

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

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|-------------------|---|--|-----------------|---|--|-------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| S521.004 | Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK) | General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous | Support in part | We seek PDP provisions that will support active modes of transport, including pedestrians, cyclists, disability scooters etc. The PDP needs revised/additional policies and rules to ensure that active transport modes will be support in practice when consents are assessed/granted. | Amend PDP to promote and support active transport and multi modal integrated transport. | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS36.005 | Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency | | Support | Supports the provision of active and multi modal of transport as this recognises accessibility, safety and integration of land use and transport planning which also aligns with the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport and Waka Kotahi strategies such as Arataki - 30 Year Plan. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS277.16 | Jenny Collison | | Support | Kerikeri is very car-focused. This needs to change | Allow | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS566.1714 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| S454.034 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous | Not Stated | The transport chapter of the FNPDP contains provisions that provide for infrastructure, including the National Grid, however not all provisions relating the infrastructure are located within the chapter. The FNPDP contains provisions in a number of other chapters that relate to | Retain the transport chapter but amend it to ensure that all provisions relating to infrastructure, including the National Grid, are contained within that chapter and cross references within all other chapters of the FNPDP make it clear that the infrastructure provisions apply, or have primacy where necessary. Should the FNPDP not be amended as requested, ensure that the District Wide | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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, including the National Grid. These include for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Natural Hazards - Hazardous substances - Historic Heritage - Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity - Natural character - Natural features and landscapes - Subdivision - Earthworks - Notable trees <p>Where necessary, Transpower has made more specific submission on provisions throughout the FNPDP as drafted seeking to ensure that critical infrastructure, such as the National Grid, is appropriately provided for and the NPSET is given effect to efficiently and effectively.</p> <p>However, Transpower's preference is for a standalone set of provisions for infrastructure, including the National Grid, within the Infrastructure Chapter as it avoids duplication (for example in the zone rules) and provides a coherent set of rules which applicants/users can refer to.</p> <p>The ability of the EPlan to provide links within the plan would ensure plan users can be directed to the Infrastructure chapter as required, when looking in other chapters. It could also be made clear that the objectives, policies and rules in the infrastructure chapter have primacy, in accordance with the requirements of the NPSET for example, where there is a conflict.</p> | <p>Matters, Zones and Overlays and other relevant sections of the Plan (such as the How the Plan Works chapter) are amended to ensure that infrastructure is appropriately provided for and the cross-referencing between chapters clearly directs the plan user to the provisions of the Infrastructure chapter that apply to an activity and where these have primacy.</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 |
|------------------|--|--|----------|--|---|----------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| partFS36.012 | Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency | | Support | Supports the clarification of cross references to ensure that infrastructure is appropriately provided for and that provisions apply or have primacy where necessary. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS346.022 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. | | Oppose | Forest & Bird opposes amendments that would give Infrastructure and transport provisions primacy over other sections of the plan, particularly IB, NATC, ONFLs and Notable Trees. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS369.013 | Top Energy | | Support | Top Energy supports appropriate cross-referencing between the Transport Chapter and other District Wide Chapters and that provisions are consistently applied across topics | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| S529.074 | Carbon Neutral NZ Trust | General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous | Support | Seek to ensure that Council and Developers are required to ensure that land use and development considers transportation effects beyond the site. That cul-de-sac roads are generally discouraged unless provision has been made for future connectivity, and that multi modal transport planning is encouraged. | Amend to seek changes to provisions within the plan that direct a high level of connectivity, integrated land use and transport planning, and multi modal transport networks. | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS36.013 | Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency | | Support | Supports the provision of an integrated land use and transport system that includes multi modal transport options. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS570.1962 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS566.1976 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS569.1998 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|--|-----------------|--|---|-------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| S431.155 | John Andrew Riddell | General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous | Not Stated | The amendment is necessary in order to achieve the purpose of the Act. | Amend all objectives, policies, rules and standards relating to providing for vehicles and roading to place much more emphasis on providing for cycling and for walking | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS332.155 | 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 | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| S427.024 | Kapiro Residents Association | General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous | Support in part | Many new subdivisions in Kerikeri and the surrounding rural area have greatly increased the volume of traffic using the central shopping/service area and roads leading to/from the CBD (e.g. Kerikeri Road, Waipapa Road, Landing Road, Kapiro Road, Pureua Road). When new developments are approved, insufficient account is taken of the total/cumulative impact of multiple developments on traffic. Other negative impacts on the community are not taken into account - such as such additional levels of noise, disruption and other changes that can affect people, amenity values and the character of the area. | Amend Plan to require full consideration of cumulative/combined traffic effects, congestion, emissions, noise etc. in townships and roads, especially roads leading to/from a CBD or service centres, and policies/rules should allow development proposals to be rejected on the grounds of significant adverse effects from traffic [inferred]. | | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS320.1 | Elizna Bates | | Support | We are writing to submit a request for amendment to the District Plan regarding hours of operation as well as additional control of noise and light pollution limits within the Rural Production Zone. The property at 2329 SH10, Waipapa has been in our family since 2013 and we would like to begin by expressing our appreciation for the attention and dedication the Council gives to the welfare and harmony of our community. It is in this spirit that we bring our concerns and | Allow | | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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>recommendations for changes to the current District Plan.</p> <p>In the Rural Production Zone, various agricultural and production activities play a vital role in our local economy. However, the existing district plan regulations concerning hours of operation and noise control have not kept pace with the evolving needs and expectations of our community. Since 2013 we have seen a significant increase in development in this area. Although this has brought increased amenities it has also led to significant increases in business traffic and the attendant noise and light pollution.</p> <p>It appears that many businesses in this area are considerate of local residents. Unfortunately, some businesses have seen this as an opportunity to expand business operations past what is reasonable considerate of their residential neighbours.</p> <p>This has led to disruption in the daily lives of nearby residents, including excessive noise during unconventional hours and significant sleep deprivation and the accompanying mental health and health impacts that come along with that. This not only impacts the quality of life but also raises concerns about the long-term well-being of our community.</p> <p>By way of example, the Allied Kapiro gas station and associated garage has historically operated within reasonable hours of 7 a.m. to 5 p.m. from Monday to Friday. This caused no disturbances to the peaceful nighttime hours that our community cherishes. However, as of January this year, the nature of their business underwent a transformation.</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>They now work on - and retail - various two-stroke equipment, including chainsaws, motor mowers, and weed-eaters. These equipment repairs and sales have introduced a significant increase in noise levels and disruptions to the surrounding area. Along with these increased work hour flood lights are now also kept on through a large portions of the night creating significant light pollution and disturbance.</p> <p>The most distressing aspect of this change is that works is now undertaken seven days a week and often well into the late hours of the night (often until 4am). Between the noise and the flood light disturbance there is simply no respite for local residents. Prior to these activities it was possible to hear local night life such as local kiwi birds in the area. This activity now appears to have ceased altogether.</p> <p>As a resident and stakeholder in this community, I believe it is crucial to strike a balance between supporting rural production activities and ensuring the peace and well-being of our residents.</p> <p>In light of the aforementioned concerns, we respectfully propose the following amendments to the district plan:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Revised Hours of Operation: We urge the City Council to implement new regulations that define reasonable hours of operation for businesses within the Rural Production Zone. These hours should strike a balance between accommodating commercial activities and preserving the | | | | |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|--|-------------------------------|--|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | | | | <p>tranquillity of residential areas. A set of guidelines tailored to the specific nature of businesses, such as the Allied Kapiro gas station and Garage, should be established.</p> <p>2. Noise Control Limits: To mitigate noise disturbances for nearby residents, we propose the implementation of stricter noise control limits. This could include limits on decibel levels, as well as the use of noise-reducing technologies or practices by businesses operating within the Rural Production Zone.</p> <p>3. Light pollution at boundary: Perhaps this could also be addressed in some way under suitable regulation.</p> <p>4. Fitting in with nature: Perhaps this could also be addressed in some way under suitable regulation.</p> <p>By adopting these proposed amendments, the Council can protect the well-being of residents while encouraging responsible business practices within our community. Clearer regulations will provide businesses with guidance and predictability, facilitating responsible growth and investment within our community. We are hopeful that this would foster a harmonious coexistence between local businesses and residents, which is essential for the overall prosperity and happiness of our community.</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>In conclusion, we respectfully ask the Council to consider and endorse these proposed amendments to the District Plan. By striking a fair balance between the needs of local businesses and the quality of life for residents we can ensure the continued growth and prosperity of our community.</p> <p>We are more than willing to provide any additional information or participate in any public consultations or hearings to further discuss these proposals.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and attention to this matter. We believe that by working together, we can find a solution that benefits both our local businesses and our community's peaceful way of life.</p> | | | | |
| FS277.13 | Jenny Collison | | Support | Strongly support, and comes back to the need for an overall plan. | Allow | | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| S560.002 | Jane E Johnston | General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous | Oppose | The parking requirements under TRAN-Table 1 are excessive and counter to the policies and objectives for sustainable transport networks, and the promotion of alternative modes of transport (to private car use). | Seeks alternative method to rules in the PDP of encouraging public transport use by advocating other divisions within Council notify requirements (to designate) public transport hubs, and associated facilities along key routes to enable public transport use and alternative modes of transport. | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| FS348.081 | Alec Brian Cox | | Oppose | The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA. | Disallow | I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed | Accept in part | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| S42.007 | Te Whatu Ora - Health New Zealand, Te Tai Tokerau | BED | Support in part | The definition of bed in the proposed district plan currently refers to watercourses. | Insert definition of bed. That the definition of bed be included as it relates to the carparking provisions in the Proposed District Plan. | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS570.024 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Oppose | Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions. | Disallow | Disallow to the extent that the submission is | Accept in part | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|---|---------------------|-----------------|---|--|---|------------------------|--|
| | | | | | | inconsistent with our original submission | | |
| FS566.038 | 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 | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS569.060 | 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 | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| S356.001 | Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency | LIMITED ACCESS ROAD | Support in part | The definition is not quite accurate as specified in the Government Roading Powers Act 1989. A large portion of the State Highway network is LAR but not all. | Amend definition as follows: "LARs are not a road for the purposes of subdivision unless the Minister of Transport agrees in a particular instance upon a recommendation from Transit New Zealand that it can be used as such. a notice is issued under s93 of the Government Roading Powers Act 1989. LARs in the district also include most of the State Highway network, all Strategic Roads and urban portions of Arterial Roads (those parts within speed restriction signs). | | Accept | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| S271.005 | Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust | New Definition | Support in part | This is a term that is used often throughout the PDP but is not defined. The principal of integrated transportation networks is supported, and it considered useful to have this term defined to ensure that it is clear to plan users what is meant. | Insert a definition for 'Integrated transport network'. | | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS25.040 | Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited | | Support | Supports the proposal to clarify what is intended by an integrated transport network. | Allow | Allow the original submission, subject to appropriate wording | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS36.015 | Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency | | Support | Supports the use of a definition for "integrated transport network" and requests to be involved in the drafting. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|----------------|-----------------|---|---|--|------------------------|--|
| FS325.021 | Turnstone Trust Limited | | Support | TT supports the proposal to clarify what is intended by an integrated transport network. | Allow | Allow the original submission subject to appropriate wording | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS277.51 | Jenny Collison | | Support | I support Our Kerikeri submission | Allow | | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS570.728 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS566.742 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS569.764 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| S529.070 | Carbon Neutral NZ Trust | New Definition | Support in part | This is a term that is used often throughout the PDP but is not defined. The principal of integrated transportation networks is supported, and it considered useful to have this term defined to ensure that it is clear to plan users what is meant. | Insert a definition for 'Integrated transport network'. | | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS570.1958 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS566.1972 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS569.1994 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| S524.005 | Vision Kerikeri (Vision for | New Definition | Support in part | This is a term that is used often throughout the PDP but is not defined. The principal of integrated | Insert a definition for 'Integrated transport network'. | | Reject | 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 |
|-------------------|---|----------------|-----------------|--|---|---|------------------------|---|
| | Kerikeri and Environs, VKK) | | | transportation networks is supported, and it considered useful to have this term defined to ensure that it is clear to plan users what is meant. | | | | Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS566.1823 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| S446.005 | Kapiro Conservation Trust | New Definition | Not Stated | This is a term that is used often throughout the PDP but is not defined. The principal of integrated transportation networks is supported, and it considered useful to have this term defined to ensure that it is clear to plan users what is meant. The definition should include enforce the importance of connectivity, and multi modal transport options. | Insert a definition for 'Integrated transport network'. | | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS569.1764 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS570.1763 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| S271.009 | Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust | Overview | Support | Seek to ensure that Council and Developers are required to ensure that land use and development considers transportation effects beyond the site. That cul-de-sac roads are generally discouraged unless provision has been made for future connectivity, and that multi modal transport planning is encouraged. | Amend to seek changes to provisions within the plan that direct a high level of connectivity, integrated land use and transport planning, and multi modal transport networks. | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS25.067 | Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited | | Support in part | Supports the intent of the proposed amendments, subject to considering the most appropriate wording. | Allow in part | Allow the original submission in part, subject to appropriate wording | Accept in part | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|---|-----------|-----------------|--|---|--|------------------------|--|
| FS111.036 | Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT) | | Support | PHTTCCT support provisions of the plan which achieve a high level of connectivity, integrated land use and transport planning and support multi modal transport networks. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS325.043 | Turnstone Trust Limited | | Support in part | TT supports the intent of the proposed amendments, subject to considering the most appropriate wording. | Allow | Allow the original submission subject to appropriate wording | Accept in part | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS570.732 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS566.746 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS569.768 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| S524.009 | Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK) | Overview | Support | Seek to ensure that Council and Developers are required to ensure that land use and development considers transportation effects beyond the site. That cul-de-sac roads are generally discouraged unless provision has been made for future connectivity, and that multi modal transport planning is encouraged. | Amend to seek changes to provisions within the plan that direct a high level of connectivity, integrated land use and transport planning, and multi modal transport networks. | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS111.037 | Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT) | | Support | PHTTCCT support provisions of the plan which achieve a high level of connectivity, integrated land use and transport planning and support multi modal transport networks. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS566.1827 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|-------------------|---|-----------|-----------------|---|---|-------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| S428.004 | Kapiro Residents Association | Overview | Support in part | We seek PDP provisions that will support active modes of transport, including pedestrians, cyclists, disability scooters etc. The PDP needs revised/additional policies and rules to ensure that active transport modes will be support in practice when consents are assessed/granted. | Amend PDP to promote and support active transport and multi modal integrated transport. | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS111.038 | Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT) | | Support | PHTTCCT support the request for revised/additional policies and rules to ensure that active transport modes will be support in practice. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| S529.050 | Carbon Neutral NZ Trust | Overview | Support in part | We seek PDP provisions that will support active modes of transport, including pedestrians, cyclists, disability scooters etc. The PDP needs revised/additional policies and rules to ensure that active transport modes will be support in practice when consents are assessed/granted. | Amend PDP to promote and support active transport and multi modal integrated transport. | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS111.039 | Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT) | | Support | PHTTCCT support the request for revised/additional policies and rules to ensure that active transport modes will be support in practice. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS570.1939 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS566.1953 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS569.1975 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|-------------------|---|------------|-----------------|---|---|-------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| S443.004 | Kapiro Conservation Trust | Overview | Support in part | We seek PDP provisions that will support active modes of transport, including pedestrians, cyclists, disability scooters etc. The PDP needs revised/additional policies and rules to ensure that active transport modes will be support in practice when consents are assessed/granted. | Amend PDP to promote and support active transport and multi modal integrated transport. | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS111.040 | Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT) | | Support | PHTTCCT support the request for revised/additional policies and rules to ensure that active transport modes will be support in practice. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS569.1749 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS570.1729 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| S425.014 | Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust | Objectives | Not Stated | In general, PHTTCCT seek to ensure that Council and Developers are required to ensure that land use and development considers transportation effects beyond the site. That cul-de-sac roads are generally discouraged unless provision has been made for future connectivity, that provision for future transport networks (see sub#4) is provided at the time of subdivision and land use, and that multi modal transport planning is encouraged | Amend provisions within the plan that direct a high level of connectivity, integrated land use and transport planning, provision for future transport networks and multi modal transport networks. | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| S425.012 | Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust | Objectives | Support in part | PHTTCCT consider that the Transport Chapter fails to sufficiently recognise and provide for regional significant transport infrastructure. It is considered that: - Including the enablement of the provisions for the Trail in this chapter confuses its | Insert the Trail in the maps as an overlay and that the suit of provisions provided as Attachment 2 be incorporated into the Plan (see section 2.0 of this submission). in the event that Council does not accept PHHTTCCT primary relief: | | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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>purpose which otherwise predominantly appears to be providing private development performance standard triggers for traffic parking and access. The Infrastructure Chapter appears the logical place, however, as currently drafted the Infrastructure Chapter only applies to works undertaken by a 'network utility operator' which PHTTCCT is not, and while FNDC are the definition of network utility operator does not extend to construction or operation of cycleways.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There are no provisions that seek to protect the trail from reverse sensitivity which as regionally significant infrastructure, is directed by 5.1.3 and 5.3.1 of the RPS, even though the overview suggests that the chapter regulates 'the impacts of land use and subdivision on the transportation network'. - The objectives and policies do not adequately recognise or provide for the development, operation, maintenance or upgrading of the Trail as regionally significant infrastructure in the mapped sensitive areas (e.g. SNA's, outstanding natural features or landscapes, and coastal environment) as is achieved in the infrastructure chapter | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Review the drafting of the chapter to make its purpose clear. - Provide direction in a clear and consistent throughout the plan in terms of how chapters are meant to interact. - Ensure that appropriate objective and policy direction is included to recognise and provide for the Trail as Regionally Significant Infrastructure | | |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|------------|------------|---|---|--|------------------------|--|
| | | | | for other regionally significant infrastructure. | | | | |
| FS299.4 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | | Oppose | See separate email | Disallow | | Accept | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| S483.103 | Top Energy Limited | Objectives | Not Stated | The Transport Chapter is not of significant interest to Top Energy. However, it is important that recognition is made for the appropriate provision of infrastructure (e.g., electricity and telecommunications) in the transport network, in particular the roading corridor, as often this infrastructure is located within it. Rather than making detailed submissions on the chapter, Top Energy seek that this is adequately addressed across the objectives, policies and rules in this chapter | Amend the transport provisions to provide for objectives, policies and rules that enable the operation, maintenance, repair and upgrading the appropriate provision of infrastructure within the transport network, in particular the roading corridor. | | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS196.195 | Joe Carr | | Support | tautoko | Allow | | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS345.154 | Ngawha Generation Limited | | Support | NGL is a subsidiary of Top Energy Limited. NGL supports all submission points made by Top Energy. | Allow | Allow all of the relief sought by Top Energy Limited in its submission (S483). | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| S516.036 | Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland | Objectives | Not Stated | Ngā Tai Ora note that the PDP is silent on the issue of the health impacts of unsealed rural roads. There are significant concerns regarding the effects that dust generated from unsealed rural roads can have on adjacent sensitive activities (e.g., residential units) that are not appropriately setback from the road. Effects include the adverse health effects such as respiratory illness (e.g., asthma) that dust generation can have | Insert the following objectives, policies and rules into either the Transport Chapter or relevant zone chapters: Objective: Manage the risk from unsealed roads to public health. Policy: To ensure sensitive activities are appropriately setback from unsealed roads to reduce the adverse effects to public health from the exposure to dust. Rule XXX Sensitive Activity: | | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|-------------------|---|------------|-----------------|--|---|-------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| | | | | for on-site water supply (e.g., rainwater harvesting). Ngā Tai Ora have strongly advocated to other Councils in Te Tai Tokerau regarding this, and recommend that FNDC should consider including mandatory setbacks for sensitive activities from unsealed rural roads, or other methods that are not cost prohibitive for property owners but can address the significant adverse health effects associated with this issue. Ngā Tai Ora would welcome meeting with FNDC staff to discuss how this matter can be sufficiently addressed in the eventual PDP. | Activity Status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The sensitive activity is setback at least 20m from any unsealed road. Activity status where compliance is not achieved: Discretionary | | | |
| FS196.237 | Joe Carr | | Support in part | Activity breach should be restricted discretionary | Allow in part | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| S446.009 | Kapiro Conservation Trust | Objectives | Support in part | In general, our group seeks to ensure that Council and Developers are required to ensure that land use and development considers transportation effects beyond the site. That cul-de-sac roads are generally discouraged unless provision has been made for future connectivity, and that multi modal transport planning is encouraged. | Amend provisions within the plan that direct a high level of connectivity, integrated land use and transport planning, and multi modal transport networks. | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS111.041 | Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT) | | Support | PHTTCCT support provisions of the plan which achieve a high level of connectivity, integrated land use and transport planning and support multi modal transport networks | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS569.1768 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS570.1767 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | | Accept in part | 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: General matters |
| S82.013 | Good Journey Limited | Objectives | Oppose | The objectives are opposed to the extent that car parking minimums are still specified in the Mixed Use zone. Should existing operations wish to more intensively develop their sites in the Mixed Use zone by increasing the amount of "gross business area" and / or the provision of residential accommodation then additional carparks are required. Additional controls such as bicycle parks and end of trip facilities are also required. Intensification and development of Mixed Use areas should be encouraged by the removal of minimum car parking standards in recognition of the benefits that Mixed Use zones can bring in terms of both land use outcomes and travel patterns. | Delete car park minimums in the Mixed Use Zone and other relief that will satisfy the concerns of the submitter. | | Accept | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| FS542.017 | Foodstuffs North Island Limited | | Support | Foodstuffs generally supports the deletion of car park minimums | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| S431.151 | John Andrew Riddell | Objectives | Not Stated | The amendment is necessary in order to achieve the purpose of the Act. | Amend all objectives, policies, rules and standards relating to providing for vehicles and roading to place much more emphasis on providing for cycling and for walking | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS332.151 | 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 | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| S356.034 | Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency | TRAN-O1 | Support | Not stated | Retain TRAN-O1 as notified | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN 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 |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|-------------------------------|--|------------------------|--|
| S561.022 | Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities | TRAN-O1 | Support | Integration of land use and transport networks is essential to enable connected, safe, efficient and affordable urban growth and development. | Retain TRAN-O1 as notified. | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS32.076 | Jeff Kemp | | Oppose | <p>The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes.</p> <p>The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts.</p> <p>The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.</p> | Disallow | Disallow the original submission. | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS23.294 | Des and Lorraine Morrison | | Support | Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land. | Allow | Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN 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 |
|------------------|---|-----------|----------|---|-------------------------------|---|------------------------|---|
| FS47.036 | Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust | | Oppose | <p>The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan.</p> <p>Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document.</p> | Disallow | Disallow the entire original submission | Accept in part | |
| FS348.109 | Alec Brian Cox | | Oppose | The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA. | Disallow | I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| S416.024 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | TRAN-O1 | Support | KiwiRail supports the objective in that the rail network, as a transport network is regionally significant infrastructure and supports community welfare. | Retain Objective TRAN-O1 | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS111.042 | Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT) | | Support | PHTTCCT supports the objective in that the cycle network, as a transport network is regionally significant infrastructure and supports community welfare. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| S463.018 | Waiaua Bay Farm Limited | TRAN-O2 | Support | WBF supports an effects management focus, rather than a narrow avoidance focus, for the development of the transportation network. | Retain Objective TRAN-O2 | | Reject | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN 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 |
| FS91.6 | Moana Kiff | | Oppose | The word "avoid" better aligns with our commitment to preserving our cultural heritage and natural environment. | Disallow | | Accept | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| S394.018 | Haititaimarangai Marae Kaitiaki Trust | TRAN-O2 | Support in part | Sustainable management may require avoidance of adverse effects (as opposed to minimisation) in some instances. | Amend Objective TRAN-O2 as follows: The transport network is designed and located to avoid or minimise adverse effects on historical, cultural and natural values. | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS363.018 | Liz Rowena Maki Hetaraka. | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS538.018 | Awhina Fiaui | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS537.018 | Maryanne June Harrison | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS536.018 | Bradley Tauhara Rupapera | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS535.018 | Dyrell Akavi | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN 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 |
| FS533.018 | Sidney John Rupapera | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS532.018 | Wiremu Hetaraka | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS531.018 | Phyllis Marie Hetaraka | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS530.018 | Norma Evans | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS529.018 | Aaron Rupapera | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS528.018 | Erana Samuels | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS527.018 | David Matiu | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN 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 |
| FS526.018 | Michelle Chase | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS525.018 | Vaughn Piripi Duvell Evans | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS524.018 | Tania Morunga | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS523.018 | Brett Larkin | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS522.018 | Stacey Matiu | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS521.018 | Marie Matiu | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS520.018 | Maureen Maheno | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN 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 |
| FS519.018 | Huia Solomon | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS518.018 | William Boyd Rupapera | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS517.018 | Mereana Alma Houkamau | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS516.018 | Rebecca Jan Stensness | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS515.018 | Anaru Poharama | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS514.018 | Robert Reihana | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS513.018 | Ester Rangi Doyle | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN 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 |
| FS512.018 | Ellen Appleby | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS511.018 | Cedric Lawrence | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS510.018 | Raniera Matiu | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS509.018 | Clinton Matiu | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS508.018 | Sana Ryan | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS507.018 | Te TeArani Lawrence | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS506.018 | Selwyn Reihana | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN 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 |
| FS505.018 | Thomson Lawrence | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS504.018 | Ngarei Reihana | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS503.018 | Nina Raharuhi | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS502.018 | Rebecca Rutene | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS501.018 | Patricia Ellen Buddy | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS500.018 | Whetu Rutene | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS499.018 | Paki Daniel Lawrence | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN 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 |
| FS498.018 | Aaron George Lawrence | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS497.018 | Tayla Bamber | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS496.018 | Cheryl Bamber | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS495.018 | Jasmine Cook | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS494.018 | Ian Ethan Bamber | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS493.018 | Albert Tawhio Cook | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS492.018 | Sarah Kati Cook | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN 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 |
| FS491.018 | Mark J Broad | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS490.018 | Julia Middleton | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS489.018 | Josephine Lawrence | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS487.018 | Timothy Matiu | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS486.018 | John Barry Horan | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS485.018 | Travis Horan | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS483.018 | Mate Simon Covich Horan | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN 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 |
| FS482.018 | Waikura Maungaia Marriott | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS481.018 | Peggy Joanne Matiu | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS480.018 | Cheryl Chase | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS479.018 | Jacob Hohaia | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS478.018 | Grayson Fleur Horan | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS477.018 | Chase McIndoe | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS476.018 | Jessica Solomon | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN 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 |
| FS475.018 | Marina Chase | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS474.018 | Steven Matiu | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS473.018 | Beryl Chase | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS472.018 | Krystal-Jade Matiu | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS471.018 | William Gary Butt | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS470.018 | Michael Matiu | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS469.018 | Anne-maree Morrissey | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN 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 |
| FS468.018 | Elias Reihana-Hetaraka | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS467.018 | Carol Matiu | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS466.018 | Janet Myra Bennett | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS465.018 | Rangimarie Muru | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS464.018 | Glennis Lawrence | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS463.018 | Jayden Murray | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS462.018 | Roharia Hepi | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN 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 |
| FS461.018 | Vincent C Matiu | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS460.018 | Tawhai Motu | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS459.018 | Maria Kim Hetaraka | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS458.018 | Alexander John Busby | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS457.018 | Ena Lesley Rupapera | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS456.018 | Rhys Alexander Lawrence-Busby | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS455.018 | Rangi Matthew Marriott | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN 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 |
| FS454.018 | Turei John Rupapera | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS453.018 | Marlaine Ulrich | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS452.018 | Reikura Joan Boyd | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS451.018 | Ariana Bellingham | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS450.018 | Georgina Laing | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS447.018 | Rangaunu Taua | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS440.018 | Hongi Laing | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN 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 |
| FS439.018 | Rahera Fiaui | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS436.018 | Parehuia Jane Williams | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS435.018 | George Hori Lawrence | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS434.018 | Anthony Murphy | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS433.018 | Christian Horan | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS432.018 | Makarita Rutene | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS431.018 | Valarie Rutene | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN 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 |
| FS430.018 | Kaeo Lawrence | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS429.018 | Cedric Rutene | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS428.018 | Shane Horan | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS427.018 | Jacey Horan | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS426.018 | Toni Maheno | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS425.018 | Florence Campbell | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS423.018 | Joseph Maheno | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN 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 |
| FS422.018 | Sharmaine Hepi | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS421.018 | Gia-Dene Gardiner | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS420.018 | Josephine Doyle | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS418.018 | Mary Watkins | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS417.018 | Maddison Lawrence | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS416.018 | Isobel Fitzgibbon | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS415.018 | Michelle Lawrence | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN 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 |
| FS408.018 | Jason Gardiner | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS388.018 | Crystal Myra Broad | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS387.018 | Aroha Whitinui | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS386.018 | Tynan Hokimate Mark | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS385.018 | Victoria Murphy | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS382.018 | Yvonne Meta Desmond | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS381.018 | Lorraine Joan Hetaraka | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN 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 |
| FS380.018 | Asleigh Heteraka-Tawhai | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS379.018 | Kaya Heteraka-Tawhai | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS378.018 | Maanu Reihana | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS365.018 | Roberta Heteraka | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS360.018 | Cameron Mccaskill | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS359.018 | Mark Brannen | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS358.018 | Kailah Raharuhi - Alatipi | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN 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 |
| FS357.018 | Raharuhi Fiaui | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS356.018 | Katharine Kino | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS568.018 | Bonnie Hepi | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS567.018 | Blaze Maraki | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS563.018 | Hohepa Fletcher | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS562.018 | Rhonda Raharuhi | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS561.018 | Ivan Wimoka Hetaraka | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN 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 |
| FS560.018 | Dylan Hetaraka | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS559.018 | Clinton Albert Doyle | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS558.018 | Timothy John Doyle | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS557.018 | Patricia Kate Broad | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS556.018 | Louis Aluishis Brabant | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS555.018 | Kelly Sharee Doyle | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS553.018 | Kenape Saupese | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN 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 |
| FS552.018 | Barbara May Hetaraka | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS551.018 | Alamein Drummond | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS546.018 | Shona Hetaraka | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS545.018 | Peter Charles Rupapera | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS544.018 | Te Waata Lawrence Kara | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS178.018 | Hera Johns | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS413.018 | Charles Lawrence | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN 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 |
| FS588.018 | Ian Taylor Bamber | | Support | Support original submission to protect our wāhi tapu sites of significance and rights as tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission. | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| S425.015 | Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust | TRAN-O3 | Support in part | The intent of the objective is unclear but given TRAN P2 & P1 it is likely intended to encourage integrated transport planning concurrently with development. Assuming this is the case (which would be supported) it could be made clearer. | Amend TRAN-O3 as follows: Land use and development planning , and transport planning all modes of transport are integrated so that the to ensure an efficient pattern of land use and transport networks that are transport network is , safe, efficient and well-connected. Or Add new policy that specifically addresses integrated land use and transport planning. | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| S416.025 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | TRAN-O3 | Support | The objective supports the safe and efficient operation of the rail transport network through ensuring development at its interface is appropriately managed. | Retain Objective TRAN-O3 | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| S331.020 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | TRAN-O3 | Support | The submitter supports objective TRAN-O3 as it will enable a safe, efficient, and well-connected transport network. In addition, the objective supports the provision of social infrastructure within the community that it serves to reduce travel times and distances and congestion, while also encouraging alternative modes of transport. | Retain objective TRAN-O3 as proposed. | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| S271.010 | Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust | TRAN-O3 | Support in part | The intent of the objective is unclear, but given TRAN - P2 & P1 it is likely intended to encourage integrated transport planning concurrently with development. Assuming this is the | Amend TRAN-O3 Land use and development planning , and transport planning all modes of transport are integrated so that the to ensure an | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN 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 |
|------------------|---|-----------|-----------------|---|---|--|------------------------|--|
| | | | | case (which would be supported) it could be made clearer. | efficient pattern of land use and transport networks that are transport network is, safe, efficient and well-connected. Or Insert a new policy that specifically addresses integrated land use and transport planning. | | | Objectives and Policies |
| FS25.068 | Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited | | Support in part | Supports the intent of the proposed amendments, subject to considering the most appropriate wording. | Allow in part | Allow the original submission in part, subject to appropriate wording. | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS111.043 | Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT) | | Support | PHTTCCT supports the clarification of this objective. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS325.044 | Turnstone Trust Limited | | Support in part | TT supports the intent of the proposed amendments, subject to considering the most appropriate wording. | Allow | Allow the original submission subject to appropriate wording. | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS570.733 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS566.747 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS569.769 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN 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 |
| S446.011 | Kapiro Conservation Trust | TRAN-O3 | Support in part | The intent of the objective is unclear, but given TRAN - P2 & P1 it is likely intended to encourage integrated transport planning concurrently with development. Assuming this is the case (which would be supported) it could be made clearer. See suggested amendment | Amend TRAN-O3 as follows: Land use and development planning , and transport planning all modes of transport are integrated so that the to ensure an efficient pattern of land use and transport networks that are transport network is , safe, efficient and well-connected. Or Insert new policy that specifically addresses integrated land use and transport planning. | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS111.044 | Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT) | | Support | PHTTCCT supports the clarification of this objective. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS569.1770 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS570.1769 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| S529.075 | Carbon Neutral NZ Trust | TRAN-O3 | Support in part | The intent of the objective is unclear but given TRAN - P2 & P1 it is likely intended to encourage integrated transport planning concurrently with development. Assuming this is the case (which would be supported) it could be made clearer. | Amend TRAN-O3 Land use and development planning , and transport planning all modes of transport are integrated so that the to ensure an efficient pattern of land use and transport networks that are transport network is , safe, efficient and well-connected. Or Insert a new policy that specifically | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN 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 |
|------------------|---|-----------|-----------------|---|---|-------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| | | | | | addresses integrated land use and transport planning. | | | |
| FS111.045 | Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT) | | Support | PHTTCCT supports the clarification of this objective. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS570.1963 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS566.1977 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS569.1999 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| S524.010 | Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK) | TRAN-O3 | Support in part | The intent of the objective is unclear, but given TRAN - P2 & P1 it is likely intended to encourage integrated transport planning concurrently with development. Assuming this is the case (which would be supported) it could be made clearer. | Amend TRAN-O3 Land use and development planning, and transport planning all modes of transport are integrated so that the to ensure an efficient pattern of land use and transport networks that are transport network is, safe, efficient and well-connected. Or Insert a new policy that specifically addresses integrated land use and transport planning | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS111.046 | Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast | | Support | PHTTCCT supports the clarification of this objective. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | 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 |
|------------------|---|-----------|-----------------|---|--|-------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| | Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT) | | | | | | | Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS566.1828 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| S271.011 | Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust | TRAN-O5 | Support in part | The intended outcome of this objective is not entirely clear. | Amend TRAN-O5 as follows: The transport network provides for the safe and efficient movement of vehicular, cycle and pedestrian traffic, and that also meets the needs of persons with a disability or limited mobility | | Accept | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS570.734 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS566.748 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS569.770 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| S529.076 | Carbon Neutral NZ Trust | TRAN-O5 | Support in part | The intended outcome of this objective is not entirely clear. | Amend TRAN-O5 as follows: The transport network provides for the safe and efficient movement of vehicular, cycle and pedestrian traffic, and that also | | Accept | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN 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 |
|------------------|---|-----------|-----------------|---|---|-------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| | | | | | meets the needs of persons with a disability or limited mobility | | | |
| FS570.1964 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS566.1978 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS569.2000 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| S524.011 | Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK) | TRAN-O5 | Support in part | The intended outcome of this objective is not entirely clear. | Amend TRAN-O5 as follows: The transport network provides for the safe and efficient movement of vehicular, cycle and pedestrian traffic, and that also meets the needs of persons with a disability or limited mobility. | | Accept | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS566.1829 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| S446.012 | Kapiro Conservation Trust | TRAN-O5 | Support in part | As per above, the intended outcome of this objective is not entirely clear. see suggested wording | Amend TRAN-O5 as follows: The transport network provides for the safe and efficient movement of vehicular, cycle and pedestrian traffic, and that also meets the needs of persons with a disability or limited mobility | | Accept | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN 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 |
|------------------|---|-----------|-----------------|---|--|------------------------|--|
| FS569.1771 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | Accept | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS570.1770 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Accept | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| S184.001 | Northland Transport Alliance ¹ | TRAN-O6 | Support in part | Consider rephrasing climate change objective to include active and public transport | Amend Objective TRAN-O6 as follows - The transport network is resilient to the likely current and future effects of climate change, and supports urban environments designed to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, by encouraging development of active mode and public transport networks. OR insert a new objective to give effect to relief sought. | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| S211.001 | Borders Real Estate Northland | TRAN-O6 | Support in part | The submitter supports in part TRAN-06 (implied) but contends that the objective should explicitly include the development of safe networks of walkways and cycleways (separated from motorised traffic) that will actively promote alternative modes of transport in urban areas and beyond. | Amend TRAN-06 to explicitly include the development of safe networks of walkways and cycleways (separated from motorised traffic) that will actively promote alternative modes of transport in urban areas and beyond. | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| S399.036 | Te Hiku Iwi Development Trust | Policies | Not Stated | Objective TRAN-O2 is the only objective which recognises that roading can have long term and permanent effects on the natural environment, including biodiversity. Effects including those due to lighting, road deaths, noise and vibration, habitat fragmentation and modification, air emissions and run off are permanent | Insert a new objective TRAN-O6 to ensure recognition of adverse effects on biodiversity are adequately addressed. We suggest the following: The maintenance and expansion of the transport network is managed so as to recognise adverse effects on indigenous | Reject | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |

¹ Far North District Council / explain referencing

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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 are often underestimated (see recent Manaaki Whenua report available at: https://www.nzta.govt.nz/resources/research/reports/692). These effects can be managed and/or addressed to some degree via appropriate design and other methods (such as rehabilitation or weed control). | biodiversity and address these effects to the extent practicable. | | |
| S427.051 | Kapiro Residents Association | Policies | Support in part | Many new subdivisions in Kerikeri and the surrounding rural area have greatly increased the volume of traffic using the central shopping/service area and roads leading to/from the CBD (e.g. Kerikeri Road, Waipapa Road, Landing Road, Kapiro Road, Purerua Road). When new developments are approved, insufficient account is taken of the total/cumulative impact of multiple developments on traffic. Other negative impacts on the community are not taken into account - such as such additional levels of noise, disruption and other changes that can affect people, amenity values and the character of the area. | Amend the policies to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Include full consideration of cumulative/combined traffic effects, congestion, emissions, noise etc. in townships and roads, especially roads leading to/from a CBD or service centres, and - Allow development proposals to be rejected on the grounds of significant adverse effects from traffic [inferred]. | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| S338.033 | Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust | Policies | Not Stated | Many new subdivisions in Kerikeri and the surrounding rural area have greatly increased the volume of traffic using the central shopping/service area and roads leading to/from the CBD (e.g. Kerikeri Road, Waipapa Road, Landing Road, Kapiro Road, Purerua Road). When new developments are approved, insufficient account is taken of the total/cumulative impact of multiple developments on traffic. Other negative impacts on the community are not taken into account - such as such additional levels of noise, disruption and other changes that can affect | Amend policies to address adverse effects of traffic on those in the neighbourhood and, where relevant, the wider community. | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| | | | | people, amenity values and the character of the area. | | | | |
| FS88.10 | Stephanie Lane | | Support | | Allow | | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS394.004 | Michael Francis Toft, Robert George Vellenoweth and Colleen Wendy, Wardlaw, AJ Maloney Trustee Limited, Donald Frank Orr, Vivien Marie Coad, Deanna Lee MacDonald, Dianne Catherine Hamilton, Robert Hamilton, Timothy George Sopp, Mathew Robert Hill, Barry Charles Young, Joan Catherine Young, Campbell Family Trustee Limited | | Support | For the reasons given within the Original Submission | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS570.971 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS566.985 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject | 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: General matters |
| FS569.1007 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| S425.013 | Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust | Policies | Support in part | <p>PHTTCCT consider that the Transport Chapter fails to sufficiently recognise and provide for regional significant transport infrastructure. It is considered that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Including the enablement of the provisions for the Trail in this chapter confuses its purpose which otherwise predominantly appears to be providing private development performance standard triggers for traffic parking and access. The Infrastructure Chapter appears the logical place, however, as currently drafted the Infrastructure Chapter only applies to works undertaken by a 'network utility operator' which PHTTCCT is not, and while FNDC are the definition of network utility operator does not extend to construction or operation of cycleways. - There are no provisions that seek to protect the trail from reverse sensitivity which as regionally significant infrastructure, is directed by 5.1.3 and 5.3.1 of the RPS, even though the overview suggests that the chapter regulates 'the impacts of land use and subdivision on the transportation network'. | <p>Insert the Trail in the maps as an overlay and that the suit of provisions provided as Attachment 2 be incorporated into the Plan (see section 2.0 of this submission). in the event that Council does not accept PHTTCCT primary relief:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Review the drafting of the chapter to make its purpose clear - Provide direction in a clear and consistent throughout the plan in terms of how chapters are meant to interact. - Ensure that appropriate objective and policy direction is included to recognise and provide for the Trail as Regionally Significant Infrastructure | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters | |

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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 objectives and policies do not adequately recognise or provide for the development, operation, maintenance or upgrading of the Trail as regionally significant infrastructure in the mapped sensitive areas (e.g. SNA's, outstanding natural features or landscapes, and coastal environment) as is achieved in the infrastructure chapter for other regionally significant infrastructure. | | | | |
| FS299.5 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | | Oppose | See separate email | Disallow | | Accept | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| S446.010 | Kapiro Conservation Trust | Policies | Support in part | In general, our group seeks to ensure that Council and Developers are required to ensure that land use and development considers transportation effects beyond the site. That cul-de-sac roads are generally discouraged unless provision has been made for future connectivity, and that multi modal transport planning is encouraged. | Amend provisions within the plan that direct a high level of connectivity, integrated land use and transport planning, and multi modal transport networks. | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS196.177 | Joe Carr | | Oppose | what on earth is wrong with cul de sacs? They are wonderful for house with children, and far more desirable than living on a through road. Every dead end road, and there are thousands of them is a cul de sac. | Disallow | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS111.047 | Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT) | | Support | PHTTCCT support provisions of the plan which achieve a high level of connectivity, integrated land use and transport planning and support multi modal transport networks. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS569.1769 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | | Accept in part | 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: General matters |
| FS570.1768 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Accept in part | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| S516.037 | Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland | Policies | Not Stated | <p>Ngā Tai Ora note that the PDP is silent on the issue of the health impacts of unsealed rural roads. There are significant concerns regarding the effects that dust generated from unsealed rural roads can have on adjacent sensitive activities (e.g., residential units) that are not appropriately setback from the road. Effects include the adverse health effects such as respiratory illness (e.g., asthma) that dust generation can have for on-site water supply (e.g., rainwater harvesting).</p> <p>Ngā Tai Ora have strongly advocated to other Councils in Te Tai Tokerau regarding this, and recommend that FNDC should consider including mandatory setbacks for sensitive activities from unsealed rural roads, or other methods that are not cost prohibitive for property owners but can address the significant adverse health effects associated with this issue. Ngā Tai Ora would welcome meeting with FNDC staff to discuss how this matter can be sufficiently addressed in the eventual PDP.</p> | <p>Insert the following objectives, policies and rules into either the Transport Chapter or relevant zone chapters:</p> <p>Objective: Manage the risk from unsealed roads to public health.</p> <p>Policy: To ensure sensitive activities are appropriately setback from unsealed roads to reduce the adverse effects to public health from the exposure to dust.</p> <p>Rule XXX Sensitive Activity:</p> <p>Activity Status: Permitted</p> <p>Where: PER-1 The sensitive activity is setback at least 20m from any unsealed road.</p> <p>Activity status where compliance is not achieved: Discretionary</p> | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS196.236 | Joe Carr | | Support in part | Activity breach should be restricted discretionary | Allow in part | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| S82.014 | Good Journey Limited | Policies | Oppose | The policies are opposed to the extent that car parking minimums are still specified in the Mixed Use zone. Should existing operations wish to | Delete car park minimums in the Mixed Use Zone and other relief that will satisfy the concerns of the submitter. | Accept | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|---|-----------|------------|---|---|--------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| | | | | more intensively develop their sites in the Mixed Use zone by increasing the amount of "gross business area" and / or the provision of residential accommodation then additional carparks are required. Additional controls such as bicycle parks and end of trip facilities are also required. Intensification and development of Mixed Use areas should be encouraged by the removal of minimum car parking standards in recognition of the benefits that Mixed Use zones can bring in terms of both land use outcomes and travel patterns. | | | | |
| FS542.018 | Foodstuffs North Island Limited | | Support | Foodstuffs generally supports the deletion of car park minimums | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| S431.152 | John Andrew Riddell | Policies | Not Stated | The amendment is necessary in order to achieve the purpose of the Act. | Amend all objectives, policies, rules and standards relating to providing for vehicles and roading to place much more emphasis on providing for cycling and for walking | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS332.152 | 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 | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| S522.023 | Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK) | Policies | Oppose | Many new subdivisions in Kerikeri and the surrounding rural area have greatly increased the volume of traffic using the central shopping/service area and roads leading to/from the CBD (e.g. Kerikeri Road, Waipapa Road, Landing Road, Kapiro Road, Purehua Road). When new developments are approved, insufficient account is taken of the total/cumulative impact of multiple developments on traffic. Other negative impacts on the community are | Amend policies to address adverse effects of traffic on those in the neighbourhood and, where relevant, the wider community. | | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| | | | | not taken into account - such as such additional levels of noise, disruption and other changes that can affect people, amenity values and the character of the area. | | | | |
| FS62.009 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 1 | | Support | <p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns, such as Kerikeri, and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. - Lot 1001 DP 532487 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. - Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. - FNDC has recognised that: 'Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|-------------------------------|--|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | | | | <p>residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive' (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. - The farmland at Lot 1001 DP 532487 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. - Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. - In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site. There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large | | | | |

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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>alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on neighbouring properties and lawfully established activities. - Residential/urban development in this location would generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; one-lane bridge in Landing Road; large volumes of traffic; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values. | | | | |
| FS566.1762 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| S529.035 | Carbon Neutral NZ Trust | Policies | Oppose | <p>Many new subdivisions in Kerikeri and the surrounding rural area have greatly increased the volume of traffic using the central shopping/service area and roads leading to/from the CBD (e.g. Kerikeri Road, Waipapa Road, Landing Road, Kapiro Road, Purerua Road). When new developments are approved, insufficient account is taken of the total/cumulative impact of multiple developments on traffic. Other</p> | Amend policies to address adverse effects of traffic on those in the neighbourhood and, where relevant, the wider community. | | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|-------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|--|-------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| | | | | negative impacts on the community are not taken into account - such as additional levels of noise, disruption and other changes that can affect people, amenity values and the character of the area. | | | | |
| FS570.1925 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS566.1939 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS569.1961 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| S449.036 | Kapiro Conservation Trust | Policies | Oppose | Many new subdivisions in Kerikeri and the surrounding rural area have greatly increased the volume of traffic using the central shopping/service area and roads leading to/from the CBD (e.g. Kerikeri Road, Waipapa Road, Landing Road, Kapiro Road, Purerua Road). When new developments are approved, insufficient account is taken of the total/cumulative impact of multiple developments on traffic. Other negative impacts on the community are not taken into account - such as such additional levels of noise, disruption and other changes that can affect people, amenity values and the character of the area. | Amend policies to address adverse effects of traffic on those in the neighbourhood and, where relevant, the wider community. | | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS569.1835 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS570.1852 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | | Reject | 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: General matters |
| S416.026 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | TRAN-P1 | Support | KiwiRail supports policy recognition for the positive benefits provided by new transport networks/infrastructure. | Retain Policy TRAN-P1 | Accept | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| S184.002 | Northland Transport Alliance | TRAN-P2 | Support in part | Road classification (listed as under most current National Transport Network Classification system - does this incorporate ONF as ONRC is phased out? | Amend clause c of Policy TRAN-P2 to include both ONF and ONRC as follows: c. recognises the different movement and place functions and the design requirements for each road classification under the most current National Transport Network classification, which may include both the One Network Framework (ONF) or One Network Road Classification (ONRC) system; | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| S184.003 | Northland Transport Alliance | TRAN-P2 | Support in part | For safety reasons, amend clause a of Policy TRAN-P2 to recognise national Road To Zero policy | Amend clause a of Policy TRAN-P2 as follows: a. provides safe and efficient linkages and connections for all users using Safe System Principles. | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| S425.016 | Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust | TRAN-P2 | Support in part | Support acknowledgment of Twin Coast Trail and future transport networks (see sub#4), particularly where they contribute to connectivity. Inclusion of multi modal transport options to ensure social and economic wellbeing of our communities, and to respond to climate change | Amend TRAN-P2 Establish and maintain a transport network that: a. provides safe efficient linkages and connections; b. avoids and mitigates adverse effects on historical, cultural and natural environment values to the extent practicable; c. recognises the different functions and design requirements for each road classification under the most current National Transport Network classification system; | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN 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 |
|------------------|---|-----------|-----------------|---|--|------------------------|---|
| | | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> d. supports reductions of greenhouse gases from vehicle movements including through implementation or multi modal transport options; e. considers the likely current and future impacts of climate change when new sections of the network are proposed or existing sections upgraded; and f. provides for existing and future pedestrian and cycling pathways that are well connected, including the Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail. | | |
| S331.021 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | TRAN-P2 | Support | The submitter supports policy TRAN-P2 to maintain a transport network that provides safe efficient linkages and connections and provides for existing and future pedestrian and cycling pathways. | Retain policy TRAN-P2 as proposed. | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| S271.012 | Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust | TRAN-P2 | Support in part | Support acknowledgment of Twin Coast Trail and future cycling pathways, particularly where they contribute to connectivity. Seek inclusion of multi modal transport options to ensure social and economic wellbeing of our communities, and to respond to climate change. | Amend TRAN-P2 Establish and maintain a transport network that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. provides safe efficient linkages and connections; b. avoids and mitigates adverse effects on historical, cultural and natural environment values to the extent practicable; c. recognises the different functions and design requirements for each road classification under the most current National Transport Network classification system; d. supports reductions of greenhouse gases from vehicle movements including through | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|---|-----------|----------|--|--|--------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| | | | | | <p>implementation or multi modal transport options;</p> <p>e. considers the likely current and future impacts of climate change when new sections of the network are proposed or existing sections upgraded; and</p> <p>f. provides for existing and future pedestrian and cycling pathways that are well connected, including the Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail.</p> | | | |
| FS25.069 | Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited | | Support | Supports the amendments for the reason given in the submission. | Allow | Allow the original submission. | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS111.048 | Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT) | | Support | PHTTCCT support inclusion of multi modal transport options to ensure social and economic wellbeing of our communities, and to respond to climate change. | Allow | allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS325.045 | Turnstone Trust Limited | | Support | TT supports the amendments for the reason given in the submission. Support acknowledgment of Twin Coast Trail and future cycling pathways, particularly where they contribute to connectivity. Seek inclusion of multi modal transport options to ensure social and economic wellbeing of our communities, and to respond to climate change. See suggested amended change to better reflect this. | Allow | Allow the original submission. | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS570.735 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|--|---|-------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| | | | | | | | | Objectives and Policies |
| FS566.749 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS569.771 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| S463.019 | Waiaua Bay Farm Limited | TRAN-P2 | Oppose | The requirement under sub-clause (b) to avoid and mitigate effects is unfeasible and does not reflect the requirement under TRAN-O2 to "minimise" effects. | Amend points b. and f. of Policy TRAN-P2 as follows: b. avoids and mitigates manages adverse effects on historical, cultural and natural environment values to the extent practicable; f. provides for existing and future pedestrian and cycling pathways, including the Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail where appropriate . | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS51.134 | Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga | | Oppose | HNZPT considers the proposed amended text removes the necessary direction to ensure the giving effect to Part 2 of the RMA relating to historic heritage. | Disallow | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS91.7 | Moana Kiff | | Oppose | "Avoids" and "mitigates", better aligns with our commitment to preserving our cultural heritage and natural environment. | Disallow | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN 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 |
|------------------|---|-----------|-----------------|---|---|-------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| S446.013 | Kapiro Conservation Trust | TRAN-P2 | Support in part | Support acknowledgment of Twin Coast Trail and future cycling pathways, particularly where they contribute to connectivity. Seek inclusion of multi modal transport options to ensure social and economic well being of our communities, and to respond to climate change. See suggested amended change to better reflect this. | Amend TRAN-P2 Establish and maintain a transport network that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. provides safe efficient linkages and connections; b. avoids and mitigates adverse effects on historical, cultural and natural environment values to the extent practicable; c. recognises the different functions and design requirements for each road classification under the most current National Transport Network classification system; d. supports reductions of greenhouse gases from vehicle movements including through implementation or multi modal transport options; e. considers the likely current and future impacts of climate change when new sections of the network are proposed or existing sections upgraded; and f. provides for existing and future pedestrian and cycling pathways that are well connected, including the Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail. | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS111.049 | Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT) | | Support | PHTTCCT support inclusion of multi modal transport options to ensure social and economic wellbeing of our communities, and to respond to climate change. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS569.1772 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | | Accept in part | 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: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS570.1771 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| S529.077 | Carbon Neutral NZ Trust | TRAN-P2 | Support in part | Support acknowledgment of Twin Coast Trail and future cycling pathways, particularly where they contribute to connectivity. Seek inclusion of multi modal transport options to ensure social and economic wellbeing of our communities, and to respond to climate change. | Amend TRAN-P2 Establish and maintain a transport network that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. provides safe efficient linkages and connections; b. avoids and mitigates adverse effects on historical, cultural and natural environment values to the extent practicable; c. recognises the different functions and design requirements for each road classification under the most current National Transport Network classification system; d. supports reductions of greenhouse gases from vehicle movements including through implementation or multi modal transport options; e. considers the likely current and future impacts of climate change when new sections of the network are proposed or existing sections upgraded; and f. provides for existing and future pedestrian and cycling pathways that are well connected, | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN 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 |
|-------------------|---|-----------|-----------------|---|--|-------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| | | | | | including the Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail. | | | |
| FS111.050 | Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT) | | Support | PHTTCCT support inclusion of multi modal transport options to ensure social and economic wellbeing of our communities, and to respond to climate change. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS570.1965 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS566.1979 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS569.2001 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| S524.012 | Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK) | TRAN-P2 | Support in part | Support acknowledgment of Twin Coast Trail and future cycling pathways, particularly where they contribute to connectivity. Seek inclusion of multi modal transport options to ensure social and economic wellbeing of our communities, and to respond to climate change. | Amend TRAN-P2 Establish and maintain a transport network that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. provides safe efficient linkages and connections; b. avoids and mitigates adverse effects on historical, cultural and natural environment values to the extent practicable; c. recognises the different functions and design requirements for each road classification under the most current National Transport Network classification system; | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN 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 |
|------------------|---|-----------|------------|--|---|--------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| | | | | | d. supports reductions of greenhouse gases from vehicle movements including through implementation or multi modal transport options; e. considers the likely current and future impacts of climate change when new sections of the network are proposed or existing sections upgraded; and f. provides for existing and future pedestrian and cycling pathways that are well connected, including the Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail. | | | |
| FS111.051 | Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT) | | Support | PHTTCCT support inclusion of multi modal transport options to ensure social and economic wellbeing of our communities, and to respond to climate change. | Allow | allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS566.1830 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| S399.035 | Te Hiku Iwi Development Trust | TRAN-P2 | Not Stated | Policy TRAN-P2 is ambiguous - it is not possible to simultaneously avoid and mitigate adverse effects. | Amend point b. of Policy TRAN-P2 as follows: b. avoids significant and remedies and/or mitigates other adverse effects on historical, cultural and natural environment values to the extent practicable; | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS339.029 | Haitaimarangai Marae Kaitiaki Trust | | Support | Setting clear directives as to what level of adverse effect is acceptable is vital to achieving sustainable management. | Allow | Allow the original submission. | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN 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 |
| S522.036 | Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK) | TRAN-P2 | Support | A large survey conducted by Our Kerikeri found that traffic is the single biggest issue for the Kerikeri community. Each new subdivision outside the urban area generates additional traffic. However, intensification of the urban area would allow many more people to live, work or go to school withing a walkable or cyclable distance from home. But this ideal can only be achieved if PDP requires new subdivisions and developments to provide connected walkways and cycleways that will contribute to future networks of walkways and cycleways. | Retain Policy TRAN-P2 (inferred) | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS62.005 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 1 | | Support | <p>it is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns, such as Kerikeri, and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. - Lot 1001 DP 532487 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|-------------------------------|--|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | | | | <p>District. This is a strictly finite resource.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. - FNDC has recognised that: 'Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive' (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). - Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. - The farmland at Lot 1001 DP 532487 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. - Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline | | | | |

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

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|---|-----------|------------|---|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| FS566.1775 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| S338.014 | Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust | TRAN-P2 | Not Stated | A large survey conducted by Our Kerikeri found that traffic is the single biggest issue for the Kerikeri community. Each new subdivision outside the urban area generates additional traffic. However, intensification of the urban area would allow many more people to live, work or go to school withing a walkable or cyclable distance from home. But this ideal can only be achieved if PDP requires new subdivisions and developments to provide connected walkways and cycleways that will contribute to future networks of walkways and cycleways. | Retain Policy TRAN-P2 (inferred) | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS570.955 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS566.969 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS569.991 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| S529.014 | Carbon Neutral NZ Trust | TRAN-P2 | Support | A large survey conducted by Our Kerikeri found that traffic is the single | Retain Policy TRAN-P2 (inferred) | | Accept in part | 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 |
|-------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| | | | | biggest issue for the Kerikeri community. Each new subdivision outside the urban area generates additional traffic. However, intensification of the urban area would allow many more people to live, work or go to school withing a walkable or cyclable distance from home. But this ideal can only be achieved if PDP requires new subdivisions and developments to provide connected walkways and cycleways that will contribute to future networks of walkways and cycleways. | | | | Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS570.1904 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS566.1918 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS569.1940 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| S449.015 | Kapiro Conservation Trust | TRAN-P2 | Support | A large survey conducted by Our Kerikeri found that traffic is the single biggest issue for the Kerikeri community. Each new subdivision outside the urban area generates additional traffic. However, intensification of the urban area would allow many more people to live, work or go to school withing a walkable or cyclable distance from home. But this ideal can only be achieved if PDP | Retain Policy TRAN-P2 (inferred) | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN 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 |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|--|--|------------------------|---|
| | | | | requires new subdivisions and developments to provide connected walkways and cycleways that will contribute to future networks of walkways and cycleways. | | | |
| FS569.1814 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS570.1831 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| S184.004 | Northland Transport Alliance | TRAN-P3 | Support in part | Amend policy TRAN-P3 to address connectivity and discourage the design and construction of "no exit" roads | Amend policy TRAN-P3 to discourage the design and construction of "no exit" roads, particularly in commercial and industrial areas (see WDC District Plan Policy TRA-P1, Item 5). | Accept | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| S211.002 | Borders Real Estate Northland | TRAN-P3 | Support in part | The submitter supports in part TRAN-P3 (implied) but contends that the policy should explicitly include the development of safe networks of walkways and cycleways (separated from motorised traffic) that will actively promote alternative modes of transport in urban areas and beyond. | Amend TRAN-P3 to explicitly include the development of safe networks of walkways and cycleways (separated from motorised traffic) that will actively promote alternative modes of transport in urban areas and beyond. | Reject | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| S416.027 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | TRAN-P3 | Support in part | Largely support the Policy but needs to be amended to provide for level crossing accessway setbacks and sightline controls. Sub clauses (f) and (g) are particularly supported. | Amend subsection a. of Policy TRAN-P3 as follows: the subdivision layout, location of buildings, structures and other potential visual obstructions that may impact on sightlines and the integrity of the road carriageway and railway lines. | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|---|-----------|-----------------|---|---|-------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| S512.015 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | TRAN-P3 | Support in part | For Fire and Emergency to be able to respond to emergencies, it is important that the transportation network is designed, constructed and operated in a way that ensures a safe, efficient, effective, integrated, resilient and sustainable transport system. | Amend TRAN -P3 b. the design of access (including emergency response access) and parking; c. vehicular access to and from sites, including emergency appliances ; ...Note: For further guidance on providing for emergency response access please see Fire and Emergency New Zealand F5-02 GD Designers' Guide to Firefighting Operations: Emergency Vehicle Access | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| S331.022 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | TRAN-P3 | Support | The submitter supports policy TRAN-P3 as it ensures the safe, efficient and well connected operation of the transport network through the management of the listed aspects. | Retain policy TRAN-P3 as proposed | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| S338.015 | Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust | TRAN-P3 | Not Stated | A large survey conducted by Our Kerikeri found that traffic is the single biggest issue for the Kerikeri community. Each new subdivision outside the urban area generates additional traffic. However, intensification of the urban area would allow many more people to live, work or go to school withing a walkable or cyclable distance from home. But this ideal can only be achieved if PDP requires new subdivisions and developments to provide connected walkways and cycleways that will contribute to future networks of walkways and cycleways. | Retain Policy TRAN-P3 (inferred) | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS570.956 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|-------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|---|
| | | | | | | | | Objectives and Policies |
| FS566.970 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS569.992 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| S529.015 | Carbon Neutral NZ Trust | TRAN-P3 | Support | A large survey conducted by Our Kerikeri found that traffic is the single biggest issue for the Kerikeri community. Each new subdivision outside the urban area generates additional traffic. However, intensification of the urban area would allow many more people to live, work or go to school withing a walkable or cyclable distance from home. But this ideal can only be achieved if PDP requires new subdivisions and developments to provide connected walkways and cycleways that will contribute to future networks of walkways and cycleways. | Retain Policy TRAN-P3 (inferred) | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS570.1905 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS566.1919 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN 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 |
|------------------|---|-----------|----------|---|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|---|
| FS569.1941 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| S522.037 | Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK) | TRAN-P3 | Support | A large survey conducted by Our Kerikeri found that traffic is the single biggest issue for the Kerikeri community. Each new subdivision outside the urban area generates additional traffic. However, intensification of the urban area would allow many more people to live, work or go to school withing a walkable or cyclable distance from home. But this ideal can only be achieved if PDP requires new subdivisions and developments to provide connected walkways and cycleways that will contribute to future networks of walkways and cycleways. | Retain Policy TRAN-P3 (inferred) | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS566.1776 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| S449.016 | Kapiro Conservation Trust | TRAN-P3 | Support | A large survey conducted by Our Kerikeri found that traffic is the single biggest issue for the Kerikeri community. Each new subdivision outside the urban area generates additional traffic. However, intensification of the urban area would allow many more people to live, work or go to school withing a walkable or cyclable distance from home. But this ideal can only be achieved if PDP requires new subdivisions and developments to provide connected walkways and cycleways that will | Retain Policy TRAN-P3 (inferred) | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN 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 |
|------------------|--|----------------------|-----------------|--|--|------------------------|---|
| | | | | contribute to future networks of walkways and cycleways. | | | |
| FS569.1815 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS570.1832 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| S184.005 | Northland Transport Alliance | TRAN-P4 | Support in part | Is it Council's intent to move towards the national policy statement on parking? If so, add new clause g. | Amend Policy TRAN-P4 to include new clause as follows: g. recognise NPS-UD car parking | Reject | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| S336.004 | Z Energy Limited | TRAN-P4 ² | Support | Z Energy supports the strategic direction of the Proposed District Plan in the Energy, Infrastructure and Transport Chapters that seek resilience to the effects of climate change and supports reduction in greenhouse gas emissions. Z considers the use of electric vehicles (EVs) to be a key utilisation of new renewable technologies that will help achieve the Council's greenhouse gas reduction and climate change goals. Policy TRAN-P5 encourages new land uses to support, inter alia, the provision of charging stations for electric vehicles. Z Energy supports this policy subject to ensuring it also is applicable to existing land uses, for example, installation of an EV charging station at an existing service station. | Retain Policy TRAN-P4 | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |

² Note that this submission point was incorrectly allocated to TRAN-P4 in the summary of submissions when it clearly relates to TRAN-P5.

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|---|-----------|-----------------|--|--|------------------------|---|
| S331.023 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | TRAN-P4 | Support | The submitter supports policy TRAN-P4 as it manages the design, location and supply of parking to achieve the safe, efficient and effective operation of the transport network and to support the operational and functional requirements of activities. | Retain policy TRAN-P4 as proposed | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| S184.008 | Far North District Council | TRAN-P5 | Support in part | TRAN-P5 (inferred) calls for "safe and secure" bike parking. Is design of bike parking included in the Engineering Standards? Suggest that safe and secure parking should also be covered. | Amend TRAN-P5 to include new clause e as follows: e. safe and secure parking. | Reject | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| S524.023 | Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK) | TRAN-P5 | Support | The intent of the objective is supported, but amendments are suggested to make this policy more impactful. | Encourage new land uses and development to support an integrated and well connected and diverse multi modal transport network by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Requiring consideration of promoting alternative transport modes at the time of land use and development; b. Ensuring that the construction of new transportation infrastructure aligns with relevant spatial or strategic document c. Encouraging the provision of safe and secure parking facilities for bicycles and associated changing or showering facilities for staff; d. Requiring allocation of parking facilities for motorcycles, mobility scooters, car share vehicles, pick up/drop off areas for ride share services and charging stations for electric vehicles; and | Reject | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN 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 |
|-------------------|---|-----------|-----------------|---|--|---|------------------------|--|
| | | | | | e. supporting the establishment and operation of accommodation and tourism related activities in close proximity to the Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail, provided reverse sensitivity effects can be avoided. | | | |
| FS93.38 | Leonie M Exel | | Support in part | I support any additional means of transport for those needing to travel with their pets. Please consider how far dog owners must walk to get to the nearest area where their dog can run freely - a requirement for a happy dog life. Add dog parks, allow dogs on a lead and cats in carry cages onto buses. Think about pet owners when you think about transport. | Allow in part | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS111.055 | Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT) | | Support | PHTTCCT support the suggested amendments | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS403.106 | Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora | | Support in part | Te Whatu Ora support amendment of this policy to provide for multi-modal transport methods. | Allow in part | Te Whatu Ora support amendment of this policy to provide for multi-modal transport methods. | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS566.1841 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| S271.023 | Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust | TRAN-P5 | Support | The intent of the objective is supported, but amendments are suggested to make this policy more impactful. | Encourage new land uses and development to support an integrated and well | | Reject | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|--|--------------------------------|------------------------|---|
| | | | | | <p>connected and diverse multi modal transport network by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Requiring consideration of promoting alternative transport modes at the time of land use and development; b. Ensuring that the construction of new transportation infrastructure aligns with relevant spatial or strategic document c. Encouraging the provision of safe and secure parking facilities for bicycles and associated changing or showering facilities for staff; d. Requiring allocation of parking facilities for motorcycles, mobility scooters, car share vehicles, pick up/drop off areas for ride share services and charging stations for electric vehicles; and e. supporting the establishment and operation of accommodation and tourism related activities in close proximity to the Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail, provided reverse sensitivity effects can be avoided. | | | Objectives and Policies |
| FS25.070 | Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited | | Support | Supports the amendments for the reason given in the submission. | Allow | Allow the original submission. | Reject | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN 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 |
|------------------|---|-----------|-----------------|--|---|---|------------------------|--|
| FS111.052 | Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT) | | Support | PHTTCCT support the suggested amendments | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS403.099 | Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora | | Support in part | Te Whatu Ora support amendment of this policy to provide for multi-modal transport methods. | Allow in part | Te Whatu Ora support amendment of this policy to provide for multi-modal transport methods. | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS570.746 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS566.760 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS569.782 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| S463.020 | Waiaua Bay Farm Limited | TRAN-P5 | Support in part | <p>WBF supports the use of the term "Encourage" in this policy. It would be inappropriate to "Require" the stated approach because in the Special Purpose Zones it may not be appropriate or possible to support a "diverse transport network" or "alternative transport notes".</p> <p>WBF suggests amending the policy to include a sub-clause (e) that reflects this context. Alternatively, the policy could be amended to confine its scope</p> | <p>Insert new point e. into Policy TRAN-P5 as follows:</p> <p>e. Recognising that in Special Purpose Zones, a bespoke response to transport network design may be appropriate.</p> | | Reject | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN 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 |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|--|-------------------------------|---|------------------------|--|
| | | | | to certain zones, excluding the Special Purpose Zones. | | | | |
| FS36.039 | Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency | | Oppose | Opposes the proposed wording as it sets unclear direction for Special Purpose Zones as to what a 'bespoke response to transport network design' is. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission. | Accept | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS403.105 | Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora | | Support in part | Te Whatu Ora support amendment of this policy to provide for multi-modal transport methods. | Allow in part | Te Whatu Ora support amendment of this policy to provide for multi-modal transport methods. | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| S561.023 | Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities | TRAN-P5 | Support | Integration of land use and transport networks is essential to enable connected, efficient and affordable urban growth and development. | Retain TRAN-P5 as notified. | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS32.077 | Jeff Kemp | | Oppose | <p>The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes.</p> <p>The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based</p> | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|---|-----------|----------|--|-------------------------------|--|------------------------|--|
| | | | | <p>district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts.</p> <p>The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.</p> | | | | |
| FS23.295 | Des and Lorraine Morrison | | Support | <p>Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.</p> | Allow | Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS47.037 | Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust | | Oppose | <p>The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan.</p> <p>Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document</p> | Disallow | Disallow the entire original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS348.110 | Alec Brian Cox | | Oppose | <p>The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA.</p> | Disallow | I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed. | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN 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 |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|--|---|------------------------|--|
| S446.014 | Kapiro Conservation Trust | TRAN-P5 | Support in part | The intent of the objective is supported, but amendments are suggested to make this policy more impactful. | <p>Amend TRAN-P5 as follows</p> <p>Encourage new land uses and development to support an integrated and well connected and diverse multi modal transport network by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Requiring consideration of promoting alternative transport modes at the time of land use and development; b. Ensuring that the construction of new transportation infrastructure aligns with relevant spatial or strategic document c. Encouraging the provision of safe and secure parking facilities for bicycles and associated changing or showering facilities for staff; d. Requiring allocation of parking facilities for motorcycles, car share vehicles, pick up/drop off areas for ride share services and charging stations for electric vehicles; and e. supporting the establishment and operation of accommodation and tourism related activities in close proximity to the Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail, provided reverse sensitivity effects can be avoided. | Reject | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN 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 |
|------------------|---|-----------|----------|--|--|-------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| FS111.053 | Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT) | | Support | PHTTCCT support the suggested amendments | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS569.1773 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | | Reject | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS570.1772 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | | Reject | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| S529.088 | Carbon Neutral NZ Trust | TRAN-P5 | Support | The intent of the objective is supported, but amendments are suggested to make this policy more impactful. | Amend TRAN-P5 as follows Encourage new land uses and development to support an integrated and well connected and diverse multi modal transport network by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Requiring consideration of promoting alternative transport modes at the time of land use and development; b. Ensuring that the construction of new transportation infrastructure aligns with relevant spatial or strategic document c. Encouraging the provision of safe and secure parking facilities for bicycles and associated changing or showering facilities for staff; | | Reject | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN 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 |
|-------------------|---|-----------|----------|---|---|-------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| | | | | | d. Requiring allocation of parking facilities for motorcycles, car share vehicles, pick up/drop off areas for ride share services and charging stations for electric vehicles; and e. supporting the establishment and operation of accommodation and tourism related activities in close proximity to the Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail, provided reverse sensitivity effects can be avoided. | | | |
| FS111.054 | Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT) | | Support | PHTTCCT support the suggested amendments | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS570.1976 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS566.1990 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS569.2012 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN 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 |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|--|---|---|------------------------|--|
| S516.035 | Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland | TRAN-P5 | Not Stated | <p>Ngā Tai Ora consider that the objectives and policies need to be stronger and more directive regarding the use of active and public transportation methods, which are beneficial to not just public health outcomes, but general environmental outcomes (e.g., reduced greenhouse gas admissions).</p> <p>Ngā Tai Ora acknowledge TRAN-P5 includes provision for alternative transport modes but weak language such as "encourage" and "promote" is used and there is no clear overall objective to directly require an increase in the provision of, and use of alternative transport modes.</p> <p>On this basis, Ngā Tai Ora consider that current objectives and policies will ultimately result in the continuation of a car centric transportation network in the Far North. Greater direction is needed within this chapter to help increase the role that alternative modes of transport play in the future of the Far North.</p> | <p>Amend Policy TRAN-P5 as follows: Ensure subdivision and development achieve Encourage new land uses to support an integrated and diverse transport network by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> promoting alternative transport modes providing multi-modal forms of transport that provides for the needs of all users, as appropriate for the surrounding environment and the function of the road within the transport network hierarchy; <p>....</p> | | Reject | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS243.064 | Kainga Ora Homes and Communities | | Support in part | <p>Kāinga Ora supports provisions that enable housing with good access to jobs, amenities and services and the co-location of activities to contribute to economic, social, environmental and cultural wellbeing. Kāinga Ora supports provisions that promote multi-nodal transport options.</p> | Allow in part | <p>Amend Policy TRAN-P5 as follows: Ensure subdivision and development achieve Encourage new land uses to support an integrated and diverse transport network by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> promoting alternative transport modes providing multi-modal forms of transport that provides for the needs of all users, as appropriate for the surrounding | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN 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 |
|-------------------|---|-----------|-----------------|--|--|---|------------------------|--|
| | | | | | | environment and the function of the road within the transport network hierarchy... | | |
| S184.006 | Northland Transport Alliance | TRAN-P5 | Support in part | Public transport not specifically mentioned in any of the rules. Consider incorporating within Policy TRAN-P5 | Amend clause a of Policy TRAN-P5 to include public transport | | Reject | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS403.097 | Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora | | Support in part | Te Whatu Ora support amendment of this policy to provide for multi-modal transport methods. | Allow in part | Te Whatu Ora support amendment of this policy to provide for multi-modal transport methods. | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| S184.007 | Northland Transport Alliance | TRAN-P5 | Support in part | Not specified | Amend clause b of Policy TRAN-P5 as follows: b. the provision of safe and secure parking facilities for bicycles and associated changing or showering facilities for staff provision of active transport end of trip facilities | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS403.098 | Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora | | Support in part | Te Whatu Ora support amendment of this policy to provide for multi-modal transport methods. | Allow in part | Te Whatu Ora support amendment of this policy to provide for multi-modal transport methods. | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| S331.024 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | TRAN-P5 | Support | The submitter supports policy TRAN-P5 as it encourages new land uses to support an integrated and diverse transport network by promoting and providing facilities for alternative transport modes. | Retain policy TRAN-P5 as proposed. | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS403.0100 | Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora | | Support in part | Te Whatu Ora support amendment of this policy to provide for multi-modal transport methods. | Allow in part | Te Whatu Ora support amendment of this policy to provide for multi-modal transport methods. | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN 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 |
| S335.027 | BP Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited, Z Energy Limited | TRAN-P5 | Support | Policy TRAN-P5 encourages new land uses to support, inter alia, the provision of charging stations for electric vehicles. The Fuel Companies support this policy subject to ensuring it also is applicable to existing land uses, for example, installation of an EV charging station at an existing service station. | Retain Policy TRAN-P5 as notified | | Accept | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS403.101 | Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora | | Support in part | Te Whatu Ora support amendment of this policy to provide for multi-modal transport methods. | Allow in part | Te Whatu Ora support amendment of this policy to provide for multi-modal transport methods. | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| S356.035 | Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency | TRAN-P5 | Support | Not stated | Retain TRAN-P5 as notified | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS403.102 | Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora | | Support in part | Te Whatu Ora support amendment of this policy to provide for multi-modal transport methods. | Allow in part | Accept in part | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| S425.017 | Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust | TRAN-P5 | Support in part | PHTTCCT consider that the objectives and policies need to be stronger and more directive regarding the use of active and public transportation methods, which are beneficial in terms of social environmental outcomes (e.g., reduced greenhouse gas admissions). PHTTCCT acknowledge TRAN-P5 includes provision for alternative transport modes but weak language such as "encourage" and "promote" is used and there is no clear overall objective to directly require an increase | Amend TRAN-P5 Encourage new land uses and development to support an integrated and well connected and diverse multi modal transport network by: a. Requiring consideration of promoting alternative transport modes at the time of land use and development ; b. Ensuring that the construction of new transportation | | Reject | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|---|-----------|-----------------|---|--|---|--|--|
| | | | | <p>in the provision of, and use of alternative transport modes.</p> <p>On this basis, PHTTCCT consider that current objectives and policies will ultimately result in the continuation of a car centric transportation network in the Far North. Greater direction is needed within this chapter to help increase the role that alternative modes of transport play in the future of the Far North.</p> | <p>infrastructure aligns with relevant spatial or strategic document</p> <p>c. Encouraging the provision of safe and secure parking facilities for bicycles and associated changing or showering facilities for staff;</p> <p>d. Requiring allocation of parking facilities for motorcycles, car share vehicles, pick up/drop off areas for ride share services and charging stations for electric vehicles; and</p> <p>e. supporting the establishment and operation of accommodation and tourism related activities in close proximity to the Pou Hereanga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail, provided reverse sensitivity effects can be avoided.</p> | | | |
| FS403.103 | Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora | | Support in part | Te Whatu Ora support amendment of this policy to provide for multi-modal transport methods. | Allow in part | Te Whatu Ora support amendment of this policy to provide for multi-modal transport methods. | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| S356.037 | Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency | TRAN-P6 | Neutral | Consideration could be had to incentivise more electric charging stations to be provided, i.e., a reduction in parking spaces if a % of electric charging stations were provided. See comments on TRAN-R4 below. | Amend for consideration of a reduction in parking if a % of electric charging stations are provided. | | Neutral – No incentivisation recommended | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| S42.014 | Te Whatu Ora - Health New Zealand, Te Tai Tokerau | TRAN-P7 | Oppose | The proposed car parking standard is too generous as the size of facilities increase to meet Australasian Health | Amend policy TRAN-P7 so that development within the Hospital Zone is not required to undertake Integrated Transport Assessments. | | Reject | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN 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 |
|------------------|---|-----------|----------|---|------------------------------------|---|------------------------|---|
| | | | | Facility Guidelines which are much larger than existing facilities. | | | | Objectives and Policies |
| FS36.040 | Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency | | Oppose | Supports the use of Integrated Transport Assessments for high traffic generating activities, and exemptions to this requirement may promote unsafe accessways/ developments which will adversely effect the safety of the wider transport system. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission. | Accept | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS570.031 | 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 | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS566.045 | 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 | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS569.067 | 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 | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| S331.025 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | TRAN-P7 | Support | The submitter supports policy TRAN-P7 as it promotes the safe and efficient operation of the transport network and accept the requirement to provide an ITA when trip generation is exceeded. | Retain policy TRAN-P7 as proposed. | | Accept | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS402.008 | Te Whatu Ora - Health New Zealand | | Oppose | Te Whatu Ora seek to amend policy TRAN-P7 to provide for the efficient operation of Hospitals without the requirement for ITA, noting that the car parking standard is too onerous. | Disallow in part | Seek provision detail as above. | Reject | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN 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 |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|--|---|---------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| S356.036 | Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency | TRAN-P7 | Support | Not stated | Retain TRAN-P7 as notified | | Accept | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| FS402.009 | Te Whatu Ora - Health New Zealand | | Oppose | Te Whatu Ora seek to amend policy TRAN-P7 to provide for the efficient operation of Hospitals without the requirement for ITA, noting that the car parking standard is too onerous. | Disallow in part | Seek provision detail as above. | Reject | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| S331.026 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | TRAN-P8 | Support | The submitter supports policy TRAN-P8 as it promotes the safe and efficient operation of the transport network. | Retain policy TRAN-P8 as proposed. | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: TRAN Overview, Objectives and Policies |
| S178.008 | Reuben Wright | Rules | Support in part | None of the Rules in the Chapter include any direct reference to requirements for subdivision. It is therefore not clear which (if any) rules require consideration as part of any subdivision application. A separate section for Transport rules that require consideration as part of any subdivision consent may be required and suitable cross referencing between the Transport and Subdivision Chapters included. | [Amend Transport Rules to include a separate section for Transport rules that require consideration as part of any subdivision consent may be required and suitable cross referencing between the Transport and Subdivision Chapters included]. | | Reject | Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: TRAN Rules – General Comments |
| S351.008 | Carrington Estate Jade LP and Carrington Farms Jade LP | Rules | Not Stated | The submitter identifies that the operative district plan rule 18.6.6.1.7 Access, Parking and Loading within the Carrington Estate Zone has not been replicated in the transport rules in the proposed district plan and submits that it should be included within the Carrington Estate zone or an exemption within the transportation chapter. | Amend the transportation rules to include reference to the Carrington Estate Development Plan and Schedule as per operative district plan rule 18.6.6.1.7 Access, Parking and Loading. | | Reject | Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: TRAN 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 |
|------------------|--|-----------|------------|---|---|--|------------------------|--|
| S483.105 | Top Energy Limited | Rules | Not Stated | The Transport Chapter is not of significant interest to Top Energy. However, it is important that recognition is made for the appropriate provision of infrastructure (e.g., electricity and telecommunications) in the transport network, in particular the roading corridor, as often this infrastructure is located within it. Rather than making detailed submissions on the chapter, Top Energy seek that this is adequately addressed across the objectives, policies and rules in this chapter | Amend the transport provisions to provide for objectives, policies and rules that enable the operation, maintenance, repair and upgrading the appropriate provision of infrastructure within the transport network, in particular the roading corridor. | | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General Matters |
| FS196.196 | Joe Carr | | Support | | Allow | | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General Matters |
| FS345.156 | Ngawha Generation Limited | | Support | NGL is a subsidiary of Top Energy Limited. NGL supports all submission points made by Top Energy. | Allow | Allow all of the relief sought by Top Energy Limited in its submission (S483). | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General Matters |
| S483.108 | Top Energy Limited | Rules | Not Stated | Include a new rule providing for the operation, maintenance, repair and upgrading of electricity and telecommunications infrastructure as a permitted activity | Insert a new rule in the Transport Chapter making the operation, maintenance, repair and upgrading of electricity and telecommunications infrastructure a permitted activity. | | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General Matters |
| FS196.198 | Joe Carr | | Support | | Allow | | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General Matters |
| FS36.042 | Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency | | Oppose | The submitter notes the upgrading and maintenance of telecommunications infrastructure has the potential to increase the scale of existing facilities in a manner that could lead to adverse safety effects on the transport system. Permitted activity pathway for upgrading telecommunications infrastructure should follow National | Disallow | Disallow the original submission. | Accept | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General Matters |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|---|-----------|------------|--|--|--|------------------------|--|
| | | | | Environmental Standards for Telecommunication Facilities. | | | | |
| FS351.022 | A.W and D.M Simpson | | Oppose | Top Energy appears to be seeking discretion to override existing constrains the PDP endeavours to use to protect Notable trees. | Disallow | Status Quo. No change to wording or PDP. | Accept | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General Matters |
| FS371.022 | Oromahoe 18R2B2B2 Trust and its associated Hapu, Ngati Kawa, Te Ngare Hauata, Te Matarahurahu, Te Whanaurara, Ngati Kaihoru, Ngati Rahiri | | Oppose | Top Energy appears to be seeking discretion to override existing constrains the PDP endeavours to use to protect Notable trees. | Disallow | Status Quo. No change to wording or PDP. | Accept | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General Matters |
| FS449.021 | The Proprietors of Tapuaetahi Incorporation | | Oppose | Top Energy appears to be seeking discretion to override existing constrains the PDP endeavours to use to protect Notable trees | Disallow | Status Quo. No change to wording or PDP. | Accept | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General Matters |
| FS346.071 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. | | Oppose | Upgrading can have adverse effects on natural values, and it is not appropriate for provisions to enable this activity as a permitted activity. | Disallow | disallow the original submission | Accept | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General Matters |
| FS345.159 | Ngawha Generation Limited | | Support | NGL is a subsidiary of Top Energy Limited. NGL supports all submission points made by Top Energy. | Allow | Allow all of the relief sought by Top Energy Limited in its submission (S483). | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General Matters |
| S516.038 | Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland | Rules | Not Stated | Ngā Tai Ora note that the PDP is silent on the issue of the health impacts of unsealed rural roads. There are significant concerns regarding the effects that dust generated from unsealed rural roads can have on adjacent sensitive activities (e.g., residential units) that are not appropriately setback from the road. | Insert the following objectives, policies and rules into either the Transport Chapter or relevant zone chapters: Objective: Manage the risk from unsealed roads to public health. Policy: To ensure sensitive activities are appropriately setback from unsealed | | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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>Effects include the adverse health effects such as respiratory illness (e.g., asthma) that dust generation can have for on-site water supply (e.g., rainwater harvesting).</p> <p>Ngā Tai Ora have strongly advocated to other Councils in Te Tai Tokerau regarding this, and recommend that FNDC should consider including mandatory setbacks for sensitive activities from unsealed rural roads, or other methods that are not cost prohibitive for property owners but can address the significant adverse health effects associated with this issue. Ngā Tai Ora would welcome meeting with FNDC staff to discuss how this matter can be sufficiently addressed in the eventual PDP.</p> | <p>roads to reduce the adverse effects to public health from the exposure to dust.</p> <p>Rule XXX Sensitive Activity:</p> <p>Activity Status: Permitted</p> <p>Where: PER-1 The sensitive activity is setback at least 20m from any unsealed road.</p> <p>Activity status where compliance is not achieved: Discretionary</p> | | |
| FS196.234 | Joe Carr | | Support | | Allow | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS196.235 | Joe Carr | | Support | Activity breach should be restricted discretionary | Allow | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| S215.016 | Haigh Workman Limited | Rules | Not Stated | The District Plan should also specify which roads must be sealed. The Engineering Standards imply that all urban roads should be sealed but some rural roads (ES Table 3-4) may be unsealed. The process for determining which public roads may be unsealed is unclear. Engineering Standards Table 3-4 and Clause 3.2.12.2.3 imply that FNDC's asset engineers will determine which roads may be unsealed by classifying the road under the One Network Road Band Number road classification system. Greater certainty should be | Insert rules on when public roads should be sealed, such as: All urban roads and Rural roads off an existing sealed public road; other Rural roads may be unsealed. | Reject | Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: TRAN 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 |
|------------------|---|-----------|-----------------|---|---|---|------------------------|--|
| | | | | given by including standards in the District Plan. | | | | |
| FS309.11 | Brad Hedger | | Support | Public roads and private roads if accessing a sealed road should be sealed to reduce the maintenance of the public road from development. | Allow in part | | Reject | Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: TRAN Rules – General Comments |
| FS403.109 | Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora | | Support in part | Te Whatu Ora consider that clarity of road sealing requirements is important. There are health impacts associated with unsealed rural roads. There are significant concerns regarding the effects that dust generated from unsealed rural roads can have on adjacent sensitive activities (e.g., residential units) that are not appropriately setback from the road. | Allow in part | Seek provision details as above..... | Reject | Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: TRAN Rules – General Comments |
| FS570.505 | 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 | Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: TRAN Rules – General Comments |
| FS566.519 | 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 | Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: TRAN Rules – General Comments |
| FS569.541 | 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 | Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: TRAN Rules – General Comments |
| S271.018 | Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust | Rules | Not Stated | An information requirement be included that details what information must be included in an integrated transport assessment. Being specific in the information required, can help direct the outcomes sought by the objectives | Insert information that specifies matters that must be addressed, including the following: - Indication as to how connection will be made with any future transportation networks identified in any spatial/strategic planning | | Reject | Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: TRAN 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 |
|------------------|---|-----------|----------|--|-------------------------------|--|------------------------|--|
| | | | | and policies in this chapter and targeted to larger development. | | <p>documents/how the proposal is consistent with such documents including the Transport Strategy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Assessment of the suitability and connectivity of the development including for pedestrians and cyclists, and how the development will be encourage walking and cycling - Evaluation of the effects of the development on surrounding transport networks including any pedestrian/vehicle/cyclist conflicts likely to occur. | | |
| FS36.041 | Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency | | Support | Supports expanded direction for robust Integrated Transport Assessments that are consistent with best practice. The submitter would like to be involved the development of information requirements to ensure consistency of approach. | Allow | Allow the original submission. Waka Kotahi seeks to be involved in the development of ITA information requirements. | Reject | Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: TRAN Rules – General Comments |
| FS111.067 | Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT) | | Support | PHTTCCT supports the inclusion of information requirements to direct effective integrated transport assessments. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: TRAN Rules – General Comments |
| FS570.741 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: TRAN Rules – General Comments |
| FS566.755 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: TRAN Rules – General Comments |
| FS569.777 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.6 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|------------|---|---|------------------------|--|
| | | | | | | | Key Issue 6: TRAN Rules – General Comments |
| S573.002 | Te Kawariki me Te Wānanga o Te Rangi Aniwaniwa | Rules | Not Stated | <p>All Iwi involved with Te Kahu o Taonui criticise the FNDC for breaching the statutory consultation obligations under Schedule 1, clause 3(d) of the RMA by not properly consulting over its development of the annual plan.</p> <p>That the Maori Ward councilors work alongside Iwi, Hapu and Ropu Maori within FNDC boundaries to develop a Mana Whakahono a Rohe Agreement that strengthens the rangatiratanga and influence of Twi and HapO in local government and the management of te taiao as outlined in section 33 of Resource Management Act .</p> <p>That Iwi/ Hapu plans sit parallel alongside FNDC Annual plans in 2023 onwards.</p> <p>That the task of FNDC is to stop the alienation of remaining Maori lands , abandoned Maori lands.</p> <p>That all SNAs be removed from the FNDC annual plan.</p> <p>That the Maori Ward Councillors broker, link and network with many agencies to bring about necessary improvement works for Iwi (as listed p41) , hapu and Maori Social Service agencies.</p> <p>That the Maori Ward Councillors consult with Iwi, Hapu and Ropu Maori within FNDC to confirm 4 takiwa for Maori ward councillors to manaaki/ mahi tahi in dealings with the FNDC.</p> <p>That the Maori Ward Councillors engage with Maori in four designated</p> | Amend the rules in the transport chapter to make provision for all marae as public event centres to have 500m tar seal either side of the marae (inferred). | Reject | Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: TRAN Rules – General Comments |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|---|-----------|------------|---|---|--|------------------------|---|
| | | | | <p>takiwa in a 8 months trial period, before final consultation Matariki 2023.</p> <p>That 200 homes be built in the next 3 years for struggling whanau .</p> <p>That all marae as public event centres have 500m tar seal either side of the marae .</p> <p>That Councillors seek funding to train tertiary students to develop resource consents for the FNDC.</p> <p>That Maori and local contractors be given opportunities to submit tenders for Council projects.</p> | | | | |
| FS36.043 | Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency | | Neutral | The submitter is unclear on the outcomes of the proposed relief to require 500m of tar seal on either side of marae. The submitter seeks further clarification on what the submitter is seeking to gain a better understanding of the potential transport effects. | Not stated | The submitter seeks further clarification to better understand what the submission is seeking. | Neutral | Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: TRAN Rules – General Comments |
| S524.018 | Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK) | Rules | Not Stated | An information requirement be included that details what information must be included in an integrated transport assessment. Being specific in the information required, can help direct the outcomes sought by the objectives and policies in this chapter and targeted to larger development. | Insert information that specifies matters that must be addressed, including the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Indication as to how connection will be made with any future transportation networks identified in any spatial/strategic planning documents/how the proposal is consistent with such documents including the Transport Strategy - Assessment of the suitability and connectivity of the development including for pedestrians and cyclists, and how the development will be encourage walking and cycling - Evaluation of the effects of the development on surrounding transport networks including any pedestrian/vehicle/cyclist conflicts likely to occur. | | Reject | Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: TRAN 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 |
|------------------|---|-----------|------------|---|---|-------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| FS111.056 | Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT) | | Support | PHTTCCT support the suggested amendments | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: TRAN Rules – General Comments |
| FS111.069 | Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT) | | Support | PHTTCCT supports the inclusion of information requirements to direct effective integrated transport assessments. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: TRAN Rules – General Comments |
| FS566.1836 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: TRAN Rules – General Comments |
| SS29.083 | Carbon Neutral NZ Trust | Rules | Not Stated | An information requirement be included that details what information must be included in an integrated transport assessment. Being specific in the information required, can help direct the outcomes sought by the objectives and policies in this chapter and targeted to larger development. | Insert information that specifies matters that must be addressed, including the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Indication as to how connection will be made with any future transportation networks identified in any spatial/strategic planning documents/how the proposal is consistent with such documents including the Transport Strategy - Assessment of the suitability and connectivity of the development including for pedestrians and cyclists, and how the development will be encourage walking and cycling - Evaluation of the effects of the development on surrounding transport networks including any pedestrian/vehicle/cyclist conflicts likely to occur. | | Reject | Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: TRAN Rules – General Comments |
| FS111.068 | Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail | | Support | PHTTCCT supports the inclusion of information requirements to direct | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: TRAN Rules – |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|-------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|--|-------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| | Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT) | | | effective integrated transport assessments. | | | | General Comments |
| FS570.1971 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: TRAN Rules – General Comments |
| FS566.1985 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: TRAN Rules – General Comments |
| FS569.2007 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: TRAN Rules – General Comments |
| S82.015 | Good Journey Limited | Rules | Oppose | The rules are opposed to the extent that car parking minimums are still specified in the Mixed Use zone. Should existing operations wish to more intensively develop their sites in the Mixed Use zone by increasing the amount of "gross business area" and / or the provision of residential accommodation then additional carparks are required. Additional controls such as bicycle parks and end of trip facilities are also required. Intensification and development of Mixed Use areas should be encouraged by the removal of minimum car parking standards in recognition of the benefits that Mixed Use zones can bring in terms of both land use outcomes and travel patterns. | Delete car park minimums in the Mixed Use Zone and other relief that will satisfy the concerns of the submitter. | | Accept | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| FS542.019 | Foodstuffs North Island Limited | | Support | Foodstuffs generally supports the deletion of car park minimums | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept | 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: Parking |
| S431.153 | John Andrew Riddell | Rules | Not Stated | The amendment is necessary in order to achieve the purpose of the Act. | Amend all objectives, policies, rules and standards relating to providing for vehicles and roading to place much more emphasis on providing for cycling and for walking | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS332.153 | 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 | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| S416.028 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Rules | Support in part | <p>KiwiRail supports provisions that retain visibility of trains at level crossings for road user safety.</p> <p>KiwiRail seeks that accessways are required to be located where there is no conflict with the safety and efficiency of the adjoining road and wider transport network. The location of vehicle crossings in relation to level crossings is a matter KiwiRail seek to manage, particularly as this can help to address stacking issues and conflict between vehicles waiting to enter/exit a property and those waiting to cross a level crossing in the event a train passes. Driver frustration can result in unsafe driving practices at crossings and the standard reduces this risk.</p> <p>It is noted that some district plans locate setbacks from level crossings and level crossing sightline restriction, in the infrastructure section. In this case standards relating to accessway location and sightlines for level crossings are proposed to be added to the 'Transport' section as this is where most transport safety diagrams are located and there is some logic to having the rail related safety controls</p> | <p>Insert new rules for permitted and restricted discretionary activities as follows:</p> <p>All zones</p> <p>Activity status: Permitted</p> <p>All new vehicle access points, on roads that cross a railway crossing shall be located a minimum of 30m from a railway level crossing. The 30m shall be measured from the edge of the closest rail track to the edge of seal on the proposed vehicle access point</p> <p>Activity status where compliance not achieved: Restricted discretionary</p> <p>All zones</p> <p>Activity status: Restricted discretionary</p> <p>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The extent to which the safety and efficiency of railway and road operations will be adversely affected. The outcome of any consultation with KiwiRail. | Accept in part | Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: TRAN 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 |
|------------------|--|-----------|------------|--|--|---|------------------------|--|
| | | | | located here also. If more appropriate, KiwiRail would accept the standard located in the infrastructure section with a cross reference to 'Transport'. | <p>3. Any characteristics of the proposed use that will make compliance unnecessary.</p> <p>Notification: Application for resource consent under this rule will be decided without public notification. KiwiRail is likely to be the only affected person determined in accordance with section 95B of the Resource Management Act 1991.</p> | | | |
| FS243.062 | Kainga Ora Homes and Communities | | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the amendment which is overly prescriptive. The proposed amendments can be simplified. | Disallow | Insert new rules for permitted and restricted discretionary activities. | Accept in part | Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: TRAN Rules – General Comments |
| S363.011 | Foodstuffs North Island Limited | Rules | Not Stated | The submitter considers that in the Transport chapter there is inconsistent application of the Far North District Council Engineering Standards and that the referenced Engineering Standards do not ensure sustainable, safe and efficient provision of roading infrastructure. | <p>Amend the Transport Chapter to ensure that the relationship of the District Plan to the Environmental Engineering Standards achieves the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Ensures the District Plan requires the delivery of infrastructure in a manner that achieves sustainable, safe and efficient provision of infrastructure. b. Ensures referencing of the Environmental Engineering Standards in the District Plan is appropriate and results in clear and measurable rules. c. Ensures cross-referencing to Environmental Engineering Standards is consistent across all chapters. | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: References to Engineering Standards |
| FS403.111 | Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora | | Support | Te Whatu Ora agree that the proposed referencing to Engineering Standards should be amended and the | Allow | Te Whatu Ora agree that the proposed referencing to Engineering Standards should be amended and | Accept in part | Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: References to |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|-------------------|---|-----------|------------|---|---|--|------------------------|--|
| | | | | relationship between documents should be reviewed. | | the relationship between documents should be reviewed. | | Engineering Standards |
| S338.034 | Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust | Rules | Not Stated | Many new subdivisions in Kerikeri and the surrounding rural area have greatly increased the volume of traffic using the central shopping/service area and roads leading to/from the CBD (e.g. Kerikeri Road, Waipapa Road, Landing Road, Kapiro Road, Purerua Road). When new developments are approved, insufficient account is taken of the total/cumulative impact of multiple developments on traffic. Other negative impacts on the community are not taken into account - such as such additional levels of noise, disruption and other changes that can affect people, amenity values and the character of the area. | Amend rules to address adverse effects of traffic on those in the neighbourhood and, where relevant, the wider community. | | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS570.972 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS566.986 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS569.1008 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| S529.036 | Carbon Neutral NZ Trust | Rules | Oppose | Many new subdivisions in Kerikeri and the surrounding rural area have greatly increased the volume of traffic using the central shopping/service area and roads leading to/from the CBD (e.g. Kerikeri Road, Waipapa Road, Landing Road, Kapiro Road, Purerua Road). When new developments are approved, insufficient account is taken of the total/cumulative impact of | Amend rules to address adverse effects of traffic on those in the neighbourhood and, where relevant, the wider community. | | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|-------------------|---|-----------|----------|---|---|-------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| | | | | multiple developments on traffic. Other negative impacts on the community are not taken into account - such as such additional levels of noise, disruption and other changes that can affect people, amenity values and the character of the area | | | | |
| FS570.1926 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS566.1940 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS569.1962 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| S522.044 | Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK) | Rules | Oppose | Many new subdivisions in Kerikeri and the surrounding rural area have greatly increased the volume of traffic using the central shopping/service area and roads leading to/from the CBD (e.g. Kerikeri Road, Waipapa Road, Landing Road, Kapiro Road, Purerua Road). When new developments are approved, insufficient account is taken of the total/cumulative impact of multiple developments on traffic. Other negative impacts on the community are not taken into account - such as such additional levels of noise, disruption and other changes that can affect people, amenity values and the character of the area. | Amend rules to address adverse effects of traffic on those in the neighbourhood and, where relevant, the wider community. | | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS566.1783 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|-------------------|---|-----------|------------|---|--|------------------------|--|
| S449.037 | Kapiro Conservation Trust | Rules | Oppose | Many new subdivisions in Kerikeri and the surrounding rural area have greatly increased the volume of traffic using the central shopping/service area and roads leading to/from the CBD (e.g. Kerikeri Road, Waipapa Road, Landing Road, Kapiro Road, Purerua Road). When new developments are approved, insufficient account is taken of the total/cumulative impact of multiple developments on traffic. Other negative impacts on the community are not taken into account - such as such additional levels of noise, disruption and other changes that can affect people, amenity values and the character of the area. | Amend rules to address adverse effects of traffic on those in the neighbourhood and, where relevant, the wider community. | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS569.1836 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS570.1853 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| S425.022 | Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust | Notes | Not Stated | PHTTCCT seek that an information requirement be included that details what information must be included in an integrated transport assessment. Being specific in the information required, can help direct the outcomes sought by the objectives and policies in this chapter and targeted to larger development. Without this direction, there is a high risk that very high-level documents, and potentially of limited use, will be provided resulting in the same marginal outcomes when it comes to transport network design at the time of development. | Amend to include information that specifies matters that must be addressed, including the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Indication as to how connection will be made with any future transportation networks identified in any spatial/strategic planning documents/how the proposal is consistent with such documents including the Transport Strategy - Assessment of the suitability and connectivity of the development including for pedestrians and cyclists, and how the development will encourage walking and cycling | Reject | Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: TRAN 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 |
|------------------|---|-----------|-----------------|---|--|---|------------------------|--|
| | | | | TRAN - S4 could then be amended to require an ITA prepared in accordance with the information requirement. | - Evaluation of the effects of the development on surrounding transport networks including any pedestrian/vehicle/cyclist conflicts likely to occur. | | | |
| S215.009 | Haigh Workman Limited | Notes | Support in part | Arterial roads are defined in the One Network Road Classification System. TRAN-Table 10 describes the classes of road, however, the Plan does make it clear how the One Network Road Classification system can be accessed to determine if a road is Arterial or not. A note in the introduction to the rules would clarify this issue. | Insert a Note in the introduction to the rules on the One Network Road Classification system (or any similar system adopted by NZTA), referring to TRAN-Table 10 and detailing how the system can be accessed. | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: TRAN Rules – General Comments |
| FS44.55 | Northland Planning & Development 2020 Ltd | | Support | Helpful for members of the public to use the plan. | Allow | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: TRAN Rules – General Comments |
| FS570.498 | 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 | Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: TRAN Rules – General Comments |
| FS566.512 | 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 | Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: TRAN Rules – General Comments |
| FS569.534 | 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 | Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: TRAN Rules – General Comments |
| S446.017 | Kapiro Conservation Trust | Notes | Not Stated | Seek that an information requirement be included that details what information must be included in an integrated transport assessment. Being | Insert information that specifies matters that must be addressed, including the following: - Indication as to how connection will be made with any future | | Reject | Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: TRAN Rules – |

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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>specific in the information required, can help direct the outcomes sought by the objectives and policies in this chapter and targeted to larger development. Without this direction, there is a high risk that very high-level documents, and potentially of limited use, will be provided resulting in the same marginal outcomes when it comes to transport network design at the time of development.</p> <p>TRAN - S4 could then be amended to require a ITA prepared in accordance with the information requirement.</p> | <p>transportation networks identified in any spatial/strategic planning documents/how the proposal is consistent with such documents including the Transport Strategy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Assessment of the suitability and connectivity of the development including for pedestrians and cyclists, and how the development will be encourage walking and cycling - Evaluation of the effects of the development on surrounding transport networks including any pedestrian/vehicle/cyclist conflicts likely to occur. | | | General Comments |
| FS111.070 | Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT) | | Support | PHTTCCT supports the inclusion of information requirements to direct effective integrated transport assessments. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: TRAN Rules – General Comments |
| FS569.1776 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | | Reject | Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: TRAN Rules – General Comments |
| FS570.1776 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | | Reject | Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: TRAN Rules – General Comments |
| S184.010 | Northland Transport Alliance | Notes | Support in part | General question on the following statement "Roads to be in compliance with April 2022 Engineering Standards". Have these been adopted yet or will they be adopted along with the District Plan? Consider revising language to be "most recently adopted Engineering Standards" to avoid minor | Amend Note 2 as follows: Design and construction standards for access, new roads, footpaths, and car parking will be in accordance with Far North-District Council the most | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: References to Engineering 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 |
|------------------|---|-----------|-----------------|---|--|--|---|
| | | | | updates to the DP if the standards change or are updated. | recently adopted Engineering Standards April 2022 | | |
| FS403.112 | Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora | | Support | Te Whatu Ora agree that the proposed referencing to Engineering Standards should be amended and the relationship between documents should be reviewed. | Allow | Te Whatu Ora agree that the proposed referencing to Engineering Standards should be amended and the relationship between documents should be reviewed. | Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: References to Engineering Standards |
| S45.009 | Puketona Business Park Limited | TRAN-R1 | Not Stated | There are some existing discrepancies in the Transport chapter of the PDP as notified whereby stacked parking spaces provided for anything other than a residential use require discretionary activity consent. It is considered this is likely to be inadvertent drafting and that stacked spaces should be enabled as a permitted activity for industrial activity, particularly where they are designated for staff use. | Amend PER-2 of Rule TRAN-R1 to extend to industrial activities. | Reject | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| S45.012 | Puketona Business Park Limited | TRAN-R1 | Support | PBPL supports the requirement for a restricted discretionary activity where transport standards are infringed. | Retain the restricted discretionary activity status where transport standards are infringed. | Accept | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| S502.093 | Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited | TRAN-R1 | Support in part | Clarification is sought on how parking is assessed for activities that are not listed within the rule or table. Where an activity does not fit in any one particular category do we utilize the closest activity or does a person need to engage a traffic engineer to determine the number of carparking spaces. Can clarity please be provided on this in the form of a note. | Amend TRAN-R1 to clarify how parking is assessed for activities that are not listed within the rule or table. | Accept in part | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| S503.039 | Waitangi Limited | TRAN-R1 | Not Stated | Clarification is sought on how parking is assessed for activities that are not listed within the rule or table. It is noted that in the Operative District Plan there was a category called places of | Amend Rule TRAN-R1 to clarify how parking is assessed where an activity does not fit in any one particular category. | Accept in part | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|---|---------------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| | | | | entertainment which captured activities such as museums which is no longer required. Where an activity does not fit in any one particular category do we utilize the closest activity or does a person need to engage a traffic engineer to determine the number of carparking spaces. Can clarity please be provided on this in the form of a note. | | | | |
| S45.007 | Puketona Business Park Limited | TRAN-R1 | Not Stated | Despite the Far North District not falling within Tier 1, 2 or 3 local authority status relative to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020, the PDP should consider removing car parking minima for non-residential activities. Instead, activities should demonstrate that they can accommodate sufficient parking to meet demand without detriment to the network or surrounding amenity and that where parking is provided, sufficient accessible parking is provided in accordance with the relevant New Zealand Standard. | Delete car parking minima for non-residential activities. Alternatively, amend the car parking ratio for industrial activities - reducing it substantially from the existing ODP and rolled over PDP ratio of 1 per 100m ² GBA. Conversely, PBPL suggests that industrial activities comprising approximately 2,500 m ² in area would require approximately 10 staff car parks and 2 visitor parks, whereas the ratio in the PDP as notified applied to that same scale industrial activity would require at least 25 car parks to comply. | | Accept | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| FS542.021 | Foodstuffs North Island Limited | | Support in part | Foodstuffs generally supports the deletion of car park minimums | Allow in part | Allow in part the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| S463.021 | Waiaua Bay Farm Limited | TRAN-R1 | Oppose | The requirement for minimum onsite parking provision (excepting accessible spaces) is contrary to subpart 8 (Car Parking) of the National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020 (May 2022). Clause 3.38(1) of that NPS states: "If the district plan of a tier 1, 2, or 3 territorial authority contains objectives, policies, rules, or assessment criteria that have the effect of requiring a minimum number of car parks to be | Delete Rule TRAN-R1 | | Reject | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|---|---|------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| | | | | provided for a particular development, land use, or activity, the territorial authority must change its district plan to remove that effect, other than in respect of accessible car parks." | | | | |
| FS542.022 | Foodstuffs North Island Limited | | Support | Foodstuffs generally supports the deletion of car park minimums. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| S215.001 | Haigh Workman Limited | TRAN-R1 | Support | | Retain TRAN-R1 | | Accept | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| FS570.490 | 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 | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| FS566.504 | 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 | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| FS569.526 | 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 | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| S184.011 | Northland Transport Alliance | TRAN-R2 | Support in part | Include ONF street categories for limited crossings - ex. Interregional connectors, or transit corridor | Amend PER-3 of Rule TRAN-R2 to include ONF street categories for limited crossings | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2 |
| S184.012 | Northland Transport Alliance | TRAN-R2 | Support in part | Consider addition to Rule TRAN-R2 or TRAN-Table 9 requirements for sealing of private accessways. Suggest the following requirements: permanent all-weather surface in the following instances: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Residential Zone - Rural and Rural Production sites with an area of less than 2,000m² | Amend Rule TRAN-R2 to insert new PER-7 as follows: PER-7 Permanent all-weather surfaces are provided in the following instances: Residential Zone Rural and Rural Production sites with an area of less than 2,000m² | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|---|-----------|-----------------|--|---|------------------------|--|
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Any accessway serving more than 5 residential units - Where the gradient exceeds 12.5% (to confirm this gradient, check against new Engineering Standards) | <p>Any accessway serving more than 5 residential units</p> <p>Where the gradient exceeds 12.5% (to confirm this gradient, check against new Engineering Standards).</p> | | |
| S178.009 | Reuben Wright | TRAN-R2 | Support in part | <p>Rule TRAN-R2 Per-2 refers to compliance with SNZ PAS 4509:2008 New Zealand Fire Fighting Water Supplies Code of Practice. It is noted that the Code of Practice is referenced in other Chapters of the Plan (see Natural Hazards). It is not considered appropriate to refer to compliance with the Code of Practice in any rule - it should be a reference document. If the intention is to require a fire fighting water supply and vehicular access requirements then that should be specifically stated in terms of (say) a minimum volume per dwelling and minimum access requirement as a rule/s.</p> | <p>Amend to remove reference for compliance SNZ PAS NZ PAS 4509:2008 New Zealand Fire Fighting Water Supplies Code of Practice.</p> | Accept | <p>Section 5.2.7</p> <p>Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2</p> |
| S425.018 | Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust | TRAN-R2 | Oppose | <p>PHTTCCT consider that parking provisions should align with the National Policy Statement-Urban Development (NPS UD) approach to parking, which requires that district plans only provide provisions relating to accessible parking, and dimensions and manoeuvring for when a developer does decide to provide car parking (Subpart 8 3.38). While PHTTCCT understand that FNDC do not consider themselves a Tier 1, 2 or 3 Council, PHTTCCT consider this to be a good approach in principal, and the existing parking requirements to be overly onerous which may present a barrier to development.</p> | <p>Amend parking provisions align with NPS UD.</p> | Accept | <p>Section 5.2.2</p> <p>Key Issue 2: Parking</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 |
|------------------|---|-----------|-----------------|---|--|---|------------------------|--|
| S463.022 | Waiaua Bay Farm Limited | TRAN-R2 | Oppose | The note to this rule refers to vehicle movements but does not specify a time period for the movements, and clarity is sought in this regard. | Amend the 'Note' to PER-1 of Rule TRAN-R2 as follows: 1 household equivalent is represented by 10 vehicle movements per day . One vehicle movement is a single movement to or from a property. | | Reject | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2 |
| S107.001 | Lynley Newport | TRAN-R2 | Oppose | The submitter opposes rule TRAN-R2 PER-2 as non-compliance with the rule automatically defaults to a discretionary activity if the crossing does not comply with the NZ Fire Fighting Water Supplies Code of Practice. The submitter considers that where the crossing is being specifically assessed against a code of practice overseen by a third party Council should consider an alternative default activity status for non-compliance if the approval of Fire and Emergency NZ | Amend TRAN-R2 PER-2 activity status column to read as follows: Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-2 where the approval of Fire and Emergency NZ has been obtained: Restricted Discretionary. | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2 |
| FS196.59 | Joe Carr | | Support | As per submitter | Allow | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2 |
| FS196.60 | Joe Carr | | Support | As per submitter's reasoning | Allow | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2 |
| S271.013 | Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust | TRAN-R2 | Support in part | The connection/trigger for vesting or requirement to form to public road standard is not clear in TRAN - R2, noting that there is no link in this rule to TRAN-S4, and that TRAN-R8 only applies where within unformed paper roads, and SUB-R4 where the proposal is associated with subdivision. | Amend TRAN-R2 to clarify that where TRAN-PER 1 cannot be complied, a public road that complies with TRAN-S4 is required to be vested in Council, or Discretionary resource consent required. | | Accept | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2 |
| FS25.071 | Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited | | Support in part | Supports the submission, subject to considering the wording as better environmental outcomes may be achieved by having a tailored regime for determining the best outcome for | Allow in part | Allow the original submission in part subject to appropriate wording. | Accept in part | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|-------------------------------|--|------------------------|--|
| | | | | specific circumstances. The activity status should also change to Restricted Discretionary as the relevant matters for assessment will be restricted to transport connections, safety, amenity, the viability of a public road, engineering construction matters. | | | | |
| FS325.046 | Turnstone Trust Limited | | Support | <p>TT supports the amendments for the reason given in the submission.</p> <p>Support acknowledgment of Twin Coast Trail and future cycling pathways, particularly where they contribute to connectivity. Seek inclusion of multi modal transport options to ensure social and economic wellbeing of our communities, and to respond to climate change. See suggested amended change to better reflect this.</p> | Allow | Allow the original submission. | Accept | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2 |
| FS325.047 | Turnstone Trust Limited | | Support in part | TT supports the submission, subject to considering the wording. The activity status should also change to Restricted Discretionary as the relevant matters for assessment will be restricted to transport connections, safety, amenity, the viability of a public road, engineering construction matters. | Allow in part | Allow the original submission in part. | Accept in part | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2 |
| FS570.736 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2 |
| FS566.750 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2 |
| FS569.772 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|------------|---|---|-----------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| S344.008 | Paihia Properties Holdings Corporate Trustee Limited and UP Management Ltd | TRAN-R2 | Not Stated | Discretionary activity status to establish a vehicle crossing off the State Highway can be appropriately managed through a restricted discretionary activity status, with targeted matters of discretion, as opposed to a blanket discretionary status. | Amend PER-3 to ensure that existing access from State Highways can be upgraded as a permitted activity. | | Reject | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2 |
| FS36.044 | Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency | | Oppose | Supports Council recognising and controlling accessways from the State highway with discretionary activity status in the district plan. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission. | Accept | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2 |
| FS370.042 | Bunnings Limited | | Support | Bunnings supports amendments to PER-3 to ensure that existing access from State Highways can be upgraded as a permitted activity, for the reasons outlined in its original submission. Bunnings Warehouse Waipapa has an approved access onto State Highway 10. This rule would mean that any upgrades to this vehicle crossing would require discretionary consent which is considered overly onerous particularly when considering that all works within the State Highway Corridor require the approval of Waka Kotahi as the requiring authority of the designation pursuant to s176/s178 of the RMA. This provides an adequate process to ensure that upgrades to existing approved (by Waka Kotahi) vehicle crossings and access do not result in any adverse effects on the Waka Kotahi transportation network (inferred). | Allow | Allow the original submission. | Reject | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2 |
| FS542.024 | Foodstuffs North Island Limited | | Support | Foodstuffs supports amendments to PER-3 to ensure that existing access from State Highways can be upgraded as a permitted activity | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|--|---|------------------------|--|
| FS406.020 | McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited | | Support in part | McDonald's supports amendment to ensure that PER-3 to refer to only new crossings | Allow in part | Allow in part original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2 |
| FS396.029 | Ed and Inge Amsler | | Support | The submission seeks various changes in relation to the urban environment / coastal environment interface as well as specific provisions in the Mixed Use Zone. Additionally, the submission seeks better reflection of business land needs that should be reflected throughout the Plan. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2 |
| S215.010 | Haigh Workman Limited | TRAN-R2 | Support in part | As stated in Note 3 of the introduction to the rules, State Highways and vehicle crossings on State Highways are controlled by NZTA. FNDC has no jurisdiction in this matter and it is inappropriate to require a resource consent as well as NZTA approval for access on to a highway. | Delete reference to State Highways in Rule TRAN-R2 /PER 3. | | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General Matters |
| FS370.041 | Bunnings Limited | | Support in part | Bunnings supports the deletion of State highways from this rule, but note the further amendments sought as outlined in its original submission. | Allow in part | Amend Rule TRAN-R2 as follows: "PER-3 Where The vehicle crossing is a new vehicle crossing it, is not off a State Highway, or off a road classified arterial or higher under the One Network Road Classification" (inferred). | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General Matters |
| FS542.023 | Foodstuffs North Island Limited | | Support | Foodstuffs generally supports the deletion of car park minimums | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General Matters |
| FS570.499 | 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 | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General Matters |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|---|---|------------------------|--|
| FS566.513 | 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 | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General Matters |
| FS569.535 | 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 | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General Matters |
| S45.010 | Puketona Business Park Limited | TRAN-R2 | Not Stated | There are some existing discrepancies in the Transport chapter of the PDP as notified. Rule TRAN-R2 inadvertently requires discretionary activity consent for a vehicle crossing off a State Highway (as it does not meet PER-3 of that rule), whilst Rule TRAN-R9 expressly allows for new or altered vehicle crossings off a State Highway as a restricted discretionary activity. | Amend to ensure that PER-3 of Rule TRAN-R2 and Rule TRAN-R9 are consistent. | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2 |
| FS370.043 | Bunnings Limited | | Support in part | Bunnings supports amendment to ensure that PER-3 of Rule TRAN-R2 and Rule TRAN R-9 are consistent but seeks that access of state highway is a permitted activity, for the reasons outlined in its original submission. Bunnings Warehouse Waipapa has an approved access onto State Highway 10. This rule would mean that any upgrades to this vehicle crossing would require discretionary consent which is considered overly onerous particularly when considering that all works within the State Highway Corridor require the approval of Waka Kotahi as the requiring authority of the designation pursuant to s176/s178 of the RMA. This provides an adequate process to ensure that upgrades to existing approved (by Waka Kotahi) vehicle | Allow in part | Amend Rule TRAN-R2 as follows: "PER-3 Where The vehicle crossing is a new vehicle crossing it, is not off a State Highway, or off a road classified arterial or higher under the One Network Road Classification" (inferred). | Accept in part | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|--|---|--|------------------------|--|
| | | | | crossings and access do not result in any adverse effects on the Waka Kotahi transportation network (inferred). | | | | |
| FS542.025 | Foodstuffs North Island Limited | | Support in part | Foodstuffs supports amendment to ensure that PER-3 of Rule TRAN-R2 and Rule TRANR9 are consistent but seeks that access of state highway is a permitted activity. | Allow in part | Amendment to ensure that PER-3 of Rule TRAN-R2 and Rule TRANR9 are consistent but seeks that access of state highway is a permitted activity | Accept in part | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2 |
| S107.002 | Lynley Newport | TRAN-R2 | Oppose | The submitter opposes TRAN-R2 PER 3 as any new crossing off a state highway or road classified as an arterial road or higher classification is a discretionary activity. This is inconsistent with TRAN-R9 which provides for new or altered vehicle crossings accessed from a state highway or limited access road as a restricted discretionary activity where it complies with TRAN-S2. | Amend TRAN-R2 PER 3, activity status column, where the new or altered vehicle crossing complies with TRAN-S2, to default to restricted discretionary activity status. | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2 |
| FS542.026 | Foodstuffs North Island Limited | | Support in part | Foodstuffs supports amendment to ensure that PER-3 of Rule TRAN-R2 and Rule TRANR9 are consistent but seeks that access of state highway is a permitted activity | Allow in part | Amendment to ensure that PER-3 of Rule TRAN-R2 and Rule TRANR9 are consistent but seeks that access of state highway is a permitted activity | Accept in part | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2 |
| S328.009 | Traverse Ltd | TRAN-R2 | Not Stated | PER-3 of Rule TRAN-R2 requires a discretionary activity resource consent for vehicle crossings to a State Highway or a road classified arterial or higher. It is unclear why a resource consent is required in addition to the standard Waka Kotahi and FNDC crossing permit procedures. This is a duplication of processes and is considered inefficient and effective in the context of Section 32 of the RMA. | Delete PER-3 of Rule TRAN-R2 | | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General Matters |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|---|--|------------------------|--|
| FS542.027 | Foodstuffs North Island Limited | | Support | Amend PER-3 to ensure that existing access from State Highways can be upgraded as a permitted activity | Allow | Amend PER-3 to ensure that existing access from State Highways can be upgraded as a permitted activity | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General Matters |
| FS406.021 | McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited | | Support in part | McDonald's supports amendment to ensure that PER-3 to refer to only new crossings. | Allow in part | Allow in part original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General Matters |
| S356.038 | Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency | TRAN-R2 | Support | not stated | Retain TRAN-R2 as notified | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2 |
| FS542.028 | Foodstuffs North Island Limited | | Oppose | Foodstuffs considers that access from State Highways can be upgraded as a permitted activity in accordance with its original submission. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2 |
| FS406.022 | McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited | | Oppose | McDonald's seeks amendment to ensure that PER-3 to refer to only new crossings. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2 |
| S371.008 | Bunnings Limited | TRAN-R2 | Support in part | <p>Of particular relevance to Bunnings is the discretionary activity trigger for any alterations to an existing vehicle crossing onto State Highway. Bunnings Warehouse Waipapa has an approved access onto State Highway 10.</p> <p>This rule would mean that any upgrades to this vehicle crossing would require discretionary consent which is considered overly onerous particularly when considering that all works within the State Highway Corridor require the approval of Waka Kotahi as the requiring authority of the designation pursuant to s176/s178 of the RMA This provides an adequate process to ensure that upgrades to existing</p> | <p>Amend PER-3 of Rule TRAN-R2 as follows:</p> <p>Where the vehicle crossing is a new vehicle crossing it, is not off a State Highway, or off a road classified arterial or higher under the One Network Road Classification</p> | | Reject | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|--|---|---|------------------------|--|
| | | | | approved (by Waka Kotahi) vehicle crossings and access do not result in any adverse effects on the Waka Kotahi transportation network | | | | |
| FS542.029 | Foodstuffs North Island Limited | | Support in part | Foodstuffs considers that access from State Highways can be upgraded as a permitted activity | Allow in part | Amend so access from State Highways can be upgraded as a permitted activity | Reject | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2 |
| FS406.023 | McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited | | Support in part | McDonald's supports amendment to ensure that PER-3 to refer to only new crossings | Allow in part | Allow in part original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2 |
| S385.007 | McDonalds Restaurants (NZ) Limited | TRAN-R2 | Support in part | <p>The discretionary activity trigger for any alterations to an existing vehicle crossing onto State Highway is considered overly onerous. McDonald's Kaitia abuts State Highway 1 and seeks to ensure flexibility for any future additions and/or alterations.</p> <p>This rule would mean that any upgrades to this vehicle crossing would require discretionary consent which is considered overly onerous particularly when considering that all works within the State Highway Corridor require the approval of Waka Kotahi as the requiring authority of the designation pursuant to s176/s178 of the RMA. This provides an adequate process to ensure that upgrades to existing approved (by Waka Kotahi) vehicle crossings and access do not result in any adverse effects on the Waka Kotahi transportation network</p> | <p>Amend PER-3 as follows (or to same effect):</p> <p>PER-3</p> <p>Where The vehicle crossing is a new vehicle crossing it, is not off a State Highway, or off a road classified arterial or higher under the One Network Road Classification.</p> | | Reject | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2 |
| FS542.030 | Foodstuffs North Island Limited | | Support in part | Foodstuffs considers that access from State Highways can be upgraded as a permitted activity | Allow in part | Amend so access from State Highways can be upgraded as a permitted activity | Accept in part | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2 |
| S400.010 | BR and R Davies | TRAN-R2 | Oppose | PER-3 of Rule TRAN-R2 requires a discretionary activity resource consent | Delete PER-3 of Rule TRAN-R2 | | Reject | 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 |
|------------------|---|-----------|-----------------|---|--|---|------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| | | | | for vehicle crossings to a State Highway or a road classified arterial or higher. It is unclear why a resource consent is required in addition to the standard Waka Kotahi and FNDC crossing permit procedures. This is a duplication of processes and is considered inefficient and effective in the context of Section 32 of the RMA. | | | | Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2 |
| FS542.031 | Foodstuffs North Island Limited | | Support | Foodstuffs considers that access from State Highways can be upgraded as a permitted activity. | Allow | Amend so that access from State Highways can be upgraded as a permitted activity. | Reject | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2 |
| FS406.025 | McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited | | Support in part | McDonald's supports amendment to ensure that PER-3 to refer to only new crossings. | Allow in part | Allow in part original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2 |
| S512.016 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | TRAN-R2 | Support | Fire and Emergency strongly support the requirement to comply with SNZ PAS 4509:2008 for vehicle crossings and access across all zones. Fire and Emergency interpret this to also apply to access once on sites to likely sources of fire (e.g. residential building) as well as any on-site water supplies. | Retain TRAN-R2 | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2 |
| FS542.032 | Foodstuffs North Island Limited | | Oppose | Foodstuffs considers that this rule needs to be amended | Disallow | Amend rule TRAN-R2 | Accept in part | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2 |
| FS406.026 | McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited | | Oppose | McDonald's seeks amendment to ensure that PER-3 to refer to only new crossings. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2 |
| S502.090 | Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited | TRAN-R2 | Support in part | Vehicle crossings off a State Highway are managed by Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency requiring a s93 notice. The requirement to then gain a resource consent from the Far North District Council for an activity which is solely reliant on NZTA's approval should not be requirement. | Amend TRAN-R2 PER-3 The vehicle crossing is not off a State Highway, or off a road classified arterial or higher under the One Network Road Classification and is not a State Highway. and include the One Network Road Classification as a reference; and | | Reject | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|--|--|------------------------|--|
| | | | | <p>We note that the vehicle crossing is not off a State Highway, or off a road classified arterial or higher under the One Network Road Classification and is not a State Highway. and should be referenced.</p> <p>Clarification is required in regard to what is considered 'unused'. Is there a timeframe associated with defining if a vehicle crossing is unused or is the term subjective at Councils discretion. We seek that additional clarity on this is added to the rule.</p> | clarify what is considered 'unused'. Is there a timeframe associated with defining if a vehicle crossing is unused or is the term subjective at Councils discretion. | | | |
| FS542.033 | Foodstuffs North Island Limited | | Support | Foodstuffs considers that access from State Highways can be upgraded as a permitted activity | Allow | Amend so that access from State Highways can be upgraded as a permitted activity | Reject | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2 |
| FS406.027 | McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited | | Support in part | McDonald's supports amendment to ensure that PER-3 only refers to new crossings | Allow in part | Allow in part the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2 |
| S363.009 | Foodstuffs North Island Limited | TRAN-R2 | Not Stated | The submitter considers that rule TRAN-R2 Vehicle crossings and access, including private accessways, PER-3 is inappropriate as it would require a discretionary consent for the upgrade of an existing vehicle crossing and accessway, with access to State Highways. | Amend rule TRAN-R2 Vehicle crossings and access, including private accessways, PER-3 to ensure that existing access from state highways can be upgraded as a permitted activity. | | Reject | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2 |
| FS406.024 | McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited | | Support in part | McDonald's supports amendment to ensure that PER-3 to refer to only new crossings. | Allow in part | Allow in part original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2 |
| S215.007 | Haigh Workman Limited | TRAN-R2 | Support | We support TRAN-R2 / PER-1 specifying that a private accessway may only serve a maximum of 8 household equivalents. | Retain rule TRAN-R2 | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2 |
| FS570.496 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Oppose | Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions. | Disallow | Disallow to the extent that the submission is | Accept in part | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|--|---|------------------------|--|
| | | | | | | inconsistent with our original submission | | |
| FS566.510 | 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 | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2 |
| FS569.532 | 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 | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2 |
| S215.011 | Haigh Workman Limited | TRAN-R2 | Support in part | Many new vehicle crossings will fail to meet the minimum sight distances in TRAN-Table 8 and will require resource consent. Under Council's vehicle crossing bylaw, all new vehicle crossings also require a permit. We suggest that where a vehicle crossing permit has been obtained, a resource consent is not required. | Insert to Rule TRAN-R2 PER-6 'or a vehicle crossing permit has been obtained under Council's Vehicle Crossing Bylaw'. | | Reject | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2 |
| FS570.500 | 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 | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2 |
| FS566.514 | 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 | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2 |
| FS569.536 | 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 | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2 |
| S529.078 | Carbon Neutral NZ Trust | TRAN-R2 | Support in part | The connection/trigger for vesting or requirement to form to public road standard is not clear in TRAN - R2, noting that there is no link in this rule to TRAN-S4, and that TRAN-R8 only applies where within unformed paper | Amend TRAN-R2 to clarify that where TRAN-PER 1 cannot be complied, a public road that complies with TRAN-S4 is required to be vested in Council, or Discretionary resource consent required. | | Accept | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|-------------------|---|-----------|-----------------|--|--|-------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| | | | | roads, and SUB-R4 where the proposal is associated with subdivision. | | | | |
| FS570.1966 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2 |
| FS566.1980 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2 |
| FS569.2002 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2 |
| S524.013 | Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK) | TRAN-R2 | Support in part | The connection/trigger for vesting or requirement to form to public road standard is not clear in TRAN - R2, noting that there is no link in this rule to TRAN-S4, and that TRAN-R8 only applies where within unformed paper roads, and SUB-R4 where the proposal is associated with subdivision. | Amend TRAN-R2 to clarify that where TRAN-PER 1 cannot be complied, a public road that complies with TRAN-S4 is required to be vested in Council, or Discretionary resource consent required. | | Accept | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2 |
| FS566.1831 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2 |
| S446.015 | Kapiro Conservation Trust | TRAN-R2 | Support in part | TRAN-R2 PER -1 allows private accessways where there is a maximum of 8 household equivalents (80 vehicle movements), where this cannot be achieved resource consent is required as a discretionary activity. TRAN - R5 suggests that where TRAN-R2 is not complied with, private access may be required to vest as road. This connection/trigger for vesting or requirement to form to public road standard is not clear in TRAN - R2, noting that there is no link in this rule to TRAN-S4, and that TRAN-R8 only applies where within unformed paper | Amend TRAN-R2 to clarify that where TRAN-PER 1 cannot be complied, a public road that complies with TRAN-S4 is required to be vested in Council, or Discretionary resource consent required. | | Accept | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|-------------------|---|-----------|-----------------|---|--|------------------------|---|
| | | | | roads, and SUB-R4 where the proposal is associated with subdivision. | | | |
| FS569.1774 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | Accept | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2 |
| FS570.1773 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Accept | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2 |
| S184.014 | Far North District Council | TRAN-R3 | Support in part | Permitted activities for maintenance or upgrade of existing roadway requires compliance with TRAN-S4 (Engineering Standards). Would maintenance/upgrade of FNDC roads fall under a discretionary activity if not compliant with Eng. Standards? Will this trigger the FNDC renewals program as needing resource consent for routine upgrades or renewals? | Not specified | Accept in part | Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: TRAN-R3 and TRAN-R4 |
| S425.019 | Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust | TRAN-R3 | Support | Given that the definition of Transport Infrastructure extends to cycle ways, this rule is supported as it provides for maintenance and upgrade as a permitted activity. | Retain as notified. | Accept in part | Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: TRAN-R3 and TRAN-R4 |
| S259.021 | Nicole Wooster | TRAN-R3 | Support in part | Access to our property is via a portion of public road, which is not maintained by the Council. As such we undertake all maintenance, repairs from slips / tree damage and in the past as required to address safety concerns by widening the road carriageway. It is acting as a private accessway and is treated by Council as such. We are at the end of the public road and are the sole users of this portion of the road. It has never been maintained by Council since constructed by the then local body back in the 1930s. At our gate the council stops all works and there is a turning area for vehicles. It has been | Amend plan to provide for situations where public roads are not maintained by Council and are treated as private accessways which are maintained by private landowners (inferred from submission). Amend to not require a higher standard of works or not allow the landowner to maintain or upgrade the road for safety reasons without requiring consent due to standards attached to this rule. | Accept in part | Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: TRAN-R3 and TRAN-R4 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|---|-----------|----------|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|---|
| | | | | only formed to a private accessway standard due to the situation. | | | | |
| FS196.20 | Joe Carr | | Support | The scenario outlined here applies to a far more extensive number of properties than you could imagine. possibly half of the rural roads in the District. the submitter makes a valid point and should be granted the relief sought. | Allow | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: TRAN-R3 and TRAN-R4 |
| S271.014 | Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust | TRAN-R3 | Support | Given that the definition of Transport Infrastructure extends to cycle ways, this rule is supported as it provides for maintenance and upgrade as a permitted activity. | Retain as notified (inferred) | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: TRAN-R3 and TRAN-R4 |
| FS111.057 | Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT) | | Support | PHTTCCT support this rule as proposed. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | |
| FS570.737 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: TRAN-R3 and TRAN-R4 |
| FS566.751 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: TRAN-R3 and TRAN-R4 |
| FS569.773 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: TRAN-R3 and TRAN-R4 |
| S446.020 | Kapiro Conservation Trust | TRAN-R3 | Support | Given that the definition of Transport Infrastructure extends to cycle ways, this rule is supported as it provides for maintenance and upgrade as a permitted activity. | Retain TRAN-R3 (inferred) | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: TRAN-R3 and TRAN-R4 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|-------------------------|---|------------------|-----------------|---|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| FS111.058 | Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT) | | Support | PHTTCCT support this rule as proposed. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: TRAN-R3 and TRAN-R4 |
| FS569.1779 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: TRAN-R3 and TRAN-R4 |
| FS570.1779 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: TRAN-R3 and TRAN-R4 |
| S529.079 | Carbon Neutral NZ Trust | TRAN-R3 | Support | Given that the definition of Transport Infrastructure extends to cycle ways, this rule is supported as it provides for maintenance and upgrade as a permitted activity. | Retain as notified (inferred) | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: TRAN-R3 and TRAN-R4 |
| FS111.059 | Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT) | | Support | PHTTCCT support this rule as proposed. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: TRAN-R3 and TRAN-R4 |
| FS570.1967 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: TRAN-R3 and TRAN-R4 |
| FS566.1981 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: TRAN-R3 and TRAN-R4 |
| FS569.2003 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: TRAN-R3 and TRAN-R4 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|-------------------|---|-----------|------------|--|---|-------------------------------|------------------------|---|
| S524.014 | Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK) | TRAN-R3 | Support | Given that the definition of Transport Infrastructure extends to cycle ways, this rule is supported as it provides for maintenance and upgrade as a permitted activity. | Retain as notified (inferred) | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: TRAN-R3 and TRAN-R4 |
| FS111.060 | Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT) | | Support | PHTTCCT support this rule as proposed. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: TRAN-R3 and TRAN-R4 |
| FS566.1832 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: TRAN-R3 and TRAN-R4 |
| S516.039 | Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland | TRAN-R4 | Not Stated | <p>Ngā Tai Ora generally support Rule TRAN-R4 (Electric Vehicle Charging Stations) which provides a permitted activity status for electric vehicle charging stations. The usage of electric vehicles is increasing and providing for them is prudent in the Far North District Plan.</p> <p>However, this also needs to be furthered by providing for safe and secure electric bicycle and electric scooter (disability) charging stations. The usage of electric bicycles is increasing by both elderly and leisure bicycle users in the Far North District. Providing charging stations would encourage more people being active in Far North communities.</p> | Amend Rule TRAN-R4 to include the requirement to provide safe and secure electric bicycle and electric scooter charging stations. | | Reject | Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: TRAN-R3 and TRAN-R4 |
| S356.039 | Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency | TRAN-R4 | Neutral | Waka Kotahi supports electric charging stations as a permitted activity as part of the parking standards. Consideration could be had to incentivise more electric charging stations to be provided, such as a % threshold of parking, or reduction in parking spaces provided if a % of | Amend for consideration of rules that would incentivise provision of electric charging stations. | | Reject | Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: TRAN-R3 and TRAN-R4 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|--|---|---|--|---|
| | | | | electric charging stations were provided. | | | | |
| FS55.005 | Z Energy Limited | | Neutral | <p>The submitter supports a permitted pathway for EV charging stations as this will help promote a network of stations and greater uptake of EV use, resulting in reduced fossil fuels and promotion of alternative modes of transport.</p> <p>The submitter notes the specific relief and outcome sought by the original submission is unclear.</p> | Not stated | Seeks clarification to better understand how provisions could be amended or inserted to further incentivise EV charging stations. | Neutral – No incentivisation recommended | Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: TRAN-R3 and TRAN-R4 |
| FS403.117 | Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora | | Support in part | Te Whatu Ora generally support Rule TRANR4 (Electric Vehicle Charging Stations) but consider that the rule also needs to be furthered by providing for safe and secure electric bicycle and electric scooter (disability) charging stations. | Allow in part | Seek provision details as above ... | Accept in part | Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: TRAN-R3 and TRAN-R4 |
| S45.032 | Puketona Business Park Limited | TRAN-R4 | Support | PBPL supports the requirement for a restricted discretionary activity where transport standards are infringed. | Retain the restricted discretionary activity status where transport standards are infringed. | | Accept | Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: TRAN-R3 and TRAN-R4 |
| FS403.113 | Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora | | Support in part | Te Whatu Ora generally support Rule TRANR4 (Electric Vehicle Charging Stations) but consider that the rule also needs to be furthered by providing for safe and secure electric bicycle and electric scooter (disability) charging stations. | Allow in part | See provisions details as above ... | Accept in part | Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: TRAN-R3 and TRAN-R4 |
| S184.015 | Northland Transport Alliance | TRAN-R4 | Support in part | No trigger for provision of EV spaces. If the intent of this rule is to allow the installation of EV charging stations as a permitted activity then no further comment. If the intent of the rule is to require the installation of EV charging stations in developments of a certain | No relief sought as intent of rule is to allow the installation of EV charging stations as a permitted activity | | Accept | Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: TRAN-R3 and TRAN-R4 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|---|-----------|-----------------|--|--|-------------------------------------|------------------------|---|
| | | | | size or character then consider the addition of a trigger for their installation | | | | |
| FS403.114 | Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora | | Support in part | Te Whatu Ora generally support Rule TRANR4 (Electric Vehicle Charging Stations) but consider that the rule also needs to be furthered by providing for safe and secure electric bicycle and electric scooter (disability) charging stations. | Allow in part | Seek provision details as above.... | Accept in part | Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: TRAN-R3 and TRAN-R4 |
| S335.028 | BP Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited, Z Energy Limited | TRAN-R4 | Support | Permitted activity TRAN-R4 (electric vehicle charging stations) is supported because it will assist to promote a broader network of EV charging stations and therefore greater uptake of EV use in the district and would contribute to FNDC's carbon reduction and climate change goals. Performance Standard PER-1 and the associated Note under Rule TRAN-R4 are similarly supported | Retain Rule TRAN-R4 as notified including PER-1 and the Note | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: TRAN-R3 and TRAN-R4 |
| FS403.115 | Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora | | Support in part | Te Whatu Ora generally support Rule TRANR4 (Electric Vehicle Charging Stations) but consider that the rule also needs to be furthered by providing for safe and secure electric bicycle and electric scooter (disability) charging stations. | Allow in part | Seek provision details as above ... | Accept in part | Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: TRAN-R3 and TRAN-R4 |
| S336.005 | Z Energy Limited | TRAN-R4 | Support | Permitted activity Rule TRAN-R4 (electric vehicle charging stations) is supported because it will assist to promote a broader network of EV charging stations and therefore greater uptake of EV use in the district and would contribute to FNDC's carbon reduction and climate change goals. Performance Standard PER-1 and the associated Note under Rule TRAN-R4 are similarly supported | Retain Rule TRAN-R4, including the performance standard PER-1 and Note | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: TRAN-R3 and TRAN-R4 |
| FS403.116 | Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora | | Support in part | Te Whatu Ora generally support Rule TRANR4 | Allow in part | Seek provision details as above ... | Accept in part | 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 |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|--|---|------------------------|---|
| | | | | (Electric Vehicle Charging Stations) but consider that the rule also needs to be furthered by providing for safe and secure electric bicycle and electric scooter (disability) charging stations. | | | Key Issue 8: TRAN-R3 and TRAN-R4 |
| S385.008 | McDonalds Restaurants (NZ) Limited | TRAN-R5 | Support in part | <p>The trip generation thresholds have changed from zone-specific daily traffic volumes to district-wide standards set by a combination of daily volumes, gross business area, and occupancy-based thresholds.</p> <p>As noted in section 2.0 and earlier submission points, the Transport Chapter includes terms that are not defined, accordingly, it is difficult for McDonald's to understand how a McDonald's restaurant would be captured.</p> <p>In terms of extensions and alteration, as currently drafted, there is no specific direction for how these would be treated where the existing activity already exceed the specified GFA. McDonalds seeks that TRAN-5 be amended to ensure that the rule does not apply where additions and alterations to an activity to not increase the GFA.</p> | <p>Amend TRAN-R5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reference defined terms consistently applied throughout the plan to provide clarity for plan users - Increase the threshold to appropriately provide for drive through and restaurant/cafes (see sub#5 and sub#6) particularly within zones where they are a permitted activity - Amend the provisions to provide for extension of activities. | Accept in part | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Trip Generation |
| S262.006 | Ti Toki Farms Limited | TRAN-R5 | Not Stated | The submitter considers that the TRAN-R5 appears to enter into the realm of managing the effects and activities which fall into the domain of Waka Kotahi. When there is no direct access onto Council infrastructure and access meets Waka Kotahi requirements it should not be required to be reviewed by Council as this is a duplication of effort. | Amend TRAN-R5 to ensure that it does not apply to sites or activities which have direct access onto a State Highway or limited access road which has been previously approved by Waka Kotahi. | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General Matters |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|-------------------------|---|------------------|-----------------|---|---|-------------------------------|---|
| S363.010 | Foodstuffs North Island Limited | TRAN-R5 | Not Stated | The submitter considers that rule TRAN-R5 Trip generation, and the thresholds for supermarket in TRAN-Table 11 - Trip generation, are inadequate particularly for extensions of existing supermarkets. | Amend rule TRAN-R5 Trip generation, to increase the threshold to appropriately provide for supermarkets particularly within zones where supermarkets are a permitted activity, amendments to the provisions to provide for extension of activities. | Reject | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Trip Generation |
| S502.091 | Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited | TRAN-R5 | Support in part | There are other forms of transport to a site such as via bus, shuttles or ferries. As these options generally carry many people it reduces the number of trips required, and parking spaces needed. For many tourist operations this is how people gain access to the site. We seek relief that other forms of transport such as those listed form part of the rule assessment. | Amend TRAN-R5 to include other forms of transport to form part of the rule assessment | Accept in part | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Trip Generation |
| S503.037 | Waitangi Limited | TRAN-R5 | Not Stated | There are other forms of transport to a site such as via bus, shuttles or ferries. As these options generally carry many people it reduces the number of trips required, and parking spaces needed. For many tourist operations this is how people gain access to the site. | Amend Rule TRAN-R5 to recognise that other forms of transport such as bus, shuttles or ferries should form part of the rule assessment. | Accept in part | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Trip Generation |
| S427.049 | Kapiro Residents Association | TRAN-R5 | Support in part | Many new subdivisions in Kerikeri and the surrounding rural area have greatly increased the volume of traffic using the central shopping/service area and roads leading to/from the CBD (e.g. Kerikeri Road, Waipapa Road, Landing Road, Kapiro Road, Purerua Road). When new developments are approved, insufficient account is taken of the total/cumulative impact of multiple developments on traffic. Other negative impacts on the community are not taken into account - such as such additional levels of noise, disruption and other changes that can affect people, amenity values and the character of the area. | Amend Rule TRAN-R5 to require full consideration of cumulative/combined traffic effects, congestion, emissions, noise etc. in townships and roads, especially roads leading to/from a CBD or service centres [inferred]. | Reject | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Trip Generation |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|---|--|------------------------|---|
| S45.033 | Puketona Business Park Limited | TRAN-R5 | Support | PBPL supports the requirement for a restricted discretionary activity where transport standards are infringed. | Retain the restricted discretionary activity status where transport standards are infringed. | | Accept | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Trip Generation |
| S184.016 | Northland Transport Alliance | TRAN-R5 | Support in part | Add trigger for Integrated Transport Assessment. Consider using WDC language in separate table (WDC District Plan Table TRA 15). Currently all new roads to vest or upgrade of vested roads trigger an ITA; suggest that this requirement is unfair for small developments that only have to upgrade the site frontage. Consider adding to the notes the requirements for an Integrated Transport Assessment. | Amend Rule TRAN-R5 to incorporate a trigger for requiring an Integrated Traffic Assessment. | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Trip Generation |
| FS347.002 | Bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited | | Oppose | The Fuel Companies consider that an Integrated Traffic Assessment (ITA) requirement for activities exceeding the thresholds in TRAN-Table 11 already exists under Rule TRAN-P7 and a new trigger is not required. The Fuel Companies do, however, consider that the ITA requirement should be clearer. | Disallow in part | Disallow in part original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Trip Generation |
| FS243.063 | Kainga Ora Homes and Communities | | Oppose | Kāinga Ora considers that an Integrated Traffic Assessment should only be triggered when thresholds are reached i.e., development serving greater than 100 residential units, or based on activity, use and occupancy. This should not apply to small developments. Kāinga Ora opposes the change sought as no details to the proposed trigger are introduced in the primary submission. | Disallow | Amend Rule TRAN-R5 to incorporate a trigger for requiring an Integrated Traffic Assessment | Accept in part | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Trip Generation |
| S342.014 | Waipapa Pine Limited and Adrian Broughton Trust | TRAN-R5 | Support in part | The PDP appears to enter into the realm of the managing those effects and activities which fall within the domain of Waka Kotahi. In this regard | Amend to ensure they do not apply to sites or activities which have direct access onto a State Highway or LAR which has been previously approved by Waka Kotahi | | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General Matters |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|--|--|---|-------------------------|--|
| | (now Fletcher Building Ltd) | | | <p>the submitter has access onto State Highway 10, the intersection approved by Waka Kotahi. As such there is no direct access onto Council infrastructure.</p> <p>The intersection meets the highway authorities' requirements and is not required to be revised by Council. To assess an activities traffic movements leading to the Highway or LAR is a duplication of effort.</p> | | | | |
| FS374.028 | Waipapa Pine Limited | | Support | The original submission reflects the position of Waipapa Pine Limited of support for the Heavy Industrial Zone with proposed changes to rules that would better support heavy industrial activities. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General Matters |
| FS542.036 | Foodstuffs North Island Limited | | Support in part | Foodstuffs considers that this rule needs to be amended to appropriately provide for supermarkets as outlined in its original submission. | Allow in part | Amend to appropriately provide for supermarkets as outlined in its original submission. | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General Matters |
| S251.003 | New Zealand Maritime Parks Ltd | TRAN-R5 | Support in part | <p>The trip generation thresholds have changed from zone-specific daily traffic volumes to district-wide standards set by a combination of daily volumes, gross business area, and occupancy-based thresholds.</p> <p>NZMPL are concerned with the proposed approach, as the Transport Chapter includes terms that are not defined, accordingly, it is difficult for NZMPL to determine the activities that would be captured.</p> | Amend TRAN-R5 to reference defined terms consistently applied throughout the plan to provide clarity for plan users. | | Awaiting recommendation | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Trip Generation |
| FS400.008 | The Paihia Property Owners Group | | Support | Submission 251 rightly notes that the underlying analyses related to the Coastal Environment provisions has not sufficiently considered the appropriate implementation of these provision in the urban environment. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Awaiting recommendation | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Trip Generation |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------|---|
| | | | | Specific provisions such a height limits and gross floor area restrictions (for example) require flexibility when considered against the urban environment values and existing environment. | | | | |
| FS396.008 | Ed and Inge Amsler | | Support | Submission 251 rightly notes that the underlying analyses related to the Coastal Environment provisions has not sufficiently considered the appropriate implementation of these provision in the urban environment. Specific provisions such a height limits and gross floor area restrictions (for example) require flexibility when considered against the urban environment values and existing environment. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Awaiting recommendation | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Trip Generation |
| FS406.028 | McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited | | Support | McDonald's supports amendments sought | Allow | Allow the original submission | Awaiting recommendation | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Trip Generation |
| S336.006 | Z Energy Limited | TRAN-R5 | Support | Trip generation is a permitted activity as long as the use or development is no greater than the thresholds in TRAN-Table 11 - Trip Generation. This rule is supported. | Retain Rule TRAN-R5 | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Trip Generation |
| FS370.044 | Bunnings Limited | | Oppose | Bunnings seeks amendments to increase traffic thresholds to provide for trade suppliers for the reasons outlined in its original submission. The trip generation thresholds have changed from zone-specific daily traffic volumes to district-wide standards set by a combination of daily volumes, gross business area, and occupancy-based thresholds. For a trade supplier, the restricted discretionary threshold is 450m ² GFA, any new development that cannot | Disallow | Amend TRAN-R5 to increase the threshold to appropriately provide for trade supplier particularly within zones where trade suppliers are a permitted activity, amendments to the provisions to provide for extension of activities (inferred). | Accept in part | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Trip Generation |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|---|-----------|----------|--|---|----------------------------------|------------------------|---|
| | | | | comply with this threshold would trigger a restricted discretionary activity status. As currently drafted, there is no specific direction for extensions, and it considered that where the extension results in a total GFA of or over 200m ² restricted discretionary consent would be required (inferred). | | | | |
| FS542.035 | Foodstuffs North Island Limited | | Oppose | Foodstuffs considers that this rule needs to be amended to appropriately provide for supermarkets as outlined in its original submission. | Disallow | Amend TRAN-R5 | Accept in part | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Trip Generation |
| FS406.030 | McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited | | Oppose | McDonald's considers that this rule needs to be amended as outlined in its original submission. | Disallow | Amend TRAN-R5 | Accept in part | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Trip Generation |
| S331.031 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | TRAN-R5 | Support | The submitter supports TRANS-R5 Trip generation as some schools will exceed the trip generation in TRAN Table-11 and will require an Integrated Transport Assessment to assess the effects. | Retain rule TRANS-R5 Trip generation as proposed. | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Trip Generation |
| FS542.034 | Foodstuffs North Island Limited | | Oppose | Foodstuffs considers that this rule needs to be amended as outlined in its original submission. | Disallow | Amend TRAN-R5 | Accept in part | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Trip Generation |
| FS406.029 | McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited | | Oppose | McDonald's considers that this rule needs to be amended as outlined in its original submission. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Trip Generation |
| S378.002 | Marshall Investments Trustee (2012) Limited | TRAN-R5 | Support | The PDP appears to enter into the realm of the managing those effects and activities which fall within the domain of Waka Kotahi. In this regard the submitter has access onto State Highway 10. As such there is no direct access onto Council infrastructure. The intersection meets the highway authorities' requirements and is not required to be revised by Council. To assess an activities traffic movements | Amend TRAN-R5 to ensure it does not apply to sites or activities which have direct access onto a State Highway or LAR which has been previously approved by Waka Kotahi | | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General Matters |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|--|---|------------------------|--|
| | | | | leading to the Highway or LAR is a duplication of effort. | | | | |
| FS542.037 | Foodstuffs North Island Limited | | Support in part | Foodstuffs considers that this rule needs to be amended to appropriately provide for supermarkets as outlined in its original submission. | Allow in part | Amend to appropriately provide for supermarkets as outlined in its original submission. | Accept in part | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General Matters |
| S384.006 | LD Family Investments Limited | TRAN-R5 | Support in part | <p>The PDP appears to enter into the realm of the managing those effects and activities which fall within the domain of Waka Kotahi. In this regard TTFL propose to create a new intersection onto State Highway 10 with all sites created under the subdivision using this new access point.</p> <p>As such there is no direct access onto Council infrastructure. The intersection will meet the highway authorities requirements and is not required to be revised by Council. To assess an activities traffic movements leading to the Highway or LAR is a duplication of effort.</p> | Amend to ensure Rule TRAN-R5 does not apply to sites or activities which have direct access onto a State Highway or LAR which has been previously approved by Waka Kotahi. | | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General Matters |
| FS542.038 | Foodstuffs North Island Limited | | Support in part | Foodstuffs considers that this rule needs to be amended to appropriately provide for supermarkets as outlined in its original submission. | Allow in part | Amend to appropriately provide for supermarkets as outlined in its original submission. | Accept in part | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General Matters |
| S215.022 | Haigh Workman Limited | TRAN-R5 | Oppose | <p>We oppose TRAN-R5 / TRAN Table 11. Table 11 allows 200 vehicle movements per day from any site, including residential sites that are currently restricted to 20 vehicle movements/day. Table 11 also allows traffic from up to 20 residential units per site as a permitted activity.</p> <p>The Note to Rule TRAN-R5 states that Rule TRAN-R2 may require a private access to be vested as road. TRAN-Table 9 requirements for private</p> | Delete TRAN-R5 | | Reject | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Trip Generation |

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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>accessways is based on the number of residential units, not the number of vehicle movements.</p> <p>TRAN-S2 controls new vehicle crossings, but not increased use of existing crossings. There is therefore no mechanism in the Proposed District Plan that would require a private access to be widened or a vehicle crossing to be upgraded to mitigate the adverse effects of the increased traffic.</p> <p>If access is directly off an existing public road, there is no mechanism for assessing whether the road is adequate for the increased traffic. Multiple sites generating 200 vehicle movements per day could have significant cumulative adverse effects on the road network which as a permitted activity would not be assessed.</p> | | | | |
| FS570.511 | 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 | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Trip Generation |
| FS566.525 | 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 | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Trip Generation |
| FS569.547 | 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 | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Trip Generation |
| S67.001 | Michael John Winch | TRAN-R5 | Oppose | I oppose Rule TRAN-R5 which allows 200 vehicle movements per day from any site, including residential sites that are currently restricted to 20 vehicle movements/day. TRAN-Table 11 also allows traffic from up to 20 residential units per site as a permitted activity. | Delete TRAN-R5 Trip Generation in the Proposed District Plan and replace with the Traffic Intensity provisions of Section 15.1.6A of the Operative District Plan. In particular, I request that the permitted activity rule for any residential or rural-residential site be limited to 20 vehicle movements per day | | Reject | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Trip Generation |

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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>Access to my residence is via a right of way shared with one other residence.</p> <p>The permitted activity rule would allow one of us to set up a business from home generating up to 200 vehicle movements per day with no consideration of the adverse effects on amenity values or the suitability of the right of way for increased traffic. Even where sites gain access directly off a public road, the increased traffic would have adverse effects on the amenity values of neighbouring properties.</p> | | | | |
| FS346.824 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. | | Support | <p>The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB.</p> <p>Forest & Bird supports the full submission than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.</p> | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Trip Generation |
| FS566.050 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Oppose | <p>Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission</p> | Disallow | Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission | Accept | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Trip Generation |
| S344.007 | Paihia Properties Holdings Corporate Trustee Limited and UP Management Ltd | TRAN-R5 | Not Stated | <p>The trip generation thresholds have changed from zone-specific daily traffic volumes to district-wide standards set by a combination of daily volumes, gross business area, and occupancy-based thresholds. PPHCTL consider this to be a more appropriate trigger for traffic-related considerations.</p> <p>The standards applying to private accessways provide little clarity of when a private access would be required to be upgraded to public road standard for any activity other than residential activities (i.e. visitor accommodation, commercial activities etc.).</p> | Amend TRAN-R5 to provide permitted activity standard for activities complying with the trip generation thresholds, that the exemptions relating to first residential unit, farming and forestry are retained, and to clarify the expectations for EVCS's and upgrading standards for private accessways. | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Trip Generation |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|---|-----------|-----------------|--|--|-------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| FS396.028 | Ed and Inge Amsler | | Support | The submission seeks various changes in relation to the urban environment / coastal environment interface as well as specific provisions in the Mixed Use Zone. Additionally, the submission seeks better reflection of business land needs that should be reflected throughout the Plan. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Trip Generation |
| S184.017 | Northland Transport Alliance | TRAN-R6 | Support in part | Consider adding signage to list of permitted activities. Road crossings, bridges, boardwalks and retaining walls should be considered as a discretionary activity. | Amend Rule TRAN-R6 to provide for signage as a permitted activity and road crossings, bridges, boardwalks and retaining walls a discretionary activity | | Reject | Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: TRAN-R6, TRAN-R7, TRAN-R8, and TRAN-R9 |
| S425.020 | Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust | TRAN-R6 | Support | <p>While PHTTCCT support some recognition of the significance of the Trail, on review of the overview, it appears that the rules pertaining to structures and buildings in the Part 3 Area Specific Matters will apply in addition to TRAN - R6. With this in mind the benefit provided to PHTTCCT is limited and alignment with the direction in the RPS for regionally significant infrastructure is not achieved. It is unclear how this Chapter interacts with the other Part 2 Chapters.</p> <p>For these rules to truly be enabling (and align with the direction of the RPS) TRAN-R6 would need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Specify buildings as well as structures; - Specify that this rule takes precedent over the rules within the underlying zones; and - Include vegetation and earthworks permitted thresholds that supersede | Amend TRAN -R6 to include additional to truly enable the maintenance, upgrade and extension of the Trail and alignment with the direction of the RPS. | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: TRAN-R6, TRAN-R7, TRAN-R8, and TRAN-R9 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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>those that would otherwise apply.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As currently drafted, the provisions do not align with the direction of the RPS for regionally significant infrastructure which is otherwise generally provide for infrastructure covered by the Infrastructure Chapter. | | | | |
| S45.034 | Puketona Business Park Limited | TRAN-R6 | Support | PBPL supports the requirement for a restricted discretionary activity where transport standards are infringed. | Retain the restricted discretionary activity status where transport standards are infringed. | | Accept | Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: TRAN-R6, TRAN-R7, TRAN-R8, and TRAN-R9 |
| S529.080 | Carbon Neutral NZ Trust | TRAN-R6 | Support | Support the enablement of works within the Twin Coast Trail, this Trail is a critical tourism attraction for the District but also has great potential to operate more as a transportation network. | Retain as notified (inferred) | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: TRAN-R6, TRAN-R7, TRAN-R8, and TRAN-R9 |
| FS111.062 | Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT) | | Support in part | PHTTCCT support the enablement of works within the Twin Coast Trail but support amendments to ensure it will truly enable the maintenance, upgrade and extension of the Trail and alignment with the direction of the RPS. | Allow in part | Allow in part original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: TRAN-R6, TRAN-R7, TRAN-R8, and TRAN-R9 |
| FS570.1968 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: TRAN-R6, TRAN-R7, TRAN-R8, and TRAN-R9 |
| FS566.1982 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: TRAN-R6, TRAN-R7, TRAN-R8, and TRAN-R9 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|---|-----------|-----------------|--|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------|---|
| FS569.2004 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: TRAN-R6, TRAN-R7, TRAN-R8, and TRAN-R9 |
| S524.015 | Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK) | TRAN-R6 | Support | Support the enablement of works within the Twin Coast Trail, this Trail is a critical tourism attraction for the District but also has great potential to operate more as a transportation network. | Retain as notified (inferred) | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: TRAN-R6, TRAN-R7, TRAN-R8, and TRAN-R9 |
| FS111.063 | Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT) | | Support in part | PHTTCCT support the enablement of works within the Twin Coast Trail but support amendments to ensure it will truly enable the maintenance, upgrade and extension of the Trail and alignment with the direction of the RPS. | Allow in part | Allow in part the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: TRAN-R6, TRAN-R7, TRAN-R8, and TRAN-R9 |
| FS566.1833 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: TRAN-R6, TRAN-R7, TRAN-R8, and TRAN-R9 |
| S271.015 | Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust | TRAN-R6 | Support | Support the enablement of works within the Twin Coast Trail, this Trail is a critical tourism attraction for the District but also has great potential to operate more as a transportation network. | Retain as notified (inferred) | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: TRAN-R6, TRAN-R7, TRAN-R8, and TRAN-R9 |
| FS570.738 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: TRAN-R6, TRAN-R7, TRAN-R8, and TRAN-R9 |
| FS566.752 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: TRAN-R6, TRAN-R7, TRAN-R8, and TRAN-R9 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|---|-----------|----------|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| FS569.774 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: TRAN-R6, TRAN-R7, TRAN-R8, and TRAN-R9 |
| S446.021 | Kapiro Conservation Trust | TRAN-R6 | Support | Support the enablement of works within the Twin Coast Trail, this Trail is a critical tourism attraction for the District but also has great potential to operate more as a transportation network. It is hoped that this route, extensions to it and future routes can be mapped in the District Plan with similar enabling rules to provide for development, but also to protect these future corridors from development, and highlight opportunities for land/easement acquisition through subdivision and development. | Retain TRAN-R6 (inferred) | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: TRAN-R6, TRAN-R7, TRAN-R8, and TRAN-R9 |
| FS569.1780 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: TRAN-R6, TRAN-R7, TRAN-R8, and TRAN-R9 |
| FS570.1780 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: TRAN-R6, TRAN-R7, TRAN-R8, and TRAN-R9 |
| S425.021 | Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust | TRAN-R7 | Support | PHTTCCT support the enablement for new sections of the Trail outside of sensitive areas noting earlier submission in regards to policy direction for sensitive areas and sub#18 in regards to ensuring actual enablement | Retain as notified. | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: TRAN-R6, TRAN-R7, TRAN-R8, and TRAN-R9 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|---|-----------|----------|--|--|-------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| S45.035 | Puketona Business Park Limited | TRAN-R7 | Support | PBPL supports the requirement for a restricted discretionary activity where transport standards are infringed. | Retain the restricted discretionary activity status where transport standards are infringed. | | Accept | Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: TRAN-R6, TRAN-R7, TRAN-R8, and TRAN-R9 |
| S446.022 | Kapiro Conservation Trust | TRAN-R7 | Support | Support the enablement of works within the Twin Coast Trail, this Trail is a critical tourism attraction for the District but also has great potential to operate more as a transportation network. It is hoped that this route, extensions to it and future routes can be mapped in the District Plan with similar enabling rules to provide for development, but also to protect these future corridors from development, and highlight opportunities for land/easement acquisition through subdivision and development. | Retain TRAN-R7 (inferred) | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: TRAN-R6, TRAN-R7, TRAN-R8, and TRAN-R9 |
| FS111.064 | Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT) | | Support | PHTTCCT support the enablement for new sections of the Trail outside of sensitive areas | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: TRAN-R6, TRAN-R7, TRAN-R8, and TRAN-R9 |
| FS569.1780 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: TRAN-R6, TRAN-R7, TRAN-R8, and TRAN-R9 |
| FS570.1781 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: TRAN-R6, TRAN-R7, TRAN-R8, and TRAN-R9 |
| S529.081 | Carbon Neutral NZ Trust | TRAN-R7 | Support | Support the enablement of works within the Twin Coast Trail, this Trail is a critical tourism attraction for the District | Retain as notified (inferred) | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: TRAN-R6, TRAN- |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|-------------------|---|-----------|----------|---|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|---|
| | | | | but also has great potential to operate more as a transportation network. | | | | R7, TRAN-R8, and TRAN-R9 |
| FS111.065 | Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT) | | Support | PHTTCCT support the enablement for new sections of the Trail outside of sensitive areas | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: TRAN-R6, TRAN-R7, TRAN-R8, and TRAN-R9 |
| FS570.1969 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: TRAN-R6, TRAN-R7, TRAN-R8, and TRAN-R9 |
| FS566.1983 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: TRAN-R6, TRAN-R7, TRAN-R8, and TRAN-R9 |
| FS569.2005 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: TRAN-R6, TRAN-R7, TRAN-R8, and TRAN-R9 |
| S524.016 | Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK) | TRAN-R7 | Support | Support the enablement of works within the Twin Coast Trail, this Trail is a critical tourism attraction for the District but also has great potential to operate more as a transportation network. | Retain as notified (inferred) | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: TRAN-R6, TRAN-R7, TRAN-R8, and TRAN-R9 |
| FS111.066 | Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT) | | Support | PHTTCCT support the enablement for new sections of the Trail outside of sensitive areas | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: TRAN-R6, TRAN-R7, TRAN-R8, and TRAN-R9 |
| FS566.1834 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: TRAN-R6, TRAN- |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|---|-----------|----------|---|---|-------------------------------|------------------------|---|
| | | | | | | | | R7, TRAN-R8, and TRAN-R9 |
| S271.016 | Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust | TRAN-R7 | Support | Support the enablement of works within the Twin Coast Trail, this Trail is a critical tourism attraction for the District but also has great potential to operate more as a transportation network. | Retain as notified (inferred) | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: TRAN-R6, TRAN-R7, TRAN-R8, and TRAN-R9 |
| FS570.739 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: TRAN-R6, TRAN-R7, TRAN-R8, and TRAN-R9 |
| FS566.753 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: TRAN-R6, TRAN-R7, TRAN-R8, and TRAN-R9 |
| FS569.775 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: TRAN-R6, TRAN-R7, TRAN-R8, and TRAN-R9 |
| S356.040 | Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency | TRAN-R8 | Oppose | Whilst admirable, the rule appears to undermine the strategic direction set out in the District Plan, so changes need to occur in the policy framework to support this approach. If the overlays are excluded from new roads, it is questionable as to why this does not apply to existing roads, and for State highways to also be exempt. | Delete PER-2 or widen to include provision for State highways and existing roads. | | Reject | Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: TRAN-R6, TRAN-R7, TRAN-R8, and TRAN-R9 |
| S463.023 | Waiaua Bay Farm Limited | TRAN-R8 | Support | With a view towards future road development at Kauri Cliffs to support future residential development, WBF supports the proposed restricted discretionary consenting pathway for roads not meeting the standards of PER-1 or PER-2. | Retain Rule TRAN-R8 | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: TRAN-R6, TRAN-R7, TRAN-R8, and TRAN-R9 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|--|--|------------------------|---|
| | | | | If road development cannot comply with these permitted standards, due to locational criteria (i.e., unavoidable siting with the coastal environment) or the need for a highly bespoke road design commensurate with the values of the Special Purpose Zone - Kauri Cliffs (such as streetlighting that does not comply with TRAN-S5), it is appropriate for a restricted discretionary consenting pathway to apply. | | | |
| S427.053 | Kapiro Residents Association | TRAN-R8 | Support in part | Many new subdivisions in Kerikeri and the surrounding rural area have greatly increased the volume of traffic using the central shopping/service area and roads leading to/from the CBD (e.g. Kerikeri Road, Waipapa Road, Landing Road, Kapiro Road, Purerua Road). When new developments are approved, insufficient account is taken of the total/cumulative impact of multiple developments on traffic. Other negative impacts on the community are not taken into account - such as additional levels of noise, disruption and other changes that can affect people, amenity values and the character of the area. | Amend Rule TRAN-R8 to include full consideration of cumulative/combined traffic effects, congestion, emissions, noise etc. in townships and roads, especially roads leading to/from a CBD or service centres [inferred]. | Reject | Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: TRAN-R6, TRAN-R7, TRAN-R8, and TRAN-R9 |
| S45.036 | Puketona Business Park Limited | TRAN-R8 | Support | PBPL supports the requirement for a restricted discretionary activity where transport standards are infringed. | Retain the restricted discretionary activity status where transport standards are infringed. | Accept in part | Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: TRAN-R6, TRAN-R7, TRAN-R8, and TRAN-R9 |
| S215.012 | Haigh Workman Limited | TRAN-R8 | Support in part | We support the requirement for new public roads to comply with Council standards. However, there are instances where unformed paper roads are formed to serve one or several properties but are not maintained by Council. These roads should be | Insert a new permitted activity clause relating to the formation and use of a paper road for private access where it serves up to 8 households, has Council consent as landowner, is constructed to private access standards and is privately maintained | Accept in part | Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: TRAN-R6, TRAN-R7, TRAN-R8, and TRAN-R9 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|---|-----------|-----------------|--|---|---|------------------------|--|
| | | | | formed as private accessways, not public road standards. Provided Council approval is obtained as landowner and the road is constructed and maintained to appropriate standards, a resource consent should not be required. | | | | |
| FS44.56 | Northland Planning & Development 2020 Ltd | | Support | This comes up very often with subdivisions or second dwellings. Generally NTA is happy so long as there are no more than 5 users. Agree to allow this as a permitted activity where council as landowner gives approval. | Allow | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: TRAN-R6, TRAN-R7, TRAN-R8, and TRAN-R9 |
| FS570.501 | 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 | Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: TRAN-R6, TRAN-R7, TRAN-R8, and TRAN-R9 |
| FS566.515 | 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 | Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: TRAN-R6, TRAN-R7, TRAN-R8, and TRAN-R9 |
| FS569.537 | 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 | Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: TRAN-R6, TRAN-R7, TRAN-R8, and TRAN-R9 |
| S215.008 | Haigh Workman Limited | TRAN-R8 | Support in part | We support TRAN-R2 / PER-1 specifying that a private accessway may only serve a maximum of 8 household equivalents. Where a large number of households are served by an accessway, it is more practical, efficient and safe for it to be a public road. For completeness, we recommend that a corresponding permitted activity rule be included in | Amend TRAN-R8 to include a corresponding permitted activity rule requiring 9 or more households to be served by a public road | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2 and Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: TRAN-R6, TRAN- |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|--|---|-------------------------|---|
| | | | | Rule TRAN-R8 requiring 9 or more households to be served by a public road. | | | | R7, TRAN-R8, and TRAN-R9 |
| FS570.497 | 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 | Awaiting recommendation | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2 and Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: TRAN-R6, TRAN-R7, TRAN-R8, and TRAN-R9 |
| FS566.511 | 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 | Awaiting recommendation | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2 and Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: TRAN-R6, TRAN-R7, TRAN-R8, and TRAN-R9 |
| FS569.533 | 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 | Awaiting recommendation | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2 and Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: TRAN-R6, TRAN-R7, TRAN-R8, and TRAN-R9 |
| S384.007 | LD Family Investments Limited | TRAN-R9 | Support in part | The PDP appears to enter into the realm of the managing those effects and activities which fall within the domain of Waka Kotahi. In this regard TTFL propose to create a new intersection onto State Highway 10 with | Amend to ensure Rule TRAN-R9 does not apply to sites or activities which have direct access onto a State Highway or LAR which has been previously approved by Waka Kotahi. | | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General Matters |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|---|-----------|-----------------|---|--|------------------------|---|
| | | | | <p>all sites created under the subdivision using this new access point.</p> <p>As such there is no direct access onto Council infrastructure. The intersection will meet the highway authorities requirements and is not required to be revised by Council. To assess an activities traffic movements leading to the Highway or LAR is a duplication of effort.</p> | | | |
| S356.041 | Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency | TRAN-R9 | Support in part | DIS-1 - Amend note to "altered" to include change in use. | <p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>Altered includes, but is not limited to, any widening, narrowing, gradient changing, redesigning, change in use and relocating of a vehicle crossing, but excludes resurfacing.</p> | Accept | <p>Section 5.2.9</p> <p>Key Issue 9: TRAN-R6, TRAN-R7, TRAN-R8, and TRAN-R9</p> |
| S378.003 | Marshall Investments Trustee (2012) Limited | TRAN-R9 | Support | <p>The PDP appears to enter into the realm of the managing those effects and activities which fall within the domain of Waka Kotahi. In this regard the submitter has access onto State Highway 10. As such there is no direct access onto Council infrastructure. The intersection meets the highway authorities' requirements and is not required to be revised by Council. To assess an activities traffic movements leading to the Highway or LAR is a duplication of effort.</p> | <p>Amend TRAN-R9 to ensure it does not apply to sites or activities which have direct access onto a State Highway or LAR which has been previously approved by Waka Kotahi.</p> | Reject | <p>Section 5.2.4</p> <p>Key Issue 4: General Matters</p> |
| S262.007 | Ti Toki Farms Limited | TRAN-R9 | Not Stated | <p>The submitter considers that the TRAN-R9 appears to enter into the realm of managing the effects and activities which fall into the domain of Waka Kotahi. When there is no direct access onto Council infrastructure and access meets Waka Kotahi requirements it should not be required to be reviewed by Council as this is a duplication of effort.</p> | Amend TRAN-R9 | Reject | <p>Section 5.2.4</p> <p>Key Issue 4: General Matters</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 |
|------------------|---|-----------|-----------------|---|--|--|------------------------|--|
| S427.054 | Kapiro Residents Association | TRAN-R9 | Support in part | Many new subdivisions in Kerikeri and the surrounding rural area have greatly increased the volume of traffic using the central shopping/service area and roads leading to/from the CBD (e.g. Kerikeri Road, Waipapa Road, Landing Road, Kapiro Road, Purerua Road). When new developments are approved, insufficient account is taken of the total/cumulative impact of multiple developments on traffic. Other negative impacts on the community are not taken into account - such as such additional levels of noise, disruption and other changes that can affect people, amenity values and the character of the area. | Amend Rule TRAN-R9 to include full consideration of cumulative/combined traffic effects, congestion, emissions, noise etc. in townships and roads, especially roads leading to/from a CBD or service centres [inferred]. | | Reject | Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: TRAN-R6, TRAN-R7, TRAN-R8, and TRAN-R9 |
| S45.011 | Puketona Business Park Limited | TRAN-R9 | Not Stated | There are some existing discrepancies in the Transport chapter of the PDP as notified. Rule TRAN-R2 inadvertently requires discretionary activity consent for a vehicle crossing off a State Highway (as it does not meet PER-3 of that rule), whilst Rule TRAN-R9 expressly allows for new or altered vehicle crossings off a State Highway as a restricted discretionary activity | Amend to ensure that PER-3 of Rule TRAN-R2 and Rule TRAN-R9 are consistent. | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2 |
| FS36.045 | Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency | | Neutral | The submitter notes there does appear to be an inconsistency in the activity status arrangements for new or altered accessways off SH between TRAN R3 and TRAN R9 and seeks further clarity. | Allow | Seeks further clarification on the activity status arrangements between TRAN-R3 and TRAN-R9. | Accept in part | Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: TRAN-R2 |
| S342.015 | Waipapa Pine Limited and Adrian Broughton Trust (now Fletcher Building Ltd) | TRAN-R9 | Support in part | The PDP appears to enter into the realm of the managing those effects and activities which fall within the domain of Waka Kotahi. In this regard the submitter has access onto State Highway 10, the intersection approved by Waka Kotahi. As such | Amend to ensure they do not apply to sites or activities which have direct access onto a State Highway or LAR which has been previously approved by Waka Kotahi. | | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General Matters |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|--|-------------------------------|------------------------|---|
| | | | | <p>there is no direct access onto Council infrastructure.</p> <p>The intersection meets the highway authorities' requirements and is not required to be revised by Council. To assess an activities traffic movements leading to the Highway or LAR is a duplication of effort.</p> | | | | |
| FS374.029 | Waipapa Pine Limited | | Support | The original submission reflects the position of Waipapa Pine Limited of support for the Heavy Industrial Zone with proposed changes to rules that would better support heavy industrial activities. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General Matters |
| S82.016 | Good Journey Limited | Standards | Oppose | The standards are opposed to the extent that car parking minimums are still specified in the Mixed Use zone. Should existing operations wish to more intensively develop their sites in the Mixed Use zone by increasing the amount of "gross business area" and / or the provision of residential accommodation then additional carparks are required. Additional controls such as bicycle parks and end of trip facilities are also required. Intensification and development of Mixed Use areas should be encouraged by the removal of minimum car parking standards in recognition of the benefits that Mixed Use zones can bring in terms of both land use outcomes and travel patterns. | Delete car park minimums in the Mixed Use Zone and other relief that will satisfy the concerns of the submitter. | | Accept | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| S178.010 | Reuben Wright | Standards | Support in part | Rules TRAN-S1-S5 do not appear to have an activity status expressed where any application will comply with the various Rules. It is assumed any subdivision should be either permitted or controlled where it complies with anyone of the rules, and restricted discretionary where it does not comply. | [Amend TRAN-S1-S5 to clarify the activity status]. | | Reject | Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: Standards – General Comments |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|--|---|------------------------|---|
| | | | | An activity status should be referenced for each rule. | | | |
| S178.011 | Reuben Wright | Standards | Support | Rule TRAN-S5 relates to 'Requirements for Streetlighting'. The provision of streetlighting for any new road of road extension should not be a rule but rather a matter that control is reserved over or discretion is restricted to for any subdivision or land use activity. | Amend the requirements for streetlighting relating to TRAN-S5, to a matter that control is reserved over or discretion is restricted to for any subdivision or land use activity. | Accept in part | Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: TRAN-S2, TRAN-S3 and TRAN-S5 |
| S416.029 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Standards | Support in part | <p>Public safety at level crossings is a key concern for KiwiRail and protection of sightlines is a key means of ensuring this.</p> <p>The inclusion of a standard to ensure sightlines are not compromised will support achieving TRAN-01 and TRAN-03 seeking to protect Regionally Significant Infrastructure, along with other Policy direction such as SIGN-P4 which specifically references signage avoiding sightlines.</p> <p>Compliance with the Standard would provide for the development as a permitted activity, with non-compliance requiring a Restricted Discretionary Activity consent, with discretion restricted to the aspects provided in TR-P3. These relate to safe and efficient use of the site and functioning of the transport network which in particular is relevant to the matters the rule is seeking to address.</p> <p>While KiwiRail does not support the creation of new level crossings without a higher level of safety protection (lights/barriers) over the expected life of the District Plan the potential for Stop or Give Way Controlled level crossings being established cannot be eliminated. This Standard would</p> | <p>Insert new standards as follows:</p> <p>Sight lines at railway level crossings</p> <p>All zones</p> <p>Activity status: Permitted where compliance is achieved with railway level crossing sight line standard 'YY'.</p> <p>All zones</p> <p>Activity status: Restricted discretionary where compliance is not achieved with standard 'YY'.</p> <p>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. The extent to which the safety and efficiency of railway and road operations will be adversely affected. ii. Any characteristics of the proposed use that will make compliance unnecessary iii. Any implications arising from advice from KiwiRail <p>TRAN STANDARD YY: Level Crossing Sight Triangles Approach sight triangles at level crossings with Stop or Give Way signs Buildings, structures, planting or other visual obstructions must not be located</p> | Accept in part | Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: TRAN Rules – General Comments |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|------------|--|--|---|------------------------|---|
| | | | | <p>therefore provide protection for these sightlines.</p> <p>It should be noted that the restart triangle applies at all level crossings, which includes those controlled with barrier arms and signals.</p> <p>This standard could equally be located in Infrastructure section however the Transport Section contains most standards for vehicle safety. Adding the standard to the Transport section ensures that it is clear it applies to all activities Plan wide.</p> | <p>within the restart or approach sightline areas of railway level crossings as shown in the shaded areas of Figure 1: Restart Sightlines and Figure 2 : Approach Sightlines (refer to submission for figures).</p> | | | |
| S431.154 | John Andrew Riddell | Standards | Not Stated | The amendment is necessary in order to achieve the purpose of the Act. | Amend all objectives, policies, rules and standards relating to providing for vehicles and roading to place much more emphasis on providing for cycling and for walking | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| FS332.154 | 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 | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General matters |
| S215.017 | Haigh Workman Limited | Standards | Not Stated | | Insert standards for sealing public roads where the gradient exceeds 12.5%. | | Reject | Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: Standards – General Comments |
| FS570.506 | 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 | Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: Standards – General Comments |
| FS566.520 | 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 | Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: Standards – General Comments |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|---|-----------|----------|--|--|---|------------------------|---|
| FS569.542 | 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 | Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: Standards – General Comments |
| S516.040 | Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland | TRANS-S1 | Support | Ngā Tai Ora support the requirements for bicycle and accessible car parking spaces in TRANS-S1, and the subsequent spaces specified in TRANS-Table 1. It is important that minimum requirements on bicycle and accessible parking spaces are established to encourage active modes of transport and accessibility for the disabled and elderly. | Retain Standard TRANS-S1 | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| S502.095 | Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited | TRANS-S1 | Oppose | It is considered this is an unnecessary component to add under the District Plan framework to add showers to Commercial, Industrial, Commercial Service activities, Hospitals & Education facilities. There is no commentary in the s32 report to support this provision. Not all areas of the Far North are suitable for alternative modes of transport and the roading network within our rural areas doesn't support cycling or walking to work. The locations where end of trip facilities are practical could rather utilize this provision to reduce the amount of car parks required instead of it being a blanket rule for the activities listed. The assessment criteria if compliance is not achieved also doesn't address matters related to no showers being provided or a reduced number of showers being provided. | Delete Trans-S1 rule 4 - End of trip facilities for commercial activities, offices, industrial activities, commercial service activities, hospital activities and educational facilities are provided for staff use in accordance with TRANS Table 4 – End of trip facility requirements; | | Reject | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| FS395.0010 | Ti Toki Farms Limited | | Support | It is agreed that this rule is unnecessary in particular locations of the Far North District. | Allow | Delete the TRANS-S1 rule 4 | Reject | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|---|---|------------------------|--|
| FS391.0010 | LD Family Investments Ltd | | Support | It is agreed that this rule is unnecessary in particular locations of the Far North District | Allow | Delete TRANS-S1 Rule 4 | Reject | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| FS403.123 | Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora | | Oppose | Te Whatu Ora support the requirements for bicycle and accessible car parking spaces and seek to retain as notified. | Disallow in part | Te Whatu Ora support the requirements for bicycle and accessible car parking spaces and seek to retain as notified. | Accept | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| S512.017 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | TRANS-S1 | Support in part | Fire and Emergency have previously found carparking or lack of parking areas has delayed emergency response times. We seek explicit reference to the effects on emergency response access. In addition see note below on minimum parking requirements | Amend TRAN-S1 Where the standard is not met, matters of discretion are restricted to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. any recommendations in a transport assessment approved by a chartered professional engineer; b. the potential for adverse effects on the safety and efficiency of the transport network, including emergency response access and effects on vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists; c. the scale, management and operation of the activity as it relates to its demand for parking; d. the use of low impact design techniques to minimise stormwater run off; and e. the ability for persons with a disability or limited mobility to park, enter and exit a vehicle and manoeuvre around a parking area safely and effectively | | Reject | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|-------------------------------|---|------------------------|--|
| FS243.187 | Kainga Ora Homes and Communities | | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes elements of the proposed change sought that may be inconsistent with NZ Standards and seeks further clarification/reasoning for the amended changes. | Disallow | (A number of submission points and relief sought) | Accept | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| FS403.124 | Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora | | Support in part | Te Whatu Ora support the requirements for bicycle and accessible car parking spaces and seek to retain as notified. | Allow in part | Te Whatu Ora support the requirements for bicycle and accessible car parking spaces and seek to retain as notified. | Accept in part | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| FS403.135 | Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora | | Support in part | Te Whatu Ora seek to amend the provisions to require a setback from "Significant Hazardous Facilities". | Allow in part | Te Whatu Ora seek to amend the provisions to require a setback from "Significant Hazardous Facilities". | Accept in part | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| S172.016 | Terra Group | TRANS-S1 | Support | Support this standard, as it will achieve positive outcomes for the proposed zone. | Retain as notified (inferred) | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| FS403.118 | Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora | | Support in part | Te Whatu Ora support the requirements for bicycle and accessible car parking spaces and seek to retain as notified. | Allow in part | Te Whatu Ora support the requirements for bicycle and accessible car parking spaces and seek to retain as notified. | Accept in part | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| S215.002 | Haigh Workman Limited | TRANS-S1 | Support | | Retain TRANS-S1 | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| FS570.491 | 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 | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| FS403.121 | Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora | | Support | Te Whatu Ora support the requirements for bicycle and accessible car parking spaces and seek to retain as notified. | Allow | Te Whatu Ora support the requirements for bicycle and accessible car parking spaces and seek to retain as notified. | Accept in part | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|---|-----------|-----------------|---|---|---|------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| FS566.505 | 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 | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| FS569.527 | 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 | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| S184.009 | Northland Transport Alliance | TRANS-S1 | Support in part | Suggest that safe and secure parking should also be covered. | Amend TRAN-S1 to include new clause 7 as follows: 7. Parking is safe and secure. | | Reject | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| FS403.119 | Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora | | Support in part | Te Whatu Ora support the requirements for bicycle and accessible car parking spaces and seek to retain as notified. | Allow in part | Te Whatu Ora support the requirements for bicycle and accessible car parking spaces and seek to retain as notified. | Accept in part | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| S184.018 | Northland Transport Alliance | TRANS-S1 | Support in part | Current DP allows for provision of bicycle parking and green space in lieu of parking as a discretionary activity - consider including here. Use of an ITA to assess and approve alternatives to minimums. Further question - Kerikeri/Waipapa is close to Tier 3 City - should this area be called out separately in line with the Urban Policy Statement on parking? | Amend Standard TRANS-S1 to provide for bicycle parking spaces in lieu of car parking, using an Integrated Transport Assessment to support alternatives. | | Reject | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| FS403.120 | Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora | | Support in part | Te Whatu Ora support the requirements for bicycle and accessible car parking spaces and seek to retain as notified. | Allow in part | Te Whatu Ora support the requirements for bicycle and accessible car parking spaces and seek to retain as notified. | Accept in part | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| S331.027 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | TRANS-S1 | Support in part | The submitter supports in part standard TRANS-S1 Requirements for parking, in respect to the TRAN-Table 1 - which requires minimum car parking spaces for primary and secondary schools, kohanga reo and child care centres. | Amend the standard TRANS-S Requirements for parking as follows: 1. The minimum number of on-site car parking and bicycle spaces are provided for each activity in | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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>The NPS-UD requires Tier 1, 2 and 3 territorial authorities to remove any minimum parking requirement in their District Plans (see subpart 8 -section 3.38).</p> <p>Council acknowledges that they are not a Tier 3 authority. However, Section 1.5 of the NPSUD states that 'Tier 3 local authorities are strongly encouraged to do the things that tier 1 or 2 local authorities are obliged to do under Parts 2 and 3' of the NPS-UD.</p> <p>Therefore, the submitter encourages council to adopt the NPS-UD and remove minimum car parking requirements for educational facilities and recommends that loading requirements for primary and secondary schools, kohanga reo and child care centres are also removed from TRAN-Table 3. The ITA should determine how many bus bays or loading areas are appropriate for educational facilities as rural schools may require more buses than schools in urban schools, where students may use public transport or active modes.</p> | <p>accordance with TRAN-Table 1 Minimum number of parking spaces, except that:</p> <p>for sites in the Mixed Use zone, no additional on-site parking spaces are required where the nature of a legally established activity changes, provided that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. the gross business area of the site is not increased; and ii. it is not a residential activity or visitor accommodation activity; <p>2. Where on-site parking is provided in accordance with (1) above, additional accessible car parking spaces must be provided in accordance with TRAN-Table 2 - Minimum number of accessible parking spaces;</p> <p>3. Loading spaces for commercial activities, offices, industrial activities, commercial service activities, hospital activities, and educational facilities are provided on site in accordance with TRAN-Table 3 - Minimum on-site loading bay requirements;</p> <p>4. End-of-trip facilities for commercial activities, offices, industrial activities, commercial service activities, hospital activities and educational facilities are provided</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>for staff use in accordance with TRAN-Table 4 - End of trip facility requirements; and</p> <p>5. All on-site car parking and manoeuvring areas are provided in accordance with TRAN-Table 5 - Parking and manoeuvring dimensions.;</p> <p>6. and 6. If any activity is not represented within TRAN-Table 1 - Minimum number of parking spaces then the activity closest in nature to the proposed activity shall apply, provided that where there are two or more similar activities in the table, the activity with the higher parking rate shall apply.</p> <p>Where the standard is not met, matters of discretion are restricted to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. any recommendations in a transport assessment approved by a chartered professional engineer; b. the potential for adverse effects on the safety and efficiency of the transport network, including effects on vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists; c. the scale, management and operation of the activity as it relates to its demand for parking; | | |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|---|-----------|-----------------|--|--|---|------------------------|---|
| | | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> d. the use of low impact design techniques to minimise stormwater run off; and e. the ability for persons with a disability or limited mobility to park, enter and exit a vehicle and manoeuvre around a parking area safely and effectively. | | | |
| FS403.122 | Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora | | Oppose | Te Whatu Ora support the requirements for bicycle and accessible car parking spaces and seek to retain as notified. | Disallow in part | Te Whatu Ora support the requirements for bicycle and accessible car parking spaces and seek to retain as notified. | Accept in part | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| S172.017 | Terra Group | TRANS-S2 | Support | Support this standard, as it will achieve positive outcomes for the proposed zone. | Retain as notified (inferred) | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: TRAN-S2, TRAN-S3 and TRAN-S5 |
| S356.042 | Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency | TRANS-S2 | Support | Not stated. | Retain TRAN-S2 as notified | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: TRAN-S2, TRAN-S3 and TRAN-S5 |
| S502.097 | Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited | TRANS-S2 | Support in part | Larger land holdings have multiple titles across a large area. As a result, they have and require a larger number of vehicle crossings. We seek clarification on a situation where you have more than one site frontage. Do you receive the allocated number of crossings per frontage or do you add them together. If the latter, what happens when you have two different road classifications | Amend TRANS-S2 to clarify a situation where you have more than one site frontage. | | Accept | Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: TRAN-S2, TRAN-S3 and TRAN-S5 |
| S503.041 | Waitangi Limited | TRANS-S2 | Not Stated | Larger land holdings such as the Waitangi Estate have multiple titles across a large area. As a result, they have and require a large number of vehicle crossings. | Amend Standard TRAN-S2 to clarify the number of crossings for a site with more than one frontage. | | Accept | Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: TRAN-S2, TRAN-S3 and TRAN-S5 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|--|---|---|------------------------|---|
| | | | | We seek clarification on a situation where you have more than one site frontage. Do you receive the allocated number of crossings per frontage or do you add them together. If the latter, what happens when you have two different road classifications? | | | | |
| S215.013 | Haigh Workman Limited | TRANS-S2 | Support in part | We support Standard TRAN-S2, conditional on amending TRAN-Table 8 as discussed below. Items 1 to 5 address important safety issues regarding vehicle crossing location and should be retained in the District Plan. However, standard TRAN-S2 does not specify the standard to which a vehicle crossing should be constructed. Reference should be made to Council's Engineering Standards for vehicle crossing construction standards. The requirement in the Operative District Plan (Rule 15.1.6C.1.5(b)) for vehicle crossings off sealed roads to be sealed has not been included in the Proposed District Plan. Vehicle crossings off sealed roads should be sealed or concreted for at least 5m from the road edge to control stormwater runoff and prevent gravel being deposited on the road. | Retain Standard TRAN-S2, conditional on amending TRAN-Table 8. Insert a new clause to standard TRAN-S2 requiring new vehicle crossings to be designed and constructed in accordance with Far North District Engineering Standards. Insert a new clause to standard TRAN-S2 requiring vehicle crossings off sealed roads to be sealed or concreted for at least 5m from the road edge to control stormwater runoff and prevent gravel being deposited on the road. | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: TRAN-S2, TRAN-S3 and TRAN-S5 |
| FS309.12 | Brad Hedger | | Support | Public roads and private roads if accessing a sealed road should be sealed to reduce the Maintenance of the public road from development. | Allow | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: TRAN-S2, TRAN-S3 and TRAN-S5 |
| FS570.502 | 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 | Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: TRAN-S2, TRAN-S3 and TRAN-S5 Section 5.2.11 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|---|---|------------------------|--|
| FS566.516 | 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 | Key Issue 11: TRAN-S2, TRAN-S3 and TRAN-S5 |
| FS569.538 | 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 | Key Issue 11: TRAN-S2, TRAN-S3 and TRAN-S5 |
| S561.024 | Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities | TRANS-S2 | Support in part | Support the requirements in this standard however Kāinga Ora seek the addition of matters of discretion where the standard is not met. As it is currently proposed, there is no ability to make the application if you cannot meet the requirements of TRAN-S2. | Amend TRAN-S2 to include the following matters of discretion: Where the standard is not met, matters of discretion are restricted to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. the potential for adverse effects on the safety and efficiency of the transport network, including effects on vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists; b. the scale, management and operation of the activity as it relates to its demand for access; c. the ability for persons with a disability or limited mobility, enter and exit a vehicle and manoeuvre. | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: TRAN-S2, TRAN-S3 and TRAN-S5 |
| FS36.046 | Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency | | Support | Support additional matters of discretion that seek to control adverse effects on the transport system. | Allow | Allow the original submission. | Accept in part | Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: TRAN-S2, TRAN-S3 and TRAN-S5 |
| FS32.078 | Jeff Kemp | | Oppose | The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes | Disallow | Disallow the original submission. | Accept in part | Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: TRAN-S2, TRAN-S3 and TRAN-S5 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|---|-----------|----------|---|-------------------------------|--|------------------------|---|
| | | | | <p>such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes.</p> <p>The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts.</p> <p>The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.</p> | | | | |
| FS23.296 | Des and Lorraine Morrison | | Support | Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land. | Allow | Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: TRAN-S2, TRAN-S3 and TRAN-S5 |
| FS47.038 | Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust | | Oppose | <p>The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan.</p> <p>Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of</p> | Disallow | Disallow the entire original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: TRAN-S2, TRAN-S3 and TRAN-S5 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|-------------------------------|---|------------------------|---|
| | | | | the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document. | | | | |
| FS348.111 | Alec Brian Cox | | Oppose | The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA. | Disallow | I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed | Reject | Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: TRAN-S2, TRAN-S3 and TRAN-S5 |
| S215.014 | Haigh Workman Limited | TRANS-S3 | Support | <p>We generally support the proposed rule, but consider that greater clarity is required. It is unclear from the standard when and where passing bays are required. Passing bays are specified for Rural Production and Rural Lifestyle zones, however, there may be situations where passing bays are required on long accesses in residential zones.</p> <p>The term 'blind corner' needs clarifying. In road safety terms, a 'blind corner' is where drivers in approaching vehicles have insufficient sight distance to react and stop in time to avoid a collision. Stopping distances need to take into account operating speeds, reaction times, carriageway surface (sealed or unsealed) and longitudinal gradient.</p> <p>A better term is 'safe intervisibility': the sight distance between two vehicles needed to allow them to stop safely. Intervisibility applies to both horizontal and vertical alignment, not just on 'blind corners'. Intervisibility sight distances required for safe access can be large. If the accessway alignment is constrained by topography, intervisibility may not be achieved over significant lengths of the accessway. As the calculation of safe stopping</p> | Amend standard TRAN-S3 to: | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Passing bays are required on single lane accessways exceeding 100m at spacings not exceeding 100m; 2. Where required, passing bays on private accessways are to be at least 15m long and provide a minimum usable access width of 5.5m. 3. On all single lane accessways serving two or more sites, safe intervisibility shall be provided as specified in Council's Engineering Standards. Sections of accessway without safe intervisibility shall be widened to two-lane. 4. All accesses serving two or more sites shall provide vehicle queuing space at the vehicle crossing to the legal road. | Accept in part | Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: TRAN-S2, TRAN-S3 and TRAN-S5 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|--|---|---|------------------------|---|
| | | | | distances / intervisibility is a technical matter, we recommend that the District plan rule refer to the Engineering Standards for guidance. We have commented on appropriate guidance standards in our comments on the Engineering Standards appended to this submission. | | | | |
| FS309.15 | Brad Hedger | | Support in part | Agree that definitions and there is inconsistency in the engineering standards, I support that there should be clear guidelines. | Allow in part | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: TRAN-S2, TRAN-S3 and TRAN-S5 |
| FS570.503 | 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 | Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: TRAN-S2, TRAN-S3 and TRAN-S5 |
| FS566.517 | 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 | Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: TRAN-S2, TRAN-S3 and TRAN-S5 |
| FS569.539 | 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 | Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: TRAN-S2, TRAN-S3 and TRAN-S5 |
| S561.025 | Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities | TRANS-S3 | Oppose | The requirement for passing bays for accesses serving 2 or more sites is too restrictive given the low traffic volumes this would involve. The Rule does not provide for the majority of accessways being over a short distance with good sightlines. Either the rule should be amended to relate to a larger number of sites, or passing bays should only be a requirement where site conditions pose a safety risk. Kāinga Ora suggest this should be amended to 8 sites to align with the number of sites permitted | Amend TRAN-S3 3. as follows: 3. All accesses serving 2 8 or more sites shall provide passing bays and a double width vehicle crossing to allow for vehicles to queue within the site. | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: TRAN-S2, TRAN-S3 and TRAN-S5 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|---|-----------|----------|---|-------------------------------|--|------------------------|---|
| | | | | off a accessway under the FNDC Engineering standards. | | | | |
| FS32.079 | Jeff Kemp | | Oppose | <p>The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes.</p> <p>The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts.</p> <p>The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.</p> | Disallow | Disallow the original submission. | Accept in part | Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: TRAN-S2, TRAN-S3 and TRAN-S5 |
| FS23.297 | Des and Lorraine Morrison | | Support | Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land. | Allow | Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: TRAN-S2, TRAN-S3 and TRAN-S5 |
| FS47.039 | Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust | | Oppose | The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP | Disallow | Disallow the entire original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.11 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|--|--|------------------------|--|
| | | | | supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document. | | | | Key Issue 11: TRAN-S2, TRAN-S3 and TRAN-S5 |
| FS348.112 | Alec Brian Cox | | Oppose | The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA. | Disallow | I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed. | Reject | Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: TRAN-S2, TRAN-S3 and TRAN-S5 |
| S172.018 | Terra Group | TRANS-S4 | Support | Support this standard, as it will achieve positive outcomes for the proposed zone. | Retain as notified (inferred) | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: TRAN-S4 |
| S184.019 | Northland Transport Alliance | TRANS-S4 | Support in part | Not all upgrades to existing roads should require an ITA - consider using a trip trigger rather than "all". Suggest development over the permitted trip generation require an Integrated Transport Assessment. See submission comment on Rule TRAN R-5 | Amend clause 1 of Standard TRAN-S4 to provide a trigger for requiring an Integrated Transport Assessment as opposed to it being a mandatory requirement for all new roads and upgrades. | | Accept | Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: TRAN-S4 |
| S211.003 | Borders Real Estate Northland | TRANS-S4 | Support in part | Standard TRANS-S4 (implied) should require subdivisions in urban areas comprising more than two lots to include pedestrian footpaths suitable for disability scooters, and within cycling distance of a township or public facilities (e.g.: school, sports field) to include safe cycleways (separated from | Amend standard TRANS-S4 (implied) to require subdivisions in urban areas comprising more than two lots to include pedestrian footpaths suitable for disability scooters, and within cycling distance of a township or public facilities (e.g.: school, sports field) to include safe cycleways | | Reject | Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: TRAN-S4 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|---|-----------|-----------------|---|--|---------------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| | | | | road traffic) which will connect to a future network of cycleways. | (separated from road traffic) which will connect to a future network of cycleways. | | | |
| S463.024 | Waiaua Bay Farm Limited | TRANS-S4 | Oppose | <p>Road design in a Special Purpose Zone may not be able to comply with the permitted activity performance standards of this rule, as to do so may conflict with the purpose or objectives of the Special Purpose Zone.</p> <p>In such cases, WBF considers that it would be appropriate for the decision maker to be directed by the matters of discretion to consider the specific circumstances of the Special Purpose Zone.</p> | <p>Insert a new matter of discretion (point c.) within Standard TRANS-S4 as follows:</p> <p>c. Whether an alternative to compliance with the standard would better achieve the purpose and objectives of a Special Purpose Zone.</p> | | Reject | Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: TRAN-S4 |
| S271.017 | Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust | TRANS-S4 | Oppose | <p>The construction of roads should exceed the standards in the Engineering Standards, particularly where required by a spatial/strategic document. Support requirement for Traffic Impact Assessment where a new road is constructed.</p> <p>Cul-de-sacs should be disincentivized as they are widely accepted as presenting bad urban design outcomes, and are currently a favoured position of developers due to the lower costs associated.</p> | <p>Amend to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide for design that exceeds that required in the Engineering Standards (e.g. provides for separated cyclist network where not otherwise required), particularly where in alignment with a spatial/strategic document. - Disincentivize cul-de-sacs, as a minimum in regard to TRAN-S4.2 The following additional requirements should be included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o ITA with targeted information requirements should be required. Without this, cul-de-sacs are essentially further incentivized as a lower costs option. - The cul-de-sac legal width must extend to the boundary of the site to facilitate future connection. | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: TRAN-S4 |
| FS25.072 | Kiwi Fresh Orange | | Support in part | Supports the proposal that there are clear standards for the development of roading infrastructure. It is appropriate | Allow in part | Allow the original submission in part | Accept in part | Section 5.2.12 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|--|--|-------------------------|---|
| | Company Limited | | | that there is the opportunity to seek resource consent for departures from standards. | | subject to appropriate wording. | | Key Issue 12: TRAN-S4 |
| FS325.048 | Turnstone Trust Limited | | Support in part | TT supports the proposal that there are clear standards for the development of roading infrastructure. It is appropriate that there is the opportunity to seek resource consent for departures from standards. | Allow in part | Allow the original submission in part. | Accept in part | Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: TRAN-S4 |
| FS570.740 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: TRAN-S4 |
| FS566.754 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Awaiting recommendation | Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: TRAN-S4 |
| FS569.776 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Awaiting recommendation | Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: TRAN-S4 |
| S368.018 | Far North District Council | TRANS-S4 | Support in part | The reference to Council engineering standards needs to be applied correctly under 'where the standard is not met, matters of discretion are restricted to: a.' - 'Far North District Council Engineering Standards April 2022' | Amend TRAN-S4 where the standard is not met, matters of discretion are restricted to: safety implications of the non-compliance with Far North District Council Engineering Standards April 2022 engineering standards; and | | Reject | Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: TRAN-S4 |
| FS25.073 | Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited | | Support in part | Supports the intent of the amendment, subject to appropriate matters of discretion that include alternatives that provide a safe and appropriate transport outcome. | Allow in part | Allow the original submission in part. | Accept in part | Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: TRAN-S4 |
| FS309.13 | Brad Hedger | | Support in part | The standards should reference the current published standards May 2023 | Allow in part | Allow the original submission in part. | Accept in part | Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: TRAN-S4 |
| FS325.049 | Turnstone Trust Limited | | Support in part | TT supports the intent of the amendment, subject to appropriate matters of discretion that include | Allow in part | Allow the original submission in part. | Accept in part | Section 5.2.12 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|--|---|------------------------|---|
| | | | | alternatives that provide a safe and appropriate transport outcome. | | | Key Issue 12: TRAN-S4 |
| S215.015 | Haigh Workman Limited | TRANS-S4 | Support | <p>We support TRAN-S4 clause 1, but oppose the some of the standards specified in Far North District Council Engineering Standards April 2022. Our comments on the Engineering Standards are appended to this submission.</p> <p>Standards for road widths, and the requirements for footpaths and lighting for public roads should be specified in the Proposed District Plan as they are in the Operative District Plan. This allows standards for public roads and private accessways to be found in the same document.</p> <p>Engineering Standards Table 3-2 Urban and Table 3-3 Rural road standards are excessive and inconsistent with Low Impact Design principles. Very few existing Council roads in the Far North District comply with the proposed standards or would be upgraded to comply with the standards. Existing Urban Collector and Arterial roads have insufficient legal width to be upgraded to comply with the standards. Operative District Plan Appendix 3B-2 standards are similar to NZS4404:2010 standards and are more appropriate for Far North roads.</p> <p>Footpaths should be 1.5m wide (not 1.8m wide) and on one side only on urban roads serving up to 20 dwelling units. With rules in the District Plan requiring off-street parking, on-street parking is not required on both sides of an urban road and should be</p> | Insert Operative District Plan Appendix 3B-2 standards for Roads to Vest in the Proposed District Plan and amend TRAN-S4 clause 1 to refer to this table, not Engineering Standards Tables 3-2 and Table 3-3. | Reject | Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: TRAN-S4 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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>discouraged on Collector and Arterial roads.</p> <p>The District Plan should also specify which roads must be sealed. The Engineering Standards imply that all urban roads should be sealed but some rural roads (ES Table 3-4) may be unsealed. The process for determining which public roads may be unsealed is unclear. Engineering Standards Table 3-4 and Clause 3.2.12.2.3 imply that FNDC's asset engineers will determine which roads may be unsealed by classifying the road under the One Network Road Band Number road classification system. Greater certainty should be given by including standards in the District Plan.</p> <p>We oppose standard TRAN-S4 clause 2. It is unclear what Rule TRAN-S4(2) for cul-de-sacs is intended to achieve: many no-exit roads are longer than 150m; pedestrian linkages may not be possible; and cul-de-sac heads when properly designed are ideal for multiple private accessways to branch off.</p> | | | | |
| FS570.504 | 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 | Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: TRAN-S4 |
| FS566.518 | 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 | Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: TRAN-S4 |
| FS569.540 | 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 | Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: TRAN-S4 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|---|-----------|------------|---|---|---|------------------------|--|
| S215.018 | Haigh Workman Limited | TRANS-S4 | Oppose | We oppose standard TRAN-S4 clause 2. It is unclear what Rule TRAN-S4(2) for cul-de-sacs is intended to achieve: many no-exit roads are longer than 150m; pedestrian linkages may not be possible; and cul-de-sac heads when properly designed are ideal for multiple private accessways to branch off. | Delete TRAN-S4(2) conditions (i), (ii) and (iii). | | Reject | Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: TRAN-S4 |
| FS570.507 | 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 | Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: TRAN-S4 |
| FS566.521 | 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 | Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: TRAN-S4 |
| FS569.543 | 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 | Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: TRAN-S4 |
| S338.016 | Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust | TRANS-S4 | Not Stated | A large survey conducted by Our Kerikeri found that traffic is the single biggest issue for the Kerikeri community. Each new subdivision outside the urban area generates additional traffic. However, intensification of the urban area would allow many more people to live, work or go to school withing a walkable or cyclable distance from home. But this ideal can only be achieved if PDP requires new subdivisions and developments to provide connected walkways and cycleways that will contribute to future networks of walkways and cycleways. | Retain Standard TRAN-S4 (inferred) | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: TRAN-S4 |
| FS570.957 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: TRAN-S4 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|---|-------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| FS566.971 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: TRAN-S4 |
| FS569.993 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: TRAN-S4 |
| S529.016 | Carbon Neutral NZ Trust | TRANS-S4 | Support | A large survey conducted by Our Kerikeri found that traffic is the single biggest issue for the Kerikeri community. Each new subdivision outside the urban area generates additional traffic. However, intensification of the urban area would allow many more people to live, work or go to school withing a walkable or cyclable distance from home. But this ideal can only be achieved if PDP requires new subdivisions and developments to provide connected walkways and cycleways that will contribute to future networks of walkways and cycleways. | Retain Standard TRAN-S4 (inferred) | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: TRAN-S4 |
| FS570.1906 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: TRAN-S4 |
| FS566.1920 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: TRAN-S4 |
| FS569.1942 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: TRAN-S4 |
| S529.082 | Carbon Neutral NZ Trust | TRANS-S4 | Oppose | The construction of roads should exceed the standards in the Engineering Standards, particularly where required by a spatial/strategic document. Support requirement for | Seek amendments that: - Provide for design that exceeds that required in the Engineering Standards (e.g. provides for separated cyclist network where not otherwise required), | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: TRAN-S4 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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>Traffic Impact Assessment where a new road is constructed.</p> <p>Cul-de-sacs should be disincentivized as they are widely accepted as presenting bad urban design outcomes, and are currently a favoured position of developers due to the lower costs associated</p> | <p>particularly where in alignment with a spatial/strategic document.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Disincentivize cul-de-sacs, as a minimum in regard to TRAN-S4.2 The following additional requirements should be included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o ITA with targeted information requirements should be required. Without this, cul-de-sacs are essentially further incentivized as a lower costs option. - The cul-de-sac legal width must extend to the boundary of the site to facilitate future connection. | | | |
| FS570.1970 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: TRAN-S4 |
| FS566.1984 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: TRAN-S4 |
| FS569.2006 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: TRAN-S4 |
| S522.038 | Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK) | TRANS-S4 | Support | A large survey conducted by Our Kerikeri found that traffic is the single biggest issue for the Kerikeri community. Each new subdivision outside the urban area generates additional traffic. However, intensification of the urban area would allow many more people to live, work or go to school withing a walkable or cyclable distance from home. But this ideal can only be achieved if PDP requires new subdivisions and developments to provide connected | Retain Standard TRAN-S4 (inferred) | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: TRAN-S4 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|-------------------|---|-----------|----------|--|---|-------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| | | | | walkways and cycleways that will contribute to future networks of walkways and cycleways. | | | | |
| FS566.1777 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: TRAN-S4 |
| S524.017 | Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK) | TRANS-S4 | Oppose | The construction of roads should exceed the standards in the Engineering Standards, particularly where required by a spatial/strategic document. Support requirement for Traffic Impact Assessment where a new road is constructed. Cul-de-sacs should be disincentivized as they are widely accepted as presenting bad urban design outcomes, and are currently a favoured position of developers due to the lower costs associated. | Seek amendments that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide for design that exceeds that required in the Engineering Standards (e.g. provides for separated cyclist network where not otherwise required), particularly where in alignment with a spatial/strategic document. - Disincentivize cul-de-sacs, as a minimum in regard to TRAN-S4.2 The following additional requirements should be included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o ITA with targeted information requirements should be required. Without this, cul-de-sacs are essentially further incentivized as a lower costs option. - The cul-de-sac legal width must extend to the boundary of the site to facilitate future connection. | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: TRAN-S4 |
| FS566.1835 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: TRAN-S4 |
| S446.016 | Kapiro Conservation Trust | TRANS-S4 | Oppose | Design of new roads is required in accordance with Councils Engineering Standards (2022) which require all new urban secondary collector and above roads to provide for cyclists separate to the movement lanes on the road, and Rural Road on primary collector and | Amend TRANS-S4 to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide for design that exceeds that required in the Engineering Standards (e.g. provides for separated cyclist network where not otherwise required), | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: TRAN-S4 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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>above on a sealed shoulder. For all other roads (which is suspected in the majority, however the road categorization could not be found in the PDP maps) cyclists must use the movement lanes.</p> <p>Provision for cyclists separate to vehicles on most roads throughout the District would be the preference, however, it is understood that the submission period for the Engineering Standards has closed.</p> <p>It is sought that in the least, provision is made for the construction of roads that exceed the standards in the Engineering Standards, particularly where required by a spatial/strategic document.</p> <p>Support requirement for Traffic Impact Assessment where a new road is constructed, noting the request below for an information requirement to clarify minimum information requirements.</p> <p>As a general comment, cul-de-sacs should be disincentivized as they are widely accepted as presenting bad urban design outcomes, and are currently a favoured position of developers due to the lower costs associated.</p> <p>As a minimum, in regard to TRAN-S4.2 The following additional requirements should be included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ITA with targeted information requirements should be required. Without this, cul-de-sacs are essentially further incentivized as a lower costs option. - The cul-de-sac legal width must extend to the boundary | <p>particularly where in alignment with a spatial/strategic document.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Disincentivize cul-de-sacs | | |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|--|--|------------------------|---|
| | | | | of the site to facilitate future connection. | | | | |
| FS569.1775 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: TRAN-S4 |
| FS570.1775 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: TRAN-S4 |
| S449.017 | Kapiro Conservation Trust | TRANS-S4 | Support | A large survey conducted by Our Kerikeri found that traffic is the single biggest issue for the Kerikeri community. Each new subdivision outside the urban area generates additional traffic. However, intensification of the urban area would allow many more people to live, work or go to school withing a walkable or cyclable distance from home. But this ideal can only be achieved if PDP requires new subdivisions and developments to provide connected walkways and cycleways that will contribute to future networks of walkways and cycleways. | Retain Standard TRAN-S4 (inferred) | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: TRAN-S4 |
| FS569.1816 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: TRAN-S4 |
| FS570.1833 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: TRAN-S4 |
| S463.025 | Waiaua Bay Farm Limited | TRANS-S5 | Oppose | Street lighting design in a Special Purpose Zone may not be able to comply with the permitted activity performance standards of this rule, as to do so may conflict with the purpose or objectives of the Special Purpose Zone. | Insert a new matter of discretion (point c.) within Standard TRANS-S5 as follows: c. Whether an alternative to compliance with the standard would better achieve the purpose and objectives of a Special Purpose Zone. | | Reject | Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: TRAN-S2, TRAN-S3 and TRAN-S5 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|--------------|-----------------|--|--|---|------------------------|---|
| | | | | In such cases, WBF considers that it would be appropriate for the decision maker to be directed by the matters of discretion to consider the specific circumstances of the Special Purpose Zone. | | | | |
| S215.019 | Haigh Workman Limited | TRANS-S5 | Support in part | Streetlighting can be over-used in rural areas creating light wells that render adjoining dark areas unsafe for motorists and pedestrians. Streetlighting can also detract from the amenity and ecological values of a 'dark sky'. The first issue may be addressed through matter of discretion (a), but we recommend further matters of discretion addressing the effect of light spill beyond the road carriageway and footpath and other issues identified in the 'Light' chapter of the Plan. | Insert matters of discretion: the effect of light spill beyond the road carriageway and footpath on amenity and ecological values. | | Reject | Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: TRAN-S2, TRAN-S3 and TRAN-S5 |
| FS570.508 | 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 | Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: TRAN-S2, TRAN-S3 and TRAN-S5 |
| FS566.522 | 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 | Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: TRAN-S2, TRAN-S3 and TRAN-S5 Section 5.2.11 |
| FS569.544 | 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 | Key Issue 11: TRAN-S2, TRAN-S3 and TRAN-S5 |
| S384.009 | LD Family Investments Limited | TRAN-Table 1 | Support | The parking thresholds effectively manage the effects of car parking on a site. | Retain the parking requirements for Industrial Activities in TRAN-Table 1. | | Reject | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| S378.005 | Marshall Investments | TRAN-Table 1 | Support | The parking thresholds effectively manage the effects of car parking on a site. | Retain the parking requirements for Industrial Activities | | Reject | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|---|--------------|-----------------|---|---|------------------------|--|
| | Trustee (2012) Limited | | | | | | |
| S262.009 | Ti Toki Farms Limited | TRAN-Table 1 | Support | The submitter considers that TRAN-Table 1 as it relates to the requirements for Industrial Activities effectively manages car parking on a site. | Retain provisions of TRAN-Table 1 as it relates to requirements for Industrial Activities. | Reject | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| S331.028 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | TRAN-Table 1 | Support in part | The submitter supports in part TRAN-Table 1 which requires minimum car parking spaces for primary and secondary schools, kohanga reo and child care centres. The NPS-UD requires Tier 1, 2 and 3 territorial authorities to remove any minimum car parking requirement in their District Plans (see subpart 8 -section 3.38). Council acknowledges that they are not a Tier 3 authority. However, Section 1.5 of the NPSUD states that 'Tier 3 local authorities are strongly encouraged to do the things that tier 1 or 2 local authorities are obliged to do under Parts 2 and 3' of the NPS-UD. Therefore, the Ministry encourages council to adopt the NPS-UD and remove minimum car parking requirements for educational facilities. The Notice of Requirement process for the Ministry often includes an ITA which would determine an appropriate amount of parking for the school. However, the Ministry support the bicycle parking requirements. | Amend the TRAN-Table 1 as follows: Activity Required car parking spaces Required bicycle parking Primary and secondary schools 2 per classroom, plus 1 loading bay for pick up/drop off 1 per 15 employees, plus 1 per 20 students Kohanga reo Child care centre - 1 per every 4 children, plus 1 loading bay for pick up/drop off - 1 per 5 employees | Accept in part | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| S363.008 | Foodstuffs North Island Limited | TRAN-Table 1 | Not Stated | The submitter considers that the retention of minimum parking requirements for supermarket / convenience / general store of 1 car park per 25m2 GFA and 1 bicycle space per 15 employees, is not consistent with the NPS-UD and therefore should be removed. | Delete minimum parking standards in TRAN-1 for supermarket/convenience/general store of 1 car park per 25m2 GFA and 1 bicycle space per 15 employees. | Accept in part | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|---|--------------|-----------------|---|---|--|------------------------|--|
| S502.094 | Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited | TRAN-Table 1 | Support in part | Clarification is sought on how parking is assessed for activities that are not listed within the rule or table. Where an activity does not fit in any one particular category do we utilize the closest activity or does a person need to engage a traffic engineer to determine the number of carparking spaces. Can clarity please be provided on this in the form of a note. | Amend Table 1 to clarify how parking is assessed for activities that are not listed within the rule or table. | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| S503.040 | Waitangi Limited | TRAN-Table 1 | Not Stated | Clarification is sought on how parking is assessed for activities that are not listed within the rule or table. It is noted that in the Operative District Plan there was a category called places of entertainment which captured activities such as museums which is no longer required. Where an activity does not fit in any one particular category do we utilize the closest activity or does a person need to engage a traffic engineer to determine the number of carparking spaces. Can clarity please be provided on this in the form of a note. | Amend TRAN-Table 1 to clarify how parking is assessed where an activity does not fit in any one particular category. | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| S159.041 | Horticulture New Zealand | TRAN-Table 1 | Support in part | The table seeks 1 parking space per 100m ² GBA for horticulture processing and distribution. Where there is large area of cool store this could be reduced as there are not significant numbers of workers in the cool store area. | Amend TRAN-Table 1 to include the following threshold for coolstores associated with Horticulture processing and distribution - one per 500m ² GBA. Retain the threshold of 1 per 100m ² GBA for other Horticulture processing and distribution activities | | Reject | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| FS151.200 | Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust | | Support | | Allow | | Reject | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| FS151.201 | Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust | | Support | | Allow | | Reject | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|--------------|-----------------|--|--|---|------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| FS570.203 | 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 | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| FS566.217 | 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 | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| FS569.239 | 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 | |
| S561.026 | Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities | TRAN-Table 1 | Support in part | The Government has signaled the need to move away from constraining the use of urban land suitable for housing by taking away land for on-site carparking. Kāinga Ora recognise the transport alternatives in FDNC are, and will be, limited into the future. As such a reduced requirement to provide onsite parking in conjunction with residential development is requested - 1 parking space per unit. | Amend to reduce the number of parking spaces required for a residential unit activity from 2, to 1 per unit and Tran Table 1 be amended to reflect this. | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| FS32.080 | Jeff Kemp | | Oppose | The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes. The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding | Disallow | Disallow the original submission. | Accept in part | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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 and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts.</p> <p>The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.</p> | | | | |
| FS23.298 | Des and Lorraine Morrison | | Support | <p>Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.</p> | Allow | Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| FS47.040 | Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust | | Oppose | <p>The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan.</p> <p>Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document.</p> | Disallow | Disallow the entire original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|---|--------------|----------|--|--|---|------------------------|--|
| FS348.113 | Alec Brian Cox | | Oppose | The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA. | Disallow | I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed | Reject | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| S342.017 | Waipapa Pine Limited and Adrian Broughton Trust (now Fletcher Building Ltd) | TRAN-Table 1 | Support | The parking thresholds effectively manage the effects of car parking on a site. | Retain the parking requirements for Industrial Activities | | Reject | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| FS374.031 | Waipapa Pine Limited | | Support | The original submission reflects the position of Waipapa Pine Limited of support for the Heavy Industrial Zone with proposed changes to rules that would better support heavy industrial activities. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| S165.009 | Arvida Group Limited | TRAN-Table 1 | Oppose | The NPS:UD 2020 (para 3.38) states that a Tier 3 territorial authority must change its District Plan if it contains provisions that have the effect of requiring a minimum number of car parks (except accessible car parks). | Delete TRAN - Table 1 Minimum number of parking spaces. | | Accept | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| FS542.039 | Foodstuffs North Island Limited | | Support | Foodstuffs supports the deletion of TRANS- Table 1. | Allow | Delete TRANS- Table 1. | Accept | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| S82.017 | Good Journey Limited | TRAN-Table 1 | Oppose | The tables are opposed to the extent that car parking minimums are still specified in the Mixed Use zone. Should existing operations wish to more intensively develop their sites in the Mixed Use zone by increasing the amount of "gross business area" and / or the provision of residential accommodation then additional carparks are required. Additional controls such as bicycle parks and end of trip facilities are also required. Intensification and development of Mixed Use areas should be encouraged by the removal of | Delete car park minimums in the Mixed Use Zone and other relief that will satisfy the concerns of the submitter. | | Accept | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|--------------|-----------------|--|--|------------------------|------------------------|--|
| | | | | minimum car parking standards in recognition of the benefits that Mixed Use zones can bring in terms of both land use outcomes and travel patterns. | | | | |
| FS542.040 | Foodstuffs North Island Limited | | Support | Foodstuffs supports the deletion of TRANS- Table 1. | Allow | Delete TRANS- Table 1. | Accept | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| S463.026 | Waiaua Bay Farm Limited | TRAN-Table 1 | Oppose | This provision is contrary to sub-part 8 (Car Parking) of the National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020 (May 2022). | Delete TRAN-Table 1 | | Accept | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| FS542.041 | Foodstuffs North Island Limited | | Oppose | Foodstuffs seeks the deletion of TRANS- Table 1. | Disallow | Delete TRANS-Table 1. | Accept | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| FS542.042 | Foodstuffs North Island Limited | | Support | Foodstuffs seeks the deletion of TRANS- Table 1. | Allow | Delete TRANS-Table 1. | Accept | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| S184.020 | Northland Transport Alliance | TRAN-Table 1 | Support in part | Consider adding a column for required EV spaces either here or in separate location if the intent is to encourage installation of EV charging stations (see note under Rule TRAN R-4). Note that bicycle parking is determined by employee numbers (in most cases) not by business type/size. Consider an alternative to the employee number as trigger. | Amend TRAN-Table 1 to include a new column for ev spaces and amend the 'required bicycle parking spaces' column to provide alternative thresholds to employee numbers. | | Reject | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| FS354.086 | Horticulture New Zealand | | Oppose | A requirement for EV parking spaces is not relevant to all sectors in the Far North, especially rural activities where use of EV's is limited. Also linking bicycle spaces to number of employees is only relevant where the facility is within cycling distance for employees. In rural locations such spaces should not be mandatory. | Disallow | Disallow S184.020 | Accept | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|-------------------|---|--------------|----------|---|--|---|------------------------|--|
| S215.003 | Haigh Workman Limited | TRAN-Table 1 | Support | | Retain TRAN-TABLE 1 | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| FS402.0010 | Te Whatu Ora - Health New Zealand | | Oppose | Te Whatu Ora seek to amend TRAN-Table 1 to provide for parking spaces to enable the efficient operation of Hospitals. | Disallow in part | Seek provision detail as above. | Accept in part | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| FS570.492 | 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 | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| FS566.506 | 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 | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| FS569.528 | 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 | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| S516.041 | Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland | TRAN-Table 1 | Support | Ngā Tai Ora support the requirements for bicycle and accessible car parking spaces in TRAN-S1, and the subsequent spaces specified in TRAN-Table 1. It is important that minimum requirements on bicycle and accessible parking spaces are established to encourage active modes of transport and accessibility for the disabled and elderly. | Retain TRAN-Table 1 | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| FS402.011 | Te Whatu Ora - Health New Zealand | | Oppose | Te Whatu Ora seek to amend TRAN-Table 1 to provide for parking spaces to enable the efficient operation of Hospitals. | Disallow in part | Seek provision detail as above. | Accept in part | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| S42.012 | Te Whatu Ora - Health New Zealand, Te Tai Tokerau | TRAN-Table 1 | Oppose | The proposed car parking standard is too generous as the size of facilities increase to meet Australasian Health | Amend the Hospital required car parking space rate to 1 space per 2 beds plus 1 per 2 employees. | | Reject | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|---|--------------|----------|--|--|---|------------------------|--|
| | | | | Facility Guidelines which are much larger than existing facilities. | | | | |
| FS570.029 | 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 | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| FS566.043 | 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 | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| FS569.065 | 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 | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| S42.013 | Te Whatu Ora - Health New Zealand, Te Tai Tokerau | TRAN-Table 1 | Oppose | The proposed car parking standard is too generous as the size of facilities increase to meet Australasian Health Facility Guidelines which are much larger than existing facilities. | Amend the Healthcare required car parking space rate to 1 space per 2 clinics plus 1 space per 2 employees. | | Reject | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| FS570.030 | 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 | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| FS566.044 | 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 | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| FS569.066 | 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 | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| S560.001 | Jane E Johnston | TRAN-Table 1 | Oppose | These parking requirements are excessive and counter to the policies and objectives for sustainable transport networks, and the promotion of alternative modes of transport (to private car use). The requirements are also inequitable, with respect to the | Amend TRAN-Table 1 to reduce the requirement for all parking requirements and include maximum spaces to allocate for different categories of unit. | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|--------------|-----------------|--|--|---|------------------------|---|
| | | | | differences provided for, "per" residential unit across the categories of "residential", "multi-unit development", "papakainga", "retirement village". They are also inequitable in terms of 'places of work' vs places temporarily occupied by people who may require 'visitors' to be accommodated (e.g hospitals, schools, event facilities - such as Marae or Community Halls and recreation spaces). | | | | |
| FS348.080 | Alec Brian Cox | | Oppose | The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA | Disallow | I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed | Reject | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| S82.018 | Good Journey Limited | TRAN-Table 2 | Oppose | The tables are opposed to the extent that car parking minimums are still specified in the Mixed Use zone. Should existing operations wish to more intensively develop their sites in the Mixed Use zone by increasing the amount of "gross business area" and / or the provision of residential accommodation then additional carparks are required. Additional controls such as bicycle parks and end of trip facilities are also required. Intensification and development of Mixed Use areas should be encouraged by the removal of minimum car parking standards in recognition of the benefits that Mixed Use zones can bring in terms of both land use outcomes and travel patterns. | Delete car park minimums in the Mixed Use Zone and other relief that will satisfy the concerns of the submitter. | | Accept | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| S561.027 | Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities | TRAN-Table 2 | Support in part | It is unclear within Table 2 as notified how accessible parking is applied to residential development. As such, our amendment provides that clarification. | Amend TRAN-Table 2 - Minimum number of accessible car parking spaces as follows: Number of parking spaces required 20 or less (except for residential developments as specified below) = | | Reject | Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: TRAN-Tables 2-8, 10 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|---|-----------|----------|---|---|--|------------------------|--|
| | | | | | 1Residential developments of 10 or more dwellings on a site = 1 (per 10 dwellings) | | | |
| FS32.081 | Jeff Kemp | | Oppose | <p>The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes.</p> <p>The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts.</p> <p>The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.</p> | Disallow | Disallow the original submission. | Accept | Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: TRAN-Tables 2-8, 10 |
| FS23.299 | Des and Lorraine Morrison | | Support | Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land. | Allow | Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission | Reject | Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: TRAN-Tables 2-8, 10 |
| FS47.041 | Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust | | Oppose | The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive | Disallow | Disallow the entire original submission | Accept | Section 5.2.13 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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>approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan.</p> <p>Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document</p> | | | | Key Issue 13: TRAN-Tables 2-8, 10 |
| FS348.114 | Alec Brian Cox | | Oppose | The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA. | Disallow | I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed. | Reject | Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: TRAN-Tables 2-8, 10 |
| S215.004 | Haigh Workman Limited | TRAN-Table 2 | Support | | Retain TRAN -TABLE 2 | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: TRAN-Tables 2-8, 10 |
| FS570.493 | 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 | Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: TRAN-Tables 2-8, 10 |
| FS566.507 | 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 | Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: TRAN-Tables 2-8, 10 |
| FS569.529 | 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 | Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: TRAN-Tables 2-8, 10 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|--------------|----------|--|--|---|------------------------|--|
| S560.003 | Jane E Johnston | TRAN-Table 2 | Oppose | These parking requirements are insufficient and counter to the policies and objectives with respect to providing sufficient accessibility for those with disabilities and in an aging population. The requirements are also inequitable, with respect to the differences provided for accessibility to commercial areas and to worksites. As more retired people are staying in the workforce, work sites ought to provide for accessibility parking for employees as well as to accommodate clients/customers or visitors. | Amend TRAN-Table 2 to increase the requirement for all accessibility parking requirements. | | Reject | Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: TRAN-Tables 2-8, 10 |
| FS348.082 | Alec Brian Cox | | Oppose | The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA | Disallow | I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed | Reject | Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: TRAN-Tables 2-8, 10 |
| S82.019 | Good Journey Limited | TRAN-Table 3 | Support | The tables are opposed to the extent that car parking minimums are still specified in the Mixed Use zone. Should existing operations wish to more intensively develop their sites in the Mixed Use zone by increasing the amount of "gross business area" and / or the provision of residential accommodation then additional carparks are required. Additional controls such as bicycle parks and end of trip facilities are also required. Intensification and development of Mixed Use areas should be encouraged by the removal of minimum car parking standards in recognition of the benefits that Mixed Use zones can bring in terms of both land use outcomes and travel patterns. | Delete car park minimums in the Mixed Use Zone and other relief that will satisfy the concerns of the submitter. | | Accept | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| S331.029 | Ministry of Education Te | TRAN-Table 3 | Oppose | The submitter opposes TRAN-Table 3 Minimum on-site loading bar requirements and recommends that all onsite loading requirements be | Delete TRAN-Table 3 Minimum on-site loading bar requirements | | Reject | Section 5.2.13 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|--------------|----------|---|--|---|------------------------|--|
| | Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | | | removed. the Notice of Requirement process for the Ministry often includes a ITA. This ITA should determine how many bus bays or loading areas are appropriate for the school as more rural schools may require more buses than schools in residential areas. | | | | Key Issue 13: TRAN-Tables 2-8, 10 |
| S215.005 | Haigh Workman Limited | TRAN-Table 3 | Support | | Retain TRAN-TABLE 3 | | Accept | Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: TRAN-Tables 2-8, 10 |
| FS570.494 | 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 | Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: TRAN-Tables 2-8, 10 |
| FS566.508 | 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 | Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: TRAN-Tables 2-8, 10 |
| FS569.530 | 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 | Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: TRAN-Tables 2-8, 10 |
| S82.020 | Good Journey Limited | TRAN-Table 4 | Oppose | The tables are opposed to the extent that car parking minimums are still specified in the Mixed Use zone. Should existing operations wish to more intensively develop their sites in the Mixed Use zone by increasing the amount of "gross business area" and / or the provision of residential accommodation then additional carparks are required. Additional controls such as bicycle parks and end of trip facilities are also required. Intensification and development of Mixed Use areas should be encouraged by the removal of minimum car parking standards in | Delete car park minimums in the Mixed Use Zone and other relief that will satisfy the concerns of the submitter. | | Accept | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|---|--------------|-----------------|---|---|------------------------|--|
| | | | | recognition of the benefits that Mixed Use zones can bring in terms of both land use outcomes and travel patterns. | | | |
| S184.021 | Northland Transport Alliance | TRAN-Table 4 | Support in part | In terms of end of trip facilities, should there be a requirement for covered, secured bike parking? | Amend TRAN-Table 4 to address requirement for covered, secured bike parking | Reject | Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: TRAN-Tables 2-8, 10 |
| S384.010 | LD Family Investments Limited | TRAN-Table 4 | Oppose | These requirements are appropriately managed through other legislation and are not required to be embodied into the Proposed District Plan. | Delete TRAN-Table 4. | Reject | Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: TRAN-Tables 2-8, 10 |
| S378.006 | Marshall Investments Trustee (2012) Limited | TRAN-Table 4 | Oppose | These requirements are appropriately managed through other legislation and are not required to be embodied into the Proposed District Plan. | Delete TRAN-Table 4 | Reject | Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: TRAN-Tables 2-8, 10 |
| S262.010 | Ti Toki Farms Limited | TRAN-Table 4 | Oppose | The submitter considers that the requirements of TRAN-Table 4 are more appropriately managed through other legislations and should not be required by a district plan. | Delete TRAN-Table 4 | Reject | Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: TRAN-Tables 2-8, 10 |
| S331.030 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | TRAN-Table 4 | Support in part | The submitter supports in part TRAN-Table 4 - End of trip facility requirements for educational facilities to encourage active modes of transport for students and staff noting that most educational facilities will supply showering and changing / clothing storage facilities for sporting activities. The submitter does not support the GFA thresholds and recommend that requirements for end of trip facilities are based on the number of full-time employees. | Amend TRAN-Table 4 - End of trip facility requirements as follows: Activity, GFA threshold, Number of showers and changing area required, Educational facilities: Up to 500m² employees No requirement, Greater than 500m² up to 2500m² 10-30 full time employees One shower and changing area with space for storage of clothing, Greater than 2500m² up to 7500m² 30-50 full time employees | Accept | Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: TRAN-Tables 2-8, 10 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|---|--------------|----------|--|--|-------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| | | | | | Two showers and changing area with space for storage of clothing. Every additional 7500m2->50 full time employees Two additional showers and changing area with space for storage of clothing. | | | |
| S342.018 | Waipapa Pine Limited and Adrian Broughton Trust (now Fletcher Building Ltd) | TRAN-Table 4 | Oppose | The parking thresholds effectively manage the effects of car parking on a site. | Delete the table (inferred) | | Reject | Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: TRAN-Tables 2-8, 10 |
| FS374.032 | Waipapa Pine Limited | | Support | The original submission reflects the position of Waipapa Pine Limited of support for the Heavy Industrial Zone with proposed changes to rules that would better support heavy industrial activities. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: TRAN-Tables 2-8, 10 |
| S502.096 | Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited | TRAN-Table 4 | Oppose | It is considered this is an unnecessary component to add under the District Plan framework to add showers to Commercial, Industrial, Commercial Service activities, Hospitals & Education facilities. There is no commentary in the s32 report to support this provision. Not all areas of the Far North are suitable for alternative modes of transport and the roading network within our rural areas doesn't support cycling or walking to work. The locations where end of trip facilities are practical could rather utilize this provision to reduce the amount of car parks required instead of it being a blanket rule for the activities listed. The assessment criteria if compliance is not achieved also doesn't address matters related to no | Delete TRAN-Table 4 | | Reject | Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: TRAN-Tables 2-8, 10 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|--------------|----------|--|--|--|------------------------|--|
| | | | | showers being provided or a reduced number of showers being provided. | | | | |
| FS403.125 | Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora | | Oppose | Te Whatu Ora support the provision of end of trip facilities to support multi-modal transport options. | Allow in part | Te Whatu Ora support the provision of end of trip facilities to support multi-modal transport options. | Accept | Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: TRAN-Tables 2-8, 10 |
| S82.021 | Good Journey Limited | TRAN-Table 5 | Oppose | The tables are opposed to the extent that car parking minimums are still specified in the Mixed Use zone. Should existing operations wish to more intensively develop their sites in the Mixed Use zone by increasing the amount of "gross business area" and / or the provision of residential accommodation then additional carparks are required. Additional controls such as bicycle parks and end of trip facilities are also required. Intensification and development of Mixed Use areas should be encouraged by the removal of minimum car parking standards in recognition of the benefits that Mixed Use zones can bring in terms of both land use outcomes and travel patterns. | Delete car park minimums in the Mixed Use Zone and other relief that will satisfy the concerns of the submitter. | | Accept | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| S172.021 | Terra Group | TRAN-Table 5 | Support | Support TRAN-Table 5 and TRAN-Figure 1, as it will achieve positive outcomes for the proposed zone. | Retain as notified (inferred) | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: TRAN-Tables 2-8, 10 |
| S172.022 | Terra Group | TRAN-Table 5 | Support | Support TRAN-Table 5 and TRAN-Figure 2, as it will achieve positive outcomes for the proposed zone. | Retain as notified (inferred) | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: TRAN-Tables 2-8, 10 |
| S172.023 | Terra Group | TRAN-Table 5 | Support | Support TRAN-Table 5 and TRAN-Figure 3, as it will achieve positive outcomes for the proposed zone. | Retain as notified (inferred) | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: TRAN-Tables 2-8, 10 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|--------------|-----------------|---|---|------------------------|--|
| S184.022 | Northland Transport Alliance | TRAN-Table 5 | Support in part | Consider including the layout / dimensions for accessible parking in the district plan as well or reference NZS 4121- link provided (https://nzrf.co.nz/techdocs/Accessible-Parking-Guide.pdf). | Amend TRAN-Table 5 to include the layout/dimensions for accessible parking or reference NZS 4121 | Accept | Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: TRAN-Tables 2-8, 10 |
| S215.006 | Haigh Workman Limited | TRAN-Table 5 | Support | <p>The Transport section of the Proposed District Plan contains some technical engineering detail that would be better contained in the Engineering Standards. It is our understanding that objectives, policies and rules should be in the District Plan, while technical standards for achieving those objectives should be in Council's Engineering Standards.</p> <p>In some cases, the standards are in the District Plan, in some they are only in the Engineering Standards and in some they are repeated in both documents. There is no consistent approach. For example, the standards for private access are in both the Proposed District Plan and Engineering Standards, while standards for public roads are only specified in the Engineering Standards. It would be simpler and less prone to error if all the key standards for public roads and private access were specified in the District Plan.</p> <p>The parking and manoeuvring dimensions TRAN-Table 5 and Figures 2 to 8 are technical details that should be moved to the Engineering Standards.</p> | Delete TRAN-Table 5, including Figures 1 to 8 and move to Far North District Council Engineering Standards. | Reject | Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: TRAN-Tables 2-8, 10 |
| FS309.14 | Brad Hedger | | Support | Clarity from private development is not clear between engineering standards and PDP. I agree clear rules in plan will provide minimum standards. | Allow | Reject | Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: TRAN-Tables 2-8, 10 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|--------------|-----------------|--|--|---|------------------------|--|
| FS570.495 | 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 | Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: TRAN-Tables 2-8, 10 |
| FS566.509 | 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 | Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: TRAN-Tables 2-8, 10 |
| FS569.531 | 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 | Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: TRAN-Tables 2-8, 10 |
| S82.022 | Good Journey Limited | TRAN-Table 6 | Oppose | The tables are opposed to the extent that car parking minimums are still specified in the Mixed Use zone. Should existing operations wish to more intensively develop their sites in the Mixed Use zone by increasing the amount of "gross business area" and / or the provision of residential accommodation then additional carparks are required. Additional controls such as bicycle parks and end of trip facilities are also required. Intensification and development of Mixed Use areas should be encouraged by the removal of minimum car parking standards in recognition of the benefits that Mixed Use zones can bring in terms of both land use outcomes and travel patterns. | Delete car park minimums in the Mixed Use Zone and other relief that will satisfy the concerns of the submitter. | | Accept | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| S172.024 | Terra Group | TRAN-Table 6 | Support | Support TRAN-Table 6 as it will achieve positive outcomes for the proposed zone. | Retain as notified (inferred) | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: TRAN-Tables 2-8, 10 |
| S184.023 | Northland Transport Alliance | TRAN-Table 6 | Support in part | The number of VC's allowed for 61-100m frontage (3) seems excessive. Consider adding language that VC | Amend TRAN-Table 6 to consider reducing the number of VC's allowed for 61-100m frontage and consider including a provision | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.13 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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 taken from the lower classification of roadway to reinforce TRAN R2. | that VC must be taken from the lower classification of roadway. | | Key Issue 13: TRAN-Tables 2-8, 10 |
| S502.098 | Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited | TRAN-Table 6 | Support in part | Larger land holdings have multiple titles across a large area. As a result, they have and require a larger number of vehicle crossings. We seek clarification on a situation where you have more than one site frontage. Do you receive the allocated number of crossings per frontage or do you add them together. If the latter, what happens when you have two different road classifications | Amend TRANS-Table-6 to clarify a situation where you have more than one site frontage. | Accept | Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: TRAN-Tables 2-8, 10 |
| S503.042 | Waitangi Limited | TRAN-Table 6 | Not Stated | Larger land holdings such as the Waitangi Estate have multiple titles across a large area. As a result, they have and require a large number of vehicle crossings. We seek clarification on a situation where you have more than one site frontage. Do you receive the allocated number of crossings per frontage or do you add them together. If the latter, what happens when you have two different road classifications? | Amend TRAN-Table 6 to clarify the number of crossings for a site with more than one frontage. | Accept | Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: TRAN-Tables 2-8, 10 |
| S82.023 | Good Journey Limited | TRAN-Table 7 | Oppose | The tables are opposed to the extent that car parking minimums are still specified in the Mixed Use zone. Should existing operations wish to more intensively develop their sites in the Mixed Use zone by increasing the amount of "gross business area" and / or the provision of residential accommodation then additional carparks are required. Additional controls such as bicycle parks and end of trip facilities are also required. Intensification and development of Mixed Use areas should be encouraged by the removal of | Delete car park minimums in the Mixed Use Zone and other relief that will satisfy the concerns of the submitter. | Accept | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|--------------|-----------------|--|---|---|------------------------|--|
| | | | | minimum car parking standards in recognition of the benefits that Mixed Use zones can bring in terms of both land use outcomes and travel patterns. | | | | |
| S82.024 | Good Journey Limited | TRAN-Table 8 | Oppose | The tables are opposed to the extent that car parking minimums are still specified in the Mixed Use zone. Should existing operations wish to more intensively develop their sites in the Mixed Use zone by increasing the amount of "gross business area" and / or the provision of residential accommodation then additional carparks are required. Additional controls such as bicycle parks and end of trip facilities are also required. Intensification and development of Mixed Use areas should be encouraged by the removal of minimum car parking standards in recognition of the benefits that Mixed Use zones can bring in terms of both land use outcomes and travel patterns. | Delete car park minimums in the Mixed Use Zone and other relief that will satisfy the concerns of the submitter. | | Accept | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| S215.020 | Haigh Workman Limited | TRAN-Table 8 | Support in part | We oppose the minimum sight distances specified in TRAN-Table 8. Our comments on TRAN-Table 8 are contained in our comments on the draft Engineering Standards | Amend TRAN-Table 8 sight distances to be based on 85%ile operating speed and sight distances that are appropriate for sealed and unsealed roads in the Far North District. Amend Far North District Engineering Standards April 2022 accordingly. | | Reject | Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: TRAN-Tables 2-8, 10 |
| FS570.509 | 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 | Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: TRAN-Tables 2-8, 10 |
| FS566.523 | 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 | Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: TRAN-Tables 2-8, 10 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|--------------|-----------------|--|---|---|------------------------|--|
| FS569.545 | 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 | Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: TRAN-Tables 2-8, 10 |
| S82.025 | Good Journey Limited | TRAN-Table 9 | Oppose | The tables are opposed to the extent that car parking minimums are still specified in the Mixed Use zone. Should existing operations wish to more intensively develop their sites in the Mixed Use zone by increasing the amount of "gross business area" and / or the provision of residential accommodation then additional carparks are required. Additional controls such as bicycle parks and end of trip facilities are also required. Intensification and development of Mixed Use areas should be encouraged by the removal of minimum car parking standards in recognition of the benefits that Mixed Use zones can bring in terms of both land use outcomes and travel patterns. | Delete car park minimums in the Mixed Use Zone and other relief that will satisfy the concerns of the submitter. | | Accept | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| S302.003 | Kristine Kerr | TRAN-Table 9 | Oppose | 6m is too wide for a private accessway for 6-8 houses and is not necessary for safety. 5m is adequate. Increased stormwater impact from increased impervious areas prevents water dispersing naturally. More than 8 houses can be located down a private accessway with no problem and 10m flag lights are not necessary. Should incorporate dark sky guidelines. | Amend to require 5m width for private accessway, more than 8 houses allowed down private roadway and not require 10m high flag lights. | | Reject | Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: TRAN-Table 9 |
| S184.013 | Northland Transport Alliance | TRAN-Table 9 | Support in part | Consider addition to Rule TRAN-R2 or TRAN-Table 9 requirements for sealing of private accessways. Suggest the following requirements: permanent all-weather surface in the following instances: <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Residential Zone | Amend Rule TRAN-Table 9 to require permanent all-weather surfaces in the following instances: <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Residential Zone- Rural and Rural Production sites with an area of less than 2,000m² | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: TRAN-Table 9 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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"> - Rural and Rural Production sites with an area of less than 2,000m² - Any accessway serving more than 5 residential units - Where the gradient exceeds 12.5% (to confirm this gradient, check against new Engineering Standards) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Any accessway serving more than 5 residential units - Where the gradient exceeds 12.5% (to confirm this gradient, check against new Engineering Standards) | | |
| S184.024 | Northland Transport Alliance | TRAN-Table 9 | Support in part | Double check this matches the draft engineering standards - particularly regarding .95m footpath width and consider if there should be a requirement to seal over a certain gradient | Amend TRAN-Table 9 to align with engineering standards and consider incorporating requirement to seal where specific gradient exceeded | Accept in part | Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: TRAN-Table 9 |
| S512.018 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | TRAN-Table 9 | Oppose | The current requirements in this table contradict with complying with SNZ PAS 4509:2008 under TRAN-R2. The current minimum carriageway width of 3.0m for rural areas and 2-4 residential units in urban areas is not sufficient for fire appliances. Fire and Emergency request that the table is updated to at least 4.0m to allow for emergency response access. In addition the maximum gradient suitable for Fire and Emergency is 16% / 1 in 6. The proposed maximum gradient exceeds this. | Amend table provisions to align with SNZ PAS 4509:2008 by including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a minimum carriageway width of 4.0m - a minimum height clearance of 4.0m - gradient shall not exceed 16% - accessway surfaces must be able to take the weight of a 20 tonne truck | Reject | Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: TRAN-Table 9 |
| FS196.229 | Joe Carr | | Support in part | I object to the Fire Service imposing a 1:6 gradient on private roads. This would make access to many properties very expensive and raises the question about the suitability or otherwise of NZFS's fire appliances for Far North conditions. | Allow in part | Accept in part | Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: TRAN-Table 9 |
| S215.021 | Haigh Workman Limited | TRAN-Table 9 | Support in part | We support standards for private accessways being specified in the District Plan, however, we oppose some of the provisions. | Amend TRAN-Table 9 and add further standards as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rural Accessways serving 3-8 residential units- the surfacing | Accept in part | Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: TRAN-Table 9 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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>The proposed carriageway widths of 3.0m and 4.5m for one and two-lane carriageways are appropriate and consistent with NZS 4404:2010. The additional 0.95m specified for footpath for Urban accessways serving 5 - 8 residential units is likely to be used by traffic. TRAN-Table 9 standards for Rural Accessways serving 3-8 residential units contains an error - the surfacing width should be 4.0m for 3-5 res units and 2x 2.75m for 6-8 residential units as specified in FNDC Engineering Standards Table 3.16; the total carriageway widths in TRAN-Table 9 are correct.</p> <p>A 4.5 m carriageway width is the bare minimum for two cars to pass on a straight accessway. Extra widening should be provided on horizontal curves to allow a car and an 8 m rigid truck to pass. This would also allow an 11 m rigid truck to traverse the accessway using the whole carriageway. Extra widening should also be provided on single lane accessways to allow an 11 m rigid truck to traverse the accessway he minimum legal width needs to be at least 2.0m wider than the carriageway width to allow for services, batters and the swept path of larger vehicles. The legal width should be increased on horizontal curves to allow for carriageway widening as discussed above.</p> <p>We recommend adding a further standard for private accessways: The minimum carriageway and legal width shall be increased on horizontal curves in accordance with Council's</p> | <p>width should be 4.0m for 3-5 residential units and 2x 2.75m for 6-8 residential units</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Include standards for extra widening on horizontal curves - Include rules on when private accessways should be sealed, such as: All urban accessways and Rural accessways serving nine or more households off a sealed public road whether private access or vested as road. - Include standards for sealing shared private accessways where the gradient exceeds 12.5%. | | |

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 |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|-------------------------------|---|------------------------|---|
| | | | | <p>Engineering Standards for private accessways.</p> <p>The Draft Engineering Standards 'rules' on sealing private accessways (ES Table 3-16) should be in the District Plan. This states that all new urban accessways should be sealed. The requirement in ES Table 3-16 to seal rural accessways serving 6 or more households is arbitrary and unnecessary, particularly when access is off an unsealed public road. It would be simpler to make the threshold the same as for a public road (9 or more) which is required to be sealed.</p> <p>We support the Engineering Standards requirement for accessways to be sealed where the gradient exceeds 12.5%. Steeper unsealed accessways result in greater difficulty in stopping downhill and gaining traction uphill, and higher maintenance costs. This requirement should be included as a District Plan standard in TRAN-Table 9.</p> <p>Note: the term 'Rural' should be defined in the Definitions section as all land that is not defined as 'Urban'</p> | | | | |
| FS570.510 | 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 | Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: TRAN-Table 9 |
| FS566.524 | 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 | Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: TRAN-Table 9 |
| FS569.546 | 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 | Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: TRAN-Table 9 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|-------------------------|---|------------------|-----------------|--|--|-------------------------------|--|
| S82.026 | Good Journey Limited | TRAN-Table 10 | Oppose | The tables are opposed to the extent that car parking minimums are still specified in the Mixed Use zone. Should existing operations wish to more intensively develop their sites in the Mixed Use zone by increasing the amount of "gross business area" and / or the provision of residential accommodation then additional carparks are required. Additional controls such as bicycle parks and end of trip facilities are also required. Intensification and development of Mixed Use areas should be encouraged by the removal of minimum car parking standards in recognition of the benefits that Mixed Use zones can bring in terms of both land use outcomes and travel patterns. | Delete car park minimums in the Mixed Use Zone and other relief that will satisfy the concerns of the submitter. | Accept | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |
| S184.025 | Northland Transport Alliance | TRAN-Table 10 | Support in part | Recommend that both the ONRC and ONF are included or that ONRC is replaced by the ONF. Advise if table of ONF street classifications is needed | Amend TRAN-Table 10 to either include ONF or replace ONRC with ONF | Reject | Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: TRAN-Tables 2-8, 10 |
| S82.027 | Good Journey Limited | TRAN-Table 11 | Oppose | The tables are opposed to the extent that car parking minimums are still specified in the Mixed Use zone. Should existing operations wish to more intensively develop their sites in the Mixed Use zone by increasing the amount of "gross business area" and / or the provision of residential accommodation then additional carparks are required. Additional controls such as bicycle parks and end of trip facilities are also required. Intensification and development of Mixed Use areas should be encouraged by the removal of minimum car parking standards in recognition of the benefits that Mixed | Delete car park minimums in the Mixed Use Zone and other relief that will satisfy the concerns of the submitter. | Accept | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Parking |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|---------------|-----------------|--|--|------------------------|---|
| | | | | Use zones can bring in terms of both land use outcomes and travel patterns. | | | |
| S458.005 | Woolworths New Zealand Limited | TRAN-Table 11 | Support in part | The Proposed District Plan currently provides for a trip generation of threshold of 200m ² for supermarkets. This is considered to be unnecessarily low, noting that many other districts in the country have trip generation thresholds for supermarkets and commercial activities ranging between 1,000m ² GFA to 2000m ² GFA. It is considered that a trip generation threshold of 1,500m ² for supermarket activities is appropriate. | Amend to increase the trip generation threshold for supermarket activities in TRAN-Table 11 to 1500m ² . | Reject | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Trip Generation |
| S400.011 | BR and R Davies | TRAN-Table 11 | Oppose | The trip generation thresholds in TRAN-Table 11 are very low, much lower (for example) than the thresholds in other recently minted plans. The Section 32 report describes the new thresholds as "more enabling". However, when compared to other District Plans, this is not the case. | Amend the trip generation thresholds in TRAN-Table 11 to be in accordance with best practice and to achieve the purpose of the RMA in the context of Section 32. | Reject | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Trip Generation |
| S384.008 | LD Family Investments Limited | TRAN-Table 11 | Support in part | The PDP appears to enter into the realm of the managing those effects and activities which fall within the domain of Waka Kotahi. In this regard TTFL propose to create a new intersection onto State Highway 10 with all sites created under the subdivision using this new access point. As such there is no direct access onto Council infrastructure. The intersection will meet the highway authorities requirements and is not required to be revised by Council. To assess an activities traffic movements leading to the Highway or LAR is a duplication of effort. | Amend to ensure Rule TRAN-Table 11 does not apply to sites or activities which have direct access onto a State Highway or LAR which has been previously approved by Waka Kotahi. | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General Matters |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|---|---------------|-----------------|--|--|------------------------|---|
| S385.009 | McDonalds Restaurants (NZ) Limited | TRAN-Table 11 | Support in part | <p>The trip generation thresholds have changed from zone-specific daily traffic volumes to district-wide standards set by a combination of daily volumes, gross business area, and occupancy-based thresholds.</p> <p>As noted in section 2.0 and earlier submission points, the Transport Chapter includes terms that are not defined, accordingly, it is difficult for McDonald's to understand how a McDonald's restaurant would be captured.</p> <p>In terms of extensions and alteration, as currently drafted, there is no specific direction for how these would be treated where the existing activity already exceed the specified GFA. McDonalds seeks that TRAN-5 be amended to ensure that the rule does not apply where additions and alterations to an activity to not increase the GFA.</p> | <p>Amend TRAN - Table 11 - Trip Generation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reference defined terms consistently applied throughout the plan to provide clarity for plan users - Increase the threshold to appropriately provide for drive through and restaurant/cafes (see sub#5 and sub#6) particularly within zones where they are a permitted activity, - Amend the provisions to provide for extension of activities. | Accept in part | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Trip Generation |
| S378.004 | Marshall Investments Trustee (2012) Limited | TRAN-Table 11 | Support | <p>The PDP appears to enter into the realm of the managing those effects and activities which fall within the domain of Waka Kotahi. In this regard the submitter has access onto State Highway 10. As such there is no direct access onto Council infrastructure. The intersection meets the highway authorities' requirements and is not required to be revised by Council. To assess an activities traffic movements leading to the Highway or LAR is a duplication of effort.</p> | <p>Amend TRAN-Table 11 to ensure it does not apply to sites or activities which have direct access onto a State Highway or LAR which has been previously approved by Waka Kotahi.</p> | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General Matters |
| S262.008 | Ti Toki Farms Limited | TRAN-Table 11 | Not Stated | <p>The submitter considers that the TRAN-Table 11 appears to enter into the realm of managing the effects and activities which fall into the domain of Waka Kotahi. When there is no direct</p> | <p>Amend TRAN-Table 11 to ensure that it does not apply to sites or activities which have direct access onto a State Highway or limited access road which has been previously approved by Waka Kotahi.</p> | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General Matters |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|---|---------------|-----------------|---|--|------------------------|---|
| | | | | access onto Council infrastructure and access meets Waka Kotahi requirements it should not be required to be reviewed by Council as this is a duplication of effort. | | | |
| S331.032 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | TRAN-Table 11 | Support in part | The submitter supports in part TRAN-Table 11 Trip generation and acknowledges that primary and secondary schools can result in high volumes of traffic, however the thresholds specified in TRAN-Table 11 is low comparatively. The submitter supports the inclusion of different types of educational facilities within TRAN-Table 11 however requests that the primary and secondary school threshold is raised, particularly given the number of students is not an accurate reflection of traffic movements. | Amend TRAN-Table 11 Trip generation as follows: Activity, Threshold, Primary and secondary schools, 10060 students | Reject | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Trip Generation |
| S503.038 | Waitangi Limited | TRAN-Table 11 | Not Stated | There are other forms of transport to a site such as via bus, shuttles or ferries. As these options generally carry many people it reduces the number of trips required, and parking spaces needed. For many tourist operations this is how people gain access to the site. | Amend TRAN-Table 11 to recognise that other forms of transport such as bus, shuttles or ferries should form part of the rule assessment. | Reject | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Trip Generation |
| S427.050 | Kapiro Residents Association | TRAN-Table 11 | Support in part | Many new subdivisions in Kerikeri and the surrounding rural area have greatly increased the volume of traffic using the central shopping/service area and roads leading to/from the CBD (e.g. Kerikeri Road, Waipapa Road, Landing Road, Kapiro Road, Purehua Road). When new developments are approved, insufficient account is taken of the total/cumulative impact of multiple developments on traffic. Other negative impacts on the community are not taken into account - such as such additional levels of noise, disruption | Amend TRAN-Table 11 to have regard to cumulative/combined traffic effects, congestion, emissions, noise etc. in townships and roads, especially roads leading to/from a CBD or service centres [inferred]. | Reject | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Trip Generation |

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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 other changes that can affect people, amenity values and the character of the area. | | | | |
| S45.008 | Puketona Business Park Limited | TRAN-Table 11 | Not Stated | The trip generation permitted thresholds are unnecessarily low for industrial activity, generally requiring restricted discretionary activity consent for anything greater than 200m ² Gross Floor Area, which is a nominal-scaled industrial activity. | Amend TRAN-Table 11 (inferred) to adopt the Auckland Unitary Plan thresholds for trip generation for industrial activities, as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Warehousing and storage 20,000m² GFA - Other industrial activities 10,000m² GFA. | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Trip Generation |
| FS36.047 | Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency | | Oppose | The relief sought significantly exceeds the proposed vehicle movement controls and has concerns this would lead to insufficient controls for high traffic generating industrial activities. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission. | Accept in part | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Trip Generation |
| S342.016 | Waipapa Pine Limited and Adrian Broughton Trust (now Fletcher Building Ltd) | TRAN-Table 11 | Support in part | The PDP appears to enter into the realm of the managing those effects and activities which fall within the domain of Waka Kotahi. In this regard the submitter has access onto State Highway 10, the intersection approved by Waka Kotahi. As such there is no direct access onto Council infrastructure. The intersection meets the highway authorities' requirements and is not required to be revised by Council. To assess an activities traffic movements leading to the Highway or LAR is a duplication of effort. | Amend to ensure they do not apply to sites or activities which have direct access onto a State Highway or LAR which has been previously approved by Waka Kotahi. | | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General Matters |
| FS36.048 | Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency | | Oppose | Supports the District Plan recognising thresholds (TRAN-Table 11) which would trigger Restricted Discretionary consent status and require an assessment of effects on the surrounding land use and transport network regardless of the legal status of the transport corridor. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission. | Accept | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General Matters |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|---------------|-----------------|--|--|---|-------------------------------|---|
| FS374.030 | Waipapa Pine Limited | | Support | The original submission reflects the position of Waipapa Pine Limited of support for the Heavy Industrial Zone with proposed changes to rules that would better support heavy industrial activities. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General Matters |
| S328.010 | Traverse Ltd | TRAN-Table 11 | Not Stated | The trip generation thresholds in TRAN-Table 11 are very low, much lower (for example) than the thresholds in other recently minted plans. The Section 32 report describes the new thresholds as "more enabling". However, when compared to other District Plans, this is not the case. | Amend the trip generation thresholds in TRAN-Table 11 to be in accordance with best practice and to achieve the purpose of the RMA in the context of Section 32. | | Reject | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Trip Generation |
| FS36.049 | Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency | | Neutral | No reasons stated. | Not stated | Waka Kotahi requests further information on the trip generation rates proposed and seeks to be involved in the drafting of any revised trip generation rates. | Neutral – No Changes to Rates | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Trip Generation |
| S371.009 | Bunnings Limited | TRAN-Table 11 | Support in part | The trip generation thresholds have changed from zone-specific daily traffic volumes to district-wide standards set by a combination of daily volumes, gross business area, and occupancy-based thresholds. For a trade supplier, the restricted discretionary threshold is 450m ² GFA, any new development that cannot comply with this threshold would trigger a restricted discretionary activity status. As currently drafted, there is no specific direction for extensions, and it considered that where the extension results in a total GFA of or over 200m ² restricted discretionary consent would be required. | Amend TRAN-Table 11 (inferred) to increase the threshold for trade suppliers particularly within zones where trade suppliers are a permitted activity and amend the provisions to provide for extension of activities. | | Reject | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Trip Generation |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|---------------|-----------------|---|--|--|------------------------|---|
| FS36.050 | Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency | | Oppose | The submitter is concerned the proposed increased thresholds for permitted activities will have the potential to adversely affect the safety and efficiency of the transport network with the potential for large scale activities going ahead with no required check of transport affects. However, the submitter does support providing additional clarity in the rules as to how extension of activities would be interpreted. | Disallow in part | Disallow the original submission in part. Waka Kotahi seeks to be involved in the drafting of any revised trip generation rates. | Accept | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Trip Generation |
| S251.004 | New Zealand Maritime Parks Ltd | TRAN-Table 11 | Support in part | The trip generation thresholds have changed from zone-specific daily traffic volumes to district-wide standards set by a combination of daily volumes, gross business area, and occupancy-based thresholds. NZMPL are concerned with the proposed approach, as the Transport Chapter includes terms that are not defined, accordingly, it is difficult for NZMPL to determine the activities that would be captured. | Amend TRAN-Table 11 to reference defined terms consistently applied throughout the plan to provide clarity for plan users. | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Trip Generation |
| FS400.009 | The Paihia Property Owners Group | | Support | Submission 251 rightly notes that the underlying analyses related to the Coastal Environment provisions has not sufficiently considered the appropriate implementation of these provision in the urban environment. Specific provisions such as height limits and gross floor area restrictions (for example) require flexibility when considered against the urban environment values and existing environment. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Trip Generation |
| FS396.009 | Ed and Inge Amsler | | Support | Submission 251 rightly notes that the underlying analyses related to the Coastal Environment provisions | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Trip Generation |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|---|---------------|-----------------|---|--|---------------------------------------|------------------------|---|
| | | | | has not sufficiently considered the appropriate implementation of these provision in the urban environment. Specific provisions such as height limits and gross floor area restrictions (for example) require flexibility when considered against the urban environment values and existing environment. | | | | |
| FS406.031 | McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited | | Support in part | McDonald's supports amendments to this table in accordance with what is outlined in its original submission. | Allow in part | Allow in part the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Trip Generation |
| S336.007 | Z Energy Limited | TRAN-Table 11 | Support | Commercial activities are identified in Table 11 where the threshold for trip generation consent under Rule R5 is 200m ² of Gross Floor Area. Z Energy supports this threshold | Retain TRAN-Table 11 | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Trip Generation |
| FS406.032 | McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited | | Oppose | McDonald's considers that this rule needs to be amended as outlined in its original submission. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Trip Generation |
| S502.092 | Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited | TRAN-Table 11 | Support in part | There are other forms of transport to a site such as via bus, shuttles or ferries. As these options generally carry many people it reduces the number of trips required, and parking spaces needed. For many tourist operations this is how people gain access to the site. We seek relief that other forms of transport such as those listed form part of the rule assessment. | Amend Table 11 to include other forms of transport to form part of the rule assessment | | Reject | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Trip Generation |
| FS368.084 | Tokerau Beach Trust | | Support in part | Amend SUB-S1 to provide for: Rural Production Controlled activity 20ha, Restricted discretionary activity 8ha and Discretionary activity 4ha Rural lifestyle discretionary activity 1ha | Allow in part | Amend | Reject | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Trip Generation |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|---------------|----------|---|--|---|------------------------|---|
| S215.023 | Haigh Workman Limited | TRAN-Table 11 | Oppose | <p>We oppose TRAN-R5 / TRAN Table 11. Table 11 allows 200 vehicle movements per day from any site, including residential sites that are currently restricted to 20 vehicle movements/day. Table 11 also allows traffic from up to 20 residential units per site as a permitted activity. The Note to Rule TRAN-R5 states that Rule TRAN-R2 may require a private access to be vested as road. TRAN-Table 9 requirements for private accessways is based on the number of residential units, not the number of vehicle movements. TRAN-S2 controls new vehicle crossings, but not increased use of existing crossings. There is therefore no mechanism in the Proposed District Plan that would require a private access to be widened or a vehicle crossing to be upgraded to mitigate the adverse effects of the increased traffic.</p> <p>If access is directly off an existing public road, there is no mechanism for assessing whether the road is adequate for the increased traffic. Multiple sites generating 200 vehicle movements per day could have significant cumulative adverse effects on the road network which as a permitted activity would not be assessed.</p> | Delete TRAN Table 11 Trip Generation and replace it with the Traffic Intensity provisions of Section 15.1.6A of the Operative District Plan. | | Reject | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Trip Generation |
| FS570.512 | 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 | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Trip Generation |
| FS566.526 | 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 | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Trip Generation |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|---------------|----------|--|---|---|------------------------|---|
| FS569.548 | 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 | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Trip Generation |
| S67.020 | Michael John Winch | TRAN-Table 11 | Oppose | I oppose TRAN-Table 11 which allows 200 vehicle movements per day from any site, including residential sites that are currently restricted to 20 vehicle movements/day. TRAN-Table 11 also allows traffic from up to 20 residential units per site as a permitted activity. Access to my residence is via a right of way shared with one other residence. The permitted activity rule would allow one of us to set up a business from home generating up to 200 vehicle movements per day with no consideration of the adverse effects on amenity values or the suitability of the right of way for increased traffic. Even where sites gain access directly off a public road, the increased traffic would have adverse effects on the amenity values of neighbouring properties. | Delete TRAN Table 11 Trip Generation in the Proposed District Plan and replace with the Traffic Intensity provisions of Section 15.1.6A of the Operative District Plan. In particular, I request that the permitted activity rule for any residential or rural-residential site be limited to 20 vehicle movements per day. | | Reject | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Trip Generation |
| FS346.843 | 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 | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Trip Generation |
| FS566.069 | 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 | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Trip Generation |
| S259.014 | Nicole Wooster | Objectives | Support | Provision needs to be made for roading takes to address climate change in areas like north Hokianga and where our farm is located. If a person subdivides or does a large scale land | Amend plan to ensure that it has the ability to take roading to address climate change / hazards issues not just urban connections. | | Reject | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General Matters |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of S42A Report |
|------------------|--|-------------------------|-----------------|---|---|------------------------|--|
| | | | | use the plan should allow for consideration of new roading routes to avoid or address hazards. For example an alternative route for the Mangamuka gorge, as we have lost access to a 45min direct route to our closest town. The coastal hazard mapping also identifies our local roading network being significantly affected. Council should be linking the District Plan to a climate response strategy to ensure communities have a safe and usable road network. | | | |
| S172.019 | Terra Group | Rules | Support | Support the general standards and rules within the Transport Chapter, as they will achieve positive outcomes for the proposed zone. | Retain as notified (inferred) | Accept in part | Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: TRAN Rules – General Comments |
| S172.020 | Terra Group | Standards | Support | Support the general standards and rules within the Transport Chapter, as they will achieve positive outcomes for the proposed zone. | Retain as notified (inferred) | Accept in part | Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: TRAN Rules – General Comments |
| S121.002 | Lynley Newport | General / Miscellaneous | Support in part | Whilst appreciating the decision to include a definition of "Limited Access Road" into the Plan, it would be more helpful for the Plan to include a map layer depicting which roads are Limited Access Road. That map layer could also distinguish between Access, Secondary Collector, Primary Collector, Arterial and Strategic Roads. This would be a useful addition to the Plan given that there are rules relating to various classifications of roads, yet nowhere to readily identify what category applies to the road on which the application site is located. | Insert a map layer in the District Plan showing road hierarchy classifications. | Accept | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General Matters |
| FS172.206 | Audrey Campbell-Frear | | Support | For the reasons set out in this primary submission. | Allow | Accept | 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: General Matters |
| FS36.080 | Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency | | Support | Supports the inclusion of a map layer showing which roads are Limited Access Roads and can provide information to assist in its development. Supports including a map that aligns with the One Network Framework that classifies roads based on the functions of movement and place. | Allow | Waka Kotahi seeks to be involved in any mapping regarding Limited Access Roads and transport corridor hierarchy. | Accept | Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: General Matters |