p>		<p>Oppose</p>	<p>The original submission seeks inappropriate changes, such as re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487, Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, Spoonbill Drive and Kingfisher Drive from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential. They also seek to amend the relevant rural provisions to be more permissive such as removing reference to rural character and amenity.</p> <p>The scale and intensity of residential development sought by the original submission would create a new township in the rural areas at the northern end of Landing Road. This scale and intensity is not anticipated in either the Operative or Proposed District Plan. It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area that lacks relevant infrastructure and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri.</p> <p>The proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects. The surrounding rural environment lacks the appropriate</p>	<p>Disallow</p>	<p>Amend zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 to Horticulture zone or Rural Production zone; Amend provisions to protect other sites referenced in the original submission by Rural Lifestyle zoning and where relevant, provisions relating to the protection of the coastal environment, wetlands/saltmarshes, and areas that are visible from coastal waters; 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</p>	<p>Accept in part</p>	<p>RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Lifestyle 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>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 &amp; ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.</p>		<p>and long-term adverse effects on productive areas, rural areas, areas visible from public land, ecological values and freshwater, wetlands and saltmarshes, areas that are visible from coastal waters or public land.</p>		
<p><b>FS569.023</b></p>	<p>Vision Kerikeri 2</p>		<p>Oppose</p>	<p>The scale and intensity of urban / residential development sought by these submissions would create a new township in rural areas at the eastern end of Kapiro Road, generating a scale and density of development that is not anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans. It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area and coastal area that lacks relevant infrastructure and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town in future.</p> <p>These submissions seek inappropriate re-zoning e.g. re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, Spoonbill Drive, Kingfisher Drive etc, as Rural Residential. Importantly, some of the submission points seek to weaken the objectives, policies and rules/standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural Lifestyle zone and Rural Residential zone in general.</p> <p>If such changes were allowed, they would apply across the entire District and would promote urban sprawl in rural areas in all parts of the District. Their proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects, such as impacts on wetlands/saltmarshes, ecological</p>	<p>Disallow</p>	<p>Re-zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland) in Rural Production or Horticulture zone.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rural Lifestyle zoning for existing residential properties in Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove and Kingfisher Drive, as in PDP planning map.</li> <li>• Minimise urban sprawl and protect the general coastal area of Skudders Beach Road by applying Rural Lifestyle zoning to existing paddocks and undeveloped areas, and ensure better protection of the coastal environment, areas that are visible from coastal waters or public land, ecological values, wetlands/ saltmarshes etc.</li> </ul>	<p>Reject</p>	<p>RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Neil Construction Limited submission on the RLZ chapter Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Lifestyle 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
				values, rural environment, coastal environment, traffic impacts on one-lane bridge, amenity values and other adverse effects noted under our Further Submission 1 above.				
<b>FS62.033</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 1		Oppose	<p>The scale and intensity of urban/residential development sought by these submissions would create a new township in rural areas at the eastern end of Kapiro Road, generating a scale and density of development that is not anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area and coastal area that lacks appropriate infrastructure and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town.</li> <li>• These submissions seek inappropriate zoning e.g. re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, Spoonbill Drive, Kingfisher Drive etc, as Rural Residential.</li> <li>• Importantly, some of the submission points seek to weaken the objectives, policies and rules/standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural Lifestyle zone and Rural Residential zone in general. If such changes were allowed, they would apply across the entire District and would promote urban sprawl in rural areas in all parts of the District.</li> </ul>	Disallow	<p>Re-zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland) in Rural Production or Horticulture zone.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rural Lifestyle zoning for existing residential properties in Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove and Kingfisher Drive, as in PDP planning map.</li> <li>• Minimise urban sprawl and protect the general coastal area of Skudders Beach Road by applying Rural Lifestyle zoning to existing paddocks and undeveloped areas, and ensure better protection of the coastal environment, areas that are visible from coastal waters or public land, ecological values, wetlands/saltmarshes etc.</li> </ul>	Reject	<p>RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1</p> <p>Key Issue 1: Neil Construction Limited submission on the RLZ chapter Section 5.2.8</p> <p>Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Lifestyle 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
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Their proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects, such as impacts on wetlands / saltmarshes, ecological values, rural environment, coastal environment, traffic impacts on one-lane bridge, amenity values and other adverse effects noted under our Further Submission 1 above.</li> </ul>				
<b>FS361.036</b>	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support in part	Willowridge Developments Limited supports in part the requested amendment to reconsider the RLZ area. It is noted that that in the original submission, Willowridge submitted that the allotment sizes of the RLZ should align with the residential intensity control of the RLZ Chapter.	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Lifestyle Zone
<b>FS549.035</b>	Vanessa Anderson		Oppose	<p>These submissions seek inappropriate changes, such as re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, Spoonbill Drive and Kingfisher Drive from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential. Some points seek to weaken the policies and rules/standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural Lifestyle zone and Rural Residential zone, e.g. S349 seeks to delete references to 'rural character' and 'amenity' for the Rural Residential zone.</p> <p>The scale and intensity of urban/residential development sought by these submissions would create a new township in the rural areas at the northern end of Landing Road; this scale and density of development is not</p>	Disallow	amend zoning	Reject	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Neil Construction Limited submission on the RLZ chapter Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Lifestyle 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
				<p>anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans.</p> <p>It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area that lacks relevant infrastructure and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town in future. Their proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects, such as a large increase in traffic on Landing Road, one-lane bridge and other adverse effects noted under my Further Submission 1 above.</p>				
FS443.035	Peter O'Neil Donnellon		Oppose	<p>These submissions seek inappropriate changes, such as re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, Spoonbill Drive and Kingfisher Drive from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential. Some points seek to weaken the policies and rules / standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural Lifestyle zone and Rural Residential zone, e.g. S349 seeks to delete references to 'rural character' and 'amenity' for the Rural Residential zone.</p> <p>The scale and intensity of urban / residential development sought by these submissions would create a new township in the rural areas at the northern end of Landing Road; this scale and density of development is not anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans.</p> <p>It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area that lacks relevant infrastructure and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town in future. Their proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects, such as a</p>	Disallow	amend zoning	Reject	<p>RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1</p> <p>Key Issue 1: Neil Construction Limited submission on the RLZ chapter Section 5.2.8</p> <p>Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Lifestyle 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
				large increase in traffic on Landing Road, one-lane bridge and other adverse effects noted under my Further Submission 1 above.				
<b>FS390.035</b>	Tracey Schubert		Oppose	<p>These submissions seek inappropriate changes, such as re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, Spoonbill Drive and Kingfisher Drive from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential. Some points seek to weaken the policies and rules / standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural Lifestyle zone and Rural Residential zone, e.g. S349 seeks to delete references to 'rural character' and 'amenity' for the Rural Residential zone.</p> <p>The scale and intensity of urban / residential development sought by these submissions would create a new township in the rural areas at the northern end of Landing Road; this scale and density of development is not anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans.</p> <p>It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area that lacks relevant infrastructure and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town in future. Their proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects, such as a large increase in traffic on Landing Road, one-lane bridge and other adverse effects noted under my Further Submission 1 above.</p>	Disallow	amend zoning	Reject	<p>RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1</p> <p>Key Issue 1: Neil Construction Limited submission on the RLZ chapter Section 5.2.8</p> <p>Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Lifestyle Zone</p>
<b>FS353.035</b>	Al Panckhurst		Oppose	<p>These submissions seek inappropriate changes, such as re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove,</p>	Disallow	amend zoning	Reject	<p>RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1</p> <p>Key Issue 1: Neil Construction</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>Spoonbill Drive and Kingfisher Drive from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential. Some points seek to weaken the policies and rules / standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural Lifestyle zone and Rural Residential zone, e.g. S349 seeks to delete references to 'rural character' and 'amenity' for the Rural Residential zone.</p> <p>The scale and intensity of urban / residential development sought by these submissions would create a new township in the rural areas at the northern end of Landing Road; this scale and density of development is not anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans.</p> <p>It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area that lacks relevant infrastructure and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town in future. Their proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects, such as a large increase in traffic on Landing Road, one-lane bridge and other adverse effects noted under my Further Submission 1 above.</p>				<p>Limited submission on the RLZ chapter Section 5.2.8</p> <p>Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Lifestyle Zone</p>
<b>FS352.035</b>	Kathryn Panckhurst		Oppose	<p>These submissions seek inappropriate changes, such as re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, Spoonbill Drive and Kingfisher Drive from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential. Some points seek to weaken the policies and rules/standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural Lifestyle zone and Rural Residential zone, e.g. S349 seeks to delete references to</p>	Disallow	amend zoning	Reject	<p>RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1</p> <p>Key Issue 1: Neil Construction</p> <p>Limited submission on the RLZ chapter Section 5.2.8</p> <p>Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to</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>'rural character' and 'amenity' for the Rural Residential zone.</p> <p>The scale and intensity of urban / residential development sought by these submissions would create a new township in the rural areas at the northern end of Landing Road; this scale and density of development is not anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans.</p> <p>It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area that lacks relevant infrastructure and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town in future. Their proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects, such as a large increase in traffic on Landing Road, one-lane bridge and other adverse effects noted under my Further Submission 1 above.</p>				the Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS342.035	Chris Baker		Oppose	<p>These submissions seek inappropriate changes, such as re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, Spoonbill Drive and Kingfisher Drive from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential. Some points seek to weaken the policies and rules/standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural Lifestyle zone and Rural Residential zone, e.g. S349 seeks to delete references to 'rural character' and 'amenity' for the Rural Residential zone.</p> <p>The scale and intensity of urban / residential development sought by these submissions would create a new township in the rural areas at the northern end of Landing Road; this scale and density of development is not</p>	Disallow	amend zoning	Reject	<p>RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1</p> <p>Key Issue 1: Neil Construction Limited submission on the RLZ chapter Section 5.2.8</p> <p>Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Lifestyle 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>anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans.</p> <p>It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area that lacks relevant infrastructure and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town in future. Their proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects, such as a large increase in traffic on Landing Road, one-lane bridge and other adverse effects noted under my Further Submission 1 above.</p>				
FS338.035	Pearl Mahoney		Oppose	<p>These submissions seek inappropriate changes, such as re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, Spoonbill Drive and Kingfisher Drive from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential. Some points seek to weaken the policies and rules/standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural Lifestyle zone and Rural Residential zone, e.g. S349 seeks to delete references to 'rural character' and 'amenity' for the Rural Residential zone.</p> <p>The scale and intensity of urban / residential development sought by these submissions would create a new township in the rural areas at the northern end of Landing Road; this scale and density of development is not anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans.</p> <p>It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area that lacks relevant infrastructure and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town in future. Their proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects, such as a</p>	Disallow	amend zoning	Reject	<p>RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1</p> <p>Key Issue 1: Neil Construction Limited submission on the RLZ chapter Section 5.2.8</p> <p>Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Lifestyle 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
				large increase in traffic on Landing Road, one-lane bridge and other adverse effects noted under my Further Submission 1 above.				
<b>FS337.035</b>	Kevin Mahoney		Oppose	<p>These submissions seek inappropriate changes, such as re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, Spoonbill Drive and Kingfisher Drive from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential. Some points seek to weaken the policies and rules/standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural Lifestyle zone and Rural Residential zone, e.g. S349 seeks to delete references to 'rural character' and 'amenity' for the Rural Residential zone.</p> <p>The scale and intensity of urban / residential development sought by these submissions would create a new township in the rural areas at the northern end of Landing Road; this scale and density of development is not anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans.</p> <p>It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area that lacks relevant infrastructure and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town in future. Their proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects, such as a large increase in traffic on Landing Road, one-lane bridge and other adverse effects noted under my Further Submission 1 above.</p>	Disallow	amend zoning	Reject	<p>RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1</p> <p>Key Issue 1: Neil Construction Limited submission on the RLZ chapter Section 5.2.8</p> <p>Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Lifestyle Zone</p>
<b>FS336.035</b>	Roger Holman		Oppose	<p>These submissions seek inappropriate changes, such as re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove,</p>	Disallow	amend zoning	Reject	<p>RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1</p> <p>Key Issue 1: Neil Construction</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>Spoonbill Drive and Kingfisher Drive from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential. Some points seek to weaken the policies and rules/standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural Lifestyle zone and Rural Residential zone, e.g. S349 seeks to delete references to 'rural character' and 'amenity' for the Rural Residential zone.</p> <p>The scale and intensity of urban / residential development sought by these submissions would create a new township in the rural areas at the northern end of Landing Road; this scale and density of development is not anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans.</p> <p>It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area that lacks relevant infrastructure and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town in future. Their proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects, such as a large increase in traffic on Landing Road, one-lane bridge and other adverse effects noted under my Further Submission 1 above.</p>				<p>Limited submission on the RLZ chapter Section 5.2.8</p> <p>Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Lifestyle Zone</p>
<b>FS335.035</b>	Craig and Mary Sawers		Oppose	<p>These submissions seek inappropriate changes, such as re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, Spoonbill Drive and Kingfisher Drive from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential. Some points seek to weaken the policies and rules/standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural Lifestyle zone and Rural Residential zone, e.g. S349 seeks to delete references to</p>	Disallow	amend zoning	Reject	<p>RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1</p> <p>Key Issue 1: Neil Construction</p> <p>Limited submission on the RLZ chapter Section 5.2.8</p> <p>Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to</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>'rural character' and 'amenity' for the Rural Residential zone.</p> <p>The scale and intensity of urban / residential development sought by these submissions would create a new township in the rural areas at the northern end of Landing Road; this scale and density of development is not anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans.</p> <p>It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area that lacks relevant infrastructure and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town in future. Their proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects, such as a large increase in traffic on Landing Road, one-lane bridge and other adverse effects noted under my Further Submission 1 above.</p>				the Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS334.035	Fiona Clarke		Oppose	<p>These submissions seek inappropriate changes, such as re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, Spoonbill Drive and Kingfisher Drive from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential. Some points seek to weaken the policies and rules/standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural Lifestyle zone and Rural Residential zone, e.g. S349 seeks to delete references to 'rural character' and 'amenity' for the Rural Residential zone.</p> <p>The scale and intensity of urban / residential development sought by these submissions would create a new township in the rural areas at the northern end of Landing Road; this scale and density of development is not</p>	Disallow	amend zoning	Reject	<p>RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1</p> <p>Key Issue 1: Neil Construction Limited submission on the RLZ chapter Section 5.2.8</p> <p>Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Lifestyle 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>anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans.</p> <p>It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area that lacks relevant infrastructure and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town in future. Their proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects, such as a large increase in traffic on Landing Road, one-lane bridge and other adverse effects noted under my Further Submission 1 above.</p>				
<b>S67.009</b>	Michael John Winch	SUB-S1	Oppose	<p>I oppose the Discretionary Activity limit of 2 ha in the Rural Lifestyle zone. The Rural Lifestyle zone statement indicates that it is primarily residential in a rural setting. Keeping livestock on a domestic scale is provided for but is not compulsory. A 2ha site of lawn and gardens is difficult and expensive to maintain without livestock. The purpose of the zone can be achieved with minimum lot sizes of 1 ha (10,000m<sup>2</sup>) which still provide 'a sense of spaciousness and rural character' required by the zoning.</p>	Amend the Discretionary Activity limit of 2 ha in the Rural Lifestyle zone to 1 ha (10,000m <sup>2</sup> )		Accept in part	<p>RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8</p> <p>Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Lifestyle Zone</p>
<b>FS44.14</b>	Northland Planning & Development 2020 Ltd		Support	<p>1ha is a more manageable size for lifestyle use. 1ha allows for people to undertake a residential activity while providing the option of growing their own food or having stock at a domestic scale.</p>	Allow		Accept in part	<p>RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8</p> <p>Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Lifestyle Zone</p>
<b>FS405.046</b>	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support in part	<p>Ballantyne &amp; Agnew supports in part the requested amendment, to reconsider the RLZ area. It is noted that, that in the original submission, Ballantyne &amp; Agnew submitted that the allotment sizes of the RLZ should align</p>	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Accept in part	<p>RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8</p> <p>Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to</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
				with the minimum lot size of the RLZ Chapter.				the Rural Lifestyle Zone
<b>FS361.038</b>	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support in part	Willowridge Developments Limited supports in part the requested amendment to reconsider the RLZ area. It is noted that that in the original submission, Willowridge submitted that the allotment sizes of the RLZ should align with the residential intensity control of the RLZ Chapter	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Lifestyle Zone
<b>FS346.832</b>	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 in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Lifestyle Zone
<b>FS566.058</b>	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	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Lifestyle Zone
<b>S286.002</b>	Tristan Simpkin	SUB-S1	Oppose	Nearly all of the land that was zoned Coastal Living throughout the whole District (minimum discretionary lot size 5000m2) has been changed to Rural Lifestyle (minimum discretionary lot size 2ha which is 4x the size of the current rule). This affects the following townships/areas: Ahipara, Opononi, Koutu, Houhora, Pukenui, Taipa, Cable Bay, Coopers Beach, Hihi, Whangaroa, Mahinepua, Wainui, Blue Penguin / Fernbird, Rangitane River Park, Kerikeri Inlet/Wharau Rd, and a lot of land around Russell & Paihia & Orongo Bay.	Either: 1) Rural lifestyle zone discretionary minimum lot size needs to be 5,000m2 - so at least the potential of the land does not get worse than it is at present; or 2) (preferred) all the land that was zoned Coastal Living be rezoned to Rural Residential and let the Coastal environment rules cover any coastal issues (also see S286.001)		Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Lifestyle 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
				<p>Each of the above townships / areas would have land in or on the fringes of it severely reduced in development and growth potential, which is exactly what the Far North coastal towns need. Submitter opposes this rezoning and can only conclude that no one has actually thought about the negative implications this will have on the growth of our coastal towns. All this land that could be subdivided down currently into 5,000m<sup>2</sup> lots, with the new Rural Lifestyle zone can only be as small as 20,000m<sup>2</sup> (2ha). Who wants 2ha with their bach by the beach?</p> <p>The Far North needs to be growing, not shrinking, so we need to provide more properties for people to live on. Further to that, the current Coastal Living zoned land has already had a reasonable amount of development under the current zoning, so why don't we intensify where houses are already, which means our Rural &amp; Horticultural land can be further preserved from development?</p>				
<b>FS44.22</b>	Northland Planning & Development 2020 Ltd		Support in part	Agree that the discretionary lot size for Rural Living should be decreased to at least 1ha to allow for future development in these areas which are predominantly located on the outskirts of smaller settlements. Smaller allotments of 1ha are more manageable size for lifestyle use. 1ha allows for people to undertake a residential activity while providing the option of growing their own food or having stock at a domestic scale.	Allow		Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Lifestyle Zone
<b>FS29.22</b>	Trent Simpkin		Support	Agree with this submission fully. There is no point going backwards and	Allow		Accept in part	RLZ 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
				making minimum lot sizes bigger in our district zoning. I support changing all rural lifestyle areas to rural residential zoning, and in case this is not possible support rural lifestyle minimum lot size to be 5000m2				Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Lifestyle Zone
<b>FS372.038</b>	John Andrew Riddell		Oppose	It is inappropriate and contrary to the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement and to the Regional policy Statement for Northland to rezone the identified land to Rural Lifestyle.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Lifestyle Zone
<b>FS405.045</b>	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support in part	Ballantyne & Agnew supports in part the requested amendment, to reconsider the RLZ area. It is noted that, that in the original submission, Ballantyne & Agnew submitted that the allotment sizes of the RLZ should align with the minimum lot size of the RLZ Chapter.	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Lifestyle Zone
<b>FS569.017</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	The scale and intensity of urban / residential development sought by these submissions would create a new township in rural areas at the eastern end of Kapiro Road, generating a scale and density of development that is not anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans. It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area and coastal area that lacks relevant infrastructure and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town in future. These submissions seek inappropriate re-zoning e.g. re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, Spoonbill Drive, Kingfisher Drive etc, as Rural Residential.	Disallow	Re-zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland) in Rural Production or Horticulture zone. • Rural Lifestyle zoning for existing residential properties in Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove and Kingfisher Drive, as in PDP planning map. • Minimise urban sprawl and protect the general coastal area of Skudders Beach Road by applying Rural Lifestyle zoning to existing paddocks and undeveloped areas, and	Reject	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Neil Construction Limited submission on the RLZ chapter Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Lifestyle 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
				<p>Importantly, some of the submission points seek to weaken the objectives, policies and rules/standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural Lifestyle zone and Rural Residential zone in general. If such changes were allowed, they would apply across the entire District and would promote urban sprawl in rural areas in all parts of the District.</p> <p>Their proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects, such as impacts on wetlands/saltmarshes, ecological values, rural environment, coastal environment, traffic impacts on one-lane bridge, amenity values and other adverse effects noted under our Further Submission 1 above.</p>		<p>ensure better protection of the coastal environment, areas that are visible from coastal waters or public land, ecological values, wetlands/ saltmarshes etc.</p>		
<b>FS62.027</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 1		Oppose	<p>The scale and intensity of urban / residential development sought by these submissions would create a new township in rural areas at the eastern end of Kapiro Road, generating a scale and density of development that is not anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans.</p> <p>It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area and coastal area that lacks relevant infrastructure and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town in future. These submissions seek inappropriate re-zoning e.g. re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, Spoonbill Drive, Kingfisher Drive etc, as Rural Residential.</p> <p>Importantly, some of the submission points seek to weaken the objectives, policies and rules/standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural</p>	Disallow	<p>Re-zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland) in Rural Production or Horticulture zone.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rural Lifestyle zoning for existing residential properties in Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove and Kingfisher Drive, as in PDP planning map.</li> <li>• Minimise urban sprawl and protect the general coastal area of Skudders Beach Road by applying Rural Lifestyle zoning to existing paddocks and undeveloped areas, and ensure better protection of the coastal environment, areas that are visible from coastal</li> </ul>	Reject	<p>RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1</p> <p>Key Issue 1: Neil Construction Limited submission on the RLZ chapter Section 5.2.8</p> <p>Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Lifestyle 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>Lifestyle zone and Rural Residential zone in general. If such changes were allowed, they would apply across the entire District and would promote urban sprawl in rural areas in all parts of the District.</p> <p>Their proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects, such as impacts on wetlands/saltmarshes, ecological values, rural environment, coastal environment, traffic impacts on one-lane bridge, amenity values and other adverse effects noted under our Further Submission 1 above.</p>		waters or public land, ecological values, wetlands/saltmarshes etc.		
<b>FS361.037</b>	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support in part	Willowridge Developments Limited supports in part the requested amendment to reconsider the RLZ area. It is noted that that in the original submission, Willowridge submitted that the allotment sizes of the RLZ should align with the residential intensity control of the RLZ Chapter.	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Accept in part	<p>RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8</p> <p>Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Lifestyle Zone</p>
<b>S401.003</b>	Braedon & Cook Limited	SUB-S1	Support in part	The PDP minimum lot sizes for subdivision in the Rural Living zone are not considered to provide for an efficient use of land and resources. A 4ha minimum lot size for subdivision will result in landholdings that are too small to be used for commercially viable productive uses, yet also too large for typical lifestyle purposes. This will also result in a cadastral pattern that will not provide a sufficient supply of rural-residential development to service demand in the Far North District. It is therefore the submitters opinion that these lot sizes should be reduced.	<p>Amend the Rural Lifestyle zone thresholds in Standard SUB-S1 as follows:</p> <p>Controlled activity 4ha <b>2ha</b></p> <p>Discretionary activity 2ha <b>1ha</b></p>		Accept	<p>RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8</p> <p>Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Lifestyle Zone</p>
<b>FS44.23</b>	Northland Planning &		Support	Allows for future development in these areas which are predominantly located	Allow		Accept	RLZ 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
	Development 2020 Ltd			on the outskirts of smaller settlements. Smaller allotments of 1ha are more manageable size for lifestyle use. 1ha allows for people to undertake a residential activity while providing the option of growing their own food or having stock at a domestic scale.				Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Lifestyle Zone
<b>FS172.296</b>	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Lifestyle Zone
<b>FS367.003</b>	Meridian Farm Ltd		Support	As noted earlier in this submission, Meridian Farm Ltd own land directly adjacent to the original submitter's site and have also lodged a submission seeking similar relief. Meridian Farm Ltd would be interested in presenting a joint case at the Proposed District Plan hearings.	Allow	allow original submission	Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Lifestyle Zone
<b>S403.003</b>	Meridian Farm Ltd	SUB-S1	Oppose	The PDP minimum lot sizes for subdivision in the RLZ are not considered to provide for an efficient use of land and resources. A 4ha minimum lot size for subdivision will result in landholdings that are too small to be used for commercially viable productive uses, yet also too large for typical lifestyle purposes. This will also result in a cadastral pattern that will not provide a sufficient supply of rural-residential development to service demand in the Far North District. It is therefore the submitters opinion that these lot sizes should be reduced.	Amend the minimum lot size criteria in SUB-S1 in the subdivision chapter for the Rural Living Zone to reduce it from 4ha (controlled activity) and 2ha (discretionary activity) to 2ha (controlled activity) and 1ha (discretionary activity).		Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Lifestyle Zone
<b>FS44.27</b>	Northland Planning &		Support	Provide for 2ha allotments as a RDA and 1ha allotments as Discretionary. Allows for future development in these	Allow		Accept	RLZ 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
	Development 2020 Ltd			areas which are predominantly located on the outskirts of smaller settlements. Smaller allotments of 1ha are more manageable size for lifestyle use. 1ha allows for people to undertake a residential activity while providing the option of growing their own food or having stock at a domestic scale.				Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Lifestyle Zone
<b>FS172.298</b>	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Lifestyle Zone
<b>FS366.003</b>	Breadon and Cook Ltd		Support	As noted earlier in this submission, Breadon and Cook Ltd own land directly adjacent to the original submitter's site and have also lodged a submission seeking similar relief. Breadon and Cook Ltd would be interested in presenting a joint case at the Proposed District Plan hearings.	Allow	allow original submission	Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Lifestyle Zone
<b>FS566.025</b>	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	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Lifestyle Zone
<b>FS569.052</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Lifestyle 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
FS570.015	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	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Lifestyle Zone
S349.017	Neil Construction Limited	SUB-S1	Oppose	A better outcome in these circumstances is to utilise the land more efficiently for rural residential use, adding much needed housing to Kerikeri in a way that does not impose any burden on the community in terms of providing or funding infrastructure.	Amend SUB-S1 to provide for lots of 3,000m2 as a controlled activity and 2,000m2 as a discretionary activity in both the Rural Lifestyle Zone and the Rural Residential Zone		Reject	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Neil Construction Limited submission on the RLZ chapter  <i>Note: This submission point is duplicated in Appendix 2 of other relevant rural section 42A reports with respect to SUB-S1 amendments for those rural zones</i>
FS67.79	The Shooting Box Limited		Support	To provide for a more efficient use of a scarce land resource	Allow		Reject	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Neil Construction Limited submission on the RLZ chapter
FS68.78	P S Yates Family Trust		Support	To provide for a more efficient use of a scarce land resource	Allow		Reject	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Neil Construction Limited submission on the RLZ chapter

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS69.76	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Support	To provide for a more efficient use of a scarce land resource	Allow		Reject	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Neil Construction Limited submission on the RLZ chapter
FS66.146	Bentzen Farm Limited		Support	To provide for a more efficient use of a scarce land resource	Allow		Reject	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Neil Construction Limited submission on the RLZ chapter
FS62.051	Kapiro Conservation Trust 1		Oppose	A better outcome in these circumstances is to utilise the land more efficiently for rural residential use, adding much needed housing to Kerikeri in a way that does not impose any burden on the community in terms of providing or funding infrastructure.	Disallow	Re-zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland) in Rural Production or Horticulture zone etc.	Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Neil Construction Limited submission on the RLZ chapter
FS333.038	Maree Hart		Oppose	<p>These submissions seek inappropriate changes, such as re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, Spoonbill Drive and Kingfisher Drive from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential. Some points seek to weaken the policies and rules / standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural Lifestyle zone and Rural Residential zone, e.g. S349 seeks to delete references to 'rural character' and 'amenity' for the Rural Residential zone.</p> <p>The scale and intensity of urban/residential development sought by these submissions would create a new township in the rural areas at the northern end of Landing Road; this scale and density of development is not</p>	Disallow	Re-zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland) in Rural Production or Horticulture zone etc.	Accept	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Neil Construction Limited submission on the RLZ chapter

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans.</p> <p>It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area that lacks relevant infrastructure and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town in future. Their proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects, such as a large increase in traffic on Landing Road, one-lane bridge and other adverse effects noted under my Further Submission 1 above.</p>				
<b>S179.106</b>	Russell Protection Society (INC)	SUB-S1	Support in part	support in order to retain the level of protection previously afforded by the General Coastal, coastal living and coastal residential zones in the operative plan	Retain Sub -S1 minimum allotment sizes for Kororareka Russell Township zone, rural production , rural residential, rural lifestyle		Accept in part	<p>RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8</p> <p>Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Lifestyle Zone</p> <p><i>Note: This submission point is duplicated in Appendix 2 of other relevant rural section 42A reports with respect to SUB-S1 amendments for those rural zones.</i></p>
<b>FS23.062</b>	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support in part	<p>Agree it is important to ensure effects of subdivision, including cumulative effects, are appropriately considered during consenting processes.</p> <p>Also agree with the lot sizes proposed for Kororāreka zone, and the other zones to the extent this is consistent with our primary submission.</p>	Allow in part	Allow relief sought to the extent relief sought is consistent with our primary submission.	Accept in part	<p>RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8</p> <p>Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Lifestyle 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
FS372.033	John Andrew Riddell		Support	The minimum lot sizes are consistent with Part 2 of the Act, with national policy statements and with the Regional Policy Statement for Northland.	Allow	Grant the submission and retain the minimum allotment sizes for Kororāreka Russell Township, Rural Production, Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle zones.	Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Lifestyle Zone
S250.012	Willowridge Developments Limited	SUB-S1	Support in part	<p>The 40ha allotment size proposed for the RPROZ is considered to be overly conservative, with insufficient consideration of other lot sizes that could reasonably achieve the sought outcomes by the zone.</p> <p>With respect to the RLZ, it is unclear why the proposed minimum lot size for controlled activity subdivision has been selected. To 4ha controlled activity subdivision is inconsistent with the residential density control provided in the RLZ Chapter.</p>	<p>Review and consider a regional consistency with neighbouring Council's for minimum lot sizes, in particular the provision of a 20ha minimum lot size in the RPROZ as a controlled activity.</p> <p>Amend to align the minimum lot size of the RLZ with the residential intensity control of the RLZ Chapter.</p> <p>Retain the minimum lot size for subdivision in the Settlement Zone as notified.</p>		Accept in part	<p>RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8</p> <p>Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Lifestyle Zone</p> <p><i>Note: This submission point is duplicated in Appendix 2 of other relevant rural section 42A reports with respect to SUB-S1 amendments for those rural zones.</i></p>
FS332.262	Russell Protection Society		Oppose	Rural production zone minimum allotment size of 40ha is appropriate in coastal areas.	Disallow in part	Disallow the original submission in part.	Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS570.698	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	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
								S1 as it applies to the Rural Lifestyle Zone
<b>FS566.712</b>	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	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Lifestyle Zone
<b>FS569.734</b>	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	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Lifestyle Zone
<b>S502.082</b>	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	SUB-S1	Support in part	<p>The economic viability in relation to productive areas for primary production varies a great deal depending on whether the use is for horticulture, dairy farming or sheep and beef grazing to name a few. It is also noted that smaller horticultural properties are more economically viable when they have the benefit of versatile soils, access to water for irrigation and access to a workforce. This is evident not only in Kerikeri but also in areas such as Pukenui and Kaitaia.</p> <p>The above lot sizes are sought to reflect the diversity of primary production throughout the entire district as there are many areas that have access to an aquifer or water irrigation which can support primary production within a smaller parcel of land. It is acknowledged within the Rural Environment Economic Analysis Update Report that there are a number</p>	<p>Amend SUB-S1 to provide for:</p> <p>Rural Production Controlled activity 20ha, Restricted discretionary activity 8ha and Discretionary activity 4ha</p> <p>Rural lifestyle discretionary activity 1ha</p>		Accept in part	<p>RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8</p> <p>Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Lifestyle Zone</p> <p><i>Note: This submission point is duplicated in Appendix 2 of other relevant rural section 42A reports with respect to SUB-S1 amendments for those rural zones.</i></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 smaller established horticultural land parcels that are likely to support viable primary productive uses.</p> <p>In addition to this not all land that is zoned as Rural Production contains Highly Versatile Soils, and not all sites that are zoned as Rural Production can be utilised or are suitable for a productive purpose. For this reason, not all sites are set aside as a productive farming unit which would require an allotment size of 40ha or more.</p> <p>As middle ground we seek to add in a Restricted Discretionary activity status of 8ha. This aligns with the Rural Environment Economic Analysis report which confirms that horticultural activities can effectively be undertaken on land of 7ha in area. This leaves an additional hectare to establish a dwelling and associated sheds and infrastructure. While the plan has proposed a horticultural zone for Kerikeri and Waipapa to give effect to this, no consideration to horticultural activities within the rest of the district has been undertaken. Having this as an enabling option ensures other horticultural areas in the District are able to achieve similar outcomes to Kerikeri.</p> <p>The 4ha allotment size as a discretionary activity enables less productive land to be utilised for activities such as lifestyle development with small scale subsistence living. This ensures small scale lifestyle development is available in more rural areas for people who either want to retire and remove the family house from the farm, or take off an area which</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>is not productive on the main farming unit, to enable a family to establish a dwelling and have a couple of sheep or cattle with gardens, where a less intensive use would be beneficial for the environment in terms of pugging and erosion. As a discretionary activity any proposal requires the full range of effects to be considered through the resource consent process and the decision remains up to Council to consider whether approval should be granted.</p> <p>We support the inclusion of the Rural Residential zone which enables Discretionary allotment sizes of up to 2000m<sup>2</sup>. Within the Section 32 report, Section 1.3, it is stated that the primary purpose of the zone is to enable people to undertake a residential activity, however the size of the lot sizes gives people the option of growing their own food or having a horse or stock at a domestic scale, while still enabling farming on larger lots. It is considered that the above-mentioned activities can occur on allotments of 1 hectare in size and greater as is evident when driving around the Far North District.</p> <p>The Section 32 report then goes on to explain that reducing fragmentation of the zone is a priority as well as reducing the pressure on providing reticulated infrastructure. Once again, it is considered lot sizes of 1 hectare are more than capable of catering for infrastructure onsite, without creating any adverse effects, as has been provided for in many instances. The majority of these areas are also not located within areas which are serviced by reticulated infrastructure, such that providing such infrastructure would not</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>even be a consideration nor an expectation.</p> <p>Providing rural amenity and avoiding reverse sensitivity effects are a main driver for the more restrictive lot sizes, however, it is considered that providing for lot sizes of 1 hectare as a Discretionary Activity will maintain and enhance the rural amenity of the zone, while providing sites which are able to be effectively managed by the owners as a small productive/lifestyle lot.</p>				
<b>FS172.224</b>	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Accept in part	<p>RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8</p> <p>Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Lifestyle Zone</p>
<b>FS383.3</b>	The Shooting Box Limited		Support	The relief sought by the submitter recognises that many rural production and rural lifestyle zoned lots are small and/or have no rural production value and should be able to be appropriately subdivided for rural-residential use.	Allow		Accept in part	<p>RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8</p> <p>Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Lifestyle Zone</p>
<b>FS384.4</b>	P S Yates Family Trust		Support	The relief sought by the submitter recognises that many rural production and rural lifestyle zoned lots are small and/or have no rural production value and should be able to be appropriately subdivided for rural-residential use.	Allow		Accept in part	<p>RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8</p> <p>Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Lifestyle Zone</p>
<b>FS397.007</b>	IDF Developments Limited		Support	The submissions are supported on the basis that they seek additional subdivision options and more appropriate vegetation clearance rules in the Rural Production Zone.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part	<p>RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8</p> <p>Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to</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 Rural Lifestyle Zone
<b>FS405.093</b>	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support in part	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the submission point on the basis that the minimum allotment size of the Rural Production Zone is changed to 20 hectares as 40 hectares is considered to be overly conservative.	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Lifestyle Zone
<b>FS332.228</b>	Russell Protection Society		Oppose	In lieu of coastal zones, Rural Production zones provide for the necessary protection of vulnerable coastal areas, especially in the Bay of Islands.	Disallow in part	Retain 40/8 ha min size for Rural Production Zone and 4/2 ha for Rural Lifestyle Zone with no restricted discretionary activities.	Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Lifestyle Zone
<b>FS354.143</b>	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	The submitter seeks to amend SUB-S1 to provide for: Rural Production Controlled activity 20ha, Restricted discretionary activity 8ha and Discretionary activity 4ha Rural lifestyle discretionary activity 1ha. HortNZ considers that this will lead to greater fragmentation of rural land, not achieve the objectives and policies in the Plan and not give effect to the NPSHPL.	Disallow	Disallow S502.082	Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Lifestyle Zone
<b>FS361.042</b>	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support in part	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the submission point on the basis that the minimum allotment size of the Rural Production Zone is changed to 20ha as 40ha is considered to be overly conservative.	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Accept in part	RLZ S42A Report Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Lifestyle Zone