

Appendix 2 – Officer's Recommended Decisions on Submissions on Rural Wide Issues and the Rural Production Zone

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S333.111	P S Yates Family Trust	General / Process	Oppose	<p>The zoned is inappropriately named "Rural Production". Large parts of the district that is zoned this is not suitable for rural production and certainly is not retained for rural production purposes. The zone should be renamed to "General Rural" which more accurately reflects the wider range of activities that occur in the rural environments of the Far North.</p> <p>These activities are provided for in the zone as drafted (at least by the rules), but not recognised in the zone name. This is not to diminish the importance of rural production activities, and these should be enabled and protected by the objectives and policies of the zone. The zone name however should recognise the broader range of land uses which occur in rural parts of the district; including bush blocks, smaller titles, residential activity and land holding which are unsuitable for rural production uses.</p> <p>It is important to strengthen the District's economy by providing for a range of land use activities in the rural area; however, accepting the priority is to sustain the productive capacity of the soil and the rural character and amenity values that are key elements. The National Planning Standards "Zone Framework Standard" refers to the "General rural zone" which is a better fit.</p>	Delete the reference to 'Rural Production' zone in every instance, amend reference to 'General Rural' zone.	Reject	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				There is more to it than the name, with the stated primary objective of the zone being that it "is used for primary production activities, ancillary activities that support primary production and other compatible activities that have a functional need to be in a rural environment". That puts undue emphasis on farming activities and does not recognise the broad applicability of the zone in many unproductive areas. This point is taken up further in this submission.				
FS64.1	Doug Jane		Support	Our land is zoned rural production and has not been such for more than 20 years. I would like this changed so I can subdivide.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
S431.156	John Andrew Riddell	General / Process	Not Stated	The amendment is necessary in order to achieve the purpose of the Act.	Insert further matters of discretion for all restricted discretionary activities in the Rural Production, Rural Lifestyle and Rural Residential zones: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do effects on natural character • effects on indigenous biodiversity • effects on historic heritage and cultural values • effects on adaptation to and mitigation of climate change 		Reject	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan Wide or Rural Wide submissions
FS332.156	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan Wide or Rural Wide submissions
FS404.057	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Support	It is appropriate for FNDC to have discretion to assess the effects of climate change and the listed matters of national importance.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan Wide or Rural Wide submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S11.001	The Ipipiri Nature Conservancy Trust	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	The Ipipiri Nature Conservancy Trust (the Trust) has recently purchased Elliot Bay Farm in Far North District. The Trust is generally supportive of the Far North Proposed District Plan as it affects the land it administers and notes the work of the Trust will significantly assist Council to achieve objectives in the proposed plan such as improving public access to coastal area and protecting natural character. The Trust is however concerned that some provisions of the coastal and natural character overlays may make its work expensive and difficult. The Trust is seeking clarification or amendment of these overlay provisions to allow it to upgrade and existing public camping area, construct walking tracks and undertake restoration work.	<p>Amend the provisions (by way of specific controls) or at least clarification to allow the following activities to be undertaken within the land at Elliot Bay Farm (most of the farm encompassed at 1077A and 1076 Rawhiti Road, Russell or certificate of titles NA40A/1111 and NA1111/297), which is currently zoned Rural Production, with Coastal and Outstanding Natural Landscape overlays:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formation of a high quality all weather walking track that includes a section from Whangamumu Harbour to Ngaiotonga Scenic Reserve. This track (maximum width 2metres) will go above Elliot Bay (outside the Coastal hazard areas) then head inland alongside Rawhiti Road before heading inland up Wairoa Stream. (Note: maps showing possible walking tracks are attached to original submission) • Maintain and upgrade the existing summer camping ground at Elliot Bay with associated car parking, walking tracks and facilities NB buildings associated with this camping ground will be toilets and structures to provide water, refuse disposal etc (new built accommodation is not planned at this site). • The potential for DOC type huts near Whangamumu and in the Wairoa Stream catchment to cater for walkers on the multi-day walk. • Directional and interpretive signs. • Restoration and amenity plantings of native species with associated fencing to exclude stock. 	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S427.012	Kapiro Residents Association	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	Land that is regarded as highly productive (LUC Classes 1,2 and 3) is a strictly finite resource, essential for future food production for a growing	Amend to include specific policies/rules to prevent fragmentation and loss of land in rural and horticulture zones.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>population here and worldwide, and important for jobs and economic development. The recently issued National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land requires councils to protect LUC Class 1-3 land from fragmentation and loss (outside of identified urban zones) and allows councils to protect other types of productive land in similar manner.</p>			
<p>S168.087</p>	<p>Setar Thirty Six Limited</p>	<p>General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>The zone is inappropriately named "Rural Production". Large parts of the district that is zoned this is not suitable for rural production and certainly is not retained for rural production purposes. The zone should be renamed to "General Rural" which more accurately reflects the wider range of activities that occur in the rural environments of the Far North.</p> <p>These activities are provided for in the zone as drafted (at least by the rules), but not recognised in the zone name. This is not to diminish the importance of rural production activities, and these should be enabled and protected by the objectives and policies of the zone. The zone name however should recognise the broader range of land uses which occur in rural parts of the district; including bush blocks, smaller titles, residential activity and land holding which are unsuitable for rural production uses.</p> <p>It is important to strengthen the District's economy by providing for a range of land use activities in the rural area; however, accepting the priority is to sustain the productive capacity of the soil and the rural character and amenity values that are key elements. The National Planning Standards</p>	<p>Delete the name of the "Rural Production" zone and in every instance throughout the Plan refer to the "General Rural" zone instead. Amend the maps accordingly.</p>	<p>Reject</p>	<p>Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP</p>

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>"Zone Framework Standard" refers to the "General rural zone" which is a better fit.</p> <p>There is more to it than the name, with the stated primary objective of the zone being that it "is used for primary production activities, ancillary activities that support primary production and other compatible activities that have a functional need to be in a rural environment". That puts undue emphasis on farming activities and does not recognise the broad applicability of the zone in many unproductive areas. This point is taken up further in this submission.</p>			
S187.078	The Shooting Box Limited	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	<p>Refer to submission for detailed reasons for decision(s) requested relating, but not limited to, to the following: large parts of the district that is zoned Rural Production is not suitable for rural production and certainly is not retained for rural production purposes; these activities are provided for in the zone as drafted (at least by the rules), but not recognised in the zone name.</p> <p>The zone name should recognise the broader range of land uses which occur in rural parts of the district; sustain the productive capacity of the soil and the rural character and amenity values that are key elements; the National Planning Standards "Zone Framework Standard" refers to the "General Rural Zone" which is a better fit; and discussion concerning the primary objective of the zone.</p>	Amend to replace "Rural Production" zone in every instance in the Proposed District Plan with "General Rural" zone.	Reject	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
S60.002	Wai 2003 and Wai 250 Claimant	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	Should there be no interest in Dairying in the Hokianga in the manner suggested in the submission, then I	Amend the rules for the Hokianga, making residential use the predominant use (inferred)	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
	Groups Te Wahapu and Hokianga			suggest the whole matter of land use for Hokianga under District Plan provisions needs to be considered and decided upon as quickly as possible.			
S477.015	Te Waka Pupuri Putea Trust	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support	As the proprietors of significant holdings within the Rural Production Zone, we are broadly supportive of the proposed changes. We support the preservation of the character of the zone in its restriction on intensification and development and the protection from reverse sensitivity related issues that can arise from activities of this kind.	Retain the rules within the Rural Production zone relating to intensification and development, reverse sensitivity and worker accommodation	Accept in part	Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
S157.004	Tane's Tree Trust - Northland Totara Working Group	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support	<p>It is critical that sustainable indigenous forestry activities are not subject to unnecessary additional, costly and uncertain resource management consenting processes required by the District Plan. In contrast, appropriate sustainable indigenous forest management activities under the Ministry of Primary Industries (MPI) approved 'Sustainable Forest Management Plans' (SFMPs) need to be encouraged, supported, and explicitly provided for to ensure the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Harvests under MPI approved provisions of Part 3A of the Forests Act (e.g. SFMPs) are attributed permitted activity status throughout the District - including within Significant Natural Areas and areas designated as Outstanding Landscapes. 2. Sustainable indigenous forestry is supported and encouraged as an example 	Amend the District Plan to allow harvests under Ministry of Primary Industries' approved sustainable forest management plans and permits as permitted activities in all rural zones, Significant Natural Areas and Outstanding Natural Landscapes.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				of an appropriate nature-based land use activity and recognised as a form of formal protection for areas of native forest, including within Significant Natural Areas.				
FS46.3	Paul Quinlan		Support	Clause 3.10 (6) (e) of The National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity (NPSIB), recently approved by government, makes it clear that harvests under MPI approved SFM Permits and Plans (under the provisions of the Forests Act) should be considered acceptable in SNAs. It follows that they should be treated as Permitted Activities in District Plans.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS404.011	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Oppose	The D-G is concerned that permitted activity or other rules of this nature would rely on the assessment of effects on indigenous biodiversity that has been undertaken under a plan or permit under the Forests Act 1949. The plans or permits are approved or issued by the Ministry of Primary Industries (MPI). When MPI consider these plans and permits, the consideration over what is 'sustainable' under the Forests Act 1949, is different to 'sustainable management' under the Resource Management Act. This means that when MPI are considering any permit or plan, the framework for decision making is different to what should be considered under the RMA. It is inappropriate to incorporate this different assessment framework in the district plan.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S359.019	Northland Regional Council	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	Reverse sensitivity is a concern in Rural Production areas - from NRC's perspective, agricultural use,	Amend to include stronger reverse sensitivity provisions. Provisions to consider requiring greater setbacks of potentially up to 100m for habitable		Accept in part	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
				burning/smoke and odour are frequent issues. Recommend strengthening reverse sensitivity provisions, especially where lifestyle/rural residential development occurs within or adjoins Rural Production, mineral extraction, Industrial zones and significant infrastructure.	buildings within production zones, appropriate visual and physical screening and limitations on intensity of noise sensitive activities			Key Issue 2: Giving effect to the NPS-HPL
FS95.005	Northland Fish and Game Council		Support in part	Support the proposed amendments to include stronger reverse sensitivity provisions however we seek to extend these to include constraining housing and industrial developments near areas with recreational hunting values.	Allow in part	Amend as sought, subject to also constraining housing and industrial developments near areas with recreational hunting values.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving effect to the NPS-HPL
FS44.41	Northland Planning & Development 2020 Ltd		Oppose	Some vacant rural lots do not have lot dimensions greater than 200m. This would heavily restrict future development on already created vacant rural lots where reverse sensitivity would have been a consideration of the original subdivision. Visual and physical screening in some instances can heavily reduce any reverse sensitivity effects such that 100m setback is not warranted. Setback distances and any screening should be based on case by case basis which will be a consideration of each individual application	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving effect to the NPS-HPL
FS176.3	Summit Forests New Zealand Limited		Support	Reverse sensitivity issues occur within and between zones where sensitive activities seek to establish in a productive landscape.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving effect to the NPS-HPL
FS155.20	Fiona King		Support in part	100 metres is too far, change to 20 metres.	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving effect to the NPS-HPL
FS108.4	Manulife Forest Management		Support	Ensuring appropriate setbacks and buffer zones between zones and land	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				uses allows for certainty of rural activities.				
FS25.085	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Support	Greenfield development is a more appropriate and more cost-effective way of meeting housing demands. Retrofitting networks to service infill development can be problematic and costly, particularly where existing development has already established infrastructure.	Allow	Allow original submission to the extent that hazard prone areas are correctly identified and mapped and that there are appropriate consent triggers that enable more detailed assessment in appropriate circumstances.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving effect to the NPS-HPL
FS374.043	Waipapa Pine Limited		Support	There is general agreement with the intention of the Submitter in that the Proposed District Plan should strengthen reverse sensitivity provisions - especially where lifestyle / rural residential development occurs and adjoins the Heavy Industrial Zone.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving effect to the NPS-HPL
FS354.004	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	The submitter is concerned that the provisions to avoid reverse sensitivity are not sufficient, especially in the rural production zone, and seek these be strengthened with greater setbacks, appropriate visual and physical screening and limitations on intensity of noise sensitive activities. HortNZ seeks to ensure that primary production activities are not constrained because of inappropriate location of sensitive activities.	Allow	Allow S359.019	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving effect to the NPS-HPL
FS325.059	Turnstone Trust Limited		Support	TT further submits that greenfield development is a more appropriate and more cost-effective way of meeting housing demands. Retrofitting networks to service infill development can be problematic and costly, particularly where existing development has already established infrastructure.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS570.1055	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving effect to the NPS-HPL
FS346.480	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS and Part 2 of the RMA and the NPS IB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving effect to the NPS-HPL
FS566.1069	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving effect to the NPS-HPL
FS569.1091	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving effect to the NPS-HPL
S359.028	Northland Regional Council	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	Recognise the use of Horticulture zone as a valuable means of providing protection for highly productive land. For areas outside this zone, we recommend applying a minimum of Rural Production or General Rural zoning to large tracts of highly productive soils, and where appropriate encouraging lifestyle/rural residential development on poorer soils with supporting infrastructure (roading, water supply, waste and stormwater).	Amend the zoning of land where it is not in the Horticulture zone and it includes highly productive land, applying a minimum of Rural Production or General Rural zoning to large tracts of highly productive soils. Where appropriate encourage lifestyle/rural residential development on poorer soils with supporting infrastructure		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving effect to the NPS-HPL
FS116.1	Bruce Donovan		Oppose	There have been a number of soil reports undertaken around the Kerikeri area on mapped Highly Productive Land (Class 1 - 3). Many reports are coming back to say that the mapping is incorrect and that the soils are in fact not highly productive (Class 4 +). Prior to the Council rezoning land that is proposed to be Rural Residential to Rural Production or Horticulture,	Disallow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				updated mapping is necessary, especially around Kerikeri and Waipapa to ensure that the soils are in fact Class 1 - 3. As such I oppose the potential rezoning of my land to any of these proposed zones.				
FS25.058	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Support in part	Supports the intent of amending the FNDP to implement the NPS-HPL. However, any provisions that are to be more stringent than the NPS-HPL need to be justified. Furthermore, the NPS-HPL provides a range of exceptions, which should be recognised.	Allow in part	Allow the original submission in part.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving effect to the NPS-HPL
FS445.003	Neil Construction Limited		Oppose	The land is not subject to the provisions of the NPS-HPL, as it is not defined as highly productive land. It should be used efficiently to provide much-needed housing supply.	Disallow	Disallow original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving effect to the NPS-HPL
FS354.006	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	The submitter seeks that highly productive land be included in the Horticultural zone or Rural Production Zone and that lifestyle development is on poorer soils. This approach is supported.	Allow	Allow S359.028	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving effect to the NPS-HPL
FS570.1064	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving effect to the NPS-HPL
FS346.489	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS and Part 2 of the RMA and the NPS IB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving effect to the NPS-HPL
FS566.1078	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS569.1100	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving effect to the NPS-HPL
S541.031	Elbury Holdings	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	The Planning Maps show the Rural Production Zone in some areas e.g. Awanui/wireless road kaitaia that are serviced by sewerage, footpaths, refuse collection etc. If this zoning continues, it will severely constrain future urban development, and this should be corrected by amending RPROZ objectives, policies and rules zones to accommodate things other than rural production.	Amend the Rural Production Zone objectives, policies and rules zones so that productive land is defined based on its ability to produce food but can accommodate things other than rural production; OR amend Planning Maps to remove RPROZ from urban areas as separately submitted.		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS48.2	Nina Pivac		Support	<p>On behalf of FNR Properties Limited:</p> <p>It is noted that the PDP proposes to retain the RPZ zoning in areas that are not suitable for production purposes, including Lots 2 and 3 DP 547587 which are located in the Awanui township with frontage to SH1.</p> <p>The proposed thresholds for residential intensity and subdivision in the RPZ will severely restrict development opportunities in an area where expansion should be accommodated.</p> <p>Some properties that are proposed to be rezoned to RPZ are located in areas that are largely characterised by high-density residential development and other activities including commercial and recreational. Therefore, it is considered that rezoning such areas to General Residential (GRZ) or Mixed Use would be more appropriate as this would recognise the immediate need for more housing in the district and in turn assist in alleviating the current housing crisis that is being observed both locally and nationwide.</p>	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS155.10	Fiona King		Support		Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS155.30	Fiona King		Support	This has already happened at wireless road and all Town services (sewage, water and roadside rubbish collection are in existence. Even a Māori school has been established there in the past 12 months. All housing down the State highway one from kaitaia to 345 are on town sewage and water. kaitaia township has been moving north rapidly with both industrial & commercial properties been built .	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS155.31	Fiona King		Support		Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S421.001	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	Federated Farmers seeks that the District Plan contains a resource management policy framework that enables primary production in rural areas to occur as existing uses where it is already established and with as few barriers where it is sought to establish new primary production activities.	Amend (inferred) the District Plan to ensure a clear pathway for existing primary production activities to continue in the rural zones of the Far North District.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS176.5	Summit Forests New Zealand Limited		Support	SFNZ supports the need for flexible primary production land-use policies and rules to ensure land owners/managers can optimise the productive use of their lands.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS155.22	Fiona King		Support		Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS155.23	Fiona King		Support		Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
								Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS108.10	Manulife Forest Management		Support in part	Where primary production complies with appropriate rules and or standards existing use rights should be permitted. Council should be supporting the ongoing development of future primary industry in the FND.	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS570.1233	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 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS346.235	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS566.1247	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 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS569.1269	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 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS373.008	Lucklaw Farm Ltd		Support	I support that a framework should be included in the subdivision section for the managed growth of rural communities.	Allow	I seek that the whole of the submission point be allowed.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
S359.004	Northland Regional Council	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	The National Policy Statement-Highly Productive Land will, and the National Policy Statement-Indigenous Biodiversity is likely to, take effect prior to the end of 2022 and the proposed	Amend the plan to have regard to the National Policy Statement-Highly Productive Land and the National Policy Statement-Indigenous Biodiversity		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				plan will need to be reviewed in light of these new pieces of national direction				
FS67.10	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	<p>The relief sought in the submission by NRC to have regard to the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity should be sought by a Schedule 1 Variation to the Proposed Plan by the FNDC, not by way of a submission. The relief sought in this submission is not specific, so as to allow landowners and the community to understand its effect, yet by introducing SNAs and associated provisions across the district, it will have significant effect. Lacking specificity as it does, the submission should be struck out. There is no section 32 RMA assessment to support the relief sought.</p> <p>While it is acknowledged that the Council is required to give effect to the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity, this is required to be done in accordance with the principles and methodology set out in the NPS, including at section 3.8 the principles of partnership, transparency, access and consistency. Giving effect to the NPS by way of a submission to the Proposed Plan falls well short of this.</p>	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving effect to the NPS-HPL
FS68.11	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	<p>The relief sought in the submission by NRC to have regard to the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity should be sought by a Schedule 1 Variation to the Proposed Plan by the FNDC, not by way of a submission. The relief sought in this submission is not specific, so as to allow landowners and the community to understand its effect, yet by introducing SNAs and associated provisions across the district, it will have significant effect. Lacking specificity as it does, the submission</p>	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>should be disallowed. There is no section 32 RMA assessment to support the relief sought.</p> <p>While it is acknowledged that the Council is required to give effect to the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity, this is required to be done in accordance with the principles and methodology set out in the NPS, including at section 3.8 the principles of partnership, transparency, access and consistency. Giving effect to the NPS by way of a submission to the Proposed Plan falls well short of this.</p>				
FS69.10	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	<p>The relief sought in the submission by NRC to have regard to the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity should be sought by a Schedule 1 Variation to the Proposed Plan by the FNDC, not by way of a submission.</p> <p>The relief sought in this submission is not specific, so as to allow landowners and the community to understand its effect, yet by introducing SNAs and associated provisions across the district, it will have significant effect. Lacking specificity as it does, the submission should be disallowed.</p> <p>There is no section 32 RMA assessment to support the relief sought. While it is acknowledged that the Council is required to give effect to the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity, this is required to be done in accordance with the principles and methodology set out in the NPS, including at section 3.8 the principles of partnership, transparency, access and consistency. Giving effect to the NPS by way of a submission to the Proposed Plan falls well short of this.</p>	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS446.004	Omata Estate		Oppose	The Plan give effect to the NPS however separate planning processes are required as it could create natural justice issues attempting to retrofit this planning document to make the changes required by new NPS that have come into force since the Proposed Plan was prepared.	Disallow	Retain	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving effect to the NPS-HPL
FS66.10	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The relief sought in the submission by NRC to have regard to the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity should be sought by a Schedule 1 Variation to the Proposed Plan by the FNDC, not by way of a submission. The relief sought in this submission is not specific, so as to allow landowners and the community to understand its effect, yet by introducing SNAs and associated provisions across the district, it will have significant effect. Lacking specificity as it does, the submission should be disallowed. There is no section 32 RMA assessment to support the relief sought. While it is acknowledged that the Council is required to give effect to the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity, this is required to be done in accordance with the principles and methodology set out in the NPS, including at section 3.8 the principles of partnership, transparency, access and consistency. Giving effect to the NPS by way of a submission to the Proposed Plan falls well short of this.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving effect to the NPS-HPL
FS23.094	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	District plans are required to give effect to higher order policy and plan instruments. It is appropriate that the provisions of the district plan be revised to the extent necessary to ensure these documents are given effect to.	Allow	Allow the relief sought by making changes necessary to give effect to higher order documents.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS354.003	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	The submitter seeks that the plan give effect to the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPSHPL) and the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity. HortNZ supports implementation of these higher order documents in the district plan.	Allow	Allow submission S359.004 to give effect to the NPSHPL and NPSIB.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving effect to the NPS-HPL
FS547.121	Heron Point Limited		Oppose	The Plan give effect to the NPS however separate planning processes are required as it could create natural justice issues attempting to retrofit this planning document to make the changes required by new NPS that have come into force since the Proposed Plan was prepared.	Disallow	Amend the plan	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving effect to the NPS-HPL
FS305.007	Dempsey Family Trust		Oppose	The District Plan gives effect to the NPS-HPL however separate planning processes are required as it could create natural justice issues attempting to retrofit this planning document to make the changes required by new NPS-HL that have come into force since the Proposed District Plan was prepared.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving effect to the NPS-HPL
FS404.007	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Support in part	The D-G notes the submitter's relief has been summarised as requesting the plan be reviewed to 'have regard' to the listed national policy statements. Pursuant to section 75(3)(a) of the Act the requirement is to 'give effect' to those documents. The relief is otherwise supported.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving effect to the NPS-HPL
FS570.1040	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving effect to the NPS-HPL
FS346.465	Royal Forest and Bird Protection		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS and Part 2 of the RMA and the NPS IB. Forest & Bird	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
	Society of New Zealand Inc.			supports the full submission other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission				
FS566.1054	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving effect to the NPS-HPL
FS569.1076	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving effect to the NPS-HPL
S333.079	P S Yates Family Trust	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	<p>The zoned is inappropriately named "Rural Production". Large parts of the district that is zoned this is not suitable for rural production and certainly is not retained for rural production purposes. The zone should be renamed to "General Rural" which more accurately reflects the wider range of activities that occur in the rural environments of the Far North.</p> <p>These activities are provided for in the zone as drafted (at least by the rules), but not recognised in the zone name. This is not to diminish the importance of rural production activities and these should be enabled and protected by the objectives and policies of the zone. The zone name however should recognise the broader range of land uses which occur in rural parts of the district; including bush blocks, smaller titles, residential activity and land holding which are unsuitable for rural production uses.</p> <p>It is important to strengthen the District's economy by providing for a range of land use activities in the rural area; however, accepting the priority is to sustain the productive capacity of the soil and the rural character and</p>	Delete the reference to 'Rural Production' zone in every instance, amend reference to 'General Rural' zone.		Reject	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP.

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>amenity values that are key elements. The National Planning Standards "Zone Framework Standard" refers to the "General rural zone" which is a better fit.</p> <p>There is more to it than the name, with the stated primary objective of the zone being that it "is used for primary production activities, ancillary activities that support primary production and other compatible activities that have a functional need to be in a rural environment". That puts undue emphasis on farming activities and does not recognise the broad applicability of the zone in many unproductive areas. This point is taken up further in this submission.</p>				
FS155.9	Fiona King		Support	<p>Rural production zones are a to wider description. This needs to be broken down into other categories within rural production depending on the soil types. some are good soils , peat, sand and clay and some are hard pan, infertile and less productive which would better used for housing. Consents for building, industrial ,schools are being issued on rural production land . Towns have moved into rural production areas and are serviced by town water, sewage schemes yet still zoned rural production. areas like this this should be changed.</p> <p>Example wireless road in Kaitaia has a school, bus depot, farm, welding businesses. It has a 60 kph speed limit and is serviced by sewage and town water. Where there are services provided this should be a new zone</p>	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP.

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S485.034	Elbury Holdings	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	The Planning Maps show the Rural Production Zone in some areas e.g. Awanui/wireless road, Kaitaia that are serviced by sewerage, footpaths, refuse collection etc. If this zoning continues, it will severely constrain future urban development, and this should be corrected by amending the Rural Production zone objectives, policies and rules to accommodate things other than rural production.	Amend the Rural Production Zone objectives, policies and rules so that productive land is defined based on its ability to produce food but can accommodate things other than rural production or amend planning maps to remove Rural Production zoning from urban areas which are serviced with infrastructure.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS155.12	Fiona King		Support		Allow	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS155.32	Fiona King		Support		Allow	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S519.034	Elbury Holdings	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	The Planning Maps show the Rural Production Zone in some areas e.g. Awanui/wireless road, Kaitaia that are serviced by sewerage, footpaths, refuse collection etc. If this zoning continues, it will severely constrain future urban development, and this should be corrected by amending the Rural Production zone objectives, policies and rules to accommodate things other than rural production.	Amend the Rural Production Zone objectives, policies and rules zones so that productive land is defined based on its ability to produce food but can accommodate things other than rural production; OR amend Planning Maps to remove RPROZ from urban areas as separately submitted	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS155.13	Fiona King		Support		Allow	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S243.107	Matauri Trustee Limited	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	The zoned is inappropriately named "Rural Production". Large parts of the district that is zoned Rural Production is not suitable for rural production and certainly is not retained for rural production purposes. The zone should be renamed to "General Rural" which more accurately reflects the wider	Amend the name of the "Rural Production" zone in every instance in the Proposed District Plan to refer to as the "General Rural" zone.	Reject	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP.

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>range of activities that occur in the rural environments of the Far North. These activities are provided for in the zone as drafted (at least by the rules), but not recognised in the zone name. This is not to diminish the importance of rural production activities, and these should be enabled and protected by the objectives and policies of the zone.</p> <p>The zone name however should recognise the broader range of land uses which occur in rural parts of the district; including bush blocks, smaller titles, residential activity and land holding which are unsuitable for rural production uses .It is important to strengthen the District's economy by providing for a range of land use activities in the rural area; however, accepting the priority is to sustain the productive capacity of the soil and the rural character and amenity values that are key elements.</p> <p>The National Planning Standards "Zone Framework Standard" refers to the "General rural zone" which is a better fit. There is more to it than the name, with the stated primary objective of the zone being that it "is used for primary production activities, ancillary activities that support primary production and other compatible activities that have a functional need to be in a rural environment". That puts undue emphasis on farming activities and does not recognise the broad applicability of the zone in many unproductive areas.</p>				
FS155.17	Fiona King		Support		Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
								Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP.
FS64.2	Doug Jane		Support	My property is zoned rural production and has not been used for that for more than twenty years. It should be subdividable and rezoned as general.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP.
FS570.665	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 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP.
FS566.679	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 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP.
FS569.701	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 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP.
S547.032	LJ King Limited	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	The Planning Maps show the Rural Production Zone in some areas e.g. Awanui/wireless road, Kaitaia that are serviced by sewerage, footpaths, refuse collection etc. If this zoning continues, it will severely constrain future urban development, and this should be corrected by amending the Rural Production zone objectives, policies and rules to accommodate things other than rural production.	Amend the Rural Production Zone objectives, policies and rules so that productive land is defined based on its ability to produce food but can accommodate things other than rural production or amend planning maps to remove Rural Production zoning from urban areas which are serviced with infrastructure.		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS155.25	Fiona King		Support		Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.3

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
								Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S543.032	LJ King Limited	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	The Planning Maps show the Rural Production Zone in some areas e.g. Awanui/wireless road, Kaitaia that are serviced by sewerage, footpaths, refuse collection etc. If this zoning continues, it will severely constrain future urban development, and this should be corrected by amending the Rural Production zone objectives, policies and rules to accommodate things other than rural production	Amend the Rural Production Zone objectives, policies and rules zones so that productive land is defined based on its ability to produce food but can accommodate things other than rural production; OR amend Planning Maps to remove RPROZ from urban areas as separately submitted.		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS155.27	Fiona King		Support		Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS566.2193	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: General Submissions
S529.022	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	Future urban/residential development needs to be compact. Sprawling residential growth outside the urban areas brings negative effects - it generates longer driving distances for basic services, climate emissions, fragments rural land, reduces the area of productive land and undermines the character and amenity values of rural and coastal areas.	Amend to insert strong policies/rules that will avoid urban/residential sprawl in rural and coastal areas in other zones/chapters than Coastal Environment.		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS143.43	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Oppose	Appropriate residential development outside of existing urban areas can be a catalyst for positive land use change with environmental benefits and should not be outright 'avoided' as sought by this submission.	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS66.26	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	Appropriate residential development outside of existing urban areas can be a catalyst for positive land use change	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				with environmental benefits and should not be outright 'avoided' as sought by this submission.				
FS570.1912	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS566.1926	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS569.1948	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S346.002	Paradise Found Developments Limited	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	<p>Resource consents granted for Wiroa Station, 40 McKenzie Road, Purerua Peninsula, Kerikeri (being Lots 1-21 DP 497523) have been given effect to, and remain live, thus development of Wiroa Station, including vacant lots and the Property itself continue to be enabled by those consents. In other words, the Resource Consents enable development, and completion of the Wiroa Station development, notwithstanding the provisions of the Proposed District Plan.</p> <p>However, the Proposed District Plan fails to recognise, have regard to, or provide for the development and subdivision enabled by the Resource Consents. The Proposed District Plan provisions will restrict development of the property in a manner that is inconsistent with the resource consents and the integrated and comprehensive development authorised by those. Especially the controls within the Coastal Environment overlay, which covers the entire property.</p>	<p>Amend the Proposed District Plan to explicitly, and specifically provide for, and preserve the activities and land uses authorised under the resource consents approved for Wiroa Station, 40 McKenzie Road, Purerua Peninsula, Kerikeri (being Lots 1-21 DP 497523); and/or insert a new special purpose zone</p> <p>And / Or</p> <p>structure plan together with appropriate provisions (objectives, policies and rules) enabling the residential activity and development authorised by the resource consents approved for Wiroa Station as a permitted activity as well as appropriate activities within the Rural Production Zone, regardless of the provisions of the Coastal Environment and Coastal Flooding</p> <p>And / Or</p> <p>Otherwise amend the provisions of the Proposed District Plan to preserve the activities and buildings authorised by the resource consents approved for Wiroa Station.</p> <p>Otherwise, amend the provisions of the Proposed District Plan to provide for extensions and alterations to existing structures at Wiroa Station, in a manner consistent with the activities and buildings authorised by the resource consents</p>	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions	

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>Parts of the property are also identified as being subject to the Coastal Flood overlays. Insofar as these interfere with, or purport to restrict development authorised under the resource consents, these are inappropriate.</p> <p>Council's s32 analysis does not mention, or consider approved but unimplemented developments within the Property, nor elsewhere. The "low intensity" development controls and height limits proposed within the Coastal Environment are given very little analysis. The proposed provisions are inconsistent with the Act and relevant planning instruments.</p>	approved for Wiroa Station.			
FS143.77	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support	<p>A special purpose zone and/or structure plan is appropriate to apply to subdivision and development such as the submitter's property, where previous resource consents have established development entitlements together with considerable landscape and biodiversity benefits. The Proposed District Plan will restrict development of the property in a manner inconsistent with these resource consents, including approved but unimplemented development on the property. The relief sought to provide for and preserve activities authorised under the resource consents is consistent with the outcome sought in submissions for Mataka Station and is supported. This includes the need to recognise the special characterises of properties such as the submitter's and the further submitter's through the application of a special purpose zone and/or structure plan.</p>	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS566.020	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: General Submissions
S91.002	PF Olsen Limited	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	There is no definition for "forestry activities" that are not plantation forestry activities. Plantation forestry and plantation forestry activities are well defined in the draft plan (in accordance with the National Environmental Standards for Plantation Forestry), however other forestry activities are not (i.e. permanent or carbon forestry).	Amend the application of objectives, policies and rules in the plan. As the plan is currently drafted there are no permanent exotic forestry/carbon farming appropriate controls in the plan as compared to plantation forestry.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS176.12	Summit Forests New Zealand Limited		Support	As described by the original submitter	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS108.2	Manulife Forest Management		Support	All forestry activities need to clearly be provided for in the DP.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS566.091	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 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S554.005	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	The terms "Highly Productive Land", Productive Land (undefined) and Versatile Land are used interchangeably throughout the PDP and further consideration should be consideration to the use of the terms to achieve consistency in application.	Amend the PDP to consistently refer to Highly Productive Land, rather than Productive Land or Versatile Land.		Accept	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS85.3	PF Olsen Ltd		Support	The terms highly productive land and versatile land should be consistent with the NPS-HPL.	Allow		Accept	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS172.342	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons stated in this primary submission.	Allow		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: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS66.85	Bentzen Farm Limited		Support	The relief gives better effect to the NPS Highly Productive Land	Allow		Accept	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS32.008	Jeff Kemp		Support in part	<p>The submitter supports the overall intent and purpose of the original submission as it is the only viable and practical option to enable planned and coordinated development in and around Kerikeri and the Waipapa area.</p> <p>The submitter notes that the documentation on proposed traffic movements is unclear. The original submission has not provided details on potential traffic movements and intersections for Waitotara Dive and Waipapa Road and how these might link to State Highway 10. For example, it is unclear if the new link from State Highway 10 through to the Kerikeri Town Centre is going to be a primary route and the link through to Waipapa Road a secondary route.</p> <p>The submitter notes it is unclear if the proposed flood mitigation measures will increase or reduce flooding along Waitotara Drive. The submitter also supports the proposed zoning as depicted within the original submission is an efficient use of land.</p>	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to consideration of traffic movements, flood mitigation measures and amending the zoning as depicted in the original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS47.004	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS569.028	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	We oppose the proposed amendments to the PDP definitions relating to productive land	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS389.011	Smartlife Trust		Oppose	All of submission S554 in relation to the proposed Structure Plan for the landholding. In particular, the documents / plans which refer to a future access point through the Further Submitters land	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
S359.042	Northland Regional Council	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	There are potential effects associated with carbon farming such as lack of fire breaks, closer planting spaces and resulting difficulty in pest management as well as those normally associated with production forestry such as amenity and visual effects, wilding pine and fire risk.	Amend the Plan to consider including controls on exotic carbon forestry within the coastal environment, natural character areas, ONFL and areas of elite soils to protect the values of these resources and to manage nuisance such as shading, plant pest spread and fire risk.		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS108.8	Manulife Forest Management		Oppose	The NES-PF already has rules in place to address these concerns. Adding further rules would be onerous and provide a lack of clarity.	Disallow		Accept	
FS570.1078	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject	
FS346.503	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS and Part 2 of the RMA and the NPS IB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	
FS566.1092	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject	

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS569.1114	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject	
S421.226	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	Federated Farmers generally supports the Rural Residential chapter of the proposed district plan.	Retain the Rural Residential chapter or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent		Accept	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS172.329	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	Lot sizes in Rural Residential are too onerous.	Disallow		Reject	
FS196.102	Joe Carr		Support		Allow		Accept	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS372.013	John Andrew Riddell		Support in part	The provisions of the Rural Residential, Rural Lifestyle and Settlement are notified are generally appropriate, subject to the amendments sought in my submission S431 and in these further submissions.	Allow in part	Allow the submission subject to the amendments sought in my submission S431 and in these further submissions	Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS570.1458	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 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS346.460	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS566.1472	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 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS569.1494	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 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
S421.227	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	Federated Farmers generally supports the Settlement chapter of the proposed district plan.	Retain the Settlement chapter or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent.		Accept	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS196.101	Joe Carr		Support		Allow		Accept	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS372.014	John Andrew Riddell		Support in part	The provisions of the Rural Residential, Rural Lifestyle and Settlement are notified are generally appropriate, subject to the amendments sought in my submission S431 and in these further submissions.	Allow in part	Allow the submission subject to the amendments sought in my submission S431 and in these further submissions	Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS542.0010	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs proposes some changes to the Settlement zone provisions	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS570.1459	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 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS346.461	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS566.1473	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 5.2.1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
								Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS569.1495	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 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
S421.225	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	Federated Farmers generally supports the Rural Lifestyle chapter of the proposed district plan.	Retain the Rural Lifestyle chapter or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent		Accept	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS196.99	Joe Carr		Support		Allow		Accept	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS196.103	Joe Carr		Support		Allow		Accept	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS372.012	John Andrew Riddell		Support in part	The provisions of the Rural Residential, Rural Lifestyle and Settlement are notified are generally appropriate, subject to the amendments sought in my submission S431 and in these further submissions.	Allow in part	Allow the submission subject to the amendments sought in my submission S431 and in these further submissions	Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS570.1457	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 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS346.459	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS566.1471	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 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
FS569.1493	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 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
S516.003	Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	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 for on-site water supply (e.g., rainwater harvesting).	Amend the District Plan to 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.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS196.233	Joe Carr		Support	Very sensible suggestion	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S359.027	Northland Regional Council	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	The government has released the NPS for Highly Productive Land. In order to consider the availability of such land for primary production now and into the future, NRC recommends council carefully consider what mechanisms it is going to put in place to protect the Class 1, 2 and 3 (and possibly some class 4) soils of the district as a valuable natural resource.	Amend the plan to reconsider mechanisms to protect Class 1, 2 and 3 (and possibly some class 4) soils as a valuable natural resource.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS25.057	Kiwi Fresh Orange		Support in part	Supports the intent of amending the FNDP to implement the NPS-HPL. However, any provisions that are to be more stringent than the NPS-HPL need	Allow in part	Allow the original submission in part.	Accept in part	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
	Company Limited			to be justified. Furthermore, the NPS-HPL provides a range of exceptions, which should be recognised.				Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS66.12	Benzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The submitter's property includes some LUC4 land on the valley flat of the farm. The responsibility to identify Highly Productive Land is the Regional Council's under the NPS: Highly Productive Land, following the process set out in the NPS. The interim provisions at 3.5(7) of the NPS only require LUC 1, 2 and 3 land to be classed as highly productive. The relief sought by the NRC to incorporate provisions in the District Plan ahead of itself giving effect to the NPS is premature. More particularly, the request to map some LUC4 land as highly productive does not give effect to the interim provisions of the NPS: Highly Productive Land.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS225.18	Pacific Eco-Logic		Support	The National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land likely requires additional plan mechanisms to protect Class 1,2 and 3 soils as a valuable resource.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS354.005	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	The submitter seeks protection of LUC1, 2 and 3 soils and possibly some LUC 4 as being highly productive. HortNZ supports this approach as the soils are a valuable resource. Much horticultural production occurs on Class 4 soils.	Allow	Allow S359.027	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS570.1063	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS346.488	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS and Part 2 of the RMA and the NPS IB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS566.1077	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS569.1099	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
S529.152	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	The name could perhaps be changed (throughout the PDP) to 'priority productive land' or 'significant productive capacity' or other phrase to reduce potential confusion with the new NPS-HPL.	Delete the term 'highly productive land' throughout the PDP, and refer to as 'priority productive land' or 'significant productive capacity'		Reject	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS66.27	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The relief sought by the submitter to delete the term 'highly productive land' throughout the PDP and refer to as 'priority productive land' or 'significant productive capacity' is contrary to the NPS: Highly Productive Land and does not enable the Plan to give effect to that NPS.	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS570.2040	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS566.2054	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS569.2076	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
S449.023	Kapiro Conservation Trust	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	Future urban/residential development needs to be compact. Sprawling residential growth outside the urban areas brings negative effects - it generates longer driving distances for basic services, climate emissions, fragments rural land, reduces the area of productive land and undermines the character and amenity values of rural and coastal areas.	Amend to add strong policies/rules that will avoid urban/residential sprawl in rural and coastal areas in other zones/chapters than Coastal Environment.		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS66.31	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The relief sought fails to recognise that positive benefits can result from appropriate residential development outside of existing urban areas, including biodiversity benefits.	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS569.1822	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS570.1839	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S427.016	Kapiro Residents Association	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	If left unchecked, ribbon development produces sprawling areas of development that may become miles long, with multiple single accessways off main roads, and problems such as traffic blocking major highways while vehicles wait to turn into those accessways.	Amend to strictly control ribbon development in rural areas which is an undesirable form of development [inferred].		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS36.004	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency		Support	Supports this submission as cumulative ribbon development has the potential to adversely affect the effectiveness, efficiency and safety of the land transport system.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S554.051	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support	To give effect to the relief sought in this submission.	Amend as necessary any objectives, policies, rules, methods, maps, figures or other provisions of the PDP to give effect to the relief sought in this submission and the reasons given, including alternative zoning, overlay or precinct maps and provisions for the Submission Area as may be necessary or desirable.		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS36.096	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency		Oppose	Opposes the proposed rezoning/ intensification of the approximately 197ha "Brownlie Land Precinct" until there is a clearer understanding on how the proposal affects the safety, efficiency, and effectiveness of the land transport system. There needs to be clear documentation of what transport infrastructure/ upgrades/mitigation measures are needed to avoid, remedy or mitigate effects on the transport system, triggers for necessary infrastructure development and how the infrastructure will be funded. The proposed rezoning needs to ensure that it includes details as to how the proposed transport network will provide active modes and support the longer term development of public transport.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission until appropriate analysis and information has been provided for the proposed rezonings (inferred).	Accept	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS32.054	Jeff Kemp		Support in part	The submitter supports the overall intent and purpose of the original submission as it is the only viable and practical option to enable planned and coordinated development in and around Kerikeri and the Waipapa area. The submitter notes that the documentation on proposed traffic movements is unclear. The original submission has not provided details on potential traffic movements and intersections for Waitotara Dive and Waipapa Road and how these might link to State Highway 10. For example, it is unclear if the new link from State	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to consideration of traffic movements, flood mitigation measures and amending the zoning as depicted in the original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>Highway 10 through to the Kerikeri Town Centre is going to be a primary route and the link through to Waipapa Road a secondary route.</p> <p>The submitter notes it is unclear if the proposed flood mitigation measures will increase or reduce flooding along Waitotara Drive. The submitter also supports the proposed zoning as depicted within the original submission is an efficient use of land.</p>				
FS389.057	Smartlife Trust		Oppose	All of submission S554 in relation to the proposed Structure Plan for the landholding. In particular, the documents / plans which refer to a future access point through the Further Submitters land	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S522.012	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	Land that is regarded as highly productive (LUC Classes 1,2 and 3) is a strictly finite resource, essential for future food production for a growing population here and worldwide, and important for jobs and economic development. The recently issued National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land requires councils to protect LUC Class 1-3 land from fragmentation and loss (outside of identified urban zones) and allows councils to protect other types of productive land in similar manner.	Amend to include/specify policies/rules to prevent fragmentation and loss of land in rural and horticulture zones [inferred].		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS550.018	Lloyd Anderson		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such 	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore, it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. 				

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site. • There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. • Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. <p>Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-</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
				lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi& ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.				
FS333.003	Maree Hart		Support	<p>The submitter supports relief sought to prevent fragmentation or loss of productive land, to avoid urban/residential sprawl in rural areas and protect amenity values.</p> <p>Residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons. It would be contrary to the NPS-UD in enabling urban sprawl and not protecting rural land. Government reports have found that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided as it leads to permanent loss of productive capability.</p> <p>Residential development on Lot 1001 would also create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities in the area.</p> <p>Lot 1001 is one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil in the district which is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential providing food, local jobs and economic well-being. FNDC submission to MPI recognised that large areas of horticultural land in Kerikeri have been converted to residential and therefore it is vital to protect the remaining rural land that is highly productive.</p> <p>Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect</p>	Allow	<p>Amend zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 to Horticulture zone or Rural Production zone; Amend Rural Production, Horticulture and Rural Lifestyle zone provisions to prevent urban sprawl, and protect productive soil, rural character and amenity values; Amend the District Plan to strengthen provisions for assessing and preventing cumulative and long-term adverse effects on productive areas, rural areas, areas visible from public land, ecological values and freshwater.</p>	Accept in part	<p>Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL</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>the essential natural resource at this site. There are alternative sites in the area which could provide a compact urban footprint and improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. Lot 1001 is also adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline which is a valuable economic asset for the area.</p> <p>Residential development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects. The surrounding rural environment lacks the appropriate infrastructure, school capacity and existing safety and traffic issues on Landing Road such as a one lane bridge. There would also be effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.</p>				
FS62.006	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 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in 	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore, it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on 				

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. • Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. <p>Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.</p>				
FS277.27	Jenny Collison		Support	Essential	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS566.1751	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS549.018	Vanessa Anderson		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore, it is vital to protect this remaining finite 	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site. • There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would 				

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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>actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. <p>Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.</p>				
FS443.018	Peter O'Neil Donnellon		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in 	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore, it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on 				

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. • Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. <p>Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.</p>				
FS390.018	Tracey Schubert		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Policy Standards recognise the need for 	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore, it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the 				

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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>permanent loss of productive capability.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site. • There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. • Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. <p>Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks</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
				appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi& ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.				
FS353.018	Al Panckhurst		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle 	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>activities over the last 20 years. Therefore, it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). 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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site. • There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that 			

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. <p>Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.</p>				
FS352.018	Kathryn Panckhurst		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one 	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

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

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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. In legal terms, there is no 'functional need 'to build residential development on this particular site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. • Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. <p>Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi& ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.</p>				
FS342.018	Chris Baker		Support	It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons -	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore, it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided 				

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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>because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site. • There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. • Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. <p>Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse</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
				effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi& ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.				
FS338.018	Pearl Mahoney		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large 	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

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

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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>noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. <p>Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi& ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.</p>				
FS337.018	Kevin Mahoney		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. 	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore, it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. Lot 				

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. • Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. <p>Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.</p>				
FS336.018	Roger Holman		Support	It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

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

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.				
FS335.018	Craig and Mary Sawers		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and 	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

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

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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"> There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. <p>Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi& ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.</p>				
FS334.018	Fiona Clarke		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, 	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore, it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. 				

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. • Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. <p>Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.</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
S522.014	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	Future urban/residential development needs to be compact. Sprawling residential growth outside the urban areas brings negative effects - it generates longer driving distances for basic services, climate emissions, fragments rural land, reduces the area of productive land and undermines the character and amenity values of rural and coastal areas.	Amend to add strong policies/rules that will avoid urban/residential sprawl in rural and coastal areas in other zones/chapters than Coastal Environment.		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS550.019	Lloyd Anderson		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. 	Allow	Allow original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

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

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. <p>Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi& ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.</p>				
FS333.004	Maree Hart		Support	<p>The submitter supports relief sought to prevent fragmentation or loss of productive land, to avoid urban/residential sprawl in rural areas and protect amenity values.</p> <p>Residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons. It would be contrary to the NPS-UD in enabling urban sprawl and not protecting rural land. Government reports have found that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided as it leads to permanent loss of productive capability.</p>	Allow	Amend zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 to Horticulture zone or Rural Production zone; Amend Rural Production, Horticulture and Rural Lifestyle zone provisions to prevent urban sprawl, and protect productive soil, rural character and amenity values; Amend the District Plan to strengthen provisions for assessing and preventing cumulative and long-term adverse effects on productive areas, rural areas, areas visible from public land, ecological values and freshwater.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>Residential development on Lot 1001 would also create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities in the area.</p> <p>Lot 1001 is one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil in the district which is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential providing food, local jobs and economic well-being. FNDC submission to MPI recognised that large areas of horticultural land in Kerikeri have been converted to residential and therefore it is vital to protect the remaining rural land that is highly productive.</p> <p>Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. There are alternative sites in the area which could provide a compact urban footprint and improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. Lot 1001 is also adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline which is a valuable economic asset for the area.</p> <p>Residential development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects. The surrounding rural environment lacks the appropriate infrastructure, school capacity and existing safety and traffic issues on Landing Road such as a one lane bridge. There would also be effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.</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
FS62.007	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 residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore, it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive' 	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>(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 alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually 				

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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>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. 				
FS277.28	Jenny Collison		Support	Urban sprawl is blight on the New Zealand landscape	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS566.1753	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS549.019	Vanessa Anderson		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns, such 	Allow	Allow original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1001 DP 532487 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. • Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: 'Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore, it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive' (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). • Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the 			

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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>permanent loss of productive capability.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 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. <p>Residential/urban development in this location would generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban</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
				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.				
FS443.019	Peter O'Neil Donnellon		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into 	Allow	Allow original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site. • There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site 				

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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>next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. <p>Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.</p>				
FS390.019	Tracey Schubert		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. 	Allow	Allow original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore, it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. Lot 				

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. • Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. <p>Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.</p>				
FS353.019	AI Panckhurst		Support	It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the	Allow	Allow original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore, it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential 				

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

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.				
FS352.019	Kathryn Panckhurst		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and 	Allow	Allow original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

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

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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"> There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. <p>Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi& ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.</p>				
FS342.019	Chris Baker		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, 	Allow	Allow original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore, it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. 				

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. • Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. <p>Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.</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
FS338.019	Pearl Mahoney		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore, it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). Government reports and 	Allow	Allow original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site. • There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. • Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully 				

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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>established activities and neighbouring producers.</p> <p>Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.</p>				
FS337.019	Kevin Mahoney		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in 	Allow	Allow original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

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

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>residential development on this particular site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. • Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. <p>Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.</p>				
FS336.019	Roger Holman		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that 	Allow	Allow original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore, it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, 				

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. • Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. <p>Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water</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
				quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.				
FS335.019	Craig and Mary Sawers		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore, it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" 	Allow	Allow original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>(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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site. • There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. 				

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. <p>Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.</p>				
FS334.019	Fiona Clarke		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good 	Allow	Allow original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore, it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable 				

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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>economic asset for the area. In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. • Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. <p>Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi& ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.</p>				
S554.046	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support	None given	The zoning rules as per Part 3 of the proposed District Plan apply to the site to support the requested Multi zone precinct.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS32.049	Jeff Kemp		Support in part	The submitter supports the overall intent and purpose of the original submission as it is the only viable and practical option to enable planned and	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to consideration of traffic movements, flood mitigation measures and amending the zoning as	Accept in part	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>coordinated development in and around Kerikeri and the Waipapa area.</p> <p>The submitter notes that the documentation on proposed traffic movements is unclear. The original submission has not provided details on potential traffic movements and intersections for Waitotara Dive and Waipapa Road and how these might link to State Highway 10. For example, it is unclear if the new link from State Highway 10 through to the Kerikeri Town Centre is going to be a primary route and the link through to Waipapa Road a secondary route.</p> <p>The submitter notes it is unclear if the proposed flood mitigation measures will increase or reduce flooding along Waitotara Drive. The submitter also supports the proposed zoning as depicted within the original submission is an efficient use of land.</p>		depicted in the original submission.		
FS389.052	Smartlife Trust		Oppose	All of submission S554 in relation to the proposed Structure Plan for the landholding. In particular, the documents / plans which refer to a future access point through the Further Submitters land	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S554.047	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support	Not stated	The district wide rules as per Part 2 of the proposed District Plan apply to the site to support the multi zone precinct		Accept in part	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS32.050	Jeff Kemp		Support in part	<p>The submitter supports the overall intent and purpose of the original submission as it is the only viable and practical option to enable planned and coordinated development in and around Kerikeri and the Waipapa area.</p> <p>The submitter notes that the documentation on proposed traffic</p>	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to consideration of traffic movements, flood mitigation measures and amending the zoning as depicted in the original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>movements is unclear. The original submission has not provided details on potential traffic movements and intersections for Waitotara Dive and Waipapa Road and how these might link to State Highway 10. For example, it is unclear if the new link from State Highway 10 through to the Kerikeri Town Centre is going to be a primary route and the link through to Waipapa Road a secondary route.</p> <p>The submitter notes it is unclear if the proposed flood mitigation measures will increase or reduce flooding along Waitotara Drive. The submitter also supports the proposed zoning as depicted within the original submission is an efficient use of land.</p>				
FS389.053	Smartlife Trust		Oppose	All of submission S554 in relation to the proposed Structure Plan for the landholding. In particular, the documents / plans which refer to a future access point through the Further Submitters land	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S403.004	Meridian Farm Ltd	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	<p>The proposed changes represent a more efficient and effective use of the land, particularly given the constraints to using the land for productive purposes.</p> <p>The proposed approach best achieves sustainable management under Part 2 of the RMA.</p>	Amend any other provisions in the proposed plan changes where those provisions are inconsistent with the outcomes sought for the land subject to this submission.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS366.004	Breadon and Cook Ltd		Support	As noted earlier in this submission, Breadon and Cook Ltd own land directly adjacent to the original submitter's site and have also lodged a submission seeking similar relief. Breadon and Cook Ltd would be interested in presenting a joint case at the Proposed District Plan hearings.	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS566.026	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 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS570.016	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 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S464.034	LJ King Ltd	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	The Planning Maps show the Rural Production Zone in some areas e.g. Awanui/wireless road, Kaitaia that are serviced by sewerage, footpaths, refuse collection etc. If this zoning continues, it will severely constrain future urban development, and this should be corrected by amending the Rural Production zone objectives, policies and rules to accommodate things other than rural production.	Amend the Rural Production Zone objectives, policies and rules so that productive land is defined based on its ability to produce food but can accommodate things other than rural production or amend planning maps to remove Rural Production zoning from urban areas which are serviced with infrastructure.		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS354.013	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	The submitter seeks changes to the objectives and policies for the rural production zone to allow a range of other activities. That approach is inconsistent with the National Planning Standards as to what is anticipated in the Rural Production Zone.	Disallow	Disallow S464.034	Accept	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS566.1577	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: General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S522.022	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	<p>The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.</p> <p>We support PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, however. the PDP needs additional specific rules/standard.</p>	<p>Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and</p> <p>Amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour. Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish. 		Accept in part	<p>Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions</p> <p>Section 5.2.15 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments</p>
FS354.019	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	The submitter seeks additional standards for crop protection structures, including non-complying activity status, which would limit the use for horticultural production in the district. They are used in rural production zones which are working environment and are anticipated in those environments.	Disallow	Disallow S522.022	Accept in part	<p>Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions</p> <p>Section 5.2.15 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments</p>
FS277.32	Jenny Collison		Support	I support Vision Kerikeri submission	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
								Section 5.2.15 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS566.1761	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.15 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
S527.030	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	We consider that all zones, except urban zones, need to be covered by firm PDP policies and rules to protect a key natural resource - productive land - now and for future generations. This means preventing fragmentation and loss of productive land from productive use, especially LUC Class 1-3 land and productive types of soil/land suitable for horticulture. It is not necessary to wait until the regional council has implemented the NPS-HPL.	Amend rural zones to firm up policies and rules to protect key natural resources - productive land.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS354.020	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	The submitter seeks to amend rural zones to firm up policies and rules to protect productive land - but elsewhere seeks to limit the use of highly productive land. HortNZ supports preventing fragmentation and loss of productive land from productive use, especially LUC Class 1- 3 land and productive types of soil/land suitable for horticulture.	Allow	Allow S527.030	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS566.1892	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S431.168	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 and policies where there is reference to protection for current and future generations, add "and intrinsic and natural values".		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS332.168	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS404.058	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Support	Relief is consistent with the purpose of the Act.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S522.015	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support	If left unchecked, ribbon development produces sprawling areas of development that may become miles long, with multiple single accessways off main roads, and problems such as traffic blocking major highways while vehicles wait to turn into those accessways.	Amend to strictly control ribbon development in rural areas which is an undesirable form of development [inferred].		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS277.29	Jenny Collison		Support	To support Vision Kerikeri submission	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS566.1754	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S338.039	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	Ribbon development in rural areas is an undesirable form of development that needs to be strictly controlled by PDP zoning rules. Examples are seen along SH10 and several other major routes. If left unchecked, ribbon development produces sprawling areas of development that may be kilometers long, multiple single accessways of roads, and problems such as traffic	Retain and enhance provisions discouraging ribbon development.		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				blocking major highways while vehicles wait to turn into those accessways				
FS277.39	Jenny Collison		Support	Ribbon development is a blight on the landscape and takes no account of carbon emissions	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS570.977	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS566.991	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS569.1013	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S529.023	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support	If left unchecked, ribbon development produces sprawling areas of development that may become miles long, with multiple single accessways off main roads, and problems such as traffic blocking major highways while vehicles wait to turn into those accessways.	Amend to strictly control ribbon development in rural areas, which is an undesirable form of development [inferred].		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS403.107	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 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS570.1913	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS566.1927	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS569.1949	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.3

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
								Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S529.020	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	Land that is regarded as highly productive (LUC Classes 1,2 and 3) is a strictly finite resource, essential for future food production for a growing population here and worldwide, and important for jobs and economic development. The recently issued National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land requires councils to protect LUC Class 1-3 land from fragmentation and loss (outside of identified urban zones) and allows councils to protect other types of productive land in similar manner.	Amend to include/specify policies/rules to prevent fragmentation and loss of land in rural and horticulture zones [inferred].		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS570.1910	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 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS566.1924	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS569.1946	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
S167.089	Bentzen Farm Limited	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	The zoned is inappropriately named "Rural Production". Large parts of the district that is zoned this is not suitable for rural production and certainly is not retained for rural production purposes. The zone should be renamed to "General Rural" which more accurately reflects the wider range of activities that occur in the rural environments of the Far North. These activities are provided for in the	Delete the reference to "Rural Production" zone throughout the Plan and replace with "General Rural" zone.		Reject	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>zone as drafted (at least by the rules), but not recognised in the zone name. The zone name should recognise the broader range of land uses which occur in rural parts of the district. It is important to strengthen the District's economy by providing for a range of land use activities in the rural area.</p> <p>The National Planning Standards "Zone Framework Standard" refers to the "General rural zone" which is a better fit.</p> <p>Rural production puts undue emphasis on farming activities and does not recognise the broad applicability of the zone in many unproductive areas.</p>				
FS566.451	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 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: Selection of Rural Zones in the PDP
S449.021	Kapiro Conservation Trust	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	Land that is regarded as highly productive (LUC Classes 1,2 and 3) is a strictly finite resource, essential for future food production for a growing population here and worldwide, and important for jobs and economic development. The recently issued National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land requires councils to protect LUC Class 1-3 land from fragmentation and loss (outside of identified urban zones) and allows councils to protect other types of productive land in similar manner.	Amend to include specify policies/rules to prevent fragmentation and loss of land in rural and horticulture zones [inferred].		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS569.1820	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS570.1837	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
S449.024	Kapiro Conservation Trust	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support	If left unchecked, ribbon development produces sprawling areas of development that may become miles long, with multiple single accessways off main roads, and problems such as traffic blocking major highways while vehicles wait to turn into those accessways.	Amend to strictly control ribbon development in rural areas which is an undesirable form of development [inferred].		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS569.1823	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS570.1840	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S159.008	Horticulture New Zealand	ARTIFICIAL CROP PROTECTION	Support in part	Seek to ensure that artificial crop protection structures are not inadvertently covered by inappropriate effects standards, where there is a risk that they may be considered 'buildings' (due to inconsistency in interpretation). A way of addressing this is to provide a clear framework through a definition and specific standard or rule for the rural zone	Amend the definition of 'artificial crop protection structures' as follows: means structures with cloth material used to protect crops and plants and/or enhance growth (excluding greenhouses) Note: For the avoidance of doubt artificial crop protection structures are not a building.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: RPROZ Rules – General Comments
FS151.160	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: RPROZ 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
FS570.170	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 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: RPROZ Rules – General Comments
FS566.184	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 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: RPROZ Rules – General Comments
FS569.206	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 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: RPROZ Rules – General Comments
S421.004	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	FARM QUARRY	Support	Federated Farmers supports the inclusion of a definition for farm quarry.	Retain the definition of 'farm quarry'		Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS570.1236	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 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS346.238	Royal Forest and Bird Protection		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
	Society of New Zealand Inc.			section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.				
FS566.1250	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 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS569.1272	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 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
S148.002	Summit Forests New Zealand Limited	FARM QUARRY	Support in part	<p>Despite the term "Farm Quarry", the definition allows for the extraction of aggregate for use on forestry tracks which appropriately implies that such quarries can be established as part of production forestry activities. The definition needs to be amended to provide greater clarity as to what is intended.</p> <p>SFNZ supports the provision for the extraction and use of aggregates within the production unit.</p>	<p>Amend the definition of Farm Quarry to explicitly recognise that it includes Forestry by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amending the term being defined to "Farm/Forest Quarry" or words to like effect Amending bullet 1 to read "taken for use ancillary to farming, production forestry, and horticulture, including for farm and forestry tracks, access ways and hardstand areas, and" 		Reject	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS346.508	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS. Loss of natural character, coastal environment values and the values of outstanding landscapes could also result.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS566.114	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: Definitions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S160.003	Manulife Forest Management (NZ) Ltd	FARM QUARRY	Support in part	The submitter supports in part the definition of Farm Quarry and considers amendments would provide certainty to what activities are covered by this definition as the same words should be used as the definitions.	Amend the definition of Farm Quarry: means the extraction of aggregates which are: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. taken for use ancillary to farming and horticulture, including for farm and plantation forestry tracks, access ways and hardstand areas, and 2. only used on the same property or on the same property ownership, and 3. not sold, or exported. 		Reject	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS346.573	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS. Loss of natural character, coastal environment values and the values of outstanding landscapes could also result.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
S518.004	New Zealand Kiwifruit Growers Incorporated	FARMING	Support in part	It is considered that it would assist District Plan users if it was clear that orchard toilets, water well drilling and pump testing are included within the definition of "farming activities". Otherwise, there may be confusion regarding the rules that apply e.g. water well drilling and pump testing could be considered temporary activities.	Amend definition of 'Farming' to add a note as follows: 'For the avoidance of doubt, the definition of farming includes orchard toilets, the drilling of water wells and pump tests'.		Reject	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS151.35	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS151.36	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow	Reject	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS151.37	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow	Reject	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
S159.010	Horticulture New Zealand	FARMING	Oppose	Does not support the use of the term farming for horticultural primary production activities. Farming suggests pastoral land use and does not encompass the range of activities included in the definition. The definition is a subset of primary production so should include parts b) and c) from the definition of primary production so there is clear alignment with this definition	<p>Rename the definition of 'Farming' to 'Rural production activities' and make consequential changes in the Plan.</p> <p>Amend the associated definition as follows:</p> <p>means the use of land for the purpose of agricultural, pastoral, horticultural or apiculture activities, including accessory buildings, but excludes mining, quarrying, plantation forestry activities, intensive indoor primary production and processing activities.</p> <p>Note: this definition is a subset of primary production.</p> <p>Rural production activities mean the use of land for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) agricultural, pastoral, horticultural or apiculture activities including accessory buildings b) includes initial processing, as an ancillary activity, of commodities that result from the activities in a) c) includes any land and buildings used for the production of commodities from a) and used for the initial processing of the commodities in b) d) excludes mining, quarrying, plantation forestry activities, and intensive indoor primary production and further processing of commodities into a different product. 	Reject	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS151.162	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS548.039	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Support	The current definition implies pastoral land which is not always the case for rural activities.	Allow	Grant the relief sought.	Reject	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS570.172	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: Definitions
FS566.186	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: Definitions
FS569.208	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: Definitions
S148.003	Summit Forests New Zealand Limited	FARMING	Not Stated	The definition of Farming excludes plantation forestry activities. This would appear to limit a farmer's ability to optimise their land use including their carbon emissions which is an objective of the proposed plan (SD-EP0-04). Rather than excluding production forestry activities, the definitions should be couched in terms of the primary purpose but, as with accessory buildings, allowing activities that are ancillary to that primary purpose.	Amend the definition of Farming to allow for plantation forestry activities that are ancillary to the primary purpose of agriculture, pastoral, horticulture, or apiculture activities		Reject	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS196.4	Joe Carr		Support	Provides for the sustainable use of land	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS346.509	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS. Loss of natural character, coastal environment values and the values of outstanding landscapes could also result.				
FS566.115	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: Definitions
S160.004	Manulife Forest Management (NZ) Ltd	FARMING	Support in part	The submitter supports the exclusion of production forestry as it is defined.	Retain definition of Farming as defined, however throughout the plan where there is reference to farming in the objectives, policies or rules, replace farming with primary production or add plantation forestry into the farming definition.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS196.5	Joe Carr		Support	Provides for the sustainable use of land	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS346.574	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS. Loss of natural character, coastal environment values and the values of outstanding landscapes could also result.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
S421.199	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	FARMING	Support in part	Not clarified	Amend the definition for 'farming' to include aircraft and helicopter movements where these are being used for operations as a part of farming on rural airstrips and landing areas.		Reject	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS184.1	Richard Milner		Support		Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS184.38	Richard Milner		Support		Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.5

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
								Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS570.1431	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: Definitions
FS346.433	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS566.1445	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: Definitions
FS569.1467	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: Definitions
S182.004	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association	FARMING	Support in part	Include agricultural aviation in the definition of farming so it is clear that it is part of the farming activity	Amend the definition of Farming: means the use of land for the purpose of agricultural, pastoral, horticultural or apiculture activities, including accessory buildings and agricultural aviation , but excludes mining, quarrying, plantation forestry activities, intensive indoor primary production and processing activities. Note: this definition is a subset of primary production.		Reject	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS184.49	Richard Milner		Support		Allow in part		Reject	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
S55.003	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	FARMING	Oppose	Intensive indoor primary production includes indoor pig farming, which is a farming activity that uses land and buildings for the purpose of agricultural	Remove the exclusion of intensive indoor primary production from the definition of farming, as follows:		Reject	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>food production. Legitimate farming operations should not be excluded from the definition of farming on the basis of intensity or whether some of the operation occurs indoors.</p> <p>Intensive primary production (covering both indoor and outdoor operations - see below) should be included in the definition of farming, with any specific requirements to address effects from intensive operations addressed via the policy and rule structure of the relevant chapters.</p>	means the use of land for the purpose of agricultural, pastoral, horticultural or apiculture activities, including accessory buildings, but excludes mining, quarrying, plantation forestry activities, intensive indoor primary production and processing activities.			
FS548.007	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Support	The definition of farming needs to include all legitimate farming activities.	Allow	Grant the relief sought.	Reject	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
S421.005	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	FARMING	Support	Federated Farmers supports the inclusion of a definition for farming.	Retain the definition of 'farming'		Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS570.1237	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 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS346.239	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS566.1251	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 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS569.1273	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 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S427.011	Kapiro Residents Association	HIGHLY PRODUCTIVE LAND	Support in part	Land that is regarded as highly productive (LUC Classes 1,2 and 3) is a strictly finite resource, essential for future food production for a growing population here and worldwide, and important for jobs and economic development. The recently issued National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land requires councils to protect LUC Class 1-3 land from fragmentation and loss (outside of identified urban zones) and allows councils to protect other types of productive land in similar manner.	Retain definition of highly productive land which provides protection for a wider range of productive land, including water availability and other factors.	Reject	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
S187.003	The Shooting Box Limited	HIGHLY PRODUCTIVE LAND	Oppose	Refer to submission for detailed reasons for decision requested relating, but not limited to, Clause 3.4 of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land 2022.	Amend the definition of Highly Productive Land as follows: means land that is, or has the potential to be, highly productive for farming activities land-based primary production . It includes versatile soils and Land Use Capability Class 4 1, 2 and 3 land and other Land Use Capability classes Land Use Capability, or has the potential to be, highly productive having regard to: a. Soil type; b. Physical characteristics; c. Climate conditions; and d. Water availability.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
S222.080	Wendover Two Limited	HIGHLY PRODUCTIVE LAND	Support in part	Amendments to the definition of Highly Productive Land also sought in this submission to support requested changes in the Rural Production zone	Not stated	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
S421.006	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	HIGHLY PRODUCTIVE LAND	Support	Federated Farmers supports the inclusion of a definition for Highly productive land.	Retain the definition of 'Highly productive land'	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS24.2	Lynley Newport		Oppose	The NPS for Highly Productive Land has now done this job for the FNDC,	Disallow	Accept in part	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
				which must simply now repeat the definition of HPL as stated in that legislation, and any subsequent amendments				Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS172.305	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	Inconsistent with NPS HPL.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS570.1238	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: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS346.240	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS566.1252	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: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS569.1274	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: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
S159.012	Horticulture New Zealand	HIGHLY PRODUCTIVE LAND	Support in part	To be consistent with amendments to farming definition and to align with the National Policy Statement Highly Productive Land	Amend the definition of 'Highly productive land' as follows: means land that is, or has the potential to be, highly productive for farming rural production activities. It includes versatile soils and Land Use Capability Class 4 land and other Land Use Capability classes Land Use Capability, or has the potential to be, highly productive having regard to:		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					a. Soil type; b. Physical characteristics; c. Climate conditions; and d. Water availability.			
FS151.164	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS151.165	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS172.237	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	Inconsistent with NPZ HPL.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS196.3	Joe Carr		Support in part	Another factor that should be considered is reverse sensitivity from established neighbouring activities such as residential land use and community facilities.	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS570.174	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: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS566.188	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: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS569.210	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: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S502.002	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	HIGHLY PRODUCTIVE LAND	Support in part	The changes proposed are consistent with the interpretation in the NPS for Highly Productive Land which covers soil classes 1 - 3. The changes made are sought to align with the NPS. We refer Council to the NPS, Interpretation, Section 3.4 & 3.5 which stipulates that Highly productive land is classes 1 - 3.	Amend the definition of Highly Productive Land: means land that is, or has the potential to be, highly productive for farming activities. It includes versatile soils and Land Use Capability Class 4 land and other Land Use Capability classes Land Use Capability, or has the potential to be, highly productive having regard to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Soil type; b. Physical characteristics; c. Climate conditions; and d. Water availability. 		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS172.215	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
S91.003	PF Olsen Limited	HIGHLY PRODUCTIVE LAND	Oppose	The definition of Highly Productive Land is inconsistent with the definition contained in the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land.	Amend the definition to Highly Productive Land to be consistent with the requirements of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land.		Accept	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS172.235	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Accept	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS25.043	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Support	The amendment seeks to align the definitions of the FNDP with the NPS-HPL, which is appropriate as it avoids confusion or inconsistency of application of provisions.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate wording.	Accept	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS66.33	Bentzen Farm Limited		Support	The definition of Highly Productive Land should be amended to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land so as to not inadvertently capture land not defined by the NPS.	Allow		Accept	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS548.018	Northland Federated		Support	Federated Farmers supports the inclusion of a definition for highly	Allow	Grant the relief sought.	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
	Farmers of New Zealand Inc			productive land. It is important that the definition in the District Plan captures all of the soils intended under the definition in the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land.				Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS566.092	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: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
S148.004	Summit Forests New Zealand Limited	HIGHLY PRODUCTIVE LAND	Not Stated	The proposed definition does not allow for the easy identification of Highly Productive Land and is inconsistent with the definition contained in the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land. While the definition contained in the NPS is primarily based on the requirement for Regional Council's to map such land, the NPS does provide a definition that can be used in the absence of such mapping.	Amend the definition to Highly Productive Land to be consistent with the requirements of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land.		Accept	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS172.236	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Accept	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS66.34	Bentzen Farm Limited		Support	The definition of Highly Productive Land should be amended to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land so as to not inadvertently capture land not defined by the NPS.	Allow		Accept	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS349.001	Northland Regional Council		Support	It is appropriate for the district plan definition to be consistent with the National Policy Statement - Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL)	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS346.510	Royal Forest and Bird		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	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
	Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.			which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS. Loss of natural character, coastal environment values and the values of outstanding landscapes could also result.				Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS566.116	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: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
S401.002	Braedon & Cook Limited	HIGHLY PRODUCTIVE LAND	Support in part	<p>Section 3.4 of the NPS for Highly Productive Land (NES HPL) directs regional council's to, as soon as practicably possible, map highly productive land (HPL) within its region. Until a regional policy statement with this mapping is made operative, Section 3.5(7) of the NPS HPL directs territorial authorities to apply the NPS as if references to HPL were references to land that is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Zoned general rural or rural production; and • LUC 1, 2 or 3 land. <p>The definition of 'Highly Productive Land' should be amended to align with the NPS HPL. Specifically, the definition should be amended to exclude the specific reference to LUC 4 soils,</p>	Amend the definition of highly productive soils as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Soil type; b. Physical characteristics; c. Climate conditions; and d. Water availability. 	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL	
FS172.295	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS367.002	Meridian Farm Ltd		Support	As noted earlier in this submission, Meridian Farm Ltd own land directly adjacent to the original submitter's site and have also lodged a submission seeking similar relief. Meridian Farm Ltd would be interested in presenting a joint case at the Proposed District Plan hearings.	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS354.027	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	HortNZ supports the inclusion of LUC 4 in the definition as horticulture occurs on Class 4 land in the Far North District and supports retention of Class 4 land until the RPS identifies highly productive land so that Class 4 HPL is not lost to rural production in the interim. The district plan can be more stringent than the NPSHPL.	Disallow	Disallow S401.002	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
S403.002	Meridian Farm Ltd	HIGHLY PRODUCTIVE LAND	Support in part	<p>Section 3.4 of the NPS for Highly Productive Land (NES HPL) directs regional council's to, as soon as practicably possible, map highly productive land (HPL) within its region. Until a regional policy statement with this mapping is made operative, Section 3.5(7) of the NPS HPL directs territorial authorities to apply the NPS as if references to HPL were references to land that is: Zoned general rural or rural production; and LUC 1, 2 or 3 land.</p> <p>Section 3.5(7) of the NPS HPL Notwithstanding the direction provided in section 3.5, the PDP definition of 'highly productive land' also includes LUC class 4 soils. This is not considered to align with the aforementioned direction provided by the NPS HPL.</p>	Highly Productive Land means land that is, or has the potential to be, highly productive for farming activities [...] It includes versatile soils and Land Use Capability Class 4 land and other Land Use Capability classes Land Use Capability, or has the potential to be, highly productive having regard to:		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS172.297	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
								Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS366.002	Breadon and Cook Ltd		Support	As noted earlier in this submission, Breadon and Cook Ltd own land directly adjacent to the original submitter's site and have also lodged a submission seeking similar relief. Breadon and Cook Ltd would be interested in presenting a joint case at the Proposed District Plan hearings.	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS566.024	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: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS569.051	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS570.014	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: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
S456.002	New Zealand Eco Farms Ltd	HIGHLY PRODUCTIVE LAND	Support in part	To ensure consistency with the NPS-HPL, the definition of 'Highly Productive Land' should be amended to exclude land containing LUC 4 soils Section 3.4 of the NPS-HPL directs regional council's to, as soon as practicably possible, map highly productive land within its region. Until a regional policy statement with this mapping is made operative, Section 3.5(7) of the NPS-HPL directs territorial authorities to apply the NPS as if references to HPL were references to land that is:	Amend definition of 'Highly Productive Land' means land that is, or has the potential to be, highly productive for farming activities. It includes versatile soils and Land Use Capability Class 4 land and other Land Use Capability classes Land Use Capability, or has the potential to be, highly productive having regard to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Soil type; b. Physical characteristics; c. Climate conditions; and d. Water availability 		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Zoned general rural or rural production; and LUC 1, 2 or 3 land. <p>Notwithstanding the direction provided above, the PDP definition of 'highly productive land' also includes LUC class 4 soils. This is not considered to align with the aforementioned direction provided by the NPS-HPL.</p>				
FS172.332	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons stated in this primary submission.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS364.002	New Zealand Eco Farms Ltd		Support	<p>a. To submit a supplementary soil and resource report that has been prepared by Hanmore Land Management. This report confirms that only low-lying areas in southern and central portions of the site are considered to be 'Highly Productive' in the context of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL). As a result, this conclusion further supports the submission made by NZEF that the proposed Horticultural Zone for the entire farm is inappropriate.</p> <p>b. The relief proposed in the NZEF original submission represents the most effective and efficient use of the land.</p> <p>c. The relief proposed best achieves sustainable management under Part 2 of the RMA.</p>	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S554.004	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited	HIGHLY PRODUCTIVE LAND	Oppose	<p>Following the notification of the PDP, the National Policy Statement on Highly Productive land (NPSHPL) was released.</p> <p>The definition of Highly Productive Land should be consistent with the definitions of the NPS- HPL. Section 3.5(7) of the NPS-HPL includes LUC 1, 2 and 3, but not LUC 4 soils. LUC 4 soils should not be referred to within the PFNDC as Highly Productive Land to ensure that there is consistency with how the NPS-HPL is applied.</p>	<p>Amend the definition of Highly Productive Land to the definition in the NPS-HPL:</p> <p>means land that has been mapped in accordance with clause 3.4 and is included in an operative regional policy statement as required by clause 3.5 (but see clause 3.5(7) for what is treated as highly productive land before the maps are included in an operative regional policy statement and clause 3.5(6) for when land is rezoned and therefore ceases to be highly productive land).</p>	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS172.341	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons stated in this primary submission.	Allow	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS32.007	Jeff Kemp		Support in part	<p>The submitter supports the overall intent and purpose of the original submission as it is the only viable and practical option to enable planned and coordinated development in and around Kerikeri and the Waipapa area.</p> <p>The submitter notes that the documentation on proposed traffic movements is unclear. The original submission has not provided details on potential traffic movements and intersections for Waitotara Drive and Waipapa Road and how these might link to State Highway 10. For example, it is unclear if the new link from State Highway 10 through to the Kerikeri Town Centre is going to be a primary route and the link through to Waipapa Road a secondary route.</p> <p>The submitter notes it is unclear if the proposed flood mitigation measures will increase or reduce flooding along Waitotara Drive. The submitter also</p>	<p>Allow</p> <p>Allow the original submission subject to consideration of traffic movements, flood mitigation measures and amending the zoning as depicted in the original submission.</p>	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				supports the proposed zoning as depicted within the original submission is an efficient use of land.				
FS47.003	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS354.028	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	HortNZ supports the inclusion of LUC 4 in the definition as horticulture occurs on Class 4 land in the Far North District and supports retention of Class 4 land until the RPS identifies highly productive land so that Class 4 HPL is not lost to rural production in the interim. The district plan can be more stringent than the NPSHPL.	Disallow	Disallow S554.004	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS569.027	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	We oppose the proposed amendments to the PDP definitions relating to productive land	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS389.010	Smartlife Trust		Oppose	All of submission S554 in relation to the proposed Structure Plan for the landholding. In particular, the documents / plans which refer to a future access point through the Further Submitters land	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
S333.003	P S Yates Family Trust	HIGHLY PRODUCTIVE LAND	Support in part	<p>Clause 3.4 of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land 2022 requires regional councils to map as highly productive land any land in its region that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> is in a general rural zone or rural production zone; and is predominantly LUC 1, 2, or 3 land; and forms a large and geographically cohesive area. 	<p>Amend the definition of Highly Productive Land as follows:</p> <p>means land that is, or has the potential to be, highly productive for farming activities land-based primary production. It includes versatile soils and Land Use Capability Class 4 1, 2 and 3 land and other Land Use Capability classes Land Use Capability, or has the potential to be, highly productive having regard to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Soil type; Physical characteristics; 		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					c. Climate conditions; and d. Water availability.			
FS196.6	Joe Carr		Support in part	I support the submission provided that the land use on the elite soils takes into account existing land uses such as Residential, or existing community facilities	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
S368.116	Far North District Council	HIGHLY PRODUCTIVE LAND	Support in part	The National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL) has been released through the submission period of the PDP. The PDP uses that term and the term 'versatile soils' in multiple chapters. To enable better integration and consistency with the NPS-HPL amendments should be made in the PDP where the terms Highly Productive land and Versatile Soils are used.	Amend, where necessary, instances where the terms 'Highly Productive land' and 'Versatile Soils' are used in the PDP and make any other amendments necessary to give effect to the NPS-HPL.		Accept	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS25.023	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Support	Supports revisiting the FNDP to ensure that it appropriately gives effect to the NPS-HPL, including its exceptions.	Allow	Allow the original submission, subject to appropriate wording.	Accept	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS354.026	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	The submitter seeks consistent use of the term highly productive land. This is supported	Allow	Allow S368.116	Accept	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
S463.001	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited	HIGHLY PRODUCTIVE LAND	Not Stated	Superseded by National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land 2022 ("NPS-HPL").	Amend the definition of 'Highly productive land' as follows: means land that is, or has the potential to be, highly productive for farming activities. It includes versatile soils and Land Use Capability Class 4 land and other Land Use Capability classes Land Use Capability, or has the potential to be, highly productive having regard to: Soil type; Physical characteristics; Climate conditions; and Water availability.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					Highly productive land has the same meaning as in the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land 2022.			
FS66.35	Bentzen Farm Limited		Support	The definition of Highly Productive Land should be amended to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land so as to not inadvertently capture land not defined by the NPS.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
S522.011	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	HIGHLY PRODUCTIVE LAND	Support in part	Land that is regarded as highly productive (LUC Classes 1,2 and 3) is a strictly finite resource, essential for future food production for a growing population here and worldwide, and important for jobs and economic development. The recently issued National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land requires councils to protect LUC Class 1-3 land from fragmentation and loss (outside of identified urban zones) and allows councils to protect other types of productive land in similar manner.	Retain definition of highly productive land which provides protection for a wider range of productive land, including water availability and other factors.		Reject	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS550.017	Lloyd Anderson		Support	It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from 	Allow	Allow original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>inappropriate urban/residential sprawl.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore, it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also 				

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>protect the 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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. • Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. <p>Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.</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
FS333.002	Maree Hart		Support	<p>The submitter supports relief sought to prevent fragmentation or loss of productive land, to avoid urban/residential sprawl in rural areas and protect amenity values.</p> <p>Residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons. It would be contrary to the NPS-UD in enabling urban sprawl and not protecting rural land. Government reports have found that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided as it leads to permanent loss of productive capability. Residential development on Lot 1001 would also create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities in the area.</p> <p>Lot 1001 is one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil in the district which is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential providing food, local jobs and economic well-being. FNDC submission to MPI recognised that large areas of horticultural land in Kerikeri have been converted to residential and therefore it is vital to protect the remaining rural land that is highly productive.</p> <p>Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. There are alternative sites in the area which could provide a compact urban footprint and improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. Lot</p>	Allow	<p>Amend zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 to Horticulture zone or Rural Production zone; Amend Rural Production, Horticulture and Rural Lifestyle zone provisions to prevent urban sprawl, and protect productive soil, rural character and amenity values; Amend the District Plan to strengthen provisions for assessing and preventing cumulative and long-term adverse effects on productive areas, rural areas, areas visible from public land, ecological values and freshwater.</p>	Reject	<p>Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL</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>1001 is also adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline which is a valuable economic asset for the area.</p> <p>Residential development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects. The surrounding rural environment lacks the appropriate infrastructure, school capacity and existing safety and traffic issues on Landing Road such as a one lane bridge. There would also be effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.</p>				
FS566.1750	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS549.017	Vanessa Anderson		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in 	Allow	Allow original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore, it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on 				

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. • Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. <p>Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.</p>				
FS443.017	Peter O'Neil Donnellon		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Policy Standards recognise the need for 	Allow	Allow original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore, it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the 				

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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>permanent loss of productive capability.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site. • There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. • Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. <p>Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks</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
				appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi& ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.				
FS390.017	Tracey Schubert		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle 	Allow	Allow original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>activities over the last 20 years. Therefore, it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). 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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site. • There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that 			

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. <p>Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.</p>				
FS353.017	AI Panckhurst		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one 	Allow	Allow original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

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

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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. In legal terms, there is no 'functional need 'to build residential development on this particular site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. • Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. <p>Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi& ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.</p>				
FS352.017	Kathryn Panckhurst		Support	It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons -	Allow	Allow original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore, it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided 				

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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>because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site. • There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. • Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. <p>Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse</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
				effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi& ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.				
FS342.017	Chris Baker		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large 	Allow	Allow original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

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

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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>noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. <p>Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.</p>				
FS338.017	Pearl Mahoney		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. 	Allow	Allow original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore, it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. Lot 				

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. • Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. <p>Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.</p>				
FS337.017	Kevin Mahoney		Support	It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the	Allow	Allow original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.2

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

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

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.				
FS336.017	Roger Holman		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks 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 	Allow	Allow original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

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

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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"> There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. <p>Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi& ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.</p>				
FS335.017	Craig and Mary Sawers		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, 	Allow	Allow original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore, it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. 				

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. • Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. <p>Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.</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
FS334.017	Fiona Clarke		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, 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 	Allow	Allow original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site. • There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. • Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully 				

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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>established activities and neighbouring producers.</p> <p>Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.</p>				
S167.003	Bentzen Farm Limited	HIGHLY PRODUCTIVE LAND	Oppose	<p>The proposed definition of Highly Productive Land refers to Land Use Capability Class 4 land which is generally not highly productive land. The definition should apply only to LUC 1, 2, and 3 consistent with the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land 2022.</p> <p>As drafted the definition is confusing with a stray reference to "Land Use Capability". Reference to "land-based primary production" in this definition rather than "farming activities" better gives effect to the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land 2022</p>	Amend the definition of Highly Productive Land as follows: means land that is, or has the potential to be, highly productive for farming activities land-based primary production . It includes versatile soils and Land Use Capability Class 4 1, 2 and 3 land and other Land Use Capability Classes Land Use Capability , or has the potential to be, highly productive having regard to:		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS354.025	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	HortNZ supports the inclusion of LUC 4 in the definition as horticulture occurs on Class 4 land in the Far North District and supports retention of Class 4 land until the RPS identifies highly productive land so that Class 4 HPL is not lost to rural production in the interim.	Disallow	Disallow S167.003	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS566.365	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: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
S527.027	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	HIGHLY PRODUCTIVE LAND	Support in part	We support the PDP's definition of highly productive land which includes versatile soils, LUC Class 4 land and other LUC classes that have the potential to be highly productive having regard to soil type, physical characteristics, climatic conditions and water availability. However, the name could perhaps be changed (throughout the PDP) to 'priority productive land' or 'significant productive capacity' or other phrase to reduce potential confusion with the new NPS-HPL.	Amend the title of the definition to 'priority productive land' or 'significant productive capacity' or other phrase to reduce potential confusion with the new NPS-HPL.		Reject	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS277.49	Jenny Collison		Support	I support Our Kerikeri submission	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS566.1889	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
S243.004	Matauri Trustee Limited	HIGHLY PRODUCTIVE LAND	Oppose	<p>Clause 3.4 of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land 2022 requires regional councils to map as highly productive land any land in its region that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) is in a general rural zone or rural production zone; and b) is predominantly LUC 1, 2, or 3 land; and c) forms a large and geographically cohesive area. 	<p>Amend the definition of Highly Productive Land as follows:</p> <p>means land that is, or has the potential to be, highly productive for farming activities land-based primary production. It includes versatile soils and Land Use Capability Class 4 (inferred strikeout) 1, 2 and 3 land and other Land Use Capability classes Land Use Capability, or has the potential to be, highly productive having regard to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Soil type; b. Physical characteristics; 		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>The proposed definition of Highly Productive Land refers to Land Use Capability Class 4 land which is generally not highly productive land.</p> <p>The definition should apply only to LUC 1, 2, and 3 consistent with the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land 2022. The Section 32 Report on the Rural provisions assess versatile soils as LUC 1, 2, or 3.</p> <p>The definition should similarly be revised to refer only to LUC 1, 2, or 3, in order to most efficiently and effectively achieve related objectives in the plan on protecting "highly productive land" from sterilisation and to enable it to be used for more productive forms of primary production (for example objective RPROZO3. In addition, as drafted the definition is confusing with a stray reference to "Land Use Capability".</p> <p>Furthermore, reference to "land-based primary production" in this definition rather than "farming activities" better gives effect to the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land 2022.</p>	<p>c. Climate conditions; and</p> <p>d. Water availability.</p>			
FS570.562	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: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS566.576	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: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS569.598	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

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
								Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
S529.019	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	HIGHLY PRODUCTIVE LAND	Support in part	Land that is regarded as highly productive (LUC Classes 1,2 and 3) is a strictly finite resource, essential for future food production for a growing population here and worldwide, and important for jobs and economic development. The recently issued National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land requires councils to protect LUC Class 1-3 land from fragmentation and loss (outside of identified urban zones) and allows councils to protect other types of productive land in similar manner.	Retain definition of highly productive land which provides protection for a wider range of productive land, including water availability and other factors.		Reject	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS570.1909	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS566.1923	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS569.1945	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
S529.151	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	HIGHLY PRODUCTIVE LAND	Support	We support the PDP's definition of highly productive land which includes versatile soils, LUC Class 4 land and other LUC classes that have the potential to be highly productive having regard to soil type, physical characteristics, climatic conditions and water availability.	Retain definition of 'Highly Productive land'		Reject	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS570.2039	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS566.2053	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS569.2075	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
S160.005	Manulife Forest Management (NZ) Ltd	HIGHLY PRODUCTIVE LAND	Support in part	The submitter considers that the definition does not provide certainty and is open to interpretation. LUC 1 to 4 should be included in the definition.	Amend the definition of Highly Productive Land as follows: Highly Productive Land means land that is, or has the potential to be, highly productive for farming activities. It includes versatile soils and Land Use Capability Class 1 to 4 land where that land shows regard to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Soil type; 2. Physical characteristics; 3. Climate conditions; and 4. Water availability. 		Reject	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS346.575	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS. Loss of natural character, coastal environment values and the values of outstanding landscapes could also result.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S449.020	Kapiro Conservation Trust	HIGHLY PRODUCTIVE LAND	Support in part	Land that is regarded as highly productive (LUC Classes 1,2 and 3) is a strictly finite resource, essential for future food production for a growing population here and worldwide, and important for jobs and economic development. The recently issued National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land requires councils to protect LUC Class 1-3 land from fragmentation and loss (outside of identified urban zones) and allows councils to protect other types of productive land in similar manner.	Retain definition of highly productive land which provides protection for a wider range of productive land, including water availability and other factors.	Reject	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS569.1819	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Reject	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS570.1836	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Reject	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
S368.029	Far North District Council	HIGHLY PRODUCTIVE LAND	Support in part	Correction: There is a typo within the definition of 'Highly Productive Land'	Amend the definition of 'Highly Productive Land' in line with the intended wording. means land that is, or has the potential to be, highly productive for farming activities. It includes versatile soils, and Land Use Capability Class 4 land. and other Land Use Capability classes of land where land is Land Use Capability , or has the potential to be, highly productive having regard to: a. Soil type; b. Physical characteristics of the land and soil; and c. Climate conditions; and d. Water availability.	Reject	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS354.285	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	The clarification sought in the submission is supported	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
S55.007	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	INTENSIVE INDOOR PRIMARY PRODUCTION	Support	<p>The definitions and associated rule structure for farming activities within the district should clearly define and delineate between intensive and extensive farming activities. At present, only intensive indoor primary production is defined, which means that all other types of farming activity would be captured by the definition of 'farming'.</p> <p>Pig farming which occurs outdoors may produce effects consistent with intensive farming in certain situations or circumstances (such as high stocking rates). This should be recognised in the plan and those activities protected from reverse sensitivity associated with sensitive activities.</p> <p>A definition and rule structure that also accounts for outdoor intensive primary production activities and outdoor extensive primary production activities would give clarity to the plan.</p>	Retain definition of Intensive Indoor Primary Production (as per National Planning Standards) means primary production activities that principally occur within buildings and involve growing fungi or keeping or rearing livestock (excluding calf-rearing for a specified time period) or poultry.		Accept	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
S159.014	Horticulture New Zealand	INTENSIVE INDOOR PRIMARY PRODUCTION	Support	The definition is from the National Planning Standards so supported	Retain definition of 'Intensive indoor primary production'		Accept	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS151.167	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS570.176	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 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS566.190	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 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS569.212	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 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
S55.005	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	INTENSIVE INDOOR PRIMARY PRODUCTION	Support	<p>The definitions and associated rule structure for farming activities within the district should clearly define and delineate between intensive and extensive farming activities. At present, only intensive indoor primary production is defined, which means that all other types of farming activity would be captured by the definition of 'farming'.</p> <p>Pig farming which occurs outdoors may produce effects consistent with intensive farming in certain situations or circumstances (such as high stocking rates). This should be recognised in the plan and those activities protected from reverse sensitivity associated with sensitive activities.</p> <p>A definition and rule structure that also accounts for outdoor intensive primary production activities and outdoor extensive primary production activities would give clarity to the plan.</p>	Retain the definition of Intensive Indoor Primary Production where this is supported by the addition of definitions to cover the typical range of primary production activities that can be deemed intensive or extensive.		Accept	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS548.008	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Support	Federated Farmers agrees with the submitter that farm workers' accommodation has different requirements to those required for minor residential accommodation.	Allow	Grant the relief sought.	Accept	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
S159.018	Horticulture New Zealand	PRIMARY PRODUCTION	Support	Definition aligns with planning standards	Retain definition of 'Primary production'		Accept	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS109.9	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association		Support	The definition is consistent with the NPS	Allow		Accept	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS151.171	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS570.180	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 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS566.194	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 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS569.216	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 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
S182.008	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association	PRIMARY PRODUCTION	Support	Support the definition that is consistent with the NPS definition	Retain the definition of Primary Production		Accept	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS184.51	Richard Milner		Support		Allow		Accept	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
S148.007	Summit Forests New Zealand Limited	PRIMARY PRODUCTION	Support	SFNZ supports the broad definition of Primary Production but as noted in our foregoing submission, the use of the term "forestry activities" is inconsistent with the terms defined in the proposed Plan.	Amend the term "forestry activity" so that it is clear what that term includes; or Amend the definition of Primary Production to read " any aquaculture, agricultural, pastoral, horticultural, mining, quarrying or production forestry activities; and"		Accept in part	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS346.513	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS,	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions 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
				NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS. Loss of natural character, coastal environment values and the values of outstanding landscapes could also result.				Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS566.119	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 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
S160.006	Manulife Forest Management (NZ) Ltd	PRIMARY PRODUCTION	Support in part	The submitter supports in part the definition of Primary Production activities	Amend the definition of Primary Production as follows: Primary Production means: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. any aquaculture, agricultural, pastoral, horticultural, mining, quarrying or plantation forestry activities; and 2. includes initial processing, as an ancillary activity, of commodities that result from the listed activities in a); 3. includes any land and buildings used for the production of the commodities from a) and used for the initial processing of the commodities in b); but 4. excludes further processing of those commodities into a different product. 		Accept in part	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS346.576	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS. Loss of natural character, coastal environment values and the values of	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				outstanding landscapes could also result.				
S159.019	Horticulture New Zealand	RURAL PRODUCE RETAIL	Oppose	The definition seeks to limit rural produce retail to the produce grown or produced on-site. Growers may have several 'sites' as defined in the plan, on which they grow produce. The definition should be linked to the growing operation not the site.	Amend the definition of 'Rural produce retail' as follows: means the sale of rural produce grown or produced on-site by the rural production operation , including products manufactured from that produce.		Accept	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS151.172	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS172.238	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Accept	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS570.181	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 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS566.195	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 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS569.217	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 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
S503.004	Waitangi Limited	RURAL TOURISM ACTIVITY	Not Stated	Inserted the words 'tourism activities within the' rural environment to make it clear that it is the use of the buildings or land specifically for tourism related activities located within the rural environment, which is being covered. This ensures that tourism activities which rely upon natural features or areas and historic items which are not rural in nature but are located within the rural production zone are able to	Amend the definition of 'Rural Tourism Activity' as follows: means the use of land or buildings for people to visit and experience tourism activities within the rural environment. It does not include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rural production retail 2. Rural production manufacturing 3. Visitor accommodation 4. Home business 		Accept	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>utilize this rule. Item 1 Rural production retail.</p> <p>We have assumed that this covers the selling of goods and services generated from nearby production activities as opposed to retail activities directly associated with the tourism activity, i.e. selling souvenirs. If this is not the intent, we seek relief via clarification in this definition that associated tourism retail is covered by the definition of Rural Tourism Activity.</p> <p>The reason for this is that if the site is the only place in which a tourism activity could go based on its natural, historic or cultural significance then the retail activity works in conjunction with the main activity as opposed to generating any additional effects such as traffic and parking. We have sought further relief with the associated rule.</p>	<p>Amend the definition of 'Rural Tourism Activity' to clarify if associated tourism retail is covered by the definition of 'Rural Tourism Activity'.</p>			
<p>FS51.29</p>	<p>Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga</p>		<p>Support in part</p>	<p>The Waitangi Treaty Grounds/Te Pitowhenua is the most symbolically important place in Aotearoa/New Zealand, being identified in 2019 as the first National Historic Landmark/ Ngā Mana whenua o Aotearoa me ōna Kōrero Tūturu in accordance with the HNZPTA.</p> <p>HNZPT's primary submission (409) seeks a planning framework over the Waitangi Treaty Grounds that represents and protects the heritage significance of the place. However, if the decision was to retain the Rural Production zone over the Grounds the addition of this proposed text would provide a degree of certainty for the tourism activities generated by the Treaty Grounds</p>	<p>Allow in part</p>		<p>Accept in part</p>	<p>Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions</p>

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S159.020	Horticulture New Zealand	RURAL TOURISM ACTIVITY	Support in part	The definition refers to rural production retail. It should be consistent with the definition for rural produce retail.	Amend definition of 'Rural tourism activity' as follows: means the use of land or buildings for people to visit and experience the rural environment. It does not include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rural production retail 2. Rural production retail manufacturing 3. Visitor accommodation 4. Home business 		Accept	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS151.173	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS570.182	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 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS566.196	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 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS569.218	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 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
S121.004	Lynley Newport	RURAL TOURISM ACTIVITY	Support in part	I am puzzled as to why the definition of "rural tourism activity" doesn't include visitor accommodation. Aren't visitors tourists?	Amend definition of "rural tourism activity" to include visitor accommodation - delete exclusion 3.		Reject	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS172.208	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
S502.010	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	RURAL TOURISM ACTIVITY	Support in part	Inserted the words 'tourism activities within the' rural environment to make it clear that it is the use of the buildings or land specifically for tourism related activities located within the rural environment, which is being covered.	Amend the definition of 'Rural Tourism Activity' as follows: the use of land or buildings for people to visit and experience the tourism activities within the rural environment. It does not include:		Accept	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>This ensures that tourism activities which rely upon natural features or areas and historic items which are not rural in nature but are located within the rural production zone are able to utilize this rule.</p> <p>Item 1 Rural production retail. We have assumed that this covers the selling of goods and services generated from nearby production activities as opposed to retail activities directly associated with the tourism activity, i.e. selling souvenirs. If this is not the intent, we seek relief via clarification in this definition that associated tourism retail is covered by the definition of Rural Tourism Activity. The reason for this is that if the site is the only place in which a tourism activity could go based on its natural, historic or cultural significance then the retail activity works in conjunction with the main activity as opposed to generating any additional effects such as traffic and parking. We have sought further relief with the associated rule.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rural production retail 2. Rural production manufacturing 3. Visitor accommodation 4. Home business <p>Amend the definition of Rural Tourism Activity to clarify if associated tourism retail is covered by the definition of Rural Tourism Activity.</p>		
FS172.216	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow	Accept	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
S159.024	Horticulture New Zealand	VERSATILE SOILS	Support in part	Aligns with definition in the RPS however needs to be updated to reflect highly productive land definition in National Policy Statement Highly Productive Land	Amend definition of 'Versatile soils' to reflect National Policy Statement Highly Productive Land	Accept	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS151.178	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow	Accept	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS570.186	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 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS566.200	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 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS569.222	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 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
S554.006	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited	VERSATILE SOILS	Oppose	While it is acknowledged that this definition is the same as the definition within the Northland Regional Plan, "Versatile Land" is not defined within the NPS-HPL, and it raises confusion in the application of the NPS-HPL in the Far North. "Highly Productive Land" should be the only definition used within the PDP regarding soils to ensure the NPS-HPL can be applied consistently across the District.	Delete the definition of Versatile Soils		Accept	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS172.343	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons stated in this primary submission.	Allow		Accept	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS32.009	Jeff Kemp		Support in part	The submitter supports the overall intent and purpose of the original submission as it is the only viable and practical option to enable planned and coordinated development in and around Kerikeri and the Waipapa area. The submitter notes that the documentation on proposed traffic movements is unclear. The original submission has not provided details on potential traffic movements and intersections for Waitotara Dive and Waipapa Road and how these might link to State Highway 10. For example, it is unclear if the new link from State	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to consideration of traffic movements, flood mitigation measures and amending the zoning as depicted in the original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>Highway 10 through to the Kerikeri Town Centre is going to be a primary route and the link through to Waipapa Road a secondary route.</p> <p>The submitter notes it is unclear if the proposed flood mitigation measures will increase or reduce flooding along Waitotara Drive. The submitter also supports the proposed zoning as depicted within the original submission is an efficient use of land.</p>				
FS47.005	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS569.029	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	We oppose the proposed amendments to the PDP definitions relating to productive land	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS389.012	Smartlife Trust		Oppose	All of submission S554 in relation to the proposed Structure Plan for the landholding. In particular, the documents / plans which refer to a future access point through the Further Submitters land	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
S55.009	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	New Definition	Oppose	<p>The definitions and associated rule structure for farming activities within the district should clearly define and delineate between intensive and extensive farming activities. At present, only intensive indoor primary production is defined, which means that all other types of farming activity would be captured by the definition of 'farming'.</p> <p>Pig farming which occurs outdoors may produce effects consistent with intensive farming in certain situations or circumstances (such as high stocking rates). This should be recognised in the plan and those</p>	<p>Insert new definition: Extensive pig farming means the keeping of pigs outdoors on land at a stock density which ensures permanent vegetation cover is maintained and in accordance with any relevant industry codes of practice, and where no fixed buildings are used for the continuous housing of animals.</p>		Reject	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>activities protected from reverse sensitivity associated with sensitive activities.</p> <p>A definition and rule structure that also accounts for outdoor intensive primary production activities and outdoor extensive primary production activities would give clarity to the plan.</p>			
S55.006	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	New Definition	Oppose	<p>The definitions and associated rule structure for farming activities within the district should clearly define and delineate between intensive and extensive farming activities. At present, only intensive indoor primary production is defined, which means that all other types of farming activity would be captured by the definition of 'farming'.</p> <p>Pig farming which occurs outdoors may produce effects consistent with intensive farming in certain situations or circumstances (such as high stocking rates). This should be recognised in the plan and those activities protected from reverse sensitivity associated with sensitive activities.</p> <p>A definition and rule structure that also accounts for outdoor intensive primary production activities and outdoor extensive primary production activities would give clarity to the plan.</p>	<p>Insert new definition:</p> <p>Intensive Primary Production means any activity defined as intensive indoor primary production or intensive outdoor primary production.</p>	Reject	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
S55.008	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	New Definition	Oppose	<p>The definitions and associated rule structure for farming activities within the district should clearly define and delineate between intensive and extensive farming activities. At present, only intensive indoor primary production is defined, which means that all other types of farming activity</p>	<p>Insert new definition:</p> <p>Intensive Outdoor Primary Production means primary production activities involving the keeping or rearing of livestock, or commercial aquaculture, where the regular feed source for the production of goods is substantially provided other than from the site concerned. The activity</p>	Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				would be captured by the definition of 'farming'. Pig farming which occurs outdoors may produce effects consistent with intensive farming in certain situations or circumstances (such as high stocking rates). This should be recognised in the plan and those activities protected from reverse sensitivity associated with sensitive activities. A definition and rule structure that also accounts for outdoor intensive primary production activities and outdoor extensive primary production activities would give clarity to the plan.	may be undertaken entirely outdoors or in a combination of indoors and outdoors, including within an outdoor enclosure. It includes: 1. free-range poultry or game bird farming and 2. aquaculture. It excludes the following: 1. woolsheds; 2. dairy sheds; 3. calf pens or wintering accommodation for stock; 4. pig production for domestic use which involves no more than 25 weaned pigs or six sows. 5. Extensive pig farming.		
S182.007	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association	New Definition	Not Stated	Seek a new definition of Improved Pasture as defined in the NPSFM 2020 to clarify rules relating to the clearance of native vegetation	Insert a new definition for 'Improved Pasture': Improved Pasture means an area of land where exotic pasture species have been deliberately sown or maintained for the purpose of pasture production, and species composition and growth has been modified and is being managed for livestock grazing.	Reject	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
S159.003	Horticulture New Zealand	New Definition	Not Stated	A definition for 'Agricultural aviation movements' would provide clarity within the plan - seeks to clearly provide for this activity as a permitted activity in rural zones due to its intermittent nature.	Insert a definition of 'agricultural aviation movements': Agricultural aviation movements mean intermittent aircraft and helicopter movements for purposes ancillary to primary production activities, including topdressing, spraying, stock management, fertiliser application, and frost mitigation, and associated refuelling.	Reject	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS109.2	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association		Support in part	NZAAA supports the intent of the submitter but prefers the specific definition in NZAAA's own submission,	Allow in part	Reject	Section 5.2.5

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				and S143.001. NZAAA supports the addition of "Frost Mitigation activities" to the NZAAA definition				Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS151.153	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS151.154	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS196.8	Joe Carr		Support	Provides for the sustainable use of land	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS184.7	Richard Milner		Support	Fully support	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS184.44	Richard Milner		Support		Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS548.037	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Support	It is appropriate that there is a definition for agricultural aviation movements in the Proposed District Plan.	Allow	Grant the relief sought.	Reject	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS570.165	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: Definitions
FS566.179	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: Definitions
FS569.201	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: Definitions
S159.002	Horticulture New Zealand	New Definition	Not Stated	Seasonal worker accommodation is distinct from visitor accommodation.	Insert a definition of 'seasonal worker accommodation':		Accept	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
					Seasonal worker accommodation means the use of land and buildings for the sole purpose of accommodating the short-term labour requirement of a farming activity, rural industry or post-harvest facility.			Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS151.152	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS548.036	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Support	The submitter is right when they state that seasonal workers accommodation is different to visitors' accommodation.	Allow	Grant the relief sought.	Accept	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS570.164	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 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS566.178	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 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS569.200	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 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
S159.004	Horticulture New Zealand	New Definition	Not Stated	Seeks to ensure that crop protection structures are not inadvertently covered by inappropriate effects standards, where there is a risk that they may be considered 'buildings' (due to inconsistency in interpretation). A way of addressing this is to provide a clear framework through a definition and specific standard or rule for the rural zone.	Insert a definition of 'crop protection structures'" Crop support structure means an open structure on which plants are grown.		Accept	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: RPROZ Rules – General Comments
FS151.155	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
								Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: RPROZ Rules – General Comments
FS354.038	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	The summary states: Insert a definition of 'crop protection structures' as follows: Crop support structure means an open structure on which plants are grown. The new definition sought is for 'crop support structures' which are different to artificial crop protection structures. There should be clarity between the two terms.	Allow	Allow S159.004 in part and insert a definition of 'crop support structures' as follows: Crop support structure means an open structure on which plants are grown	Accept	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: RPROZ Rules – General Comments
FS570.166	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 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: RPROZ Rules – General Comments
FS566.180	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 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: RPROZ Rules – General Comments
FS569.202	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 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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 14: RPROZ Rules – General Comments
S159.005	Horticulture New Zealand	New Definition	Not Stated	A definition should be included for greenhouses as it is used in the definition of artificial crop protection structures. To support diversification to alternative growing methods.	Insert a definition of 'greenhouses': Greenhouses means a structure enclosed by glass or other transparent material and used for the cultivation or protection of plants in a controlled environment but excludes artificial crop protection structures		Accept	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS151.156	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS570.167	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 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS566.181	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 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS569.203	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 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
S182.010	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association	New Definition	Not Stated	Seek a new definition of Rural Airstrip in the Plan	Insert a new definition for 'rural airstrip': Rural Airstrip means any defined area of land intended or designed to be used, whether wholly or partly, for the landing, departure, movement, or servicing or aircraft in the rural area.		Accept	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS184.43	Richard Milner		Support		Allow		Accept	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
S421.007	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	New Definition	Support	Federated Farmers supports the inclusion of a definition for land-based primary production. The National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land came into force on 12 October 2022	Insert a definition for 'Land-based primary production', as defined in the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land 2022		Reject	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>and contains an appropriate definition for land-based primary production that can be used.</p> <p>The District Plan contains a definition for primary production which includes non-land-based activities as well as the initial processing of goods. The definition is not easy to understand or to work out what it is covered and what is not.</p> <p>Given that there is now national direction on how to address highly productive soils, it would be appropriate to use the definitions in the national policy statement to achieve consistency in the district plan.</p>				
FS349.004	Northland Regional Council		Support	It is appropriate for the definition of Highly Productive Land within the Proposed Plan is consistent with the NPS-HPL	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS354.041	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	The definition of land-based primary production is in the NPS-HPL and it is relevant to include in the district plan.	Allow	Allow S421.007	Reject	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS570.1239	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: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS346.241	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS566.1253	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

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
								Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS569.1275	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: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
S55.004	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	New Definition	Not Stated	<p>The requirements of farm worker accommodation can differ from those provided for as a minor residential unit. Many farms providing accommodation do so for the worker and their family. A 65m2 is not enough to comfortably accommodate a family.</p> <p>The location of the farm worker accommodation will need to respond to the activity of the site and cannot be constrained to the 15m maximum separation distance between the minor residential unit and the principal residential unit proposed for minor residential units in RPOZ-R19. Include a definition, policy and rule structure for farm worker accommodation.</p>	<p>Insert new definition as follows:</p> <p>Farm Workers' accommodation Means a minor residential unit for people whose duties require them to live on-site, and in the rural zones for people who work on the site or in the surrounding rural area. Includes farm managers, workers and staff.</p>		Reject	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS534.005	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited		Support	<p>As indicated by WBFL's original submission point no. S463.096 on RPROZ-R3, WBFL agrees that the development of a framework for staff accommodation activities in rural zones (and potentially, in industrial and in special purpose zones) would be beneficial. The notified framework is somewhat unwieldy in relation to these activities.</p> <p>Rule RPROZ-R3 (Residential activities) is a poor fit for worker accommodation. The density limit of RPROZ-R3(PER-1) is obviously targeted at restricting ad-hoc rural lifestyle-type subdivision around rural dwellings and if PER-1 is</p>	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				not met, a discretionary status applies under RPROZ-R3(DIS-1). The rules for "minor residential units" are an uncomfortable fit for worker accommodation in the RPROZ. The requirements of RPROZ-R19 appear to be target towards a unit for a family member (unit GFA of 15 m between the minor and principal residential units. This is not adequate for staff accommodation.				
S91.001	PF Olsen Limited	New Definition	Not Stated	There is no definition for "forestry activities" that are not plantation forestry activities. Plantation forestry and plantation forestry activities are well defined in the draft plan (in accordance with the National Environmental Standards for Plantation Forestry), however other forestry activities are not (i.e. permanent or carbon forestry).	Insert new definition for "permanent exotic forestry/carbon farming"		Accept in part	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS566.090	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 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S69.002	Robyn Josephine Baker	SUB-S1	Oppose	A minimum allotment of 8Ha is not practicable. This size is too large for most people wishing to have a lifestyle block. The constant effort / time / expense of keeping the area clear of noxious vegetation and predators is not viable for a small landholder. Economically and socially the Far North needs to be able to attract more residents, being able to offer more lifestyle blocks for those people interested in pursuing a more self-sufficient lifestyle, would be a good way of increasing our population. People from the main population centres in NZ that want to get away	Amend SUB-S1 to provide for smaller allotment sizes where the land does not contain highly productive land.		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>from the cramped 'chicken coop' living environment.</p> <p>Land owners should be entitled to further develop their land as they see fit, if it is otherwise unproductive.</p>			
S257.010	Te Hiku Community Board	SUB-S1	Oppose	We do not support the large title sizes in the rural zone. We submit that subdivision should allow lots to 4ha or smaller, and that the subdivision of smaller lots around existing houses be provided for.	Amend standard SUB-S1 in relation to the Rural Production Zone, to generally allow lots of 4ha, and allow lots less than 4ha around existing houses.	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
S427.015	Kapiro Residents Association	SUB-S1	Oppose	Land fragmentation is a significant problem - we seek strong policies/rules specifically to prevent/avoid fragmentation of land in the horticulture zone, all rural zones and coastal areas.	Amend subdivision provisions that specify minimum lot sizes for all rural zones for a breach of these minimum sizes should be a non-complying activity [inferred].	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
S386.018	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew	SUB-S1	Support in part	While Ballantyne & Agnew recognise the importance and purpose of the RPROZ, particularly the need to protect highly versatile soils, manage the fragmentation of land for productive purposes, and avoid reverse sensitivity effects arising, it is considered that all of these matters can be achieved at lot sizes smaller than 40ha. At a minimum, FNDC should consider alignment neighbouring Council's (i.e. the Whangārei District Plan RPROZ provisions) to achieve region wide consistency under the RPS. Finally, with respect to the RLZ, it is unclear why the proposed minimum lot size for controlled activity subdivision has been selected. 4ha controlled activity subdivision is inconsistent with the residential density control provided in the RLZ Chapter. It is common practice to align these controls to provide consistent outcomes across land use and subdivision controls.	<p>Review and amend minimum lot sizes, in particular the provision of a 20ha minimum lot size in the RPROZ as a controlled activity, to ensure regional consistency.</p> <p>Amend the minimum lot size of the RLZ to align with the residential intensity control of the RLZ Chapter.</p>	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1 <i>Note: This submission point is duplicated in Appendix 2 of other relevant rural section 42A reports with respect to SUB-S1 amendments for those rural zones.</i>

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S310.004	Lianne Kennedy	SUB-S1	Oppose	The increased minimum lot size appears to be double the previous size. I believe this is an unreasonable size increase. This no longer allows owners to retire in their existing homes with a smaller area of land and reduces the ability for rural landowners to provide small blocks for family members to build on and enter the property market.	Amend standard SUB-S1 to retain the previous rules for the Rural Production Zone identified under Table 13.7.2.1 Minimum Lot Sizes (i) Rural Production Zone.		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS297.2	Wilson Hookway		Support	Retain the ODP minimum allotment sizes and do not increase the discretionary activity standard in the Rural Production zone to 8 hectares. The smaller lot sizes gives flexibility to land owners to meet needs of the land and also of families in the midst of a housing crisis especially prevalent in the far north district	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS100.27	Allen Hookway		Support	The smaller lot sizes gives flexibility to land owners to meet needs of the land and also of families in the midst of a housing crisis especially prevalent in the far north district	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS172.283	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS293.2	Danielle Hookway		Support	Retain the ODP minimum allotment sizes and do not increase the discretionary activity standard in the Rural Production zone to 8 hectares. The smaller lot sizes gives flexibility to land owners to meet needs of the land and also of families in the midst of a housing crisis especially prevalent in the far north district	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS257.2	Amber Hookway		Support	Retain the ODP minimum allotment sizes and do not increase the discretionary activity standard in the Rural Production zone to 8 hectares.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				The smaller lot sizes gives flexibility to land owners to meet needs of the land and also of families in the midst of a housing crisis especially prevalent in the far north district				
FS256.25	Lianne Kennedy		Support	The smaller lot sizes gives flexibility to land owners to meet needs of the land and also of families in the midst of a housing crisis especially prevalent in the far north district	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS350.045	Puketona Lodge Ltd		Support	The reasons given in the primary submission of the submitter. The increased minimum lot size appears to be double the previous size. I believe this is an unreasonable size increase. This no longer allows owners to retire in their existing homes with a smaller area of land and reduces the ability for rural landowners to provide small blocks for family members to build on and enter the property market.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS405.057	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support in part	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the requested amendment in relation to reducing the controlled activity minimum allotment size in the Rural Production Zone, although notes that the original submission seeks consideration of regional consistency with neighbouring Council's for minimum lot sizes.	Allow in part	Allow in part the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS368.071	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Amend to reinstate the Operative District Plan rule for minimum lot size on the Rural Production Zone (Table 13.7.2.1), with 20 ha minimum lot size as a controlled activity.	Allow	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS441.040	Adrian and Sue Knight		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission	Allow	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS361.049	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support in part	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the requested amendment in relation to reducing the controlled activity minimum allotment size in the Rural Production Zone, although notes that the original submission seeks consideration of regional consistency with neighbouring Council's for minimum lot sizes.	Allow in part	Allow in part the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS570.903	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 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS566.917	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 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS569.939	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 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
S261.004	Amber Hookway	SUB-S1	Oppose	The increased lot size for Rural Production Zone appears to be double the previous size. I believe this is an unreasonable size increase. This no longer allows owners to retire in their existing homes with a smaller area of land and reduces the ability for rural landowners to provide small blocks for family members to build on and enter the property market	Amend to reinstate the Operative District Plan rule for minimum lot size on the Rural Production Zone (Table 13.7.2.1), with 20 ha minimum lot size as a controlled activity.		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS297.19	Wilson Hookway		Support	Retain the ODP minimum allotment sizes and do not increase the discretionary activity standard in the Rural Production zone to 8 hectares. The smaller lot sizes gives flexibility to land owners to meet needs of the land and also of families in the midst of a housing crisis especially prevalent in the far north district	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS44.20	Northland Planning & Development 2020 Ltd		Support	Smaller lot sizes should be provided for within the Rural Production zone. This enables small scale lifestyle development for people who want to retire and remove the family house from the farm or take off an area which is not productive on the main farming unit.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS100.23	Allen Hookway		Support	The smaller lot sizes gives flexibility to land owners to meet needs of the land and also of families in the midst of a housing crisis especially prevalent in the far north district	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS293.19	Danielle Hookway		Support	Retain the ODP minimum allotment sizes and do not increase the discretionary activity standard in the Rural Production zone to 8 hectares. The smaller lot sizes gives flexibility to land owners to meet needs of the land and also of families in the midst of a housing crisis especially prevalent in the far north district	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS257.19	Amber Hookway		Support	Retain the ODP minimum allotment sizes and do not increase the discretionary activity standard in the Rural Production zone to 8 hectares. The smaller lot sizes gives flexibility to land owners to meet needs of the land and also of families in the midst of a housing crisis especially prevalent in the far north district	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS256.21	Lianne Kennedy		Support	The smaller lot sizes gives flexibility to land owners to meet needs of the land and also of families in the midst of a housing crisis especially prevalent in the far north district	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS405.053	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support in part	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the requested amendment to SUB-S1 to change the minimum allotment size. It notes in their original submission, the	Allow in part	Allow in part the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				provision of a 20ha minimum lot size in the RPROZ as a controlled activity is sought.				
FS368.068	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Amend to reinstate the Operative District Plan rule for minimum lot size on the Rural Production Zone (Table 13.7.2.1), with 20 ha minimum lot size as a controlled activity	Allow	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS361.045	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support in part	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the requested amendment to SUB-S1 to change the minimum allotment size. It notes in their original submission the provision of a 20ha minimum lot size in the RPROZ as a controlled activity is sought.	Allow in part	Allow in part the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
S309.004	Danielle Hookway	SUB-S1	Oppose	The increased minimum lot size appears to be double the previous size. I believe this is an unreasonable size increase. This no longer allows owners to retire in their existing homes with a smaller area of land and reduces the ability for rural landowners to provide small blocks for family members to build on and enter the property market.	Amend standard SUB-S1 to retain the previous rules for the Rural Production Zone identified under Table 13.7.2.1 Minimum Lot Sizes (i) Rural Production Zone.		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS297.22	Wilson Hookway		Support	Retain the ODP minimum allotment sizes and do not increase the discretionary activity standard in the Rural Production zone to 8 hectares. The smaller lot sizes gives flexibility to land owners to meet needs of the land and also of families in the midst of a housing crisis especially prevalent in the far north district	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS100.25	Allen Hookway		Support	The smaller lot sizes gives flexibility to land owners to meet needs of the land and also of families in the midst of a housing crisis especially prevalent in the far north district	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS293.21	Danielle Hookway		Support	Retain the ODP minimum allotment sizes and do not increase the discretionary activity standard in the Rural Production zone to 8 hectares. The smaller lot sizes gives flexibility to land owners to meet needs of the land and also of families in the midst of a housing crisis especially prevalent in the far north district	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS257.21	Amber Hookway		Support	Retain the ODP minimum allotment sizes and do not increase the discretionary activity standard in the Rural Production zone to 8 hectares. The smaller lot sizes gives flexibility to land owners to meet needs of the land and also of families in the midst of a housing crisis especially prevalent in the far north district	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS256.23	Lianne Kennedy		Support	The smaller lot sizes gives flexibility to land owners to meet needs of the land and also of families in the midst of a housing crisis especially prevalent in the far north district	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS405.056	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support in part	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the requested amendment in relation to reducing the controlled activity minimum allotment size in the Rural Production Zone, although notes that the original submission seeks consideration of regional consistency with neighbouring Council's for minimum lot sizes.	Disallow in part	Allow in part the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS368.070	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Amend to reinstate the Operative District Plan rule for minimum lot size on the Rural Production Zone (Table 13.7.2.1), with 20 ha minimum lot size as a controlled activity	Allow	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS361.048	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support in part	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the requested amendment in relation to reducing the controlled activity minimum allotment size in the Rural Production Zone, although notes that the original submission seeks consideration of regional consistency with neighbouring Council's for minimum lot sizes.	Allow in part	Allow in part the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
S311.004	Allen Hookway	SUB-S1	Oppose	The increased minimum lot size appears to be double the previous size. I believe this is an unreasonable size increase. This no longer allows owners to retire in their existing homes with a smaller area of land and reduces the ability for rural landowners to provide small blocks for family members to build on and enter the property market.	Amend standard SUB-S1 to retain the previous rules for the Rural Production Zone identified under Table 13.7.2.1 Minimum Lot Sizes (i) Rural Production Zone.		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS297.23	Wilson Hookway		Support	Retain the ODP minimum allotment sizes and do not increase the discretionary activity standard in the Rural Production zone to 8 hectares. The smaller lot sizes gives flexibility to land owners to meet needs of the land and also of families in the midst of a housing crisis especially prevalent in the far north district	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS100.26	Allen Hookway		Support	The smaller lot sizes gives flexibility to land owners to meet needs of the land and also of families in the midst of a housing crisis especially prevalent in the far north district	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS172.285	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS293.22	Danielle Hookway		Support	Retain the ODP minimum allotment sizes and do not increase the discretionary activity standard in the Rural Production zone to 8 hectares.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				The smaller lot sizes gives flexibility to land owners to meet needs of the land and also of families in the midst of a housing crisis especially prevalent in the far north district				
FS257.22	Amber Hookway		Support	Retain the ODP minimum allotment sizes and do not increase the discretionary activity standard in the Rural Production zone to 8 hectares. The smaller lot sizes gives flexibility to land owners to meet needs of the land and also of families in the midst of a housing crisis especially prevalent in the far north district	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS256.24	Lianne Kennedy		Support	The smaller lot sizes gives flexibility to land owners to meet needs of the land and also of families in the midst of a housing crisis especially prevalent in the far north district	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS405.058	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support in part	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the requested amendment in relation to reducing the controlled activity minimum allotment size in the Rural Production Zone, although notes that the original submission seeks consideration of regional consistency with neighbouring Council's for minimum lot sizes.	Allow in part	Allow in part the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS368.072	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Amend to reinstate the Operative District Plan rule for minimum lot size on the Rural Production Zone (Table 13.7.2.1), with 20 ha minimum lot size as a controlled activity	Allow	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS361.050	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support in part	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the requested amendment in relation to reducing the controlled activity minimum allotment size in the Rural Production Zone, although notes that the original submission seeks consideration of regional consistency	Allow in part	Allow in part the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				with neighbouring Council's for minimum lot sizes.				
S421.177	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	SUB-S1	Support in part	<p>Federated Farmers supports rule SUB-R3 in general but does support the proposed 40ha rural production-controlled standard in SUB-S1.</p> <p>The 40ha requirement is overtly limiting and would require farmers to sacrifice more productive land for subdivision. This will leave less productive farmland on the working farm and more productive land on a smaller lifestyle property.</p> <p>We seek that the 40ha requirement in SUB-S1 is amended to the existing 20ha. This will ensure that landowners have suitable options available to react to economic, environmental and farm succession changes as required.</p>	Amend the minimum allotment size threshold for land zoned Rural Production in Standard SUB-S1 (inferred), decreasing it from 40ha to 20ha		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS24.25	Lynley Newport		Support	Support reducing 40ha to 20ha	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS172.313	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons stated in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS196.145	Joe Carr		Support	Tautoko	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS350.047	Puketona Lodge Ltd		Support	<p>The reasons given in the primary submission of the submitter.</p> <p>Federated Farmers supports rule SUB-R3 in general but does support the proposed 40ha rural production-controlled standard in SUB-S1. The 40ha requirement is overtly limiting and would require farmers to sacrifice more productive land for subdivision. This will leave less productive farmland on</p>	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				the working farm and more productive land on a smaller lifestyle property. We seek that the 40ha requirement in SUB-S1 is amended to the existing 20ha. This will ensure that landowners have suitable options available to react to economic, environmental and farm succession changes as required.				
FS405.055	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the requested amendment, as the 40ha allotment size proposed for the RPROZ is considered to be overly conservative.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS441.042	Adrian and Sue Knight		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS361.047	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the requested amendment, as the 40ha allotment size proposed for the RPROZ is considered to be overly conservative.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS570.1409	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 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS346.411	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS566.1423	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 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS569.1445	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 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S17.001	Jeanette Mcglashan	SUB-S1	Oppose	<p>Rural production can still be achieved in land holdings smaller than 8 ha. Do not disadvantage existing land holders and rate payers. The smaller lot sizes give flexibility to land owners to meet needs of the land and also of families in the midst of a housing crisis especially prevalent in the far north district.</p> <p>Submitter has a small block of land zoned rural production of 16ha in size. The new rules do not provide any flexibility to be able to subdivide this in future if so desired, other than halving the size of the land, this has a direct impact on the value of this investment and submitters ability to create allotment sizes that will benefit more people if desired while still holding the character of the land with smaller lots that can still be utilised for rural production.</p>	Amend the minimum allotment sizes for Rural Production Zone, to allow smaller lot sizes. Seeks that existing (Operative District Plan) allotment sizes for the Rural Production Zone are reinstated (inferred).	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS44.8	Northland Planning & Development 2020 Ltd		Support in part	<p>We support that the lot size as a discretionary activity should be reduced to allow for a lot smaller than 8ha. We have proposed a 4ha allotment as a Discretionary Activity and 8ha as a Restricted Discretionary Activity, to enable less productive land to be utilised for activities such as lifestyle development with small scale subsistence living.</p> <p>This enables small scale lifestyle development for people who want to retire and remove the family house from the farm or take off an area which is not productive on the main farming unit.</p>	Allow in part	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS24.58	Lynley Newport		Support	Agree rural production can occur on smaller holdings also, council needs to acknowledge that not all rural land is	Allow	Reject	Section 5.2.30

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				highly productive, so smaller lot sizes are sustainable and NOT detrimental to rural productivity.				Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS566.004	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 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS368.132	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Rural production can still be achieved in land holdings smaller than 8 ha. Do not disadvantage existing land holders and rate payers. The smaller lot sizes give flexibility to land owners to meet needs of the land and also of families in the midst of a housing crisis especially prevalent in the far north district...	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS587.001	Peter Malcolm		Support	The submitter considers the minimum lot sizes for the Rural Production zone are too large and / or restrictive. Some flexibility is required for those wanting to convert their land into lifestyle blocks or smaller independent blocks rather than having to sell larger parcels of productive land and move from the district. The relief sought could help generate greater investment and enhanced rural productivity.	Allow	Retain operative Rule 13.7.2.1(i) minimum lot size 20ha as a controlled activity and provide for a limited number of minimum lot size 4ha as a discretionary activity for Rural Production Zone. Amend the Subdivision Chapter to insert a cluster option for larger blocks which enables 4 x 10,000m ² per initial parent lot with the balance parcel containing a minimum area (i.e., 40ha). Amend Subdivision Chapter to enable boundary adjustments between existing titles in rural zones as a permitted activity and require the minimum area for the smaller parcel to be 1ha (inferred).	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
S47.001	Paul O'Connor	SUB-S1	Oppose	The new subdivision rules requiring a minimum lot size of 8ha (without a management plan) will severely restrict	Amend Rural Production lot sizes to Allow lot size of 8000sqm for a number of lots then 4ha generally after that.		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				the ability to create small rural lots in the rural production zone. Effects of this restriction include: no longer allowing farmers to retire in existing home creation of 8ha blocks too large for lifestyle, too small to be productive reduce capacity to reduce dept				
FS44.13	Northland Planning & Development 2020 Ltd		Support in part	Smaller lot sizes should be provided for within the Rural Production zone. This enables small scale lifestyle development for people who want to retire and remove the family house from the farm or take off an area which is not productive on the main farming unit.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS45.6	Tristan Simpkin		Support in part	Support this submission in part. The min. Lot size to be made available for further subdivision should be 5ha - as anything less than this is not economically viable as rural production. Kaipara have a very similar rule which works well called 'Small Lot Development' - I suggest FNDC research duplicate this. There will always be a need for smaller Lots in the Rural Production area, and doing an arbitrary 8ha minimum Lot size is stifling this demand.	Allow in part		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS172.228	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS548.003	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Support	Federated Farmers supports the relief sought. The issues raised by the submitter are major issues faced by our farming members and heavily influence how they operate their farms.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
S77.001	Strand Homes Ltd/Okahu	SUB-S1	Oppose	The new subdivision rules, requiring a minimum lot size of 8ha (without a	Amend allotment sizes for properties (or parts thereof) that do not consist of highly productive		Reject	Section 5.2.30

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
	Developments Ltd			<p>Management Plan) will severely restrict the ability to create small rural lots in the rural production zone.</p> <p>The reason given for this rule is to protect the productive potential of the rural area, in particular, highly productive land. However, the majority of land in the Far North District does not come under this category, and the PDP does not distinguish between highly productive land and less productive land when it comes to subdivision.</p> <p>With Council struggling to provide urban amenities (sewerage, water supply and stormwater) and people wanting to live independent of these services in the rural areas without too much land to care for, it makes sense to allow small rural blocks.</p>	<p>land. Reconsider allotment sizes, perhaps with a limited number of allotments of a minimum of 8000sqm or 1ha, then 4ha generally after that.</p> <p>Consequential amendments to RPROZ-R3 Residential activity and SUB-R7 Management plan subdivision.</p>			Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS44.15	Northland Planning & Development 2020 Ltd		Support	Provision should be made for smaller allotments which do not boast productive potential.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS368.049	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	<p>Amend allotment sizes in the Rural Production zone, perhaps with a limited number of allotments with minimum areas of 8000m² or 1ha, then 4ha generally after that. Smaller lot sizes should apply for properties (or parts thereof) that do not consist of highly productive land.</p> <p>Consequential amendments to RPROZ-R3 Residential activity and SUB-R7 Management plan subdivision</p>	Allow	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS587.009	Peter Malcolm		Support	The submitter considers the minimum lot sizes for the Rural Production zone are too large and / or restrictive. Some flexibility is required for those wanting to convert their land into lifestyle blocks or smaller independent blocks rather	Allow in part	Retain operative Rule 13.7.2.1(i) minimum lot size 20ha as a controlled activity and provide for a limited number of minimum lot size 4ha as a discretionary activity for	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>than having to sell larger parcels of productive land and move from the district. The relief sought could help generate greater investment and enhanced rural productivity.</p>	<p>Rural Production Zone. Amend the Subdivision Chapter to insert a cluster option for larger blocks which enables 4 x 10,000m2 per initial parent lot with the balance parcel containing a minimum area (i.e., 40ha). Amend Subdivision Chapter to enable boundary adjustments between existing titles in rural zones as a permitted activity and require the minimum area for the smaller parcel to be 1ha (inferred).</p>		
S43.001	Andrea Vicki Thomas	SUB-S1	Oppose	<p>Submitter opposes the new subdivision rules requiring a minimum lot size of 8 ha as a discretionary activity in the Rural Production zone, without a management plan. This will restrict the ability to create small rural lots.</p> <p>These blocks are too large for lifestyle blocks and too small to be productive so that a living could be had. This will also no longer allow rural landowners to provide small blocks for young families to build on and enter the property market. Subdividing off 8ha will diminish the productive capacity of a farm more than a smaller block.</p> <p>With Council struggling to provide urban stormwater, sewerage and water supply and people wanting to live independent of these services it makes sense to allow smaller blocks. In our area in Doubtless Bay we are already in overload and Council is not coping. It is fine to protect rural productive potential. This can still be achieved without imposing a total restriction on rural lifestyle properties.</p>	Retain current minimum lot size of 4ha as a discretionary activity in the Rural Production zone.	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS44.17	Northland Planning & Development 2020 Ltd		Support	Agree that 4ha lots as a discretionary activity should be provided for within the rural production zone. This enables small scale lifestyle development for people who want to retire and remove the family house from the farm or take off an area which is not productive on the main farming unit.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS368.065	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Retain current minimum lot size of 4ha as a discretionary activity in the Rural Production zone	Allow	Retain	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
S112.001	Lynley Newport	SUB-S1	Oppose	<p>I am generally not opposed to removing restricted discretionary minimum lot size provisions, EXCEPT for the Rural Production Zone. This zoning has been applied to large portion of the district. The rural nature of the district and the fact that rural and horticultural production accounts a large chunk of the district's economic activity and forms a major part of the district's community, suggests that Council should be spending more time and effort listening to that rural community.</p> <p>The Council has imposed punitive and restrictive rules to the zone, apparently regardless of a property's productive capacity or existing lot sizes and land use patterns, seemingly not caring that such restrictions are likely to render many marginal productive units uneconomic to continue productive use on because of an inability for the property owner to diversify or reduce debt burden. Where a zone covers such a wide area and exhibits such a wide range of physical characteristics and lot sizes, a one size fits all approach is not supportable or sustainable for the rural community.</p>	<p>Amend SUB-S1, minimum lot sizes applying to the Rural Production Zone to:</p> <p>Controlled Activity: 40ha;</p> <p>Restricted Discretionary Activity: 12ha; OR up to 3 lots of between 4,000m2 and 8,000m2 over the period of the life of the District Plan, provided {a) there is a remaining balance of 12ha; {b) the total area of the three lots does not exceed 2ha;</p> <p>Discretionary Activity: 4ha.</p>		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>Restricting subdivision options across the entire zone will likely have serious negative impact on the rural community:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The subdivision regime being proposed will prevent the ability for farmers to retire in their existing homes with a small area of land; • Will prevent farmers and their families from creating small blocks for younger family members to build on and enter the property market; • Reduce the ability of farmers to decrease debt burden; • Discourage diversification. This is a zone that has scope to have more options available, whilst not negatively impacting on overall productive capacity. <p>There are options for subdivision that should and can be available whilst still being consistent with central government requirements to protect highly versatile soils for productive use. There needs to be more options than currently being proposed, designed to enable more case by case assessment of the suitability of the land for subdivision to the minimum lot size specified, e.g. there is very little negative impact on overall productivity of a property if 2 or 3 small lots (4,000-5,000m² lots) are subdivided off, especially if around existing homes and on land not considered highly productive or on highly versatile soils.</p> <p>I also doubt the logic for applying an 8ha minimum size for discretionary</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>activity lots. This area seems too small to be a standalone productive unit, yet far too large to be managed for lifestyle /boutique farming.</p> <p>I have submitted elsewhere that there is land in the Rural Production Zone that is likely more appropriately zoned Rural Lifestyle Zone. The latter should be applied in more areas, especially where there are enclaves of rural land already in blocks of less than 8ha.</p> <p>If the Council has concerns about introducing the multiple small lot option as a restricted discretionary activity, then it could be introduced as a discretionary activity option.</p> <p>The key should be in the matters to be considered when assessing the land's suitability - location, physical attributes.</p>				
FS44.18	Northland Planning & Development 2020 Ltd		Support	<p>Agree that the matters which should be considered when assessing the land suitability for subdivision should be based upon location, physical attributes, reverse sensitivity effects etc. 8ha is too small for a standalone unit but too big to be utilised for lifestyle use - 4ha is more appropriate in this instance.</p> <p>Agree that smaller lots created around existing dwellings or on land, which is not productive land, will have little to nil effect on the productive capacity of the larger farming unit and therefore, provision should be made for this. 20ha as a controlled activity.</p>	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS172.195	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS196.65	Joe Carr		Support	The one size fits all would have a lot of unintended consequences.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS397.002	IDF Developments Limited		Support	Inferred - The submission is supported on the basis that subdivision options remain appropriate for the Rural Production Zone given the large percentage / area the zone covers in the district.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS405.047	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support in part	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the submission point on the basis that the minimum allotment size of the Rural Production Zone is changed to 20 hectares as 40 hectares is considered to be overly conservative.	Allow in part	Allow in part the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS361.039	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support in part	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the submission point on the basis that the minimum allotment size of the Rural Production Zone is changed to 20 hectares as 40 hectares is considered to be overly conservative	Allow in part	Allow in part the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
S190.001	Thomson Survey Ltd	SUB-S1	Oppose	I am generally not opposed to removing restricted discretionary minimum lot size provisions, EXCEPT for the Rural Production and Horticultural Zones. This zoning has been applied to large portions of the district. The rural nature of the district and the fact that rural and horticultural production accounts a large chunk of the district's economic activity and forms a major part of the district's community, suggests that Council should be spending more time and effort listening to that rural community. The Council has imposed punitive and restrictive rules to the zones, apparently regardless of a property's productive capacity or existing lot sizes	Amend SUB-S1, minimum lot sizes applying to the Rural Production Zone to: Controlled Activity: 20ha Restricted Discretionary Activity: <i>12ha</i> ; <i>OR in each five year period, up to 2 lots of between 3,000m² and 1ha over the period of the life of the District Plan</i> ; Discretionary Activity: 4ha .		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>and land use patterns, seemingly not caring that such restrictions are likely to render many marginal productive units uneconomic to continue productive use on because of an inability for the property owner to diversify or reduce debt burden. Where a zone covers such a wide area and exhibits such a wide range of physical characteristics and lot sizes, a one size fits all approach is not supportable or sustainable for the rural community.</p> <p>The objective is to protect agricultural and horticultural production capabilities, as per Objective SUB-04. SUB-04 Subdivision provides for the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Protection of highly productive land; <p>Where "highly productive land" is defined as: land that is, or has the potential to be, highly productive for farming activities. It includes versatile soils and Land Use Capability Class 4 land and other Land Use Capability classes Land Use Capability, or has the potential to be, highly productive having regard to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Soil type; b. Physical characteristics; c. Climate conditions; and d. Water availability. <p>In the PDP, "versatile soils" are defined as: soils that are Land Use Capability Classes 1c1, 2e1, 2w1, 2w2, 2s1, 3e1, 3e5, 3s1,3s2, 3s4.</p> <p>There are large areas in the rural and horticultural localities where the existing properties are not economic productive units. Many rural properties contain soils with Land Use Capability (LUC) Classes between 4-6. Class 4 LUC soils have low arable land which is only suitable for occasional cropping,</p>			

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>and Classes 5-6 are not suitable for arable use. By its own definition, the FNDC does not consider Class 4 LUC soils to be versatile. Classes 5-6 LUC land have productive capabilities limited to pasture or forestry. Soil suitability decreases as the LUC Class numbers increase. The PDP does not make any allowance for subdivision on areas of rural and horticultural lands that contain these soil types with limited productivity.</p> <p>Restricting subdivision options across the entire zone will likely have serious negative impact on the rural community, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The subdivision regime being proposed will prevent the ability for farmers and horticulturalists to retire in their existing homes with a small area of land; • Will prevent farmers/horticulturalists and their families from creating small blocks for younger family members to build on and enter the property market; • Reduce the ability of farmers/horticulturalists to decrease debt burden; • Discourage diversification. <p>Rural and horticultural workers are not always provided on-site accommodation as part of their employment. It is functional and necessary for these workers to be able to source small rural properties which allow them to work more closely to their places of employment, rather than</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>commuting from less suitable urban environments. Not only is this functional and necessary, but it is also more environmentally and economically sustainable than longer distance travel, and would comply with policy TRAN-P2 d.</p> <p>The Rural Production and Horticultural zones are areas that have scope to have more options available, whilst not negatively impacting on overall productive capacity. There are options for subdivision that should and can be available whilst still being consistent with central government requirements to protect highly versatile soils for productive use.</p> <p>There needs to be more options than currently being proposed, designed to enable more case by case assessment of the suitability of the land for subdivision to the minimum lot size specified, e.g. there is very little negative impact on overall productivity of a property if 1 or 2 small lots (3,000-lha lots) are subdivided off, especially if around existing homes and on land not considered highly productive or on highly versatile soils.</p> <p>I also doubt the logic for applying an Sha minimum size for discretionary activity lots on the Rural Production Zone. This area seems too small to be a standalone productive unit, yet far too large to be managed for lifestyle/boutique farming, particularly on LUC class soils which have reduced productivity. It would be more appropriate to keep the size at 4ha and is in keeping with the proposed discretionary size for the new</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
				Horticultural Zone, which has similar productive characteristics. I have submitted elsewhere that there is land in the Rural Production Zone that is likely more appropriately zoned Rural Lifestyle Zone. The latter should be applied in more areas, especially where there are enclaves of rural land already in blocks of less than 8ha.				
FS44.19	Northland Planning & Development 2020 Ltd		Support	Smaller lot sizes should be provided for within the Rural Production zone. This enables small scale lifestyle development for people who want to retire and remove the family house from the farm or take off an area which is not productive on the main farming unit.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS172.250	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS115.003	Glen and Sheryl Moore		Support	Proposed Subdivision rules for the Rural Production zone are too restrictive.	Allow	Amend SUB-S1 minimum lot sizes applying to the Rural Production Zone to provide for 20ha as a controlled activity, 12ha as a restricted discretionary activity or in each five year period, up to 2 lots of between 3,000m2 and 1ha and 4ha as a discretionary activity.	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS141.001	Gray Phillips		Support	Proposed Subdivision rules for the Rural Production zone are too restrictive.	Allow	amend	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS327.003	LMD Planning Consultancy		Support	The proposed Subdivision rules for the Rural Production zone are too restrictive.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS405.048	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support in part	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the submission point on the basis that the minimum allotment size of the Rural	Allow in part	Allow in part the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.30

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				Production Zone is changed to 20 hectares as 40 hectares is considered to be overly conservative.				Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS354.139	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	HortNZ does not support reducing the minimum lot sizes in the Rural Production Zone as it will not achieve the objectives and policies in the Plan. Introducing a further layer as sought is not effects based.	Disallow	Disallow S190.001	Accept	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS361.040	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support in part	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the submission point on the basis that the minimum allotment size of the Rural Production Zone is changed to 20 hectares as 40 hectares is considered to be overly conservative.	Allow in part	Allow in part the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS566.012	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 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS569.044	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS570.007	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 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS587.012	Peter Malcolm		Support	The submitter considers the minimum lot sizes for the Rural Production zone are too large and / or restrictive. Some flexibility is required for those wanting to convert their land into lifestyle blocks or smaller independent blocks rather than having to sell larger parcels of productive land and move from the district. The relief sought could help generate greater investment and enhanced rural productivity.	Allow in part	Retain operative Rule 13.7.2.1(i) minimum lot size 20ha as a controlled activity and provide for a limited number of minimum lot size 4ha as a discretionary activity for Rural Production Zone. Amend the Subdivision Chapter to insert a cluster option for larger blocks which enables 4 x 10,000m2 per initial parent lot with the balance parcel containing a minimum area (i.e.,	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
						40ha). Amend Subdivision Chapter to enable boundary adjustments between existing titles in rural zones as a permitted activity and require the minimum area for the smaller parcel to be 1ha (inferred).		
S419.007	LMD Planning Consultancy	SUB-S1	Oppose	Increasing the controlled activity subdivision Rule standard from 20ha to 40ha is unfair on cash strapped rural property owners during these tough economic times.	Amend Standard SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Production zone as follows: Controlled Activity - 40ha 20ha Discretionary Activity - 8ha 4ha		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS44.24	Northland Planning & Development 2020 Ltd		Support	Support the stated allotment sizes as smaller lot sizes should be provided for within the Rural Production zone. This enables small scale lifestyle development for people who want to retire and remove the family house from the farm or take off an area which is not productive on the main farming unit.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS172.304	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS350.046	Puketona Lodge Ltd		Support	The reasons given in the primary submission of the submitter. Increasing the controlled activity subdivision Rule standard from 20ha to 40ha is unfair on cash strapped rural property owners during these tough economic times.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS441.041	Adrian and Sue Knight		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS566.1246	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 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S319.003	FNR Properties Limited	SUB-S1	Oppose	The submitter opposes SUB-S1 provisions relating to the minimum allotment size in the Rural Production Zone as it will be increasing the controlled activity lot size from 20 ha to 40 ha and limiting in the zone and is heavy handed.	Amend SUB-S1 minimum allotment size in the Rural Production Zone to reduce the minimum allotment size and/or provide for more options as a controlled, restricted discretionary and discretionary activity.		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS44.26	Northland Planning & Development 2020 Ltd		Support	Agree that controlled activity size should be decreased to 20ha and reduction in discretionary size as well as provision for RDA.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS405.059	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support in part	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the requested amendment in relation to reducing the controlled activity minimum allotment size in the Rural Production Zone, although notes that the original submission seeks consideration of regional consistency with neighbouring Council's for minimum lot sizes.	Allow in part	Allow in part the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS361.051	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support in part	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the requested amendment in relation to reducing the controlled activity minimum allotment size in the Rural Production Zone, although notes that the original submission seeks consideration of regional consistency with neighbouring Council's for minimum lot sizes.	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
S403.003	Meridian Farm Ltd	SUB-S1	Oppose	The PDP minimum lot sizes for subdivision in the RLZ are not considered to provide for an efficient use of land and resources. A 4ha minimum lot size for subdivision will result in landholdings that are too small to be used for commercially viable productive uses, yet also too large for typical lifestyle purposes. This will also result in a cadastral pattern that will not provide a sufficient supply of rural-	Amend the minimum lot size criteria in SUB-S1 in the subdivision chapter for the Rural Living Zone to reduce it from 4ha (controlled activity) and 2ha (discretionary activity) to 2ha (controlled activity) and 1ha (discretionary activity).		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				residential development to service demand in the Far North District. It is therefore the submitters opinion that these lot sizes should be reduced.				
FS44.27	Northland Planning & Development 2020 Ltd		Support	Provide for 2ha allotments as a RDA and 1ha allotments as Discretionary. Allows for future development in these areas which are predominantly located on the outskirts of smaller settlements. Smaller allotments of 1ha are more manageable size for lifestyle use. 1ha allows for people to undertake a residential activity while providing the option of growing their own food or having stock at a domestic scale.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS172.298	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS366.003	Breadon and Cook Ltd		Support	As noted earlier in this submission, Breadon and Cook Ltd own land directly adjacent to the original submitter's site and have also lodged a submission seeking similar relief. Breadon and Cook Ltd would be interested in presenting a joint case at the Proposed District Plan hearings.	Allow	Allow original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS566.025	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 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS569.052	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS570.015	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S253.013	IDF Developments Limited	SUB-S1	Support	<p>The 40ha allotment size as a controlled activity is not considered as the most appropriate provision to meet Part 2 of the RMA considering the Rural Production zone makes up approximately 65% of all land in the District.</p> <p>A more appropriate density should be enabled, or other techniques proposed (outside of a management plan approach / environmental benefit approach) that benefit larger landholdings to still enable housing development whilst retaining large balance farm allotments.</p> <p>The 8ha allotment size enables better management of the land resources and is supported.</p>	Retain the discretionary activity allotment size of 8ha in the Rural Production zone (inferred).	Accept in part	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS44.28	Northland Planning & Development 2020 Ltd		Oppose	<p>The 4ha allotment size as a discretionary activity enables less productive land to be utilised for activities such as lifestyle development with small scale subsistence living.</p> <p>This ensures small scale lifestyle development is available in more rural areas for people who either want to retire and remove the family house from the farm or take off an area which is not productive on the main farming unit, to enable a family to establish a dwelling and have a couple of sheep or cattle with gardens, where a less intensive use would be beneficial for the environment in terms of pugging and erosion.</p> <p>As a discretionary activity any proposal requires the full range of effects to be considered through the resource consent process and the decision remains up to Council to consider whether approval should be granted.</p>	Disallow	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S47.002	Paul O'Connor	SUB-S1	Oppose	The new subdivision rules requiring a minimum lot size of 8ha (without a management plan) will severely restrict the ability to create small rural lots in the rural production zone. effects of this restriction include: no longer allowing farmers to retire in existing home creation of 8ha blocks too large for lifestyle, too small to be productive reduce capacity to reduce debt.	Amend rural production allotment sizes to allow smaller lot sizes on less productive land.		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS24.59	Lynley Newport		Support	What is being suggested is logical	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS172.229	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS548.004	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Support	Federated Farmers supports the relief sought. The issues raised by the submitter are major issues faced by our farming members and heavily influence how they operate their farms.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS587.007	Peter Malcolm		Support	The submitter considers the minimum lot sizes for the Rural Production zone are too large and / or restrictive. Some flexibility is required for those wanting to convert their land into lifestyle blocks or smaller independent blocks rather than having to sell larger parcels of productive land and move from the district. The relief sought could help generate greater investment and enhanced rural productivity.	Allow	Retain operative Rule 13.7.2.1(i) minimum lot size 20ha as a controlled activity and provide for a limited number of minimum lot size 4ha as a discretionary activity for Rural Production Zone. Amend the Subdivision Chapter to insert a cluster option for larger blocks which enables 4 x 10,000m ² per initial parent lot with the balance parcel containing a minimum area (i.e., 40ha). Amend Subdivision Chapter to enable boundary adjustments between existing titles in rural zones as a permitted activity and require the minimum area for the	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
						smaller parcel to be 1ha (inferred).		
S71.001	Brian and Katherine Susan Hutching	SUB-S1	Support in part	<p>The submitter considers that the minimum lot sizes in the Rural Production Zone that have already been subdivided down to a size that are not economically viable as rural production units could be further subdivided.</p> <p>There are areas in the existing Rural Production where subdivisions have occurred, resulting in small lots not suitable for Rural Production purposes. Generally, these properties are residential in nature but on lot sizes larger than standard residential sites, varying between 1 & 2 hectares. The ability to further subdivide these properties to a minimum of 3,000 or 4,000m² would make land available where subdivision has already occurred, preventing larger allotments from being subdivided and keeping higher density development grouped in areas already developed.</p>	Amend the provision to allow further subdivision of existing lots if they are below an area between 1 & 2 hectares. The ability to further subdivide these properties to a minimum of 3,000 or 4,000m ² would make land available where subdivision has already occurred, preventing larger allotments from being subdivided that are viable as a rural production unit in the Rural Production Zone.		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS45.1	Tristan Simpkin		Support	<p>Support this submission, with the exception that the min. Lot size to be made available for further subdivision should be 5ha - as anything less than this is not economically viable as rural production anyway. Kaipara have a very similar rule which works well called 'Small Lot Development' - I suggest FNDC duplicate this.</p> <p>There will always be a need for smaller Lots in the Rural Production area, and doing an arbitrary 8ha minimum Lot size as currently proposed is stifling this demand.</p>	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS172.234	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS368.067	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Amend the provision to allow further subdivision of existing lots if they are below an area between 1 & 2 hectares. The ability to further subdivide these properties to a minimum of 3,000 or 4,000m ² would make land available where subdivision has already occurred, preventing larger allotments from being subdivided that are viable as a rural production unit in the Rural Production Zone	Allow	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS566.005	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 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
S348.001	Sapphire Surveyors Limited	SUB-S1	Oppose	<p>The new subdivision rules, requiring a minimum lot size of 8ha (without a Management Plan) will severely restrict the ability to create small rural lots in the rural production zone.</p> <p>The reason given for this rule is to protect the productive potential of the rural area, in particular, highly productive land. However, the majority of land in the Far North District does not come under this category, and the PDP does not distinguish between highly productive land and less productive land when it comes to subdivision.</p> <p>With Council struggling to provide urban amenities (sewerage, water supply and stormwater) and people wanting to live independent of these services in the rural areas without too much land to care for, it makes sense to allow small rural blocks.</p>	<p>Amend allotment sizes in the Rural Production zone, perhaps with a limited number of allotments with minimum areas of 8000m² or 1ha, then 4ha generally after that. Smaller lot sizes should apply for properties (or parts thereof) that do not consist of highly productive land.</p> <p>Perhaps there should be more focus on the size of the balance parcel - subdividing off 4ha to leave a 10ha balance parcel does not protect productivity, while subdividing 1ha off a 200ha block has next to no effect, especially if the smaller block consists of bush.</p> <p>Consequential amendments to RPROZ-R3 Residential activity and SUB-R7 Management plan subdivision.</p>	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1	

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				It is correct to protect rural productive potential, but this can be achieved without imposing a total restriction on rural lifestyle properties.			
FS48.5	Nina Pivac		Support	<p>On behalf of FNR Properties:</p> <p>As notified in the PDP, it is noted that the permitted threshold for residential intensity in the RPZ will be reduced from one residential unit per 12ha to one residential unit per 40ha. Further, the total number of residential units on one site in the RPZ shall not exceed six.</p> <p>It is also noted that the PDP does not provide for any subdivision in the RPZ as a Restricted Discretionary Activity, and that the Discretionary Activity thresholds have been significantly reduced.</p> <p>Overall, it is considered that such a substantial reduction in the permitted residential intensity threshold in the RPZ is extremely heavy-handed and will result in significant adverse effects on the socio-economic wellbeing of the Far North District.</p> <p>Reasons are as follows:</p> <p>It is noted that the majority of the Far North District is proposed to be zoned RPZ which does not recognise the immediate need for more housing in the district. Imposing such restrictions on residential intensity will only contribute further to the current housing crisis that is being observed both locally and nationwide.</p> <p>Further, the RPZ objectives and policies as notified primarily provide for primary production activities in the RPZ and do not recognise that some properties are no longer suitable for</p>	Allow	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>production, or never have been suitable or used for production (e.g. due to factors such as topography, soil type and productivity, the preservation of indigenous flora and habitats of fauna).</p> <p>Whilst it is acknowledged that the Far North District largely identifies by its rural character and amenity, the PDP also needs to recognise that housing developments can occur in a manner that will not adversely affect rural amenity and character to a 'more than minor' degree. Providing more options for residential intensity as a Controlled, Restricted Discretionary, and Discretionary Activity would be more appropriate as this will enable such development to occur in the RPZ while providing for case by case consideration of any proposed residential activity within the context of the subject site and immediate surrounding environment (as opposed to a 'one size fits all' approach).</p>				
FS172.287	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS368.075	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Amend allotment sizes in the Rural Production zone, perhaps with a limited number of allotments with minimum areas of 8000m ² or 1ha, then 4ha generally after that. Smaller lot sizes should apply for properties (or parts thereof) that do not consist of highly productive land. Perhaps there should be more focus on the size of the balance parcel - subdividing off 4ha to leave a 10ha balance parcel does not protect productivity, while subdividing 1ha off a 200ha block has next to no	Allow	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				effect, especially if the smaller block consists of bush. Consequential amendments to RPROZ-R3 Residential activity and SUB-R7 Management plan subdivision			
S541.001	Elbury Holdings	SUB-S1	Oppose	<p>The new subdivision rules, requiring a minimum lot size of 8ha (without a Management Plan) will severely restrict the ability to create small rural lots in the rural production zone. The reason given for this rule is to protect the productive potential of the rural area, in particular, highly productive land.</p> <p>However, the majority of land in the Far North District does not come under this category, and the PDP does not distinguish between highly productive land and less productive land when it comes to subdivision. With Council struggling to provide urban amenities (sewerage, water supply and stormwater) and people wanting to live independent of these services in the rural areas without too much land to care for, it makes sense to allow small rural blocks.</p>	<p>Amend allotment sizes for properties (or parts thereof) that do not consist of highly productive land. Reconsider allotment sizes, perhaps with a limited number of allotments of a minimum of 8000sqm or 1ha, then 4ha generally after that.</p> <p>Consequential amendments to RPROZ-R3 Residential activity and SUB-R7 Management plan subdivision.</p>	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS155.72	Fiona King		Support	<p>8ha to large for lifestyle blocks. Most people want to be out of town with a paddock or two (4 ha at the most). All on sewage systems . But it is not enough to graze any more than 10-12 stock (2yr to mixed age) all year round if it is all in good grass and grazable. that is productive land. The weed and pest control on most of these small blocks are not maintained i.e. gorse, devil groundsill, carrot weed etc. and effects other neighbouring properties . Soil types play a big part in what size the block needs to be. i suggest that 4 ha is more than enough for a lifestyle block. Even the 2000sq metre blocks</p>	Allow	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				were sufficient for someone that just wants to be outside the urban boundaries				
FS172.337	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons stated in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS196.241	Joe Carr		Support	I support in principle	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS368.062	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Amend allotment sizes in the Rural Production zone, perhaps with a limited number of allotments with minimum areas of 8000m ² or 1ha, then 4ha generally after that. Smaller lot sizes should apply for properties (or parts thereof) that do not consist of highly productive land. Consequential amendments to RPROZ-R3 Residential activity and SUB-R7 Management plan subdivision	Allow	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
S541.020	Elbury Holdings	SUB-S1	Oppose	We do not support the large title sizes in the rural zone. We submit that subdivision should allow lots to 4ha or smaller, and that the subdivision of smaller lots around existing houses be provided for.	Amend standard SUB-S1 in relation to the Rural Production Zone, to generally allow lots of 4ha, and allow lots less than 4ha around existing houses.		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS155.73	Fiona King		Support	8ha to large for lifestyle blocks. Most people want to be out of town with a paddock or two (4 ha at the most). All on sewage systems . But it is not enough to graze any more than 10-12 stock (2yr to mixed age) all year round if it is all in good grass and grazable. that is productive land. The weed and pest control on most of these small blocks are not maintained i.e., gorse, devil groundsill, carrot weed etc. and effects other neighbouring properties.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				Soil types play a big part in what size the block needs to be. I suggest that 4 ha is more than enough for a lifestyle block. Even the 2000sq metre blocks were sufficient for someone that just wants to be outside the urban boundaries. the rural production productive soils is to much of a blanket approach there are pockets of land with different types of soils.				
FS368.081	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Amend standard SUB-S1 in relation to the Rural Production Zone, to generally allow lots of 4ha, and allow lots less than 4ha around existing houses	Allow	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
S485.001	Elbury Holdings	SUB-S1	Oppose	<p>The new subdivision rules, requiring a minimum lot size of 8ha (without a Management Plan) will severely restrict the ability to create small rural lots in the rural production zone.</p> <p>The reason given for this rule is to protect the productive potential of the rural area, in particular, highly productive land. However, the majority of land in the Far North District does not come under this category, and the PDP does not distinguish between highly productive land and less productive land when it comes to subdivision.</p> <p>With Council struggling to provide urban amenities (sewerage, water supply and stormwater) and people wanting to live independent of these services in the rural areas without too much land to care for, it makes sense to allow small rural blocks.</p>	Amend allotment sizes for properties (or parts thereof) that do not consist of highly productive land. Reconsider allotment sizes, perhaps with a limited number of allotments of a minimum of 8000sqm or 1ha, then 4ha generally after that. Consequential amendments to RPROZ-R3 Residential activity and SUB-R7 Management plan subdivision.		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS155.74	Fiona King		Support	Same as above comments. I would like to be heard on this please	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS368.061	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Amend allotment sizes in the Rural Production zone, perhaps with a limited number of allotments with minimum areas of 8000m ² or 1ha, then 4ha generally after that. Smaller lot sizes should apply for properties (or parts thereof) that do not consist of highly productive land. Consequential amendments to RPROZ-R3 Residential activity and SUB-R7 Management plan subdivision	Allow	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
S485.022	Elbury Holdings	SUB-S1	Oppose	We do not support the large title sizes in the rural zone and submit that the subdivision of smaller lots around existing houses be provided for.	Amend standard SUB-S1 in relation to the Rural Production Zone, to generally allow lots of 4ha, and allow lots less than 4ha around existing houses.		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS155.75	Fiona King		Support	same as comments above. also productive like dairying people like me should be able to retire and cut off their house say 2000sq metres land (which is still a lot to maintain) to continue their lives there. but this will stop that and force rural people off their land.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS368.079	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Amend standard SUB-S1 in relation to the Rural Production Zone, to generally allow lots of 4ha, and allow lots less than 4ha around existing houses	Allow	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
S519.001	Elbury Holdings	SUB-S1	Oppose	The new subdivision rules, requiring a minimum lot size of 8ha (without a Management Plan) will severely restrict the ability to create small rural lots in the Rural Production Zone. These effects include a reduction in vitality for rural communities, farmers unable to retire in their existing homes on a smaller area of land or provide smaller blocks for family members, 8ha is too large for lifestyle blocks and too small to be productive, and reduced capacity for farmers to decrease debt.	Amend allotment sizes for properties (or parts thereof) that do not consist of highly productive land. Reconsider allotment sizes, perhaps with a limited number of allotments of a minimum of 8000sqm or 1ha, then 4ha generally after that. Consequential amendments to RPROZ-R3 Residential activity and SUB-R7 Management plan subdivision.		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				As a retiring farmer I would like to cut off my home with a small area surrounding it and not have ha's that need management of weeds, pest, livestock etc.				
FS155.76	Fiona King		Support		Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
S519.022	Elbury Holdings	SUB-S1	Oppose	We do not support the large title sizes in the rural zone and submit that the subdivision of smaller lots around existing houses be provided for.	Amend standard SUB-S1 in relation to the Rural Production Zone, to generally allow lots of 4ha, and allow lots less than 4ha around existing houses.		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS155.77	Fiona King		Support	same as comments above. also productive like dairying people like me should be able to retire and cut off their house say 2000sq mtrs land (which is still a lot to maintain) to continue their lives there. but this will stop that and force rural people off their land.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS368.080	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Amend standard SUB-S1 in relation to the Rural Production Zone, to generally allow lots of 4ha, and allow lots less than 4ha around existing houses	Allow	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
S174.001	Tristan Simpkin	SUB-S1	Oppose	<p>Opposes that the Rural Production minimum lot sizes have been increased so much. Doubling the size of the controlled activity from 20ha min to 40ha min, and also the discretionary going from 4ha min to 8ha min, also removing all other options for Titles pre-2000.</p> <p>Where is the ability for new titles to be created in rural communities for housing & lifestyle blocks? (because it's clear across the entire district that land zoning has been choked rather than increased). Consider the amount of new housing that has been built across rural communities over the past</p>	<p>Amend the minimum lot sizes to 4 ha as a discretionary activity (as pe Operative District Plan), and insert the following Restricted Discretionary activity rules into the Proposed District Plan (from the Operative District Plan):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A maximum of 3 lots in any subdivision, provided that the minimum lot size is 4,000m2 and there is at least 1 lot in the subdivision with a minimum lot size of 4ha, and provided further that the subdivision is of sites which existed at or prior to 28 April 2000, or which are amalgamated from 		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				15 years (on new Titles - can we really expect all that development to rush into our towns?)	<p>titles existing at or prior to 28 April 2000; or</p> <p>2. A maximum of 5 lots in a subdivision (including the parent lot) where the minimum size of the lots is 2ha, and where the subdivision is created from a site that existed at or prior to 28 April 2000;</p>			
FS29.18	Trent Simpkin		Support	Fully support including terms like this in the Rural production subdivision rules, to allow sites to be created in rural areas. Rural sites are fully self-sufficient and instead of encouraging people to split sites up into unusable sized larger areas, allow them to split of small sites for houses and people just to live on, which retains the main farm and reduces the 'fragmentation' of farms, but still allows people to live rurally.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS172.247	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS550.037	Lloyd Anderson		Oppose	These submissions seek inappropriate changes, such as re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, Spoonbill Drive and Kingfisher Drive from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential. Some points seek to weaken the policies and rules/standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural Lifestyle zone and Rural Residential zone, e.g. S349 seeks to delete references to 'rural character' and 'amenity' for the Rural Residential zone. The scale and intensity of urban/residential development sought	Disallow	Amend zoning	Accept in part	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>by these submissions would create a new township in the rural areas at the northern end of Landing Road; this scale and density of development is not anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans.</p> <p>It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area that lacks relevant infrastructure and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town in future.</p> <p>Their proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects, such as a large increase in traffic on Landing Road, one-lane bridge and other adverse effects noted under my Further Submission 1 above.</p>				
FS333.021	Maree Hart		Oppose	<p>The original submission seeks inappropriate changes, such as re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487, Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, Spoonbill Drive and Kingfisher Drive from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential. They also seek to amend the relevant rural provisions to be more permissive such as removing reference to rural character and amenity.</p> <p>The scale and intensity of residential development sought by the original submission would create a new township in the rural areas at the northern end of Landing Road. This scale and intensity is not anticipated in either the Operative or Proposed District Plan. It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area that lacks relevant infrastructure and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri.</p>	Disallow	<p>Amend zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 to Horticulture zone or Rural Production zone; Amend provisions to protect other sites referenced in the original submission by Rural Lifestyle zoning and where relevant, provisions relating to the protection of the coastal environment, wetlands/saltmarshes, and areas that are visible from coastal waters; Amend Rural Production, Horticulture and Rural Lifestyle zone provisions to prevent urban sprawl, and protect productive soil, rural character and amenity values; Amend the District Plan to strengthen provisions for assessing and preventing cumulative and long-term adverse effects on productive areas, rural areas, areas visible</p>	Accept in part	<p>Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1</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>The proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects. The surrounding rural environment lacks the appropriate infrastructure, school capacity and existing safety and traffic issues on Landing Road such as a one lane bridge. There would also be effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.</p>	<p>from public land, ecological values and freshwater, wetlands and saltmarshes, areas that are visible from coastal waters or public land.</p>		
<p>FS569.019</p>	<p>Vision Kerikeri 2</p>		<p>Oppose</p>	<p>The scale and intensity of urban/residential development sought by these submissions would create a new township in rural areas at the eastern end of Kapiro Road, generating a scale and density of development that is not anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans. It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area and coastal area that lacks appropriate infrastructure and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town.</p> <p>These submissions seek inappropriate zoning e.g. re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, Spoonbill Drive, Kingfisher Drive etc., as Rural Residential. Importantly, some of the submission points seek to weaken the objectives, policies and rules/standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural Lifestyle zone and Rural Residential zone in general. If such changes were allowed, they would apply across the entire District and would promote urban sprawl in rural areas in all parts of the District.</p> <p>Their proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative</p>	<p>Disallow</p> <p>Re-zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland) in Rural Production or Horticulture zone.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rural Lifestyle zoning for existing residential properties in Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove and Kingfisher Drive, as in PDP planning map. • Minimise urban sprawl and protect the general coastal area of Skudders Beach Road by applying Rural Lifestyle zoning to existing paddocks and undeveloped areas, and ensure better protection of the coastal environment, areas that are visible from coastal waters or public land, ecological values, wetlands/ saltmarshes etc 	<p>Accept in part</p>	<p>Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1</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
				adverse effects, such as impacts on wetlands/saltmarshes, ecological values, rural environment, coastal environment, traffic impacts on one-lane bridge, amenity values and other adverse effects noted under our Further Submission 1 above				
FS62.029	Kapiro Conservation Trust 1		Oppose	<p>The scale and intensity of urban/residential development sought by these submissions would create a new township in rural areas at the eastern end of Kapiro Road, generating a scale and density of development that is not anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans. It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area and coastal area that lacks appropriate infrastructure and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town.</p> <p>These submissions seek inappropriate zoning e.g. re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, Spoonbill Drive, Kingfisher Drive etc., as Rural Residential. Importantly, some of the submission points seek to weaken the objectives, policies and rules/standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural Lifestyle zone and Rural Residential zone in general. If such changes were allowed, they would apply across the entire District and would promote urban sprawl in rural areas in all parts of the District.</p> <p>Their proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects, such as impacts on wetlands/saltmarshes, ecological values, rural environment, coastal environment, traffic impacts on one-</p>	Disallow	<p>Re-zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland) in Rural Production or Horticulture zone.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rural Lifestyle zoning for existing residential properties in Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove and Kingfisher Drive, as in PDP planning map. • Minimise urban sprawl and protect the general coastal area of Skudders Beach Road by applying Rural Lifestyle zoning to existing paddocks and undeveloped areas, and ensure better protection of the coastal environment, areas that are visible from coastal waters or public land, ecological values, wetlands/saltmarshes etc. 	Accept in part	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				lane bridge, amenity values and other adverse effects noted under our Further Submission 1 above				
FS549.037	Vanessa Anderson		Oppose	<p>These submissions seek inappropriate changes, such as re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, Spoonbill Drive and Kingfisher Drive from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential. Some points seek to weaken the policies and rules/standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural Lifestyle zone and Rural Residential zone, e.g. S349 seeks to delete references to 'rural character' and 'amenity' for the Rural Residential zone.</p> <p>The scale and intensity of urban/residential development sought by these submissions would create a new township in the rural areas at the northern end of Landing Road; this scale and density of development is not anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans.</p> <p>It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area that lacks relevant infrastructure and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town in future.</p> <p>Their proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects, such as a large increase in traffic on Landing Road, one-lane bridge and other adverse effects noted under my Further Submission 1 above.</p>	Disallow	Amend zoning	Accept in part	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS443.037	Peter O'Neil Donnellon		Oppose	These submissions seek inappropriate changes, such as re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove,	Disallow	Amend zoning	Accept in part	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>Spoonbill Drive and Kingfisher Drive from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential. Some points seek to weaken the policies and rules/standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural Lifestyle zone and Rural Residential zone, e.g. S349 seeks to delete references to 'rural character' and 'amenity' for the Rural Residential zone.</p> <p>The scale and intensity of urban/residential development sought by these submissions would create a new township in the rural areas at the northern end of Landing Road; this scale and density of development is not anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans.</p> <p>It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area that lacks relevant infrastructure and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town in future.</p> <p>Their proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects, such as a large increase in traffic on Landing Road, one-lane bridge and other adverse effects noted under my Further Submission 1 above.</p>				
FS390.037	Tracey Schubert		Oppose	<p>These submissions seek inappropriate changes, such as re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, Spoonbill Drive and Kingfisher Drive from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential. Some points seek to weaken the policies and rules/standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural Lifestyle zone and Rural Residential zone, e.g. S349 seeks to delete references to</p>	Disallow	Amend zoning	Accept in part	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>'rural character' and 'amenity' for the Rural Residential zone.</p> <p>The scale and intensity of urban/residential development sought by these submissions would create a new township in the rural areas at the northern end of Landing Road; this scale and density of development is not anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans.</p> <p>It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area that lacks relevant infrastructure and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town in future.</p> <p>Their proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects, such as a large increase in traffic on Landing Road, one-lane bridge and other adverse effects noted under my Further Submission 1 above.</p>				
FS353.037	AI Panckhurst		Oppose	<p>These submissions seek inappropriate changes, such as re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, Spoonbill Drive and Kingfisher Drive from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential. Some points seek to weaken the policies and rules/standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural Lifestyle zone and Rural Residential zone, e.g. S349 seeks to delete references to 'rural character' and 'amenity' for the Rural Residential zone.</p> <p>The scale and intensity of urban/residential development sought by these submissions would create a new township in the rural areas at the northern end of Landing Road; this scale and density of development is not</p>	Disallow	Amend zoning	Accept in part	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans. It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area that lacks relevant infrastructure and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town in future.</p> <p>Their proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects, such as a large increase in traffic on Landing Road, one-lane bridge and other adverse effects noted under my Further Submission 1 above.</p>				
FS352.037	Kathryn Panckhurst		Oppose	<p>These submissions seek inappropriate changes, such as re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, Spoonbill Drive and Kingfisher Drive from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential. Some points seek to weaken the policies and rules/standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural Lifestyle zone and Rural Residential zone, e.g. S349 seeks to delete references to 'rural character' and 'amenity' for the Rural Residential zone.</p> <p>The scale and intensity of urban/residential development sought by these submissions would create a new township in the rural areas at the northern end of Landing Road; this scale and density of development is not anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans.</p> <p>It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area that lacks relevant infrastructure and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town in future.</p>	Disallow	Amend zoning	Accept in part	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>Their proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects, such as a large increase in traffic on Landing Road, one-lane bridge and other adverse effects noted under my Further Submission 1 above.</p>				
FS342.037	Chris Baker		Oppose	<p>These submissions seek inappropriate changes, such as re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, Spoonbill Drive and Kingfisher Drive from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential. Some points seek to weaken the policies and rules/standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural Lifestyle zone and Rural Residential zone, e.g. S349 seeks to delete references to 'rural character' and 'amenity' for the Rural Residential zone.</p> <p>The scale and intensity of urban/residential development sought by these submissions would create a new township in the rural areas at the northern end of Landing Road; this scale and density of development is not anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans. It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area that lacks relevant infrastructure and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town in future.</p> <p>Their proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects, such as a large increase in traffic on Landing Road, one-lane bridge and other adverse effects noted under my Further Submission 1 above.</p>	Disallow	Amend zoning	Accept in part	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS338.037	Pearl Mahoney		Oppose	<p>These submissions seek inappropriate changes, such as re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, Spoonbill Drive and Kingfisher Drive from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential. Some points seek to weaken the policies and rules/standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural Lifestyle zone and Rural Residential zone, e.g. S349 seeks to delete references to 'rural character' and 'amenity' for the Rural Residential zone.</p> <p>The scale and intensity of urban/residential development sought by these submissions would create a new township in the rural areas at the northern end of Landing Road; this scale and density of development is not anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans.</p> <p>It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area that lacks relevant infrastructure and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town in future.</p> <p>Their proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects, such as a large increase in traffic on Landing Road, one-lane bridge and other adverse effects noted under my Further Submission 1 above.</p>	Disallow	Amend zoning	Accept in part	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS337.037	Kevin Mahoney		Oppose	<p>These submissions seek inappropriate changes, such as re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, Spoonbill Drive and Kingfisher Drive from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential. Some points seek to weaken the policies and</p>	Disallow	Amend zoning	Accept in part	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>rules/standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural Lifestyle zone and Rural Residential zone, e.g. S349 seeks to delete references to 'rural character' and 'amenity' for the Rural Residential zone.</p> <p>The scale and intensity of urban/residential development sought by these submissions would create a new township in the rural areas at the northern end of Landing Road; this scale and density of development is not anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans.</p> <p>It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area that lacks relevant infrastructure and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town in future.</p> <p>Their proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects, such as a large increase in traffic on Landing Road, one-lane bridge and other adverse effects noted under my Further Submission 1 above.</p>				
FS336.037	Roger Holman		Oppose	<p>These submissions seek inappropriate changes, such as re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, Spoonbill Drive and Kingfisher Drive from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential. Some points seek to weaken the policies and rules/standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural Lifestyle zone and Rural Residential zone, e.g. S349 seeks to delete references to 'rural character' and 'amenity' for the Rural Residential zone.</p> <p>The scale and intensity of urban/residential development sought</p>	Disallow	Amend zoning	Accept in part	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>by these submissions would create a new township in the rural areas at the northern end of Landing Road; this scale and density of development is not anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans.</p> <p>It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area that lacks relevant infrastructure and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town in future.</p> <p>Their proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects, such as a large increase in traffic on Landing Road, one-lane bridge and other adverse effects noted under my Further Submission 1 above.</p>				
FS335.037	Craig and Mary Sawers		Oppose	<p>These submissions seek inappropriate changes, such as re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, Spoonbill Drive and Kingfisher Drive from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential. Some points seek to weaken the policies and rules/standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural Lifestyle zone and Rural Residential zone, e.g. S349 seeks to delete references to 'rural character' and 'amenity' for the Rural Residential zone.</p> <p>The scale and intensity of urban/residential development sought by these submissions would create a new township in the rural areas at the northern end of Landing Road; this scale and density of development is not anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans. It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area that lacks relevant infrastructure and</p>	Disallow	Amend zoning	Accept in part	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town in future.</p> <p>Their proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects, such as a large increase in traffic on Landing Road, one-lane bridge and other adverse effects noted under my Further Submission 1 above.</p>				
FS334.037	Fiona Clarke		Oppose	<p>These submissions seek inappropriate changes, such as re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, Spoonbill Drive and Kingfisher Drive from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential. Some points seek to weaken the policies and rules/standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural Lifestyle zone and Rural Residential zone, e.g. S349 seeks to delete references to 'rural character' and 'amenity' for the Rural Residential zone.</p> <p>The scale and intensity of urban/residential development sought by these submissions would create a new township in the rural areas at the northern end of Landing Road; this scale and density of development is not anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans.</p> <p>It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area that lacks relevant infrastructure and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town in future.</p> <p>Their proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects, such as a large increase in traffic on Landing Road, one-lane bridge and other adverse</p>	Disallow	Amend zoning	Accept in part	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				effects noted under my Further Submission 1 above.			
S502.082	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	SUB-S1	Support in part	<p>The economic viability in relation to productive areas for primary production varies a great deal depending on whether the use is for horticulture, dairy farming or sheep and beef grazing to name a few. It is also noted that smaller horticultural properties are more economically viable when they have the benefit of versatile soils, access to water for irrigation and access to a workforce. This is evident not only in Kerikeri but also in areas such as Pukenui and Kaitaia.</p> <p>2.4. The above lot sizes are sought to reflect the diversity of primary production throughout the entire district as there are many areas that have access to an aquifer or water irrigation which can support primary production within a smaller parcel of land. It is acknowledged within the Rural Environment Economic Analysis Update Report that there are a number of smaller established horticultural land parcels that are likely to support viable primary productive uses.</p> <p>In addition to this not all land that is zoned as Rural Production contains Highly Versatile Soils, and not all sites that are zoned as Rural Production can be utilised or are suitable for a productive purpose. For this reason, not all sites are set aside as a productive farming unit which would require an allotment size of 40ha or more.</p> <p>As middle ground we seek to add in a Restricted Discretionary activity status of 8ha. This aligns with the Rural Environment Economic Analysis report</p>	<p>Amend SUB-S1 to provide for:</p> <p>Rural Production Controlled activity 20ha, Restricted discretionary activity 8ha and Discretionary activity 4ha</p> <p>Rural lifestyle discretionary activity 1ha</p>	Reject	<p>Section 5.2.30</p> <p>Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1</p> <p><i>Note: This submission point is duplicated in Appendix 2 of other relevant rural section 42A reports with respect to SUB-S1 amendments for those rural zones.</i></p>

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>which confirms that horticultural activities can effectively be undertaken on land of 7ha in area. This leaves an additional hectare to establish a dwelling and associated sheds and infrastructure.</p> <p>While the plan has proposed a horticultural zone for Kerikeri and Waipapa to give effect to this, no consideration to horticultural activities within the rest of the district has been undertaken. Having this as an enabling option ensures other horticultural areas in the District are able to achieve similar outcomes to Kerikeri. The 4ha allotment size as a discretionary activity enables less productive land to be utilised for activities such as lifestyle development with small scale subsistence living.</p> <p>This ensures small scale lifestyle development is available in more rural areas for people who either want to retire and remove the family house from the farm, or take off an area which is not productive on the main farming unit, to enable a family to establish a dwelling and have a couple of sheep or cattle with gardens, where a less intensive use would be beneficial for the environment in terms of pugging and erosion. As a discretionary activity any proposal requires the full range of effects to be considered through the resource consent process and the decision remains up to Council to consider whether approval should be granted.</p> <p>We support the inclusion of the Rural Residential zone which enables Discretionary allotment sizes of up to 2000m².</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>Within the Section 32 report, Section 1.3, it is stated that the primary purpose of the zone is to enable people to undertake a residential activity, however the size of the lot sizes give people the option of growing their own food or having a horse or stock at a domestic scale, while still enabling farming on larger lots. It is considered that the above-mentioned activities can occur on allotments of 1 hectare in size and greater as is evident when driving around the Far North District.</p> <p>The Section 32 report then goes on to explain that reducing fragmentation of the zone is a priority as well as reducing the pressure on providing reticulated infrastructure. Once again, it is considered lot sizes of 1 hectare are more than capable of catering for infrastructure onsite, without creating any adverse effects, as has been provided for in many instances. The majority of these areas are also not located within areas which are serviced by reticulated infrastructure, such that providing such infrastructure would not even be a consideration nor an expectation.</p> <p>Providing rural amenity and avoiding reverse sensitivity effects are a main driver for the more restrictive lot sizes, however, it is considered that providing for lot sizes of 1 hectare as a Discretionary Activity will maintain and enhance the rural amenity of the zone, while providing sites which are able to be effectively managed by the owners as a small productive/lifestyle lot.</p>			
FS172.224	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow	Reject	Section 5.2.30

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS383.3	The Shooting Box Limited		Support	The relief sought by the submitter recognises that many rural production and rural lifestyle zoned lots are small and/or have no rural production value and should be able to be appropriately subdivided for rural-residential use.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS384.4	P S Yates Family Trust		Support	The relief sought by the submitter recognises that many rural production and rural lifestyle zoned lots are small and/or have no rural production value and should be able to be appropriately subdivided for rural-residential use.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS397.007	IDF Developments Limited		Support	The submissions are supported on the basis that they seek additional subdivision options and more appropriate vegetation clearance rules in the Rural Production Zone.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS405.093	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support in part	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the submission point on the basis that the minimum allotment size of the Rural Production Zone is changed to 20 hectares as 40 hectares is considered to be overly conservative	Allow in part	Allow in part the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS332.228	Russell Protection Society		Oppose	In lieu of coastal zones, Rural Production zones provide for the necessary protection of vulnerable coastal areas, especially in the Bay of Islands.	Disallow in part	Retain 40/8 ha min size for Rural Production Zone and 4/2 ha for Rural Lifestyle Zone with no restricted discretionary activities.	Accept	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS354.143	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	The submitter seeks to amend SUB-S1 to provide for: Rural Production Controlled activity 20ha, Restricted discretionary activity 8ha and Discretionary activity 4ha Rural lifestyle discretionary activity 1ha. HortNZ considers that this will lead to greater fragmentation of rural land, not achieve	Disallow	Disallow S502.082	Accept	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				the objectives and policies in the Plan and not give effect to the NPSHPL.				
FS361.042	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support in part	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the submission point on the basis that the minimum allotment size of the Rural Production Zone is changed to 20 hectares as 40 hectares is considered to be overly conservative	Allow in part	Allow in part the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
S47.003	Paul O'Connor	SUB-S1	Oppose	The new subdivision rules requiring a minimum lot size of 8ha (without a management plan) will severely restrict the ability to create small rural lots in the rural production zone effects of this restriction include; no longer allowing farmers to retire in existing home creation of 8ha blocks too large for lifestyle, too small to be productive reduce capacity to reduce dept smaller lots provide opportunities for farmers in rural communities	Amend rural Production zone allotment sizes to focus on the size of the remaining land - subdividing off smaller parcels (say 1ha) off a 200 ha block has no effect on productivity of small lots.		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS172.230	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS548.005	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Support	Federated Farmers supports the relief sought. The issues raised by the submitter are major issues faced by our farming members and heavily influence how they operate their farms.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS397.001	IDF Developments Limited		Support	We agree that the RPZ zone allotment dimensions could be altered in specific scenarios where large landholdings are involved	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS587.008	Peter Malcolm		Support	The submitter considers the minimum lot sizes for the Rural Production zone are too large and / or restrictive. Some flexibility is required for those wanting to convert their land into lifestyle blocks or smaller independent blocks rather	Allow	Retain operative Rule 13.7.2.1(i) minimum lot size 20ha as a controlled activity and provide for a limited number of minimum lot size 4ha as a discretionary activity for	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				than having to sell larger parcels of productive land and move from the district. The relief sought could help generate greater investment and enhanced rural productivity.		Rural Production Zone. Amend the Subdivision Chapter to insert a cluster option for larger blocks which enables 4 x 10,000m2 per initial parent lot with the balance parcel containing a minimum area (i.e., 40ha). Amend Subdivision Chapter to enable boundary adjustments between existing titles in rural zones as a permitted activity and require the minimum area for the smaller parcel to be 1ha (inferred).		
S253.008	IDF Developments Limited	SUB-S1	Oppose	<p>The 40ha allotment size as a controlled activity is not considered as the most appropriate provision to meet Part 2 of the RMA considering the Rural Production zone makes up approximately 65% of all land in the District.</p> <p>A more appropriate density should be enabled, or other techniques proposed (outside of a management plan approach/environmental benefit approach) that benefits larger landholdings to still enable housing development whilst retaining large balance farm allotments.</p> <p>The 8ha allotment size enables better management of the land resources and is supported.</p>	Delete the proposed minimum allotment size of 40ha as a controlled activity in the Rural Production zone (inferred)		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS172.271	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
S255.001	Arahia Burkhardt Macrae	SUB-S1	Oppose	Oppose 40ha minimum allotment size as a controlled activity standard in Rural Production Zone, in particular for land that is not classed/mapped as	Amend standard to 20ha minimum lot size as a controlled activity in the Rural Production Zone.		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				highly productive land by NPS Highly Productive Land 2022.				
FS172.273	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS405.052	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support in part	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the requested amendment, as the 40ha allotment size proposed for the RPROZ is considered to be overly conservative. It notes that in the original submission, this requested change relates to all RPROZ zoned land, not just land which is not highly productive land.	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS373.014	Lucklaw Farm Ltd		Support	I support 20ha minimum lot sizes as controlled activities as it aligns with the Operative General Coastal Zone standards	Allow	I seek that the whole of the submission point be allowed	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
S279.002	Manu Burkhardt Macrae	SUB-S1	Oppose	Opposes minimum lot size of 40ha in Rural Production Zone as a controlled activity, in particular for land which is not highly productive land as described in the NPS Highly Productive Land 2022.	Amend minimum allotment size to 20 ha in the Rural Production Zone, as a controlled activity (as per the Operative District Plan), in particular for land which is not highly productive land as described in the NPS Highly Productive Land 2022.		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS172.279	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS405.054	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support in part	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the requested amendment, as the 40ha allotment size proposed for the RPROZ is considered to be overly conservative. It notes that in the original submission, this requested change relates to all RPROZ zoned land, not just land which is not highly productive land.	Allow in part	Allow in part the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS368.073	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Amend minimum allotment size to 20 ha in the Rural Production Zone, as a controlled activity (as per the Operative District Plan), in particular for land which is not highly productive land as described in the NPS Highly Productive Land 2022.	Allow	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS361.046	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support in part	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the requested amendment, as the 40ha allotment size proposed for the RPROZ is considered to be overly conservative. It notes that in the original submission, this requested change relates to all RPROZ zoned land, not just land which is not highly productive land.	Allow in part	Allow in part the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
S312.001	Morgan Horsford	SUB-S1	Oppose	<p>The proposed minimum lot size in Rural Production Zones will prove detrimental to the character and eventual survival of rural communities.</p> <p>The overall guidelines of limiting fragmentation, loss of productive land are important but proposed changes will have significant negative effects on rural communities.</p> <p>Proposed minimum lot sizes will prevent older generations stepping activity and being able to maintain connection to area by dividing off piece of land. It will limit other family members living in same community. It will affect ability for local schools to have sufficient numbers. Should also have mechanisms to restrict ability of small block owners or tenants to impede rights of rural production businesses.</p> <p>Minimum lot sizes are too restrictive and will harm sense of place, community's cultural, social, environmental and economic wellbeing</p>	<p>Amend SUB-S1 for Rural Production as follows:</p> <p>Controlled activity: 40ha 4ha where the land type, ability to provide on-site services such as power & water supply & waste disposal, existing land use, and residual property size are suitable.</p> <p>Discretionary activity: 8ha 2ha, 1ha or 0.5ha as appropriate, where the land type, ability to provide on-site services such as power & water supply & waste disposal, existing land use, and residual property size are suitable.</p>		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				and have effects on business operation benefits.				
FS172.286	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
S395.001	Sean Jozef Vercammen	SUB-S1	Oppose	<p>The new subdivision rules, requiring a minimum lot size of 8ha (without a Management Plan) will severely restrict the ability to create small rural lots in the rural production zone.</p> <p>The reason given for this rule is to protect the productive potential of the rural area, in particular, highly productive land. However, the majority of land in the Far North District does not come under this category, and the PDP does not distinguish between highly productive land and less productive land when it comes to subdivision.</p> <p>With Council struggling to provide urban amenities (sewerage, water supply and stormwater) and people wanting to live independent of these services in the rural areas without too much land to care for, it makes sense to allow small rural blocks.</p>	Amend allotment sizes for properties (or parts thereof) that do not consist of highly productive land. Reconsider allotment sizes, perhaps with a limited number of allotments of a minimum of 8000sqm or 1ha, then 4ha generally after that. Consequential amendments to RPROZ-R3 Residential activity and SUB-R7 Management plan subdivision.		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS172.293	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS368.053	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Amend allotment sizes in the Rural Production zone, perhaps with a limited number of allotments with minimum areas of 8000m ² or 1ha, then 4ha generally after that. Smaller lot sizes should apply for properties (or parts thereof) that do not consist of highly productive land.	Allow	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				Consequential amendments to RPROZ-R3 Residential activity and SUB-R7 Management plan subdivision				
S410.001	Kerry-Anne Smith	SUB-S1	Oppose	<p>The new subdivision rules, requiring a minimum lot size of 8ha (without a Management Plan) will severely restrict the ability to create small rural lots in the rural production zone.</p> <p>The reason given for this rule is to protect the productive potential of the rural area, in particular, highly productive land. However, the majority of land in the Far North District does not come under this category, and the PDP does not distinguish between highly productive land and less productive land when it comes to subdivision.</p> <p>With Council struggling to provide urban amenities (sewerage, water supply and stormwater) and people wanting to live independent of these services in the rural areas without too much land to care for, it makes sense to allow small rural blocks.</p>	Amend allotment sizes for properties (or parts thereof) that do not consist of highly productive land. Reconsider allotment sizes, perhaps with a limited number of allotments of a minimum of 8000sqm or 1ha, then 4ha generally after that.	Consequential amendments to RPROZ-R3 Residential activity and SUB-R7 Management plan subdivision.	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS172.300	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS368.054	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	<p>Amend allotment sizes in the Rural Production zone, perhaps with a limited number of allotments with minimum areas of 8000m² or 1ha, then 4ha generally after that. Smaller lot sizes should apply for properties (or parts thereof) that do not consist of highly productive land.</p> <p>Consequential amendments to RPROZ-R3 Residential activity and SUB-R7 Management plan subdivision</p>	Allow	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S411.001	Roger Myles Smith	SUB-S1	Oppose	<p>The new subdivision rules, requiring a minimum lot size of 8ha (without a Management Plan) will severely restrict the ability to create small rural lots in the rural production zone.</p> <p>The reason given for this rule is to protect the productive potential of the rural area, in particular, highly productive land. However, the majority of land in the Far North District does not come under this category, and the PDP does not distinguish between highly productive land and less productive land when it comes to subdivision.</p> <p>With Council struggling to provide urban amenities (sewerage, water supply and stormwater) and people wanting to live independent of these services in the rural areas without too much land to care for, it makes sense to allow small rural blocks.</p>	<p>Amend allotment sizes for properties (or parts thereof) that do not consist of highly productive land. Reconsider allotment sizes, perhaps with a limited number of allotments of a minimum of 8000sqm or 1ha, then 4ha generally after that.</p> <p>Consequential amendments to RPROZ-R3 Residential activity and SUB-R7 Management plan subdivision.</p>		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS172.302	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS368.055	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	<p>Amend allotment sizes in the Rural Production zone, perhaps with a limited number of allotments with minimum areas of 8000m² or 1ha, then 4ha generally after that. Smaller lot sizes should apply for properties (or parts thereof) that do not consist of highly productive land.</p> <p>Consequential amendments to RPROZ-R3 Residential activity and SUB-R7 Management plan subdivision</p>	Allow	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
S439.001	John Joseph and Jacqueline	SUB-S1	Oppose	The new subdivision rules, requiring a minimum lot size of 8ha (without a Management Plan) will severely restrict	Amend allotment sizes for properties (or parts thereof) that do not consist of highly productive land. Reconsider allotment sizes, perhaps with a		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
	Elizabeth Matthews			<p>the ability to create small rural lots in the rural production zone.</p> <p>The reason given for this rule is to protect the productive potential of the rural area, in particular, highly productive land. However, the majority of land in the Far North District does not come under this category, and the PDP does not distinguish between highly productive land and less productive land when it comes to subdivision.</p> <p>With Council struggling to provide urban amenities (sewerage, water supply and stormwater) and people wanting to live independent of these services in the rural areas without too much land to care for, it makes sense to allow small rural blocks.</p>	<p>limited number of allotments of a minimum of 8,000m or 1ha, then 4ha generally after that.</p> <p>Consequential amendments to RPROZ-R3 Residential activity and SUB-R7 Management plan subdivision.</p>			
FS172.330	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons stated in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS368.056	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	<p>Amend allotment sizes in the Rural Production zone, perhaps with a limited number of allotments with minimum areas of 8000m² or 1ha, then 4ha generally after that. Smaller lot sizes should apply for properties (or parts thereof) that do not consist of highly productive land.</p> <p>Consequential amendments to RPROZ-R3 Residential activity and SUB-R7 Management plan subdivision</p>	Allow	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
S540.001	Geoffrey Raymond Lodge	SUB-S1	Oppose	The Council has imposed punitive and restrictive rules to the zones, apparently regardless of a property's productive capacity or existing lot sizes and land use patterns, seemingly not caring that such restrictions are likely to render many marginal productive units	<p>Amend SUB-S1 minimum lot sizes applying to the Rural Production Zone to:</p> <p>Controlled Activity: 40 ha 20haRestricted Discretionary Activity: 12ha; or in each five-year period, up to 2 lots of between 3,000m² and 1ha over the period of the</p>		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>uneconomic to continue productive use on because of an inability for the property owner to diversity or reduce debt burden.</p> <p>Where a zone covers such a wide area and exhibits such a wide range of physical characteristics and lot sizes, a one size fits all approach is not supportable or sustainable for the rural community.</p>	<p>life of the District Plan Discretionary Activity: 8ha 4ha</p>		
FS172.335	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons stated in this primary submission.	Allow	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
S472.010	Michael Foy	SUB-S1	Oppose	<p>The new subdivision rules, requiring a minimum lot size of 8ha (without a management plan) will severely restrict the ability to create small rural lots in the rural production zone. The effects of this restriction include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A reduction in vitality for rural communities • no longer allowing farmers to retire in their existing homes with a small area of land • the creation of 8ha blocks, which are too large for lifestyle blocks and too small to be productive • no longer allowing for the creation of appropriately sized and desirable lifestyle blocks • reduce the ability for rural landowners to provide small blocks for young family members to build on and enter the property market this is contrary to Council policies in relation to affordable 	Amend standard SUB-S1 in relation to the Rural Production Zone, to generally allow lots of 4ha, and allow lots less than 4ha around existing houses	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				housing reduced capacity for farmers to decrease their debt burdens by subdividing off small block of land that do not significantly add to the productivity of their farm. Where it is necessary to reduce debt by subdivision, subdividing off 8ha will diminish the productive capacity of the farm more than a smaller block.				
FS258.5	logan king		Support		Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS259.5	Leah Frieling		Support		Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS259.8	Leah Frieling		Support		Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS368.078	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Amend standard SUB-S1 in relation to the Rural Production Zone, to generally allow lots of 4ha, and allow lots less than 4ha around existing houses.	Allow	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
S417.001	Kathleen Jones	SUB-S1	Oppose	The proposed increase of lot sizes may lead to an increase in productive land being taken out of production, noting even 2ha lots are too large for many homeowners to have as house lots resulting in productive land being wasted. Also, the minimum lot sizes for both permitted and discretionary activities do not provide provision for housing lots for family members.	Amend the site areas for rural production zone so they are reduced and insert provision for 0.5ha to 1ha lots.		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS196.94	Joe Carr		Support in part	I support the submitter in part as the relief sought would need to be	Allow in part		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				accompanied by very strong reverse sensitivity Plan provisions				
S464.001	LJ King Ltd	SUB-S1	Oppose	<p>The new subdivision rules, requiring a minimum lot size of 8ha (without a Management Plan) will severely restrict the ability to create small rural lots in the rural production zone.</p> <p>The reason given for this rule is to protect the productive potential of the rural area, in particular, highly productive land. However, the majority of land in the Far North District does not come under this category, and the PDP does not distinguish between highly productive land and less productive land when it comes to subdivision.</p> <p>With Council struggling to provide urban amenities (sewerage, water supply and stormwater) and people wanting to live independent of these services in the rural areas without too much land to care for, it makes sense to allow small rural blocks.</p>	Amend allotment sizes for properties (or parts thereof) that do not consist of highly productive land. Reconsider allotment sizes, perhaps with a limited number of allotments of a minimum of 8000sqm or 1ha, then 4ha generally after that.	Consequential amendments to RPROZ-R3 Residential activity and SUB-R7 Management plan subdivision	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS196.179	Joe Carr		Support	i support in principle	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS368.057	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	<p>Amend allotment sizes in the Rural Production zone, perhaps with a limited number of allotments with minimum areas of 8000m² or 1ha, then 4ha generally after that. Smaller lot sizes should apply for properties (or parts thereof) that do not consist of highly productive land.</p> <p>Consequential amendments to RPROZ-R3 Residential activity and SUB-R7 Management plan subdivision</p>	Allow	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS566.1546	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 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
S179.106	Russell Protection Society (INC)	SUB-S1	Support in part	Support in order to retain the level of protection previously afforded by the General Coastal, coastal living and coastal residential zones in the operative plan	Retain Sub -S1 minimum allotment sizes for Kororareka Russell Township zone, rural production, rural residential, rural lifestyle		Accept	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1 <i>Note: This submission point is duplicated in Appendix 2 of other relevant rural section 42A reports with respect to SUB-S1 amendments for those rural zones.</i>
FS23.062	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support in part	Agree it is important to ensure effects of subdivision, including cumulative effects, are appropriately considered during consenting processes. Also agree with the lot sizes proposed for Kororareka zone, and the other zones to the extent this is consistent with our primary submission.	Allow in part	Allow relief sought to the extent relief sought is consistent with our primary submission.	Accept	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS372.033	John Andrew Riddell		Support	The minimum lot sizes are consistent with Part 2 of the Act, with national policy statements and with the Regional Policy Statement for Northland.	Allow	Grant the submission and retain the minimum allotment sizes for Kororareka Russell Township, Rural Production, Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle zones.	Accept	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
S40.001	Martin John Yuretich	SUB-S1	Oppose	The new subdivision rules, requiring a minimum lot size of 8ha (without a Management Plan) will severely restrict the ability to create small rural lots in the rural production zone. The reason given for this rule is to protect the productive potential of the rural area, in particular, highly productive land. However, the majority of land in the Far North District does not come under this category, and the	Amend allotment sizes, perhaps with a limited number of allotments of a minimum of 8000m ² or 1ha, then 4ha generally after that. Smaller lot sizes should apply for properties (or parts thereof) that do not consist of highly productive land. Perhaps there should be more focus on the size of the balance parcel - subdividing off 4ha to leave a 10ha balance parcel does not protect productivity, while subdividing 1ha off a 200ha block has next to no effect, especially if the smaller block consists of bush.		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>PDP does not distinguish between highly productive land and less productive land when it comes to subdivision.</p> <p>With Council struggling to provide urban amenities (sewerage, water supply and stormwater) and people wanting to live independent of these services in the rural areas without too much land to care for, it makes sense to allow small rural blocks.</p> <p>It is correct to protect rural productive potential, but this can be achieved without imposing a total restriction on rural lifestyle properties.</p>	Consequential amendments to RPROZ-R3 Residential activity and SUB-R7 Management plan subdivision.			
FS548.001	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Support	Federated Farmers supports the relief sought. The issues raised by the submitter are major issues faced by our farming members and heavily influence how they operate their farms.	Allow	Allow	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS587.003	Peter Malcolm		Support	The submitter considers the minimum lot sizes for the Rural Production zone are too large and / or restrictive. Some flexibility is required for those wanting to convert their land into lifestyle blocks or smaller independent blocks rather than having to sell larger parcels of productive land and move from the district. The relief sought could help generate greater investment and enhanced rural productivity.	Allow in part	Retain operative Rule 13.7.2.1(i) minimum lot size 20ha as a controlled activity and provide for a limited number of minimum lot size 4ha as a discretionary activity for Rural Production Zone. Amend the Subdivision Chapter to insert a cluster option for larger blocks which enables 4 x 10,000m ² per initial parent lot with the balance parcel containing a minimum area (i.e., 40ha). Amend Subdivision Chapter to enable boundary adjustments between existing titles in rural zones as a permitted activity and require the minimum area for the smaller parcel to be 1ha (inferred).	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S41.001	Joel Vieviorka	SUB-S1	Oppose	<p>The new subdivision rules, requiring a minimum lot size of 8ha (without a Management Plan) will severely restrict the ability to create small rural lots in the rural production zone.</p> <p>The reason given for this rule is to protect the productive potential of the rural area, in particular, highly productive land. However, the majority of land in the Far North District does not come under this category, and the PDP does not distinguish between highly productive land and less productive land when it comes to subdivision.</p> <p>With Council struggling to provide urban amenities (sewerage, water supply and stormwater) and people wanting to live independent of these services in the rural areas without too much land to care for, it makes sense to allow small rural blocks.</p> <p>It is correct to protect rural productive potential, but this can be achieved without imposing a total restriction on rural lifestyle properties.</p>	<p>Amend allotment sizes in the Rural Production zone, perhaps with a limited number of allotments with minimum areas of 8000m² or 1ha, then 4ha generally after that. Smaller lot sizes should apply for properties (or parts thereof) that do not consist of highly productive land.</p> <p>Perhaps there should be more focus on the size of the balance parcel - subdividing off 4ha to leave a 10ha balance parcel does not protect productivity, while subdividing 1ha off a 200ha block has next to no effect, especially if the smaller block consists of bush.</p> <p>Consequential amendments to RPROZ-R3 Residential activity and SUB-R7 Management plan subdivision.</p>		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS548.002	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Support	Federated Farmers supports the relief sought. The issues raised by the submitter are major issues faced by our farming members and heavily influence how they operate their farms.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS368.048	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	<p>Amend allotment sizes in the Rural Production zone, perhaps with a limited number of allotments with minimum areas of 8000m² or 1ha, then 4ha generally after that. Smaller lot sizes should apply for properties (or parts thereof) that do not consist of highly productive land.</p> <p>Consequential amendments to</p>	Allow	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				RPROZ-R3 Residential activity and SUB-R7 Management plan subdivision				
FS587.004	Peter Malcolm		Support	The submitter considers the minimum lot sizes for the Rural Production zone are too large and / or restrictive. Some flexibility is required for those wanting to convert their land into lifestyle blocks or smaller independent blocks rather than having to sell larger parcels of productive land and move from the district. The relief sought could help generate greater investment and enhanced rural productivity.	Allow in part	Retain operative Rule 13.7.2.1(i) minimum lot size 20ha as a controlled activity and provide for a limited number of minimum lot size 4ha as a discretionary activity for Rural Production Zone. Amend the Subdivision Chapter to insert a cluster option for larger blocks which enables 4 x 10,000m ² per initial parent lot with the balance parcel containing a minimum area (i.e., 40ha). Amend Subdivision Chapter to enable boundary adjustments between existing titles in rural zones as a permitted activity and require the minimum area for the smaller parcel to be 1ha (inferred).	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
S146.001	Trevor John Ashford	SUB-S1	Oppose	<p>The new subdivision rules, requiring a minimum lot size of 8ha (without a Management Plan) will severely restrict the ability to create small rural lots in the rural production zone.</p> <p>The reason given for this rule is to protect the productive potential of the rural area, in particular, highly productive land. However, the majority of land in the Far North District does not come under this category, and the PDP does not distinguish between highly productive land and less productive land when it comes to subdivision.</p> <p>With Council struggling to provide urban amenities (sewerage, water supply and stormwater) and people</p>	Amend allotment sizes for properties (or parts thereof) that do not consist of highly productive land. Reconsider allotment sizes, perhaps with a limited number of allotments of a minimum of 8000sqm or 1ha, then 4ha generally after that.	Consequential amendments to RPROZ-R3 Residential activity and SUB-R7 Management plan subdivision.	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				wanting to live independent of these services in the rural areas without too much land to care for, it makes sense to allow small rural blocks.				
FS548.030	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Support	Federated Farmers supports the relief sought. The issues raised by the submitter are major issues faced by our farming members and heavily influence how they operate their farms.	Allow	Support the relief sought.	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS368.050	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Amend allotment sizes in the Rural Production zone, perhaps with a limited number of allotments with minimum areas of 8000m ² or 1ha, then 4ha generally after that. Smaller lot sizes should apply for properties (or parts thereof) that do not consist of highly productive land. Consequential amendments to RPROZ-R3 Residential activity and SUB-R7 Management plan subdivision	Allow	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
S167.064	Bentzen Farm Limited	SUB-S1	Oppose	The Proposed 40ha minimum allotment size in the Rural Production Zone is opposed and a 20ha average lot size is sought for the following reasons: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The 40ha minimum follows a productive use of land imperative for the zone which in many instances cannot be achieved and is unsuitable to many steep, coastal and/or bush-clad parts of the district. A smaller 20ha lot size is more able to be managed by owners with non-productive land units such as bush blocks and regenerating land. The district has a long-established subdivision 	Amend SUB-S1 as follows: Minimum allotment sizes to a 20ha minimum average allotment size as a controlled activity in the Rural Production Zone. Minimum allotment sizes to a 8ha minimum average allotment size as a discretionary activity in the Rural Production Zone.		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>pattern through a minimum lot size of 20ha.</p> <p>3. 20ha can be a productive lot.</p> <p>4. An average lot size reduces the risk of arbitrary lot design, enabling the landowner to design a subdivision in a manner that takes the characteristics of the land and its resources into account.</p>				
FS393.014	Amanda Kennedy, Julia Kennedy Till and Simon Till		Support	For the reasons given within the Original Submission No 167.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS405.050	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support in part	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the requested amendment to SUB-S1 to change the minimum allotment size. It notes in their original submission, the provision of a 20ha minimum lot size in the RPROZ as a controlled activity is sought.	Allow in part	Allow in part the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS401.012	Carrington Estate Jade LP and Carrington Farms Jade LP		Support	For the reasons given within the Original Submission No 167	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS361.043	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support in part	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the requested amendment to SUB-S1 to change the minimum allotment size. It notes in their original submission the provision of a 20ha minimum lot size in the RPROZ as a controlled activity is sought.	Allow in part	Allow in part the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS566.426	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow		Accept	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S415.001	LMD Planning Consultancy	SUB-S1	Oppose	Subdivision standards proposed for the Rural Production zone are too restrictive, particularly as applicable to Sacred Heart Catholic Church premises at 867 State Highway 10, Waitaruke (Part Waihapa 3A1 Blk).	Amend Standard SUB-S1 to reduce the thresholds for subdivision in the Rural Production Zone as follows: Controlled activity - 40ha 20ha Discretionary activity - 8ha 4ha		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS405.049	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support in part	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the submission point on the basis that the minimum allotment size of the Rural Production Zone is changed to 20 hectares as 40 hectares is considered to be overly conservative.	Allow in part	Allow in part the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS361.041	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support in part	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the submission point on the basis that the minimum allotment size of the Rural Production Zone is changed to 20 hectares as 40 hectares is considered to be overly conservative	Allow in part	Allow in part the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS587.013	Peter Malcolm		Support	The submitter considers the minimum lot sizes for the Rural Production zone are too large and / or restrictive. Some flexibility is required for those wanting to convert their land into lifestyle blocks or smaller independent blocks rather than having to sell larger parcels of productive land and move from the district. The relief sought could help generate greater investment and enhanced rural productivity.	Allow	Retain operative Rule 13.7.2.1(i) minimum lot size 20ha as a controlled activity and provide for a limited number of minimum lot size 4ha as a discretionary activity for Rural Production Zone. Amend the Subdivision Chapter to insert a cluster option for larger blocks which enables 4 x 10,000m ² per initial parent lot with the balance parcel containing a minimum area (i.e., 40ha). Amend Subdivision Chapter to enable boundary adjustments between existing titles in rural zones as a permitted activity and require the minimum area for the smaller parcel to be 1ha (inferred).	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S243.082	Matauri Trustee Limited	SUB-S1	Oppose	<p>The Proposed 40ha minimum allotment size in the Rural Production Zone is opposed and a 20ha average lot size is sought for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The 40ha minimum follows a productive use of land imperative for the zone which in many instances cannot be achieved and is unsuitable to many steep, coastal and/or bush-clad parts of the district. A smaller 20ha lot size is more able to be managed by owners with non-productive land units such as bush blocks and regenerating land. 2. The district has a long-established subdivision pattern through a minimum lot size of 20ha. 3. 20ha can be a productive lot. 4. An average lot size reduces the risk of arbitrary lot design, enabling the landowner to design a subdivision in a manner that takes the characteristics of the land and its resources into account. 	<p>Amend SUB-S1 as follows:</p> <p>Minimum allotment sizes to a 20ha minimum average allotment size as a controlled activity in the Rural Production Zone.</p> <p>Minimum allotment sizes to a 8ha minimum average allotment size as a discretionary activity in the Rural Production Zone.</p>		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS405.051	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support in part	<p>Ballantyne & Agnew supports the requested amendment to SUB-S1 to change the minimum allotment size. It notes in their original submission the provision of a 20ha minimum lot size in the RPROZ as a controlled activity is sought.</p>	Allow in part	Allow in part the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS361.044	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support in part	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the requested amendment to SUB-S1 to change the minimum allotment size. It notes in their original submission the provision of a 20ha minimum lot size in the RPROZ as a controlled activity is sought.	Allow in part	Allow in part the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS570.640	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 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS566.654	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 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS569.676	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 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
S250.012	Willowridge Developments Limited	SUB-S1	Support in part	The 40ha allotment size proposed for the RPROZ is considered to be overly conservative, with insufficient consideration of other lot sizes that could reasonably achieve the sought outcomes by the zone. With respect to the RLZ, it is unclear why the proposed minimum lot size for controlled activity subdivision has been selected. To 4ha controlled activity subdivision is inconsistent with the residential density control provided in the RLZ Chapter.	Review and consider a regional consistency with neighbouring Council's for minimum lot sizes, in particular the provision of a 20ha minimum lot size in the RPROZ as a controlled activity. Amend to align the minimum lot size of the RLZ with the residential intensity control of the RLZ Chapter. Retain the minimum lot size for subdivision in the Settlement Zone as notified.		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1 <i>Note: This submission point is duplicated in Appendix 2 of other relevant rural section 42A reports with respect to SUB-S1 amendments for those rural zones.</i>
FS332.262	Russell Protection Society		Oppose	Rural production zone minimum allotment size of 40ha is appropriate in coastal areas.	Disallow in part	Disallow the original submission in part.	Accept	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS570.698	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS566.712	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 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS569.734	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 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
S334.002	FNR Properties Limited	SUB-S1	Oppose	<p>Do not support the RPZ provisions relating to minimum allotment size. Such a substantial reduction in the permitted residential intensity threshold in the RPZ is extremely heavy-handed and will result in significant adverse effects on the socio-economic wellbeing of the Far North District.</p> <p>Reasons are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not recognise the immediate need for more housing in the district. • Imposing such restrictions on residential intensity will only contribute further to the current housing crisis that is being observed both locally and nationwide. • Providing more options for residential intensity as a Controlled, Restricted Discretionary, and Discretionary Activity would be more appropriate as this will enable such development to occur in the RPZ while providing for case by case consideration of any proposed residential activity within the context of the subject site and immediate surrounding environment (as 	Amend SUB-S1 Minimum Allotment Sizes (Rural Production) and reduce the minimum lot sizes in the RPZ, and/or to provide for more options for subdivision in the RPZ as a Controlled, Restricted Discretionary, and Discretionary Activity.		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				opposed to a 'one size fits all' approach).				
FS305.014	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	Further residential / subdivision opportunities within the Rural Production zone should be provided for.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS368.074	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Amend SUB-S1 Minimum Allotment Sizes (Rural Production) and reduce the minimum lot sizes in the RPZ, and/or to provide for more options for subdivision in the RPZ as a Controlled, Restricted Discretionary, and Discretionary Activity	Allow	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
S377.001	Rua Hatu Trust	SUB-S1	Oppose	<p>The new subdivision rules, requiring a minimum lot size of 8ha (without a Management Plan) will severely restrict the ability to create small rural lots in the rural production zone.</p> <p>The reason given for this rule is to protect the productive potential of the rural area, in particular, highly productive land. However, the majority of land in the Far North District does not come under this category, and the PDP does not distinguish between highly productive land and less productive land when it comes to subdivision.</p> <p>With Council struggling to provide urban amenities (sewerage, water supply and stormwater) and people wanting to live independent of these services in the rural areas without too much land to care for, it makes sense to allow small rural blocks.</p>	Amend allotment sizes for properties (or parts thereof) that do not consist of highly productive land. Reconsider allotment sizes, perhaps with a limited number of allotments of a minimum of 8000sqm or 1ha, then 4ha generally after that. Consequential amendments to RPROZ-R3 Residential activity and SUB-R7 Management plan subdivision.		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS368.041	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support in part	Amend allotment sizes, perhaps with a limited number of allotments of a minimum of 8000m ² or 1ha, then 4ha generally after that. Smaller lot sizes should apply for properties (or parts	Allow in part	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				thereof) that do not consist of highly productive land. ...Consequential amendments to RPROZ-R3 Residential activity and SUB-R7 Management plan subdivision				
S161.001	Shanon Garton	SUB-S1	Oppose	<p>The new subdivision rules, requiring a minimum lot size of 8ha (without a Management Plan) will severely restrict the ability to create small rural lots in the rural production zone.</p> <p>The reason given for this rule is to protect the productive potential of the rural area, in particular, highly productive land. However, the majority of land in the Far North District does not come under this category, and the PDP does not distinguish between highly productive land and less productive land when it comes to subdivision.</p> <p>With Council struggling to provide urban amenities (sewerage, water supply and stormwater) and people wanting to live independent of these services in the rural areas without too much land to care for, it makes sense to allow small rural blocks.</p>	Amend allotment sizes for Rural Production properties (or parts thereof) that do not consist of highly productive land. Reconsider allotment sizes, perhaps with a limited number of allotments of a minimum of 8000sqm or 1ha, then 4ha generally after that.	Consequential amendments to RPROZ-R3 Residential activity and SUB-R7 Management plan subdivision.	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS368.051	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	<p>Amend allotment sizes in the Rural Production zone, perhaps with a limited number of allotments with minimum areas of 8000m² or 1ha, then 4ha generally after that. Smaller lot sizes should apply for properties (or parts thereof) that do not consist of highly productive land.</p> <p>Consequential amendments to RPROZ-R3 Residential activity and SUB-R7 Management plan subdivision</p>	Allow	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS587.0010	Peter Malcolm		Support	The submitter considers the minimum lot sizes for the Rural Production zone	Allow in part	Retain operative Rule 13.7.2.1(i) minimum lot size	Reject	Section 5.2.30

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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>are too large and / or restrictive. Some flexibility is required for those wanting to convert their land into lifestyle blocks or smaller independent blocks rather than having to sell larger parcels of productive land and move from the district. The relief sought could help generate greater investment and enhanced rural productivity.</p>	<p>20ha as a controlled activity and provide for a limited number of minimum lot size 4ha as a discretionary activity for Rural Production Zone. Amend the Subdivision Chapter to insert a cluster option for larger blocks which enables 4 x 10,000m2 per initial parent lot with the balance parcel containing a minimum area (i.e., 40ha). Amend Subdivision Chapter to enable boundary adjustments between existing titles in rural zones as a permitted activity and require the minimum area for the smaller parcel to be 1ha (inferred).</p>		<p>Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1</p>
<p>S163.001</p>	<p>Julianne Sally Bainbridge</p>	<p>SUB-S1</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>The new subdivision rules, requiring a minimum lot size of 8ha (without a Management Plan) will severely restrict the ability to create small rural lots in the rural production zone.</p> <p>The reason given for this rule is to protect the productive potential of the rural area, in particular, highly productive land. However, the majority of land in the Far North District does not come under this category, and the PDP does not distinguish between highly productive land and less productive land when it comes to subdivision.</p> <p>With Council struggling to provide urban amenities (sewerage, water supply and stormwater) and people wanting to live independent of these services in the rural areas without too much land to care for, it makes sense to allow small rural blocks.</p>	<p>Amend allotment sizes for properties (or parts thereof) that do not consist of highly productive land. Reconsider allotment sizes, perhaps with a limited number of allotments of a minimum of 8000sqm or 1ha, then 4ha generally after that.</p> <p>Consequential amendments to RPROZ-R3 Residential activity and SUB-R7 Management plan subdivision.</p>	<p>Reject</p>	<p>Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1</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
FS368.052	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Amend allotment sizes in the Rural Production zone, perhaps with a limited number of allotments with minimum areas of 8000m ² or 1ha, then 4ha generally after that. Smaller lot sizes should apply for properties (or parts thereof) that do not consist of highly productive land. Consequential amendments to RPROZ-R3 Residential activity and SUB-R7 Management plan subdivision	Allow	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS587.011	Peter Malcolm		Support	The submitter considers the minimum lot sizes for the Rural Production zone are too large and / or restrictive. Some flexibility is required for those wanting to convert their land into lifestyle blocks or smaller independent blocks rather than having to sell larger parcels of productive land and move from the district. The relief sought could help generate greater investment and enhanced rural productivity.	Allow in part	Retain operative Rule 13.7.2.1(i) minimum lot size 20ha as a controlled activity and provide for a limited number of minimum lot size 4ha as a discretionary activity for Rural Production Zone. Amend the Subdivision Chapter to insert a cluster option for larger blocks which enables 4 x 10,000m ² per initial parent lot with the balance parcel containing a minimum area (i.e., 40ha). Amend Subdivision Chapter to enable boundary adjustments between existing titles in rural zones as a permitted activity and require the minimum area for the smaller parcel to be 1ha (inferred).	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
S543.001	LJ King Limited	SUB-S1	Oppose	The new subdivision rules, requiring a minimum lot size of 8ha (without a Management Plan) will severely restrict the ability to create small rural lots in the rural production zone. The reason given for this rule is to protect the productive potential of the rural area, in particular, highly productive land. However, the majority	Amend allotment sizes for properties (or parts thereof) that do not consist of highly productive land. Reconsider allotment sizes, perhaps with a limited number of allotments of a minimum of 8000sqm or 1ha, then 4ha generally after that. Consequential amendments to RPROZ-R3 Residential activity and SUB-R7 Management plan subdivision		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>of land in the Far North District does not come under this category, and the PDP does not distinguish between highly productive land and less productive land when it comes to subdivision.</p> <p>With Council struggling to provide urban amenities (sewerage, water supply and stormwater) and people wanting to live independent of these services in the rural areas without too much land to care for, it makes sense to allow small rural blocks.</p>				
FS368.058	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	<p>Amend allotment sizes in the Rural Production zone, perhaps with a limited number of allotments with minimum areas of 8000m² or 1ha, then 4ha generally after that. Smaller lot sizes should apply for properties (or parts thereof) that do not consist of highly productive land.</p> <p>Consequential amendments to RPROZ-R3 Residential activity and SUB-R7 Management plan subdivision</p>	Allow	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS566.2162	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 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
S547.001	LJ King Limited	SUB-S1	Oppose	<p>The new subdivision rules, requiring a minimum lot size of 8ha (without a Management Plan) will severely restrict the ability to create small rural lots in the rural production zone.</p> <p>The reason given for this rule is to protect the productive potential of the rural area, in particular, highly productive land. However, the majority of land in the Far North District does not come under this category, and the PDP does not distinguish between highly productive land and less</p>	Amend allotment sizes for properties (or parts thereof) that do not consist of highly productive land. Reconsider allotment sizes, perhaps with a limited number of allotments of a minimum of 8000sqm or 1ha, then 4ha generally after that.		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
				Consequential amendments to RPROZ-R3 Residential activity and SUB-R7 Management plan subdivision				

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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>productive land when it comes to subdivision.</p> <p>With Council struggling to provide urban amenities (sewerage, water supply and stormwater) and people wanting to live independent of these services in the rural areas without too much land to care for, it makes sense to allow small rural blocks</p>				
FS368.059	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	<p>Amend allotment sizes in the Rural Production zone, perhaps with a limited number of allotments with minimum areas of 8000m² or 1ha, then 4ha generally after that. Smaller lot sizes should apply for properties (or parts thereof) that do not consist of highly productive land.</p> <p>Consequential amendments to RPROZ-R3 Residential activity and SUB-R7 Management plan subdivision</p>	Allow	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
S470.001	Helmut Friedrick Paul Letz and Angelika Eveline Letz	SUB-S1	Oppose	<p>The new subdivision rules, requiring a minimum lot size of 8ha (without a Management Plan) will severely restrict the ability to create small rural lots in the rural production zone.</p> <p>The reason given for this rule is to protect the productive potential of the rural area, in particular, highly productive land. However, the majority of land in the Far North District does not come under this category, and the PDP does not distinguish between highly productive land and less productive land when it comes to subdivision.</p> <p>With Council struggling to provide urban amenities (sewerage, water supply and stormwater) and people wanting to live independent of these services in the rural areas without too</p>	<p>Amend allotment sizes for properties (or parts thereof) that do not consist of highly productive land. Reconsider allotment sizes, perhaps with a limited number of allotments of a minimum of 8000sqm or 1ha, then 4ha generally after that.</p> <p>Consequential amendments to RPROZ-R3 Residential activity and SUB-R7 Management plan subdivision.</p>		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				much land to care for, it makes sense to allow small rural blocks.				
FS368.060	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Amend allotment sizes in the Rural Production zone, perhaps with a limited number of allotments with minimum areas of 8000m ² or 1ha, then 4ha generally after that. Smaller lot sizes should apply for properties (or parts thereof) that do not consist of highly productive land. Consequential amendments to RPROZ-R3 Residential activity and SUB-R7 Management plan subdivision	Allow	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
S544.001	Kelvin Richard Horsford	SUB-S1	Oppose	The new subdivision rules, requiring a minimum lot size of 8ha (without a Management Plan) will severely restrict the ability to create small rural lots in the rural production zone. The reason given for this rule is to protect the productive potential of the rural area, in particular, highly productive land. However, the majority of land in the Far North District does not come under this category, and the PDP does not distinguish between highly productive land and less productive land when it comes to subdivision. With Council struggling to provide urban amenities (sewerage, water supply and stormwater) and people wanting to live independent of these services in the rural areas without too much land to care for, it makes sense to allow small rural blocks	Amend allotment sizes for properties (or parts thereof) that do not consist of highly productive land. Reconsider allotment sizes, perhaps with a limited number of allotments of a minimum of 8000sqm or 1ha, then 4ha generally after that. Consequential amendments to RPROZ-R3 Residential activity and SUB-R7 Management plan subdivision		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS368.063	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Amend allotment sizes in the Rural Production zone, perhaps with a limited number of allotments with minimum areas of 8000m ² or 1ha, then 4ha generally after that. Smaller lot sizes	Allow	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>should apply for properties (or parts thereof) that do not consist of highly productive land.</p> <p>Consequential amendments to RPROZ-R3 Residential activity and SUB-R7 Management plan subdivision</p>				
FS587.014	Peter Malcolm		Support	<p>The submitter considers the minimum lot sizes for the Rural Production zone are too large and / or restrictive. Some flexibility is required for those wanting to convert their land into lifestyle blocks or smaller independent blocks rather than having to sell larger parcels of productive land and move from the district. The relief sought could help generate greater investment and enhanced rural productivity.</p>	Allow in part	<p>Retain operative Rule 13.7.2.1(i) minimum lot size 20ha as a controlled activity and provide for a limited number of minimum lot size 4ha as a discretionary activity for Rural Production Zone. Amend the Subdivision Chapter to insert a cluster option for larger blocks which enables 4 x 10,000m2 per initial parent lot with the balance parcel containing a minimum area (i.e., 40ha). Amend Subdivision Chapter to enable boundary adjustments between existing titles in rural zones as a permitted activity and require the minimum area for the smaller parcel to be 1ha (inferred).</p>	Reject	<p>Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1</p>
S569.001	Rodney S Gates and Cherie R Gates	SUB-S1	Oppose	<p>The new subdivision rules, requiring a minimum lot size of 8ha (without a Management Plan) will severely restrict the ability to create small rural lots in the rural production zone.</p> <p>The reason given for this rule is to protect the productive potential of the rural area, in particular, highly productive land. However, the majority of land in the Far North District does not come under this category, and the PDP does not distinguish between highly productive land and less</p>	Amend allotment sizes for properties (or parts thereof) that do not consist of highly productive land. Reconsider allotment sizes, perhaps with a limited number of allotments of a minimum of 8000sqm or 1ha, then 4ha generally after that.	Consequential amendments to RPROZ-R3 Residential activity and SUB-R7 Management plan subdivision	Reject	<p>Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1</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
				productive land when it comes to subdivision. With Council struggling to provide urban amenities (sewerage, water supply and stormwater) and people wanting to live independent of these services in the rural areas without too much land to care for, it makes sense to allow small rural blocks.				
FS368.064	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Amend allotment sizes in the Rural Production zone, perhaps with a limited number of allotments with minimum areas of 8000m ² or 1ha, then 4ha generally after that. Smaller lot sizes should apply for properties (or parts thereof) that do not consist of highly productive land. Consequential amendments to RPROZ-R3 Residential activity and SUB-R7 Management plan subdivision	Allow	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS348.232	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 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
S53.001	Far North Real Estate 2010 Limited	SUB-S1	Oppose	Retain the ODP minimum allotment sizes and do not increase the discretionary activity standard in the Rural Production zone to 8 hectares.	Retain the ODP minimum allotment sizes and do not increase the discretionary activity standard in the Rural Production zone to 8 hectares.		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS368.066	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Retain the ODP minimum allotment sizes and do not increase the discretionary activity standard in the Rural Production zone to 8 hectares	Allow	Retain	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
S357.010	Sean Frieling	SUB-S1	Oppose	The new subdivision rules will severely restrict the ability to create small rural lots in the rural production zone. The reason given for this rule is to protect the productive potential of the rural area, in particular, highly productive land. However, the majority	Amend standard SUB-S1 in relation to the Rural Production Zone, to generally allow lots of 4ha, and allow lots less than 4ha around existing houses.		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>of land in the Far North District does not come under this category, and the PDP does not distinguish between highly productive land and the less productive land when it comes to subdivision.</p> <p>It is correct to protect rural productive potential, but this can be achieved without imposing a total restriction on rural lifestyle properties. We do not support the large title sizes in the rural zone. We submit that subdivision should allow lots to 4ha or smaller, and that the subdivision of smaller lots around existing houses be provided for.</p>				
FS368.076	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Amend standard SUB-S1 in relation to the Rural Production Zone, to generally allow lots of 4ha, and allow lots less than 4ha around existing houses.	Allow	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
S358.010	Leah Frieling	SUB-S1	Oppose	<p>We do not support the large title sizes in the Rural Production zone. We submit that subdivision should allow lots to 4ha or smaller, and that the subdivision of smaller lots around existing houses be provided for. With Council struggling to provide urban amenities and people wanting to live independent of these services in the rural areas without too much land to care for, it makes sense to allow small rural blocks.</p> <p>It is correct to protect rural productive potential, but this can be achieved without imposing a total restriction on rural lifestyle properties.</p>	Amend standard SUB-S1 in relation to the Rural Production Zone, to generally allow lots of 4ha, and allow lots less than 4ha around existing houses.		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS368.077	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Amend standard SUB-S1 in relation to the Rural Production Zone, to generally allow lots of 4ha, and allow lots less than 4ha around existing houses.	Allow	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S543.021	LJ King Limited	SUB-S1	Oppose	We do not support the large title sizes in the rural zone and submit that the subdivision of smaller lots around existing houses be provided for	Amend standard SUB-S1 in relation to the Rural Production Zone, to generally allow lots of 4ha, and allow lots less than 4ha around existing houses.		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS368.082	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Amend standard SUB-S1 in relation to the Rural Production Zone, to generally allow lots of 4ha, and allow lots less than 4ha around existing houses	Allow	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS566.2182	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 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
S547.021	LJ King Limited	SUB-S1	Oppose	We do not support the large title sizes in the rural zone and submit that the subdivision of smaller lots around existing houses be provided for	Amend standard SUB-S1 in relation to the Rural Production Zone, to generally allow lots of 4ha, and allow lots less than 4ha around existing houses.		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS368.083	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Amend standard SUB-S1 in relation to the Rural Production Zone, to generally allow lots of 4ha, and allow lots less than 4ha around existing houses	Allow	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
S464.021	LJ King Ltd	SUB-S1	Oppose	We do not support the large title sizes in the rural zone and submit that the subdivision of smaller lots around existing houses be provided for.	Amend SUB-S1 to allow for lots less than 4ha around existing houses in the Rural Production Zone.		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS566.1566	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 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
S28.001	Trent Simpkin	SUB-S2	Oppose	Opposes that the Rural Production minimum lot sizes have been increased so much. Doubling the size of the controlled activity from 20ha min to 40ha min, and also the discretionary going from 4ha min to 8ha min (from the Operative District Plan), and also removing all other options for Titles pre 2000. Where is the new land coming from? (because it's clear across the entire district that land zoning has been	Insert a 'cluster option' for rural areas to be subdivided - suggest 4 x 4,000m2 sections per parent lot (which means the bulk of the farm is retained in one large lot). Amend minimum lot sizes to 20 ha minimum (as a controlled activity), and 4 ha minimum (as a discretionary activity).		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1 <i>Note: Though under provision SUB-S2, this submission is clearly related to SUB-S1 and has been addressed as such.</i>

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				choked rather than increased). Some other councils are allowing Rural 'clusters' similar to what the old DP allowed. This means that New Zealanders can still buy a small rural block of land to live on rather than having a massive 8Ha lot to keep (or not keep!)				
FS45.9	Tristan Simpkin		Support	<p>Support the principle of this submission.</p> <p>Lot size to be made available for further subdivision should be 5ha or even 10ha - as anything less than this is not economically viable as rural production anyway.</p> <p>Kaipara have a very similar rule which works well called 'Small Lot Development' - I suggest FNDC duplicate this.</p> <p>There will always be a need for smaller Lots in the Rural Production area, and doing an arbitrary 8ha minimum Lot size is stifling this demand.</p>	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS172.248	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS550.036	Lloyd Anderson		Oppose	These submissions seek inappropriate changes, such as re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, Spoonbill Drive and Kingfisher Drive from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential. Some points seek to weaken the policies and rules/standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural Lifestyle zone and Rural Residential zone, e.g. S349 seeks to delete references to 'rural character' and 'amenity' for the Rural Residential zone.	Disallow	Amend zoning	Accept in part	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>The scale and intensity of urban/residential development sought by these submissions would create a new township in the rural areas at the northern end of Landing Road; this scale and density of development is not anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans.</p> <p>It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area that lacks relevant infrastructure and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town in future.</p> <p>Their proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects, such as a large increase in traffic on Landing Road, one-lane bridge and other adverse effects noted under my Further Submission 1 above.</p>				
FS333.020	Maree Hart		Oppose	<p>The original submission seeks inappropriate changes, such as re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487, Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, Spoonbill Drive and Kingfisher Drive from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential. They also seek to amend the relevant rural provisions to be more permissive such as removing reference to rural character and amenity.</p> <p>The scale and intensity of residential development sought by the original submission would create a new township in the rural areas at the northern end of Landing Road. This scale and intensity is not anticipated in either the Operative or Proposed District Plan. It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area that lacks relevant infrastructure and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri.</p>	Disallow	Amend zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 to Horticulture zone or Rural Production zone; Amend provisions to protect other sites referenced in the original submission by Rural Lifestyle zoning and where relevant, provisions relating to the protection of the coastal environment, wetlands/saltmarshes, and areas that are visible from coastal waters; Amend Rural Production, Horticulture and Rural Lifestyle zone provisions to prevent urban sprawl, and protect productive soil, rural character and amenity values; Amend the District Plan to strengthen provisions for assessing and preventing cumulative and long-term	Accept in part	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				The proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects. The surrounding rural environment lacks the appropriate infrastructure, school capacity and existing safety and traffic issues on Landing Road such as a one lane bridge. There would also be effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.		adverse effects on productive areas, rural areas, areas visible from public land, ecological values and freshwater, wetlands and saltmarshes, areas that are visible from coastal waters or public land.		
FS368.085	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Insert a 'cluster option' for rural areas to be subdivided - suggest 4 x 4,000m2 sections per parent lot (which means the bulk of the farm is retained in one large lot). Amend minimum lot sizes to 20 ha minimum (as a controlled activity), and 4 ha minimum (as a discretionary activity).	Allow	Insert/Amend	Accept in part	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS569.024	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	<p>The scale and intensity of urban/residential development sought by these submissions would create a new township in rural areas at the eastern end of Kapiro Road, generating a scale and density of development that is not anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans. It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area and coastal area that lacks relevant infrastructure and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town in future.</p> <p>These submissions seek inappropriate re-zoning e.g. re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, Spoonbill Drive, Kingfisher Drive etc., as Rural Residential. Importantly, some of the submission points seek to weaken the objectives, policies and rules/standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural Lifestyle</p>	Disallow	<p>Re-zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland) in Rural Production or Horticulture zone.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rural Lifestyle zoning for existing residential properties in Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove and Kingfisher Drive, as in PDP planning map. • Minimise urban sprawl and protect the general coastal area of Skudders Beach Road by applying Rural Lifestyle zoning to existing paddocks and undeveloped areas, and ensure better protection of the coastal environment, areas that are visible from coastal waters or public land, ecological values, wetlands/ saltmarshes etc. 	Accept in part	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>zone and Rural Residential zone in general. If such changes were allowed, they would apply across the entire District and would promote urban sprawl in rural areas in all parts of the District.</p> <p>Their proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects, such as impacts on wetlands/saltmarshes, ecological values, rural environment, coastal environment, traffic impacts on one-lane bridge, amenity values and other adverse effects noted under our Further Submission 1 above.</p>				
<p>FS62.034</p>	<p>Kapiro Conservation Trust 1</p>		<p>Oppose</p>	<p>The scale and intensity of urban/residential development sought by these submissions would create a new township in rural areas at the eastern end of Kapiro Road, generating a scale and density of development that is not anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans. It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area and coastal area that lacks appropriate infrastructure and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town.</p> <p>These submissions seek inappropriate zoning e.g. re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, Spoonbill Drive, Kingfisher Drive etc., as Rural Residential. Importantly, some of the submission points seek to weaken the objectives, policies and rules/standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural Lifestyle zone and Rural Residential zone in general. If such changes were allowed, they would apply across the entire District and would promote urban</p>	<p>Disallow</p>	<p>Re-zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland) in Rural Production or Horticulture zone.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rural Lifestyle zoning for existing residential properties in Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove and Kingfisher Drive, as in PDP planning map. • Minimise urban sprawl and protect the general coastal area of Skudders Beach Road by applying Rural Lifestyle zoning to existing paddocks and undeveloped areas, and ensure better protection of the coastal environment, areas that are visible from coastal waters or public land, ecological values, wetlands/saltmarshes etc. 	<p>Accept in part</p>	<p>Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1</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>sprawl in rural areas in all parts of the District.</p> <p>Their proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects, such as impacts on wetlands/saltmarshes, ecological values, rural environment, coastal environment, traffic impacts on one-lane bridge, amenity values and other adverse effects noted under our Further Submission 1 above</p>				
FS549.036	Vanessa Anderson		Oppose	<p>These submissions seek inappropriate changes, such as re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, Spoonbill Drive and Kingfisher Drive from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential. Some points seek to weaken the policies and rules/standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural Lifestyle zone and Rural Residential zone, e.g. S349 seeks to delete references to 'rural character' and 'amenity' for the Rural Residential zone.</p> <p>The scale and intensity of urban/residential development sought by these submissions would create a new township in the rural areas at the northern end of Landing Road; this scale and density of development is not anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans.</p> <p>It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area that lacks relevant infrastructure and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town in future.</p> <p>Their proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects, such as a large increase in traffic on Landing Road,</p>	Disallow	Amend zoning	Accept in part	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				one-lane bridge and other adverse effects noted under my Further Submission 1 above.				
FS443.036	Peter O'Neil Donnellon		Oppose	<p>These submissions seek inappropriate changes, such as re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, Spoonbill Drive and Kingfisher Drive from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential. Some points seek to weaken the policies and rules/standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural Lifestyle zone and Rural Residential zone, e.g. S349 seeks to delete references to 'rural character' and 'amenity' for the Rural Residential zone.</p> <p>The scale and intensity of urban/residential development sought by these submissions would create a new township in the rural areas at the northern end of Landing Road; this scale and density of development is not anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans.</p> <p>It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area that lacks relevant infrastructure and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town in future.</p> <p>Their proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects, such as a large increase in traffic on Landing Road, one-lane bridge and other adverse effects noted under my Further Submission 1 above.</p>	Disallow	Amend zoning	Accept in part	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS390.036	Tracey Schubert		Oppose	These submissions seek inappropriate changes, such as re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove,	Disallow	Amend zoning	Accept in part	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>Spoonbill Drive and Kingfisher Drive from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential. Some points seek to weaken the policies and rules/standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural Lifestyle zone and Rural Residential zone, e.g. S349 seeks to delete references to 'rural character' and 'amenity' for the Rural Residential zone.</p> <p>The scale and intensity of urban/residential development sought by these submissions would create a new township in the rural areas at the northern end of Landing Road; this scale and density of development is not anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans.</p> <p>It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area that lacks relevant infrastructure and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town in future.</p> <p>Their proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects, such as a large increase in traffic on Landing Road, one-lane bridge and other adverse effects noted under my Further Submission 1 above.</p>				
FS353.036	Al Panckhurst		Oppose	<p>These submissions seek inappropriate changes, such as re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, Spoonbill Drive and Kingfisher Drive from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential. Some points seek to weaken the policies and rules/standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural Lifestyle zone and Rural Residential zone, e.g. S349 seeks to delete references to</p>	Disallow	Amend zoning	Accept in part	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>'rural character' and 'amenity' for the Rural Residential zone.</p> <p>The scale and intensity of urban/residential development sought by these submissions would create a new township in the rural areas at the northern end of Landing Road; this scale and density of development is not anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans.</p> <p>It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area that lacks relevant infrastructure and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town in future.</p> <p>Their proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects, such as a large increase in traffic on Landing Road, one-lane bridge and other adverse effects noted under my Further Submission 1 above.</p>				
FS352.036	Kathryn Panckhurst		Oppose	<p>These submissions seek inappropriate changes, such as re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, Spoonbill Drive and Kingfisher Drive from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential. Some points seek to weaken the policies and rules/standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural Lifestyle zone and Rural Residential zone, e.g. S349 seeks to delete references to 'rural character' and 'amenity' for the Rural Residential zone.</p> <p>The scale and intensity of urban/residential development sought by these submissions would create a new township in the rural areas at the northern end of Landing Road; this scale and density of development is not</p>	Disallow	Amend zoning	Accept in part	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans. It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area that lacks relevant infrastructure and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town in future.</p> <p>Their proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects, such as a large increase in traffic on Landing Road, one-lane bridge and other adverse effects noted under my Further Submission 1 above.</p>				
FS342.036	Chris Baker		Oppose	<p>These submissions seek inappropriate changes, such as re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, Spoonbill Drive and Kingfisher Drive from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential. Some points seek to weaken the policies and rules/standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural Lifestyle zone and Rural Residential zone, e.g. S349 seeks to delete references to 'rural character' and 'amenity' for the Rural Residential zone.</p> <p>The scale and intensity of urban/residential development sought by these submissions would create a new township in the rural areas at the northern end of Landing Road; this scale and density of development is not anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans.</p> <p>It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area that lacks relevant infrastructure and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town in future.</p>	Disallow	Amend zoning	Accept in part	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>Their proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects, such as a large increase in traffic on Landing Road, one-lane bridge and other adverse effects noted under my Further Submission 1 above.</p>				
<p>FS338.036</p>	<p>Pearl Mahoney</p>		<p>Oppose</p>	<p>These submissions seek inappropriate changes, such as re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, Spoonbill Drive and Kingfisher Drive from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential. Some points seek to weaken the policies and rules/standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural Lifestyle zone and Rural Residential zone, e.g. S349 seeks to delete references to 'rural character' and 'amenity' for the Rural Residential zone.</p> <p>The scale and intensity of urban/residential development sought by these submissions would create a new township in the rural areas at the northern end of Landing Road; this scale and density of development is not anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans. It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area that lacks relevant infrastructure and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town in future.</p> <p>Their proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects, such as a large increase in traffic on Landing Road, one-lane bridge and other adverse effects noted under my Further Submission 1 above.</p>	<p>Disallow</p>	<p>Amend zoning</p>	<p>Accept in part</p>	<p>Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1</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
FS337.036	Kevin Mahoney		Oppose	<p>These submissions seek inappropriate changes, such as re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, Spoonbill Drive and Kingfisher Drive from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential. Some points seek to weaken the policies and rules/standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural Lifestyle zone and Rural Residential zone, e.g. S349 seeks to delete references to 'rural character' and 'amenity' for the Rural Residential zone.</p> <p>The scale and intensity of urban/residential development sought by these submissions would create a new township in the rural areas at the northern end of Landing Road; this scale and density of development is not anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans.</p> <p>It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area that lacks relevant infrastructure and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town in future.</p> <p>Their proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects, such as a large increase in traffic on Landing Road, one-lane bridge and other adverse effects noted under my Further Submission 1 above.</p>	Disallow	Amend zoning	Accept in part	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
FS336.036	Roger Holman		Oppose	<p>These submissions seek inappropriate changes, such as re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, Spoonbill Drive and Kingfisher Drive from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential. Some points seek to weaken the policies and</p>	Disallow	Amend zoning	Accept in part	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>rules/standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural Lifestyle zone and Rural Residential zone, e.g. S349 seeks to delete references to 'rural character' and 'amenity' for the Rural Residential zone.</p> <p>The scale and intensity of urban/residential development sought by these submissions would create a new township in the rural areas at the northern end of Landing Road; this scale and density of development is not anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans.</p> <p>It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area that lacks relevant infrastructure and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town in future.</p> <p>Their proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects, such as a large increase in traffic on Landing Road, one-lane bridge and other adverse effects noted under my Further Submission 1 above.</p>				
FS335.036	Craig and Mary Sawers		Oppose	<p>These submissions seek inappropriate changes, such as re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, Spoonbill Drive and Kingfisher Drive from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential. Some points seek to weaken the policies and rules/standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural Lifestyle zone and Rural Residential zone, e.g. S349 seeks to delete references to 'rural character' and 'amenity' for the Rural Residential zone.</p> <p>The scale and intensity of urban/residential development sought</p>	Disallow	Amend zoning	Accept in part	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>by these submissions would create a new township in the rural areas at the northern end of Landing Road; this scale and density of development is not anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans. It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area that lacks relevant infrastructure and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town in future.</p> <p>Their proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects, such as a large increase in traffic on Landing Road, one-lane bridge and other adverse effects noted under my Further Submission 1 above.</p>				
FS334.036	Fiona Clarke		Oppose	<p>These submissions seek inappropriate changes, such as re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (Tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, Spoonbill Drive and Kingfisher Drive from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential. Some points seek to weaken the policies and rules/standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural Lifestyle zone and Rural Residential zone, e.g. S349 seeks to delete references to 'rural character' and 'amenity' for the Rural Residential zone.</p> <p>The scale and intensity of urban/residential development sought by these submissions would create a new township in the rural areas at the northern end of Landing Road; this scale and density of development is not anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans.</p> <p>It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area that lacks relevant infrastructure and would fail to provide</p>	Disallow	Amend zoning	Accept in part	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town in future.</p> <p>Their proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects, such as a large increase in traffic on Landing Road, one-lane bridge and other adverse effects noted under my Further Submission 1 above.</p>				
FS587.002	Peter Malcolm		Support	The submitter considers the minimum lot sizes for the Rural Production zone are too large and / or restrictive. Some flexibility is required for those wanting to convert their land into lifestyle blocks or smaller independent blocks rather than having to sell larger parcels of productive land and move from the district. The relief sought could help generate greater investment and enhanced rural productivity.	Allow	Retain operative Rule 13.7.2.1(i) minimum lot size 20ha as a controlled activity and provide for a limited number of minimum lot size 4ha as a discretionary activity for Rural Production Zone. Amend the Subdivision Chapter to insert a cluster option for larger blocks which enables 4 x 10,000m ² per initial parent lot with the balance parcel containing a minimum area (i.e., 40ha). Amend Subdivision Chapter to enable boundary adjustments between existing titles in rural zones as a permitted activity and require the minimum area for the smaller parcel to be 1ha (inferred).	Accept in part	Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1
S55.024	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	Overview	Support in part	Support the description of the RPZ, but this should include a description of the character and amenity of the zone that is to be maintained.	Amend overview to include a description of the character and amenity of the zone, to link to objective RPROZ-O4.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: RPROZ Overview
S183.010	MLP LLC	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Landing Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable	Amend the Overview of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Landing Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Landing Scheme as well as the		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	continuation of farming activities.		
S226.010	Tryphena Trustees Limited, David Haythornwaite	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Rural Production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S227.010	Isles Casey Trustee Services Limited, WWC Trustee Company Limited	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Rural Production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S228.010	Jayesh Govind and Others	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Rural Production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S229.010	Laurie Pearson	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not	Amend the Overview of the Rural Production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource	Reject	Section 5.2.3

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.		Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S231.010	Ovisnegra Limited	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Rural Production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S232.010	Tobias Groser	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Rural Production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S233.010	Whale Bay Limited	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Rural Production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S234.010	Whale Bay Limited	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Rural Production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S235.010	WW Trustee Services 2016 Limited, Eloise Caroline Caswell, Donald Gordon Chandler	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Rural Production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S236.010	Connemara Black Limited	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Rural Production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S237.010	Evan Williams and Katherine Williams	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most	Amend the Overview of the Rural Production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).			
S238.010	John Gowing and Miriam Van Lith	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Rural Production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S239.010	John Gowing, Miriam Van Lith, Ellis Gowing, James Gowing, Byron Gowing	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Rural Production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S240.010	Matthew Watson, Kaylene Watson, D R Thomas Limited	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Rural Production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S241.010	Matthew Draper and Michaela Jannard	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will	Amend the Overview of the Rural Production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.		
S352.010	Philibert Jean-G Frick	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Rural Production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S168.088	Setar Thirty Six Limited	Overview	Oppose	For the reasons set out throughout the submission	Insert the following to the Overview: The purpose of the zone is also to contribute to the social, economic and cultural well-being of the district by providing for a range of other land use activities.	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: RPROZ Overview
S422.010	Maurice Dabbah	Overview	Oppose	The Proposed Plan, if approved, will directly affect members of the [Mataka Residents'] Association by imposing undue restrictions on the construction of residential dwellings on the Site through the application of specified overlays and rules.	Amend the Overview of the Rural Production Chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S423.010	Bernard Sabrier	Overview	Oppose	The Proposed Plan, if approved, will directly affect members of the [Mataka Residents'] Association by imposing undue restrictions on the construction of residential dwellings on the Site through the application of specified overlays and rules.	Amend the Overview of the Rural Production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S434.010	Francois Dotta	Overview	Oppose	The Proposed Plan, if approved, will directly affect members of the [Mataka Residents'] Association by imposing	Amend the Overview of the Rural Production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource	Reject	Section 5.2.3

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				undue restrictions on the construction of residential dwellings on the Site through the application of specified overlays and rules.	consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.		Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S435.010	Elka Gouzer	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Rural Production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S421.204	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Overview	Support in part	<p>Federated Farmers supports the recognition in the overview of the fact it is important to differentiate the rural production zone from the rural lifestyle and rural residential zones. We also support the strong recognition that has been given to rural land as an important resource.</p> <p>The concern Federated Farmers has is that the overview is focused on the absolute protection of highly productive from any activities other than primary production. The approach taken by the Council to prevent the fragmentation of rural production land is support but acknowledgement is also needed that all highly productive may not be profitable for the landowner. It would be unequitable for the Council to prohibit a rural landowner who has cared for the land for many years from achieving the real potential value of that land.</p> <p>The proposed district plan has strayed into private property rights through dictating what can and cannot be done on rural production land.</p>	Amend the Overview to recognise and provide for private property rights and allow landowners to subdivide land in the rural production zone for specific purposes such as creating lifestyle lots and lots for family members (amongst other matters)	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: RPROZ 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>Returns from farming are variable due to a variety of factors including weather conditions, economic conditions, individual property circumstances and market demands. Like any business, diversification, flexibility, responsiveness, and cash flow are critically important to retaining their viability.</p> <p>Farmers undertake low impact subdivision for a variety of reasons. These vary from diversifying their business into tourism operations (luxury lodges and or associated tourism development and infrastructure), providing for disposing of a surplus dwelling on the property where a neighbouring farm is purchased, providing for a family member or staff member to live on the farm or to implement a succession plan for multiple siblings through small lot subdivision. The proposed chapter has taken away any flexibility for farmers to subdivide their land for specific purposes without undermining the primary production or life-style value of the remaining land.</p> <p>The chapter as drafted, adds another layer complexity on top of the regulations and provisions that exist in regional council planning documents and in National Policy Statements. The Council seems intent of duplicating provisions which may have already been dealt with at regional and national levels.</p>				
FS24.27	Lynley Newport		Support	<p>Agree with the sentiment. Need to recognise and support the need for diversity in our rural community and enable that to occur, not prevent. Not all rural land is highly productive and</p>	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: RPROZ 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
				even when it is, there needs to be provision made for retirement lots and the like.				
FS172.315	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons stated in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: RPROZ Overview
FS196.123	Joe Carr		Support	Tautoko	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: RPROZ Overview
FS332.237	Russell Protection Society		Oppose	Subdivision of Rural production zoned land for lifestyle blocks should not be an automatic right.	Disallow in part	Disallow the original submission in part.	Accept	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: RPROZ Overview
FS368.005	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support in part	Amend the Rules to recognise and provide for private property rights and allow landowners to subdivide land in the rural production zone for specific purposes such as creating lifestyle lots and lots for family members (amongst other matters).	Allow in part	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: RPROZ Overview
FS570.1436	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: RPROZ Overview
FS346.438	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: RPROZ Overview
FS566.1450	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: RPROZ Overview
FS569.1472	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: RPROZ 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
S159.095	Horticulture New Zealand	Overview	Support	Supports the intent for the Rural Production zone	Retain the Overview		Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: RPROZ Overview
FS151.265	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: RPROZ Overview
FS570.257	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: RPROZ Overview
FS566.271	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: RPROZ Overview
FS569.293	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: RPROZ Overview
S167.090	Bentzen Farm Limited	Overview	Oppose	The zoned is inappropriately named "Rural Production". Large parts of the district that is zoned this is not suitable for rural production and certainly is not retained for rural production purposes. The zone should be renamed to "General Rural" which more accurately reflects the wider range of activities that occur in the rural environments of the Far North.	Insert the following to the Overview: The purpose of the zone is also to contribute to the social, economic and cultural well-being of the district by providing for a range of other land use activities.		Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: RPROZ Overview
FS368.026	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Insert the following to the Overview: "The purpose of the zone is also to contribute to the social, economic and cultural well-being of the district by providing for a range of other land use activities"	Allow	Insert as above	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: RPROZ Overview
FS354.195	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	The submitter seeks to amend the overview by adding: "The purpose of the zone is also to contribute to the social, economic and cultural well-being of the district by providing for a	Disallow	Disallow S167.090	Accept	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: RPROZ 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
				range of other land use activities." HortNZ does not support this as it is contrary to the direction in the National Planning Standards for the Rural Production Zone. Only those non-primary production activities that have a functional or operational need to locate in the rural environment should be provided for.				
FS566.452	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow		Accept	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: RPROZ Overview
S187.079	The Shooting Box Limited	Overview	Oppose	Refer to submission for detailed reasons for decision(s) requested relating, but not limited to, to the following: large parts of the district that is zoned Rural Production is not suitable for rural production and certainly is not retained for rural production purposes; these activities are provided for in the zone as drafted (at least by the rules, but not recognised in the zone name; the zone name should recognise the broader range of land uses which occur in rural parts of the district; sustain the productive capacity of the soil and the rural character and amenity values that are key elements; the National Planning Standards "Zone Framework Standard" refers to the "General Rural Zone" which is a better fit; and discussion concerning the primary objective of the zone.	Insert the following to the Overview: The purpose of the zone is also to contribute to the social, economic and cultural well-being of the district by providing for a range of other land use activities.		Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: RPROZ Overview
FS368.027	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Insert the following to the Overview: "The purpose of the zone is also to contribute to the social, economic and cultural well-being of the district by providing for a range of other land use activities	Allow	Insert as above	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: RPROZ 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
S222.083	Wendover Two Limited	Overview	Oppose	<p>Large parts of the district that is zoned this is not suitable for rural production and certainly is not retained for rural production purposes. The zone should be renamed to "General Rural" which more accurately reflects the wider range of activities that occur in the rural environments of the Far North. These activities are provided for in the zone as drafted (at least by the rules), but not recognised in the zone name. This is not to diminish the importance of rural production activities and these should be enabled and protected by the objectives and policies of the zone. The zone name however should recognise the broader range of land uses which occur in rural parts of the district; including bush blocks, smaller titles, residential activity and land holding which are unsuitable for rural production uses.</p> <p>It is important to strengthen the District's economy by providing for a range of land use activities in the rural area; however, accepting the priority is to sustain the productive capacity of the soil and the rural character and amenity values that are key elements. The National Planning Standards "Zone Framework Standard" refers to the "General rural zone" which is a better fit.</p> <p>There is more to it than the name, with the stated primary objective of the zone being that it "is used for primary production activities, ancillary activities that support primary production and other compatible activities that have a functional need to be in a rural environment". That puts undue emphasis on farming activities and</p>	<p>Insert the following to the Overview:</p> <p>The purpose of the zone is also to contribute to the social, economic and cultural well-being of the district by providing for a range of other land use activities.</p>	Reject	<p>Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: RPROZ Overview</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
				does not recognise the broad applicability of the zone in many unproductive areas. This point is taken up further in this submission.				
FS368.028	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Insert the following to the Overview: "The purpose of the zone is also to contribute to the social, economic and cultural well-being of the district by providing for a range of other land use activities"	Allow	Insert as above	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: RPROZ Overview
S243.108	Matauri Trustee Limited	Overview	Oppose	<p>The zoned is inappropriately named "Rural Production". Large parts of the district that is zoned Rural Production is not suitable for rural production and certainly is not retained for rural production purposes. The zone should be renamed to "General Rural" which more accurately reflects the wider range of activities that occur in the rural environments of the Far North.</p> <p>These activities are provided for in the zone as drafted (at least by the rules), but not recognised in the zone name. This is not to diminish the importance of rural production activities and these should be enabled and protected by the objectives and policies of the zone. The zone name however should recognise the broader range of land uses which occur in rural parts of the district; including bush blocks, smaller titles, residential activity and land holding which are unsuitable for rural production uses.</p> <p>It is important to strengthen the District's economy by providing for a range of land use activities in the rural area; however, accepting the priority is to sustain the productive capacity of the soil and the rural character and amenity values that are key elements.</p>	<p>Insert the following to the Overview:</p> <p>The purpose of the zone is also to contribute to the social, economic and cultural well-being of the district by providing for a range of other land use activities.</p>		Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: RPROZ 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>The National Planning Standards "Zone Framework Standard" refers to the "General rural zone" which is a better fit.</p> <p>There is more to it than the name, with the stated primary objective of the zone being that it "is used for primary production activities, ancillary activities that support primary production and other compatible activities that have a functional need to be in a rural environment". That puts undue emphasis on farming activities and does not recognise the broad applicability of the zone in many unproductive areas.</p>				
FS368.029	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Insert the following to the Overview: "The purpose of the zone is also to contribute to the social, economic and cultural well-being of the district by providing for a range of other land use activities	Allow	Insert as above	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: RPROZ Overview
FS354.196	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	<p>The submitter seeks to amend the overview by adding: "The purpose of the zone is also to contribute to the social, economic and cultural well-being of the district by providing for a range of other land use activities."</p> <p>HortNZ does not support this as it is contrary to the direction in the National Planning Standards for the Rural Production Zone. Only those non-primary production activities that have a functional or operational need to locate in the rural environment should be provided for. The submitter suggests that the zone would be better called 'General Rural Zone' but that zone description is very similar and focused on primary production with other activities that supports primary production, including rural industry and</p>	Disallow	Disallow S243.108	Accept	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: RPROZ 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
				other activities that require a rural location.				
FS570.666	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: RPROZ Overview
FS566.680	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: RPROZ Overview
FS569.702	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: RPROZ Overview
S333.080	P S Yates Family Trust	Overview	Oppose	<p>The zoned is inappropriately named "Rural Production". Large parts of the district that is zoned this is not suitable for rural production and certainly is not retained for rural production purposes. The zone should be renamed to "General Rural" which more accurately reflects the wider range of activities that occur in the rural environments of the Far North.</p> <p>These activities are provided for in the zone as drafted (at least by the rules), but not recognised in the zone name. This is not to diminish the importance of rural production activities and these should be enabled and protected by the objectives and policies of the zone. The zone name however should recognise the broader range of land uses which occur in rural parts of the district; including bush blocks, smaller titles, residential activity and land holding which are unsuitable for rural production uses.</p> <p>It is important to strengthen the District's economy by providing for a range of land use activities in the rural area; however, accepting the priority is</p>	<p>Insert the following to the overview:</p> <p>"The purpose of the zone is also to contribute to the social, economic and cultural well-being of the district by providing for a range of other land use activities".</p>	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: RPROZ 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>to sustain the productive capacity of the soil and the rural character and amenity values that are key elements. The National Planning Standards "Zone Framework Standard" refers to the "General rural zone" which is a better fit.</p> <p>There is more to it than the name, with the stated primary objective of the zone being that it "is used for primary production activities, ancillary activities that support primary production and other compatible activities that have a functional need to be in a rural environment". That puts undue emphasis on farming activities and does not recognise the broad applicability of the zone in many unproductive areas. This point is taken up further in this submission.</p>				
FS368.030	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Insert the following to the Overview: "The purpose of the zone is also to contribute to the social, economic and cultural well-being of the district by providing for a range of other land use activities	Allow	Insert as above	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: RPROZ Overview
S230.010	Mataka Residents' Association Inc	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Rural Production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS566.569	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: General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S183.011	MLP LLC	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Landing Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Landing Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Landing Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S226.011	Tryphena Trustees Limited, David Haythornwaite	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S227.011	Isles Casey Trustee Services Limited, WWC Trustee Company Limited	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S228.011	Jayesh Govind and Others	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most	Amend the Objectives of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).			
S229.011	Laurie Pearson	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S231.011	Ovisnegra Limited	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S232.011	Tobias Groser	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S233.011	Whale Bay Limited	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will	Amend the Objectives of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.		
S234.011	Whale Bay Limited	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S235.011	WW Trustee Services 2016 Limited, Eloise Caroline Caswell, Donald Gordon Chandler	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S236.011	Connemara Black Limited	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S237.011	Evan Williams and Katherine Williams	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S238.011	John Gowing and Miriam Van Lith	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S239.011	John Gowing, Miriam Van Lith, Ellis Gowing, James Gowing, Byron Gowing	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S240.011	Matthew Watson, Kaylene Watson, D R Thomas Limited	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most	Amend the Objectives of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).			
S241.011	Matthew Draper and Michaela Jannard	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S352.011	Philibert Jean-G Frick	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S422.011	Maurice Dabbah	Objectives	Oppose	The Proposed Plan, if approved, will directly affect members of the [Mataka Residents'] Association by imposing undue restrictions on the construction of residential dwellings on the Site through the application of specified overlays and rules.	Amend the Objectives of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S423.011	Bernard Sabrier	Objectives	Oppose	The Proposed Plan, if approved, will directly affect members of the [Mataka Residents'] Association by imposing undue restrictions on the construction of residential dwellings on the Site through the application of specified overlays and rules.	Amend the Objectives of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S345.001	Nicole Way and Christopher Huijich as Trustees of the Trssh Birnie Settlement Trust	Objectives	Oppose	<p>The Resource Consents at Mataka Station enable development, and completion of the Mataka Station development, notwithstanding the provisions of the Proposed District Plan.</p> <p>The Proposed District Plan fails to recognise, have regard to, or provide for the development and subdivision enabled by the Resource Consents. The Proposed District Plan provisions will restrict development of the Property, and Mataka Station more generally, in a manner that is inconsistent with the Resource Consents and the integrated and comprehensive development authorised by those.</p> <p>The Council's s32 analysis does not mention or consider approved but unimplemented developments within the Property and Mataka Station more generally, nor elsewhere. The "low intensity" development controls and height limits proposed within the Coastal Environment are given very little analysis.</p> <p>The proposed provisions are inconsistent with the Act and relevant planning instruments.</p>	<p>Amend to explicitly, and specifically provide for, and preserve the activities and land uses authorised under the Resource Consents at Mataka Station.</p> <p>and/or</p> <p>Insert a new special purpose zone and/or structure plan together with appropriate provisions (objectives, policies and rules) enabling the residential activity and development as is authorised by the Resource Consents as a permitted activity (where they are in general accordance with the Resource Consents) as well as appropriate activities within the Rural Production Zone, regardless of the provisions of the CE, ONL or HNC.</p> <p>and/or</p> <p>Amend the provisions of the Proposed District Plan to preserve the activities and buildings authorised by the Resource Consents on the Property.</p>	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S360.004	Waste Management NZ Limited	Objectives	Oppose	<p>It is critical that the Proposed Plan provide for 'waste management facilities' in a broader range of zones to reflect the functional and operational requirements of such activities, and to provide a framework within which the effects of such activities can be appropriately managed. In this respect, it is appropriate that the Proposed Plan provides for waste management facilities at the 'strategic direction' level,</p>	Amend the objectives to provide for waste management facilities.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				as well as specifically within the Light Industrial, Heavy Industrial and Rural Production zones.			
S434.011	Francois Dotta	Objectives	Oppose	The Proposed Plan, if approved, will directly affect members of the [Mataka Residents] Association by imposing undue restrictions on the construction of residential dwellings on the Site through the application of specified overlays and rules.	Amend the Objectives of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S435.011	Elka Gouzer	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S259.001	Nicole Wooster	Objectives	Support	Our family operates a beef unit, beehives, with a mixed fruit orchard that supplies local markets. It is important to ensure that farming / horticulture activities are not restricted in this zone as no other zone is suitable for the range of primary production activities we have established. Unlike residential, commercial and industrial activities, we cannot establish in settlements / towns and therefore those activities should not constrain or control what occurs on our land. Farmers should not be required to provide amenity for lifestyle / small lots. Having a horticulture activity on the property means we do not want residential activities occurring in close proximity that will complain about use of sprays.	Retain provision for farming and horticulture activities in rural production zone and ensure it is protected from inappropriate lifestyle, residential, commercial and industrial activities.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Objectives and Policies – General Comments

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS172.275	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	Does not recognise existing fragmentation.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Objectives and Policies – General Comments
FS350.037	Puketona Lodge Ltd		Oppose	Does not recognise existing fragmentation.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Objectives and Policies – General Comments
FS548.069	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Support	Federated Farmers supports this submission as rural production activities cannot be picked up and moved to other sites	Allow	Grant the relief sought.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Objectives and Policies – General Comments
FS441.032	Adrian and Sue Knight		Oppose	Does not recognise existing fragmentation.	Allow	Retain	Accept in part	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Objectives and Policies – General Comments
FS354.278	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	The submitter considers that it is important to ensure that farming/horticulture activities are not restricted in this zone as no other zone is suitable for the range of primary production activities we have established. HortNZ supports this position.	Allow	Allow S259.001	Accept in part	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Objectives and Policies – General Comments
S421.205	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Objectives	Support in part	Federated Farmers supports the recognition in the overview of the fact it is important to differentiate the rural production zone from the rural lifestyle and rural residential zones. We also support the strong recognition that has been given to rural land as an important resource. The concern Federated Farmers has is that the overview is focused on the	Amend the Objectives to recognise and provide for private property rights and allow landowners to subdivide land in the rural production zone for specific purposes such as creating lifestyle lots and lots for family members (amongst other matters)		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>absolute protection of highly productive from any activities other than primary production. The approach taken by the Council to prevent the fragmentation of rural production land is support but acknowledgement is also needed that all highly productive may not be profitable for the landowner. It would be unequitable for the Council to prohibit a rural landowner who has cared for the land for many years from achieving the real potential value of that land.</p> <p>The proposed district plan has strayed into private property rights through dictating what can and cannot be done on rural production land. Returns from farming are variable due to a variety of factors including weather conditions, economic conditions, individual property circumstances and market demands. Like any business, diversification, flexibility, responsiveness, and cash flow are critically important to retaining their viability.</p> <p>Farmers undertake low impact subdivision for a variety of reasons. These vary from diversifying their business into tourism operations (luxury lodges and or associated tourism development and infrastructure), providing for disposing of a surplus dwelling on the property where a neighbouring farm is purchased, providing for a family member or staff member to live on the farm or to implement a succession plan for multiple siblings through small lot subdivision. The proposed chapter has taken away any flexibility for farmers to subdivide their land for specific purposes without undermining the</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>primary production or life-style value of the remaining land.</p> <p>The chapter as drafted, adds another layer complexity on top of the regulations and provisions that exist in regional council planning documents and in National Policy Statements. The Council seems intent of duplicating provisions which may have already been dealt with at regional and national levels.</p>				
FS24.28	Lynley Newport		Support	Agree with sentiment - diversity is essential, as is sustainability. not all land and not all circumstances are the same. Too much emphasis on locking up all rural land for productive purposes with little thought given to alternative and appropriate use and lot size.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS172.316	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons given in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS196.122	Joe Carr		Support	Tautoko	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS332.238	Russell Protection Society		Oppose	Subdivision of Rural production zone land for lifestyle blocks should not be an automatic right.	Disallow in part	Disallow the original submission in part.	Accept	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS368.006	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support in part	Amend the Rules to recognise and provide for private property rights and allow landowners to subdivide land in the rural production zone for specific purposes such as creating lifestyle lots and lots for family members (amongst other matters).	Allow in part	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS570.1437	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

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
								Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS346.439	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS566.1451	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: General Submissions
FS569.1473	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: General Submissions
S472.030	Michael Foy	Objectives	Support in part	A separate alternative submission is to ask that the Plan redefines the RPROZ so that productive land is defined based on its ability to produce food but can accommodate things other than rural production.ie. Rural production zoning on poor soils is wrong. That is the right place to put smaller areas for housing ie.2000sq metres. The Planning Maps show the Rural Production Zone in some areas e.g. Awanui/wireless road Kaitaia that are serviced by sewerage, footpaths, etc., and it is submitted that these areas are re-zoned to reflect the existing infrastructure available and be re-zoned to allow for intensification. This should be corrected by amending RPROZ objectives, policies and rules zones to accommodate things other than rural production.	Amend the Rural Production Zone objectives so that productive land is defined based on its ability to produce food but can accommodate things other than rural production; OR amend Planning Maps to remove RPROZ from urban areas as separately submitted.		Reject	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Objectives and Policies – General Comments
FS24.68	Lynley Newport		Support in part	This is a big issue that will need to be addressed and probably cannot be done via submissions. The Council has	Allow in part		Reject	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Objectives and

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>applied a one-size fits all approach to most of the rural land within the district, zoning it Rural Production - inferring all rural land is productive, i.e. suitable for growing things. This is not true. Soil type; climatic conditions; topography; size of property; existing land uses - all contribute to productivity of a site.</p> <p>Perhaps the time is right for the Council to re-examine where it has applied the Rural Production zone and consider if this can and should be split between Rural Production and simply General Rural as well as giving serious consideration to re-visiting the zoning of areas already removed from 'production', i.e. too small; supporting alternative land uses, so that they are zoned something more appropriate than rural production - when the land can clearly not be used for rural production purposes any more. It is appreciated that this matter cannot be addressed simply through submissions and that there may need to be a re-notification of parts of the PDP, but I believe it is worth the effort.</p>				Policies – General Comments
FS155.90	Fiona King		Support		Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Objectives and Policies – General Comments
FS155.91	Fiona King		Support		Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Objectives and Policies – General Comments
FS258.1	Logan king		Support	See comments from Lynley Newport on this rule . We support her comments	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Objectives and

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
								Policies – General Comments
FS258.6	Logan king		Support		Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Objectives and Policies – General Comments
FS259.6	Leah Frieling		Support		Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Objectives and Policies – General Comments
FS259.9	Leah Frieling		Support		Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Objectives and Policies – General Comments
FS368.032	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support in part	Amend the Rural Production Zone objectives so that productive land is defined based on its ability to produce food but can accommodate things other than rural production	Allow in part	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Objectives and Policies – General Comments
S257.025	Te Hiku Community Board	Objectives	Oppose	The Planning Maps show the Rural Production Zone in some areas e.g. Awanui that are serviced by sewerage, footpaths, refuse collection etc. If this zoning continues, it will severely constrain future urban development, and this should be corrected by amending RPROZ objectives, policies and rules zones to accommodate things other than rural production.	Amend the Rural Production Zone objectives so that productive land is defined based on its ability to produce food but can accommodate things other than rural production; OR amend Planning Maps to remove RPROZ from urban areas as separately submitted.		Reject	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Objectives and Policies – General Comments
FS48.8	Nina Pivac		Support	On behalf of FNR Properties Limited and Ngai Takoto: We support this submission for those reasons outlined by Te Hiku Community Board.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Objectives and Policies – 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
S505.001	Dr Lynn Kincla	Objectives	Support in part	The properties bordering Henderson Bay Road are only 4 hectare blocks - and rural production requires a minimum of 40 hectares. I have concerns that some permissible rural production activities would possibly have a negative impact on the local environment and the small sizes of the blocks would also compound these effects. For example, intensive cropping of avocados or raising of some types of animals like pigs or chickens would impact on neighbouring properties and would put added pressures in the Roding infrastructure. I think certain intensive farming activities should be excluded from the proposed Rural production zoning at Henderson Bay to protect this coastal environment.	Amend to exclude certain intensive farming activities from the proposed Rural production zone at Henderson Bay.		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS283.2	Mark Spaans		Support in part	I agree in part. Henderson Bay has its own natural character and the current zone changes has not allowed for the status quo that was seen under the previous zoning of General Coastal Zone. Therefore, I support either a special zoning like that of the previous General Coastal or for Rural Production to have tighter control on permissible activities in Henderson Bay that protect the natural character of the area/ coastline.	Allow in part		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS311.2	Warren McKay		Support in part	The Rural production zone is not really the right zone for many properties in Henderson Bay. Most blocks are bush blocks and they are not suitable for farming activities The rural production zoning takes away some of the permitted activities covered by the Coastal General zone.	Allow in part		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>I am concerned that other activities will now be permitted that are not in keeping with the unique character of the land.</p> <p>I am concerned with the changes in setback from boundaries. In Rural zone 300m setback is needed for a dog breeding kennel at the moment it is only 50m.</p>				
FS276.1	Antoinette Pot		Support in part	<p>I agree in part. Henderson Bay has its own natural character and the current zone changes has not allowed for the status quo that was seen under the previous zoning of General Coastal Zone. Therefore, I support either a special zoning like that of the previous General Coastal or for Rural Production to have tighter control on permissible activities in Henderson Bay that protect the natural character of the area/coastline.</p>	Allow in part		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S511.118	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	Objectives	Support in part	<p>This chapter covers mineral extraction activities and farm quarries. However, there is no policy direction in the Chapter to reflect the rules to mineral extraction.</p>	Insert objectives to reflect the rule status of mineral extraction activities in accordance with the relief set out below.		Reject	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Objectives and Policies – General Comments
FS164.118	Scrumptious Fruit Trust		Support	<p>Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and secondly as passive recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help</p>	Allow	Amend HNC overlay to include Taupo Bay; Amend provisions to require strong wildlife protection; Amend provisions to require dogs on leash in beach areas; Adopt SNA and HNC provisions (inferred).	Reject	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Objectives and Policies – 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
				support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.				
FS570.1689	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Objectives and Policies – General Comments
FS566.1703	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Objectives and Policies – General Comments
FS569.1725	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Objectives and Policies – General Comments
S358.029	Leah Frieling	Objectives	Oppose	The Plan redefines the Rural Production zone so that it is based on its ability to produce food but can accommodate things other than rural production i.e.. Rural Production zoning on poor soils is wrong. That is the right place to put smaller areas for housing i.e. 2,000 m ² .	Amend the Rural Production zone objectives so that productive land is defined based on its ability to produce food but can accommodate things other than rural production; OR amend planning maps to remove the Rural Production zone from urban areas (as separately submitted).		Reject	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Objectives and Policies – General Comments
FS368.031	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support in part	Amend the Rural Production zone objectives so that productive land is defined based on its ability to produce food but can accommodate things other than rural production	Allow in part	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Objectives and Policies – General Comments
S340.002	Rosemorn Industries Limited	Objectives	Support in part	The objectives in the Rural Production Zone chapter do not provide any clear direction on when, or under what circumstances it is appropriate for existing commercial and industrial	Amend objectives of the Rural Production Zone to include more specific direction on when it is appropriate to extend existing commercial and/or industrial activities.		Reject	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Objectives and

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				activities to be extended. Clear direction is required given the level of investment associated with purchasing properties and establishing the existing activities, and the implications that the PFNDP could have with respect to any future plans for those sites and activities.				Policies – General Comments
FS354.197	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	Commercial and industrial activities do not require a rural location so should not be located in the rural production zone. While this may have occurred historically the PDP is providing a new direction consistent with the National Planning Standards.	Disallow	Disallow S340.002	Accept	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Objectives and Policies – General Comments
S442.137	Kapiro Conservation Trust	Objectives	Support in part	This chapter covers mineral extraction activities and farm quarries. However, there is no policy direction in the Chapter to reflect the rules to mineral extraction	Insert objectives to reflect the rule status of mineral extraction activities in accordance with the relief set out below.		Reject	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Objectives and Policies – General Comments
FS346.748	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS and Part 2 of the RMA and the NPS IB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Objectives and Policies – General Comments
S230.011	Mataka Residents' Association Inc	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS566.570	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: General Submissions
S143.011	Ballance Agri-Nutrients Limited	RPROZ-O1	Support	Ballance supports recognising the importance of primary production and its long-term protection.	Retain the objective RPROZ -O1		Accept	Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Objectives RPROZ-O1 and O3
S182.025	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association	RPROZ-O1	Support	Support recognizing the importance of primary production and its long term protection	Retain RPROZ-O1		Accept	Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Objectives RPROZ-O1 and O3
S213.002	Timothy and Dion Spicer	RPROZ-O1	Support		Retain objective		Accept	Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Objectives RPROZ-O1 and O3
S421.209	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	RPROZ-O1	Oppose	<p>Federated Farmers opposes objectives RPZOZ-O1 and RPZOZ-O3 as they are drafted in the proposed district plan. The objectives promote the absolute protection of the rural production zone and highly productive land.</p> <p>The National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land sets out the requirements for the management of highly productive land. Policy 8 requires the protection of highly productive land from inappropriate use and development. Clause 3.8 provides for the subdivision of highly productive land provided certain matters are met.</p> <p>Clause 3.11 state that territorial authorities must include objectives, policies, and rules in their district plans to enable the maintenance, operation, or upgrade of any existing activities on highly productive land; and ensure that</p>	Amend Objective RPZOZ-O1 to achieve consistency with the requirements of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land.		Reject	Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Objectives RPROZ-O1 and O3

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				any loss of highly productive land from those activities is minimised. The proposed district plan needs to be consistent with the requirements of the National Policy Statement. In our opinion, Objectives RPZOZ-O1 and RPZOZ-O3 do not meet the requirements of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land as they do not provide for the ongoing operation of existing activities.				
FS172.320	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons stated in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Objectives RPROZ-O1 and O3
FS196.118	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Objectives RPROZ-O1 and O3
FS66.159	Bentzen Farm Limited		Support	The District Plan is required to give effect to the NPS: Highly Productive Land	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Objectives RPROZ-O1 and O3
FS570.1441	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 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Objectives RPROZ-O1 and O3
FS346.443	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Objectives RPROZ-O1 and O3
FS566.1455	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 5.2.8

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
								Key Issue 8: Objectives RPROZ-O1 and O3
FS569.1477	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 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Objectives RPROZ-O1 and O3
S463.089	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited	RPROZ-O1	Oppose	The drafting of this objective is vague. Presumably it seeks to ensure the ongoing availability of RPROZ land for primary production, however this is unclear from the text.	Amend Policy RPROZ-O1 to clarify the outcome that this objective seeks.		Reject	Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Objectives RPROZ-O1 and O3
FS91.19	Moana Kiff		Oppose	We want to retain long term protection for current and future generations. By combining legal safeguards, cultural stewardship, sustainable land management, education, collaboration, resource allocation, climate adaptation, and Treaty recognition, New Zealand can ensure the long-term protection of Whenua Māori. This approach will not only benefit the current generation but will also honor the legacy of the past and provide a strong foundation for future generations to thrive while maintaining their cultural heritage and connection to the land.	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Objectives RPROZ-O1 and O3
S159.096	Horticulture New Zealand	RPROZ-O1	Support	Managing the Rural Production Zone for primary production is supported	Retain Objective RPROZ-O1		Accept	Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Objectives RPROZ-O1 and O3
FS570.258	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 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Objectives RPROZ-O1 and O3
FS566.272	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 5.2.8

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
								Key Issue 8: Objectives RPROZ-01 and O3
FS569.294	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 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Objectives RPROZ-01 and O3
S160.032	Manulife Forest Management (NZ) Ltd	RPROZ-01	Support	The submitter supports objective RPROZ-01.	Retain objective RPROZ-01 as it is written.		Accept	Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Objectives RPROZ-01 and O3
FS346.602	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS. Loss of natural character, coastal environment values and the values of outstanding landscapes could also result.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Objectives RPROZ-01 and O3
S143.012	Ballance Agri-Nutrients Limited	RPROZ-02	Support	Ballance supports recognising the importance of ancillary activities (such as agricultural aviation) that support primary production.	Retain the objective RPROZ-02		Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Objectives RPROZ-02 and O4
S182.026	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association	RPROZ-02	Support	Support recognising compatible activities that support primary production	Retain RPROZ-02		Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Objectives RPROZ-02 and O4
S333.081	P S Yates Family Trust	RPROZ-02	Support in part	Reference to "functional need" in this objective potentially negates the ability for other activities to establish which may be a sustainable use of land and also contribute to the economic and social development of the district. Functional need is tightly defined in the Proposed Plan as "the need for a	Amend Objective RPROZ-02 The Rural Production zone is used for primary production activities, ancillary activities that support primary production and other compatible activities that have a functional need to be in a rural environment.		Reject	Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Objectives RPROZ-02 and O4

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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>proposal or activity to traverse, locate or operate in a particular environment because the activity can only occur in that environment".</p> <p>There is a disconnect here with the subdivision opportunities provided for in the Rural Production Zone (e.g. environmental enhancement and management plan opportunities). Also, with the range of uses permitted in the zone that perhaps also have no 'functional need' to locate within the tight constraint of the definition i.e., the activity can only occur in that environment (such as Residential activities, Visitor accommodation, Educational facilities, Conservation activities, Recreational activities, Cemeteries / Urupā and Minor residential units). These subdivision opportunities where they result in environmental benefit are recognised by policy RPROZ-P6.</p>			
S168.089	Setar Thirty Six Limited	RPROZ-O2	Support in part	<p>Reference to "functional need" in this objective potentially negates the ability for other activities to establish which may be a sustainable use of land and also contribute to the economic and social development of the district. Functional need is tightly defined in the Proposed Plan as "the need for a proposal or activity to traverse, locate or operate in a particular environment because the activity can only occur in that environment".</p> <p>There is a disconnect here with the subdivision opportunities provided for in the Rural Production Zone (eg environmental enhancement and management plan opportunities). Also with the range of uses permitted in the zone that perhaps also have no</p>	<p>Amend Objective RPROZ-O2 as follows:</p> <p>The Rural Production zone is used for primary production activities, ancillary activities that support primary production and other compatible activities that have a functional need to be in a rural environment.</p>	Reject	<p>Section 5.2.9</p> <p>Key Issue 9: Objectives RPROZ-O2 and O4</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>'functional need' to locate within the tight constraint of the definition ie the activity can only occur in that environment (such as Residential activities, Visitor accommodation, Educational facilities, Conservation activities, Recreational activities, Cemeteries/Urupā and Minor residential units). These subdivision opportunities where they result in environmental benefit are recognised by policy RPROZ-P6.</p>			
<p>S187.080</p>	<p>The Shooting Box Limited</p>	<p>RPROZ-O2</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>Refer to submission for detailed reasons for decision(s) requested relating, but not limited to, to the following: the reference to "functional need" in this objective potentially negates the ability for other activities to establish which may be a sustainable use of land and also contribute to the economic social development of the district; and there is a disconnect here with the subdivision opportunities provided for in the Rural Production Zone - these subdivision opportunities where they result in environmental benefit are recognised by RPRIZ-P6.</p>	<p>Amend Objective RPROZ-O2 The Rural Production zone is used for primary production activities, ancillary activities that support primary production and other compatible activities that have a functional need to be in a rural environment.</p>	<p>Reject</p>	<p>Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Objectives RPROZ-O2 and O4</p>
<p>S222.084</p>	<p>Wendover Two Limited</p>	<p>RPROZ-O2</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>Reference to "functional need" in this objective potentially negates the ability for other activities to establish which may be a sustainable use of land and also contribute to the economic and social development of the district. Functional need is tightly defined in the Proposed Plan as "the need for a proposal or activity to traverse, locate or operate in a particular environment because the activity can only occur in that environment". There is a disconnect here with the subdivision opportunities provided for in the Rural Production Zone (eg environmental</p>	<p>Amend Objective RPROZ-O2 The Rural Production zone is used for primary production activities, ancillary activities that support primary production and other compatible activities that have a functional need to be in a rural environment".</p>	<p>Reject</p>	<p>Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Objectives RPROZ-O2 and O4</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
				enhancement and management plan opportunities). Also with the range of uses permitted in the zone that perhaps also have no 'functional need' to locate within the tight constraint of the definition ie the activity can only occur in that environment (such as Residential activities, Visitor accommodation, Educational facilities, Conservation activities, Recreational activities, Cemeteries / Urupā and Minor residential units). These subdivision opportunities where they result in environmental benefit are recognised by policy RPROZ-P6.			
S489.025	Radio New Zealand	RPROZ-O2	Support	RNZ support the direction to primarily use land in the rural production zone for primary production, and also activities with a functional need to be in this environment. The maintenance of a rural environment will reduce the potential for activities to be established that conflict with rural activities, and infrastructure such as RNZ's Facilities that are located in the rural production	Retain Objective RPROZ-O2	Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Objectives RPROZ-O2 and O4
S243.109	Matauri Trustee Limited	RPROZ-O2	Support in part	Reference to "functional need" in this objective potentially negates the ability for other activities to establish which may be a sustainable use of land and also contribute to the economic and social development of the district. Functional need is tightly defined in the Proposed Plan as "the need for a proposal or activity to traverse, locate or operate in a particular environment because the activity can only occur in that environment". There is a disconnect here with the subdivision opportunities provided for in the Rural Production Zone (e.g. environmental enhancement and	Amend Objective RPROZ-O2 The Rural Production zone is used for primary production activities, ancillary activities that support primary production and other compatible activities that have a functional need to be in a rural environment.	Reject	Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Objectives RPROZ-O2 and O4

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				management plan opportunities). Also with the range of uses permitted in the zone that perhaps also have no 'functional need' to locate within the tight constraint of the definition i.e. the activity can only occur in that environment (such as Residential activities, Visitor accommodation, Educational facilities, Conservation activities, Recreational activities, Cemeteries / Urupā and Minor residential units). These subdivision opportunities where they result in environmental benefit are recognised by policy RPROZ-P6.				
FS24.63	Lynley Newport		Support	Agree with sentiment being expressed.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Objectives RPROZ-O2 and O4
FS570.667	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 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Objectives RPROZ-O2 and O4
FS566.681	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 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Objectives RPROZ-O2 and O4
FS569.703	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 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Objectives RPROZ-O2 and O4
S167.091	Bentzen Farm Limited	RPROZ-O2	Support in part	Reference to "functional need" in this objective potentially negates the ability for other activities to establish which may be a sustainable use of land and also contribute to the economic and social development of the district. There is a disconnect here with the subdivision opportunities provided for	Amend Objective RPROZ-O2 The Rural Production zone is used for primary production activities, ancillary activities that support primary production and other compatible activities that have a functional need to be in a rural environment.		Reject	Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Objectives RPROZ-O2 and O4

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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 the Rural Production Zone (eg environmental enhancement and management plan opportunities). Also with the range of uses permitted in the zone that perhaps also have no 'functional need' to locate.				
FS143.38	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support	Reference to "functional need" in this rural production zone objective potentially negates the ability for other activities to establish which may be a sustainable use of land and also contribute to the economic and social development of the district - as is the case at Mataka Station.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Objectives RPROZ-O2 and O4
FS354.198	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	The submitter seeks to delete ' that have a functional need to be in a rural environment' from the objective. The objective is consistent with the National Planning Standards and should be retained.	Disallow	Disallow S167.091	Accept	Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Objectives RPROZ-O2 and O4
FS566.453	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 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Objectives RPROZ-O2 and O4
S159.097	Horticulture New Zealand	RPROZ-O2	Support	Inclusion of ancillary activities that support primary production is important	Retain Objective RPROZ-O2		Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Objectives RPROZ-O2 and O4
FS151.266	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Objectives RPROZ-O2 and O4
FS570.259	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: Objectives RPROZ-O2 and O4

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS566.273	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: Objectives RPROZ-O2 and O4
FS569.295	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: Objectives RPROZ-O2 and O4
S102.001	Lynley Newport	RPROZ-O2	Support in part	<p>The intent of the objectives is not debated.</p> <p>RPROZ-O2 reads as though there is no other land uses other than those listed that are considered appropriate zone. This in itself is not correct and is also contrary to the proposed rule regime to apply to the zone.</p> <p>The zone is already full of uses other than primary production activities, ancillary activities that support primary production, and other activities that would not be considered 'compatible' . Council is setting up a situation where an existing site supports existing land uses contrary to the objectives applying to it. Broaden/soften the wording of the objective.</p>	Amend RPROZ-O2 to read : The Rural Production Zone is primarily used for		Reject	Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Objectives RPROZ-O2 and O4
FS172.183	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Objectives RPROZ-O2 and O4
FS196.48	Joe Carr		Support	as per submitter's reasoning	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Objectives RPROZ-O2 and O4
FS548.024	Northland Federated		Oppose	Federated Farmers submission supported the objective as it was notified. The amendment sought is inconsistent with the National Policy	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Accept	Section 5.2.9

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
	Farmers of New Zealand Inc			Statement for Highly Productive Land and does not recognize the importance of ensuring rural activities can continue in the rural zone.				Key Issue 9: Objectives RPROZ-O2 and O4
S197.001	Thomson Survey Ltd	RPROZ-O2	Support in part	<p>The intent of the objectives is not debated. However, RPROZ-02 is overly restrictive in that intent. It reads as though there is no other land uses other than those listed that are considered appropriate zone. This in itself is not correct and is also contrary to the proposed rule regime to apply to the zone.</p> <p>In addition, the zone is already full of uses other than primary production activities, ancillary activities that support primary production, and other activities that would not be considered 'compatible'.. so the Council is setting up a situation where an existing site supports existing land uses contrary to the objectives applying to it. Broaden/soften the wording of the objective.</p>	Amend Objective RPROZ-O2 as follows: The Rural Production zone is primarily used for primary production activities, ancillary activities that support primary production and other compatible activities that have a functional need to be in a rural environment.		Reject	Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Objectives RPROZ-O2 and O4
FS172.253	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Objectives RPROZ-O2 and O4
FS548.064	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	The purpose of the rural production zone is to allow for rural production activities to continue and provide for similar activities to be established. It is not appropriate to loosen up the objective purely based on the fact that there are already other non-rural production uses in the zone.	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Accept	Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Objectives RPROZ-O2 and O4
FS354.199	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	While there may currently be an array of other activities in the Rural Zone the plan seeks to change that framework. Current activities will continue to have	Disallow	Disallow S197.001	Accept	Section 5.2.9

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
				existing use rights if they were lawfully established.				Key Issue 9: Objectives RPROZ-O2 and O4
S421.211	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	RPROZ-O2	Support	Federated Farmers supports objectives RPZOZ-O2 and RPZOZ-O4 as they are currently drafted in the proposed district plan.	Retain Policy RPZOZ-O2 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent		Accept	Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Objectives RPROZ-O2 and O4
FS196.116	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko	Allow		Accept	Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Objectives RPROZ-O2 and O4
FS570.1443	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 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Objectives RPROZ-O2 and O4
FS346.445	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Objectives RPROZ-O2 and O4
FS566.1457	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 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Objectives RPROZ-O2 and O4
FS569.1479	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 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Objectives RPROZ-O2 and O4
S463.090	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited	RPROZ-O2	Support	WBF agrees with the primacy accorded to primary production by this objective (inferred).	Retain Objective (inferred) RPROZ-O2		Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Objectives RPROZ-O2 and O4
FS91.20	Moana Kiff		Oppose	Oppose; We disagree that this policy be supported because we contend that	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.9

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>a residential development is NOT 'a compatible activity that has a functional need to be in a rural environment.' The rural environment contains neighbouring hāpu properties that will be detrimentally impacted on and therefore a residential development is not considered to be a compatible activity in a rural coastal zone.</p> <p>The incompatibility of a large-scale residential development in a rural coastal zone environment for Tangata Whenua, is rooted in the potential harm to cultural heritage, ecological damage, resource competition, urbanization, infrastructure challenges, climate vulnerability, and the disruption of traditional practices. Preserving these rural coastal areas in their natural state or with minimal disturbance is vital to safeguarding the cultural and environmental heritage of local Hapū as Tangata Whenua.</p>				Key Issue 9: Objectives RPROZ-O2 and O4
S331.065	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	RPROZ-O2	Support in part	The submitter supports in part objective RPROZ-O2 as it considers educational facilities to be compatible with the activities in this zone however, they also have an operational need to be in the rural environment.	Amend objective RPROZ-O2 as follows: The Rural Production zone is used for primary production activities, ancillary activities that support primary production and other compatible activities that have a functional or operational need to be in a rural environment.		Reject	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions
FS78.015	Transpower New Zealand Limited		Support	The proposed amendment recognises that at times some non-rural activities, such as specified infrastructure as defined in the NPSHPL need to be located in the Rural Production Zone, which is consistent with Section	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				3.9(2)(j) of the NPSHPL and Policy 3 of the NPSET.				
FS548.071	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	Federated Farmers supports the development and maintenance of vibrant rural communities. However, sensitive activities such as educational facilities need to be carefully considered to ensure that they do not impact on existing, lawfully established rural activities. Rural activities are not able to be packaged up and moved elsewhere to deal with any negative effects from other activities.	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Accept	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions
S454.108	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	RPROZ-02	Not Stated	Objective RPROZ-02 identifies the activities that the Rural Production Zone will be used for. Transpower supports the intent of this objective to identify the activities that are likely to occur within the Rural Production zone, however critical infrastructure, such as the National Grid, is not addressed. Due to their linear nature and the requirement to connect new electricity generation to the National Grid, regardless of where the new generation facilities are located, transmission lines may need to traverse any zone within the Far North District. The objective could be made more explicit to ensure that it is clear that infrastructure such as the National Grid is contemplated in this zone, not just compatible activities.	Amend RPROZ-02 (inferred) as follows: The Rural Production zone is used for primary production activities, ancillary activities that support primary production, other compatible activities and infrastructure (including the National Grid) that have a functional or operational need to be in a rural environment.		Reject	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions
FS548.134	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	The amendment sought is unnecessary as infrastructure is already located in the zone and can be assumed to be a compatible activity.	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Accept	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions
FS354.200	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	There is no need to specifically refer to the National Grid in the objective as it	Disallow	Disallow S454.108	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
				has a functional need to locate in the rural environment.				Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions
FS369.500	Top Energy		Support	Top Energy supports the amendments to provide for infrastructure that has a functional or operational need to locate in the zone	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions
S160.033	Manulife Forest Management (NZ) Ltd	RPROZ-02	Support	The submitter supports objective RPROZ-02.	Retain RPROZ-02 as it is written.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Objectives RPROZ-02 and O4
FS346.603	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS. Loss of natural character, coastal environment values and the values of outstanding landscapes could also result.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Objectives RPROZ-02 and O4
S55.025	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	RPROZ-03	Not Stated	Point a. of this objective enables the use of highly productive land for more productive forms of primary production. This intent of this objective is vague and requires clarification. What is defined as 'more productive forms of primary production' and how will it be measured/assessed?	Amend to Define "more productive forms of primary production"		Accept in part	Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Objectives RPROZ-01 and O3
S148.045	Summit Forests New Zealand Limited	RPROZ-03	Support in part	In general, SFNZ supports the objectives and policies of this zone except where they seek to grandparent existing land use in favour of one form of primary production over others. Land use in the rural production zone needs to be able to adapt to changing	Amend any reference to "farming activities" in the Rural Production objectives to "primary production activities" and any reference to "farming" to "primary production" and any other changes to like effect.		Accept	Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Objectives RPROZ-01 and O3

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				economic and climatic conditions to ensure long term sustainability.				
FS85.36	PF Olsen Ltd		Support	PF Olsen supports SFNZL's submission to amend c of RPROZ-O3 because primary production is defined under the NSP-HPL, and this definition should be consistent across the legislation. Besides, there is no rationale that only farming does not compromise land use. It is an unacceptable form of grandparenting existing land use, favouring one form of primary production over others.	Allow		Accept	Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Objectives RPROZ-O1 and O3
FS346.551	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS. Loss of natural character, coastal environment values and the values of outstanding landscapes could also result.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Objectives RPROZ-O1 and O3
FS566.157	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 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Objectives RPROZ-O1 and O3
S167.092	Bentzen Farm Limited	RPROZ-O3	Support	The support for this objective is conditional on the amendments to the definition of highly productive land also sought by this submission. Reference to "other compatible activities" is supported because it recognises the broader range of land uses which occur in rural parts of the district.	Retain Objective RPROZ-O3		Accept in part	Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Objectives RPROZ-O1 and O3
FS85.37	PF Olsen Ltd		Oppose	The objective RPROZ-O3, letter c, should not be retained as there is no rationale that only farming does not	Disallow in part		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
				compromise land use. It is an unacceptable form of grandparenting existing land use, favoring one form of primary production over others.				Key Issue 8: Objectives RPROZ-O1 and O3
FS566.454	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Objectives RPROZ-O1 and O3
S143.013	Ballance Agri-Nutrients Limited	RPROZ-O3	Support	Ballance supports the protection of highly productive land and the protection of primary production activities from reverse sensitivity effects	Retain the objective RPROZ -O3		Accept in part	Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Objectives RPROZ-O1 and O3
FS85.38	PF Olsen Ltd		Oppose	The objective RPROZ-O3, letter c, should not be retained as there is no rationale that only farming does not compromise land use. It is an unacceptable form of grandparenting existing land use, favouring one form of primary production over others.	Disallow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Objectives RPROZ-O1 and O3
S182.027	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association	RPROZ-O3	Support	Support the protection for primary production activities from reverse sensitivity effects	Retain RPROZ-O3		Accept in part	Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Objectives RPROZ-O1 and O3
FS85.39	PF Olsen Ltd		Oppose	The objective RPROZ-O3, letter c, should not be retained as there is no rationale that only farming does not compromise land use. It is an unacceptable form of grandparenting existing land use, favoring one form of primary production over others.	Disallow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Objectives RPROZ-O1 and O3
S159.098	Horticulture New Zealand	RPROZ-O3	Support	The rural working environment is what provides the rural character and amenity to the Rural Production zone	Retain Objective RPROZ-O3		Accept in part	Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Objectives RPROZ-O1 and O3
FS85.40	PF Olsen Ltd		Oppose	The objective RPROZ-O3, letter c, should not be retained as there is no	Disallow in part		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
				rationale that only farming does not compromise land use. It is an unacceptable form of grandparenting existing land use, favoring one form of primary production over others.				Key Issue 8: Objectives RPROZ-O1 and O3
FS151.267	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Objectives RPROZ-O1 and O3
FS570.260	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 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Objectives RPROZ-O1 and O3
FS566.274	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 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Objectives RPROZ-O1 and O3
FS569.296	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 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Objectives RPROZ-O1 and O3
S243.110	Matauri Trustee Limited	RPROZ-O3	Support	The support for this objective is conditional on the amendments to the definition of highly productive land also sought by this submission. Reference to "other compatible activities" is supported because it recognises the broader range of land uses which occur in rural parts of the district.	Retain Objective RPROZ-O3		Accept in part	Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Objectives RPROZ-O1 and O3
FS85.41	PF Olsen Ltd		Oppose	The objective RPROZ-O3, letter c, should not be retained as there is no rationale that only farming does not compromise land use. It is an unacceptable form of grandparenting existing land use, favouring one form of primary production over others.	Disallow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Objectives RPROZ-O1 and O3

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS570.668	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 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Objectives RPROZ-O1 and O3
FS566.682	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 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Objectives RPROZ-O1 and O3
FS569.704	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 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Objectives RPROZ-O1 and O3
S222.085	Wendover Two Limited	RPROZ-O3	Support	The support for this objective is conditional on the amendments to the definition of highly productive land also sought by this submission. Reference to "other compatible activities" is supported because it recognises the broader range of land uses which occur in rural parts of the district.	Retain Objective RPROZ-O3		Accept in part	Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Objectives RPROZ-O1 and O3
FS85.42	PF Olsen Ltd		Oppose	The objective RPROZ-O3, letter c, should not be retained as there is no rationale that only farming does not compromise land use. It is an unacceptable form of grandparenting existing land use, favoring one form of primary production over others.	Disallow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Objectives RPROZ-O1 and O3
S421.210	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	RPROZ-O3	Oppose	Federated Farmers opposes objectives RPZOZ-O1 and RPZOZ-O3 as they are drafted in the proposed district plan. The objectives promote the absolute protection of the rural production zone and highly productive land. The National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land sets out the requirements for the management of highly productive land. Policy 8 requires the protection of highly	Amend Objective RPZOZ-O3 to achieve consistency with the requirements of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land		Accept in part	Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Objectives RPROZ-O1 and O3

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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>productive land from inappropriate use and development. Clause 3.8 provides for the subdivision of highly productive land provided certain matters are met. Clause 3.11 state that territorial authorities must include objectives, policies, and rules in their district plans to enable the maintenance, operation, or upgrade of any existing activities on highly productive land; and ensure that any loss of highly productive land from those activities is minimised.</p> <p>The proposed district plan needs to be consistent with the requirements of the National Policy Statement. In our opinion, Objectives RPZOZ-O1 and RPZOZ-O3 do not meet the requirements of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land as they do not provide for the ongoing operation of existing activities.</p>				
FS172.321	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons stated in this primary submission.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Objectives RPROZ-O1 and O3
FS196.117	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Objectives RPROZ-O1 and O3
FS66.160	Bentzen Farm Limited		Support	The District Plan is required to give effect to the NPS: Highly Productive Land	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Objectives RPROZ-O1 and O3
FS570.1442	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 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Objectives RPROZ-O1 and O3
FS346.444	Royal Forest and Bird		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	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
	Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.			which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.				Key Issue 8: Objectives RPROZ-O1 and O3
FS566.1456	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 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Objectives RPROZ-O1 and O3
FS569.1478	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 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Objectives RPROZ-O1 and O3
S91.020	PF Olsen Limited	RPROZ-O3	Support in part	PF Olsen supports clauses a. and b. Clause c. is an unacceptable form of grandparenting existing land use, favouring one form of primary production over others.	Retain clauses a. and b. Amend clause c. to apply to all primary production activities.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Objectives RPROZ-O1 and O3
FS548.021	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	Federated Farmers opposed objective RPZOZ-O3 as notified. The objective does not meet the requirements of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land as it does not provide for the ongoing operation of existing activities.	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Objectives RPROZ-O1 and O3
FS566.109	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 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Objectives RPROZ-O1 and O3
S333.082	P S Yates Family Trust	RPROZ-O4	Oppose	The proposed objective that "the rural character and amenity associated with a rural working environment is maintained", fails to recognise that character and amenity of the zone is not only defined by a working rural environment for the reasons discussed above in this submission, and that such character and amenity can be very	Delete Objective RPROZ-O4 and replace with the following: Subdivision, use and development in the Rural Area maintain the rural character and amenity of the zone.		Reject	Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Objectives RPROZ-O2 and O4

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				location specific. The proposed alternative objective allows a more nuanced assessment of character and amenity. In contrast, this diverse range of rural environments, rural character and amenity values throughout the District is recognised by policy RPROZ-P4.			
S168.090	Setar Thirty Six Limited	RPROZ-O4	Oppose	The proposed objective that "the rural character and amenity associated with a rural working environment is maintained", fails to recognise that character and amenity of the zone is not only defined by a working rural environment for the reasons discussed above in this submission, and that such character and amenity can be very location specific. The proposed alternative objective allows a more nuanced assessment of character and amenity. In contrast, this diverse range of rural environments, rural character and amenity values throughout the District is recognised by policy RPROZ-P4.	Delete Objective RPROZ-O4 and replace with the following: Subdivision, use and development in the Rural Area maintain the rural character and amenity of the zone.	Reject	Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Objectives RPROZ-O2 and O4
S187.081	The Shooting Box Limited	RPROZ-O4	Oppose	The proposed objective that "the rural character and amenity associated with a rural working environment is maintained", fails to recognise that character and amenity of the zone is not only defined by a working rural environment for the reasons discussed above in this submission, and that such character and amenity can be very location specific. The proposed alternative objective allows a more nuanced assessment of character and amenity. In contrast, this diverse range of rural environments, rural character and	Delete Objective RPROZ-O4 and replace with the following: Subdivision, use and development in the Rural Area maintain the rural character and amenity of the zone.	Reject	Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Objectives RPROZ-O2 and O4

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				amenity values throughout the District is recognised by policy RPROZ-P4.				
S222.086	Wendover Two Limited	RPROZ-O4	Oppose	The proposed objective that "the rural character and amenity associated with a rural working environment is maintained", fails to recognise that character and amenity of the zone is not only defined by a working rural environment for the reasons discussed above in this submission, and that such character and amenity can be very location specific. The proposed alternative objective allows a more nuanced assessment of character and amenity. In contrast, this diverse range of rural environments, rural character and amenity values throughout the District is recognised by policy RPROZ-P4.	Delete Objective RPROZ-O4 and insert the following: Subdivision, use and development in the Rural Area maintain the rural character and amenity of the zone.		Reject	Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Objectives RPROZ-O2 and O4
S489.026	Radio New Zealand	RPROZ-O4	Support	RNZ supports the maintenance of rural character and amenity.	Retain Objective RPROZ-O4		Accept	Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Objectives RPROZ-O2 and O4
S421.212	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	RPROZ-O4	Support	Federated Farmers supports objectives RPZOZ-O2 and RPZOZ-O4 as they are currently drafted in the proposed district plan.	Retain Policy RPZOZ-O4 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent		Accept	Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Objectives RPROZ-O2 and O4
FS196.115	Joe Carr		Support	Tautoko	Allow		Accept	Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Objectives RPROZ-O2 and O4
FS570.1444	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 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Objectives RPROZ-O2 and O4
FS346.446	Royal Forest and Bird Protection		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.9

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
	Society of New Zealand Inc.			functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.				Key Issue 9: Objectives RPROZ-O2 and O4
FS566.1458	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 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Objectives RPROZ-O2 and O4
FS569.1480	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 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Objectives RPROZ-O2 and O4
S167.093	Bentzen Farm Limited	RPROZ-O4	Oppose	The proposed objective that "the rural character and amenity associated with a rural working environment is maintained", fails to recognise that character and amenity of the zone is not only defined by a working rural environment for the reasons discussed above in this submission, and that such character and amenity can be very location specific. The proposed alternative objective allows a more nuanced assessment of character and amenity. In contrast, this diverse range of rural environments, rural character and amenity values throughout the District is recognised by policy RPROZ-P4.	Delete Objective RPROZ-O4 and replace with the following: Subdivision, use and development in the Rural Area maintain the rural character and amenity of the zone.		Reject	Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Objectives RPROZ-O2 and O4
FS534.049	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited		Oppose	The National Planning Standards describe the RPROZ as a zone focused on primary production activities. The notified policy appropriately reflects this "working rural environment" focus. The National Planning Standards anticipate that where non-agricultural activities in rural environments require a different type of rural character and amenity, the Rural Lifestyle Zone will	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Objectives RPROZ-O2 and O4

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				be applied - not the Rural Production Zone				
FS566.455	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 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Objectives RPROZ-O2 and O4
S243.111	Matauri Trustee Limited	RPROZ-O4	Oppose	The proposed objective that "the rural character and amenity associated with a rural working environment is maintained", fails to recognise that character and amenity of the zone is not only defined by a working rural environment for the reasons discussed above in this submission, and that such character and amenity can be very location specific. The proposed alternative objective allows a more nuanced assessment of character and amenity. In contrast, this diverse range of rural environments, rural character and amenity values throughout the District is recognised by policy RPROZ-P4	Delete Objective RPROZ-O4 and replace with the following: Subdivision, use and development in the rural area maintain the rural character and amenity of the zone.		Reject	Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Objectives RPROZ-O2 and O4
FS570.669	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 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Objectives RPROZ-O2 and O4
FS566.683	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 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Objectives RPROZ-O2 and O4
FS569.705	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 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Objectives RPROZ-O2 and O4
S160.034	Manulife Forest Management (NZ) Ltd	RPROZ-O4	Support	The submitter supports objective RPROZ-O4.	Retain objective RPROZ-O4 as it is written.		Accept	Section 5.2.9

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
								Key Issue 9: Objectives RPROZ-O2 and O4
FS346.604	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS. Loss of natural character, coastal environment values and the values of outstanding landscapes could also result.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Objectives RPROZ-O2 and O4
S183.012	MLP LLC	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Landing Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Landing Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Landing Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S226.012	Tryphena Trustees Limited, David Haythornwaite	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S227.012	Isles Casey Trustee Services Limited, WWC Trustee	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will	Amend the Policies of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
	Company Limited			not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.		
S228.012	Jayesh Govind and Others	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S229.012	Laurie Pearson	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S232.012	Tobias Groser	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S233.012	Whale Bay Limited	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S234.012	Whale Bay Limited	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S235.012	WW Trustee Services 2016 Limited, Eloise Caroline Caswell, Donald Gordon Chandler	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S236.012	Connemara Black Limited	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most	Amend the Policies of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).			
S237.012	Evan Williams and Katherine Williams	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S238.012	John Gowing and Miriam Van Lith	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S239.012	John Gowing, Miriam Van Lith, Ellis Gowing, James Gowing, Byron Gowing	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S240.012	Matthew Watson, Kaylene	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will	Amend the Policies of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
	Watson, D R Thomas Limited			not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.		
S241.012	Matthew Draper and Michaela Jannard	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S352.012	Philibert Jean-G Frick	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S257.026	Te Hiku Community Board	Policies	Oppose	The Planning Maps show the Rural Production Zone in some areas e.g. Awanui that are serviced by sewerage, footpaths, refuse collection etc. If this zoning continues, it will severely constrain future urban development, and this should be corrected by amending RPROZ objectives, policies and rules zones to accommodate things other than rural production.	Amend the Rural Production Zone policies so that productive land is defined based on its ability to produce food but can accommodate things other than rural production; OR amend Planning Maps to remove RPROZ from urban areas as separately submitted.	Reject	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Objectives and Policies – General Comments
S422.012	Maurice Dabbah	Policies	Oppose	The Proposed Plan, if approved, will directly affect members of the [Mataka Residents'] Association by imposing	Amend the Policies of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which	Reject	Section 5.2.3

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				undue restrictions on the construction of residential dwellings on the Site through the application of specified overlays and rules.	provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.		Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S423.012	Bernard Sabrier	Policies	Oppose	The Proposed Plan, if approved, will directly affect members of the [Mataka Residents'] Association by imposing undue restrictions on the construction of residential dwellings on the Site through the application of specified overlays and rules.	Amend the Policies of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S360.007	Waste Management NZ Limited	Policies	Oppose	It is critical that the Proposed Plan provide for 'waste management facilities' in a broader range of zones to reflect the functional and operational requirements of such activities, and to provide a framework within which the effects of such activities can be appropriately managed. In this respect, it is appropriate that the Proposed Plan provides for waste management facilities at the 'strategic direction' level, as well as specifically within the Light Industrial, Heavy Industrial and Rural Production zones.	Amend the policies to provide for waste management facilities	Accept in part	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S434.012	Francois Dotta	Policies	Oppose	The Proposed Plan, if approved, will directly affect members of the [Mataka Residents'] Association by imposing undue restrictions on the construction of residential dwellings on the Site through the application of specified overlays and rules.	Amend the Policies of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S435.012	Elka Gouzer	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose	Amend the Policies of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).			
S421.206	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Policies	Support in part	<p>Federated Farmers supports the recognition in the overview of the fact it is important to differentiate the rural production zone from the rural lifestyle and rural residential zones. We also support the strong recognition that has been given to rural land as an important resource.</p> <p>The concern Federated Farmers has is that the overview is focused on the absolute protection of highly productive from any activities other than primary production. The approach taken by the Council to prevent the fragmentation of rural production land is support but acknowledgement is also needed that all highly productive may not be profitable for the landowner. It would be unequitable for the Council to prohibit a rural landowner who has cared for the land for many years from achieving the real potential value of that land.</p> <p>The proposed district plan has strayed into private property rights through dictating what can and cannot be done on rural production land.</p> <p>Returns from farming are variable due to a variety of factors including weather conditions, economic conditions, individual property circumstances and market demands. Like any business, diversification, flexibility, responsiveness, and cash flow are critically important to retaining their viability.</p> <p>Farmers undertake low impact subdivision for a variety of reasons. These vary from diversifying their business into tourism operations (luxury lodges and or associated tourism development and</p>	Amend the Policies to recognise and provide for private property rights and allow landowners to subdivide land in the rural production zone for specific purposes such as creating lifestyle lots and lots for family members (amongst other matters)	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>infrastructure), providing for disposing of a surplus dwelling on the property where a neighbouring farm is purchased, providing for a family member or staff member to live on the farm or to implement a succession plan for multiple siblings through small lot subdivision. The proposed chapter has taken away any flexibility for farmers to subdivide their land for specific purposes without undermining the primary production or life-style value of the remaining land.</p> <p>The chapter as drafted, adds another layer complexity on top of the regulations and provisions that exist in regional council planning documents and in National Policy Statements. The Council seems intent of duplicating provisions which may have already been dealt with at regional and national levels.</p>				
FS24.29	Lynley Newport		Support in part	Support the sentiment - whilst important to protect highly productive land, the council has gone well beyond that in its approach, assuming all rural land is the same and preventing other sustainable uses.	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS172.317	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons stated in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS196.121	Joe Carr		Support	Tautoko	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS332.239	Russell Protection Society		Oppose	Subdivision of Rural production zone land for lifestyle blocks should not be an automatic right.	Disallow in part	Disallow the original submission in part.	Accept	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS368.007	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support in part	Amend the Rules to recognise and provide for private property rights and	Allow in part	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.3

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				allow landowners to subdivide land in the rural production zone for specific purposes such as creating lifestyle lots and lots for family members (amongst other matters).				Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS570.1438	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: General Submissions
FS346.440	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS566.1452	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: General Submissions
FS569.1474	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: General Submissions
S472.031	Michael Foy	Policies	Support in part	A separate alternative submission is to ask that the Plan redefines the RPROZ so that productive land is defined based on its ability to produce food but can accommodate things other than rural production. ie. Rural production zoning on poor soils is wrong. That is the right place to put smaller areas for housing ie.2000sq metres. The Planning Maps show the Rural Production Zone in some areas e.g. Awanui/wireless road Kaitaia that are serviced by sewerage, footpaths, etc., and it is submitted that these areas are re-zoned to reflect the existing infrastructure available, and be re-zoned to allow for intensification. This should be corrected by amending	Amend the Rural Production Zone policies so that productive land is defined based on its ability to produce food but can accommodate things other than rural production; OR amend Planning Maps to remove RPROZ from urban areas as separately submitted		Reject	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Objectives and Policies – 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
				RPROZ objectives, policies and rules zones to accommodate things other than rural production.				
FS155.92	Fiona King		Support		Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Objectives and Policies – General Comments
FS258.7	logan king		Support		Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Objectives and Policies – General Comments
FS259.10	Leah Frieling		Support		Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Objectives and Policies – General Comments
FS368.033	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support in part	Amend the Rural Production Zone objectives so that productive land is defined based on its ability to produce food but can accommodate things other than rural production	Allow in part	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Objectives and Policies – General Comments
S505.002	Dr Lynn Kincla	Policies	Support in part	The properties bordering Henderson Bay Road are only 4 hectare blocks - and rural production requires a minimum of 40 hectares. I have concerns that some permissible rural production activities would possibly have a negative impact on the local environment and the small sizes of the blocks would also compound these effects. For example, intensive cropping of avocados or raising of some types of animals like pigs or chickens would impact on neighbouring properties and would put added pressures in the Roading infrastructure. I think certain intensive farming	Amend to exclude certain intensive farming activities from the proposed Rural production zone at Henderson Bay.		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				activities should be excluded from the proposed Rural production zoning at Henderson Bay to protect this coastal environment.			
FS283.3	Mark Spaans		Support in part	I agree in part. Henderson Bay has its own natural character and the current zone changes has not allowed for the status quo that was seen under the previous zoning of General Coastal Zone. Therefore, I support either a special zoning like that of the previous General Coastal or for Rural Production to have tighter control on permissible activities in Henderson Bay that protect the natural character of the area/ coastline.	Allow in part	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS276.2	Antoinette Pot		Support in part	I agree in part. Henderson Bay has its own natural character and the current zone changes has not allowed for the status quo that was seen under the previous zoning of General Coastal Zone. Therefore, I support either a special zoning like that of the previous General Coastal or for Rural Production to have tighter control on permissible activities in Henderson Bay that protect the natural character of the area/ coastline.	Allow in part	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S522.047	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	Policies	Support in part	Land that is regarded as highly productive (LUC Classes 1,2 and 3) is a strictly finite resource, essential for future food production for a growing population here and worldwide, and important for jobs and economic development. The recently issued National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land requires councils to protect LUC Class 1-3 land from fragmentation and loss (outside of identified urban zones) and allows	Amend to include specific policies/rules to prevent fragmentation and loss of land in rural and horticulture zones [inferred].	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				councils to protect other types of productive land in similar manner.				
FS550.022	Lloyd Anderson		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore, it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" 	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>(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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site. • There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. 				

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. <p>Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.</p>				
FS333.007	Maree Hart		Support	<p>The submitter supports relief sought to prevent fragmentation or loss of productive land, to avoid urban / residential sprawl in rural areas and protect amenity values.</p> <p>Residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons.</p> <p>It would be contrary to the NPS-UD in enabling urban sprawl and not protecting rural land. Government reports have found that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided as it leads to permanent loss of productive capability.</p> <p>Residential development on Lot 1001 would also create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities in the area.</p> <p>Lot 1001 is one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil in the</p>	Allow	Amend zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 to Horticulture zone or Rural Production zone; Amend Rural Production, Horticulture and Rural Lifestyle zone provisions to prevent urban sprawl, and protect productive soil, rural character and amenity values; Amend the District Plan to strengthen provisions for assessing and preventing cumulative and long-term adverse effects on productive areas, rural areas, areas visible from public land, ecological values and freshwater.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>district which is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential providing food, local jobs and economic well-being. FNDC submission to MPI recognised that large areas of horticultural land in Kerikeri have been converted to residential and therefore it is vital to protect the remaining rural land that is highly productive.</p> <p>Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. There are alternative sites in the area which could provide a compact urban footprint and improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. Lot 1001 is also adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline which is a valuable economic asset for the area.</p> <p>Residential development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects. The surrounding rural environment lacks the appropriate infrastructure, school capacity and existing safety and traffic issues on Landing Road such as a one lane bridge. There would also be effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.</p>				
FS566.1786	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS549.022	Vanessa Anderson		Support	It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

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

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.				
FS443.022	Peter O'Neil Donnellon		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and 	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

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

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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"> There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. <p>Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi& ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.</p>				
FS390.022	Tracey Schubert		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, 	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore, it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. 				

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. • Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. <p>Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.</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
FS353.022	Al Panckhurst		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore, it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). Government reports and 	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site. • There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. • Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully 				

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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>established activities and neighbouring producers.</p> <p>Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.</p>				
FS352.022	Kathryn Panckhurst		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in 	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

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

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>residential development on this particular site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. • Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. <p>Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.</p>				
FS342.022	Chris Baker		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that 	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore, it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, 				

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. • Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. <p>Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water</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
				quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.				
FS338.022	Pearl Mahoney		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore, it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" 	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>(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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site. • There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. 				

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. <p>Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.</p>				
FS337.022	Kevin Mahoney		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good 	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore, it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable 				

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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>economic asset for the area. In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. • Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. <p>Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.</p>				
FS336.022	Roger Holman		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban 	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore, it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. 				

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site. • There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. • Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. <p>Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-</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
				lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi& ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.				
FS335.022	Craig and Mary Sawers		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, 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 	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site. • There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would 				

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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>actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. <p>Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.</p>				
FS334.022	Fiona Clarke		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in 	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore, it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on 			

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. • Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. <p>Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.</p>			
S454.109	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	Policies	Not Stated	<p>RPROZ-P1 sets out the activities that are to be enabled in the Rural Production zone. Transpower supports the intent of this policy, however critical infrastructure, such as the National Grid, is not clearly provided for. Due to its linear nature</p>	<p>Insert new policy RPROZ-Px as follows: Enable compatible activities and infrastructure, that have a functional or operational need to locate in the Rural Production zone.</p>	Reject	<p>Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions</p>

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				and the requirement to connect new electricity generation to the National Grid, regardless of where the new generation facilities are located, transmission lines may need to traverse any zone within the Far North District. A new policy is required to make it explicit that infrastructure such as the National Grid is enabled in the Rural Production zone.				
FS304.005	Radio New Zealand		Support	Support in so far as it relates to the Rural Production Zone. The submitter's facilities are located in this zone and the submitter made a submission in support of RPOZ-O2 (which refers to the use by compatible activities that have a functional need to be in a rural environment), but would support the recognition of functional and operational requirements in the relevant policy framework.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions
FS548.135	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	The amendment sought is not necessary as infrastructure has already been provided for in the policies for the zone.	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Accept	
FS243.167	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, as it is inconsistent with its primary submission. The amendment is unnecessary.	Disallow	(similar relief sought to above submission - numerous points)	Accept	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions
FS354.203	Horticulture New Zealand		Support in part	Providing for infrastructure that has a functional need to locate in the rural zone is supported but it should be a policy of 'provide' not 'enable'.	Allow	Allow S454.109 to the extent of providing for infrastructure that has a functional need to locate in the rural production zone.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions
FS369.501	Top Energy		Support	Top Energy supports the amendments RPROZ-P1 to provide for infrastructure that has a functional or operational need to locate in the zone.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan wide or rural wide submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S511.119	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	Policies	Support in part	This chapter covers mineral extraction activities and farm quarries. However, there is no policy direction in the Chapter to reflect the rules to mineral extraction	Include objectives and policies to reflect the rule status of mineral extraction activities in accordance with the relief set out below.		Reject	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Objectives and Policies – General Comments
FS164.119	Scrumptious Fruit Trust		Support	<p>Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and secondly as passive recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery.</p> <p>The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.</p>	Allow	Amend HNC overlay to include Taupo Bay; Amend provisions to require strong wildlife protection; Amend provisions to require dogs on leash in beach areas; Adopt SNA and HNC provisions (inferred).	Reject	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Objectives and Policies – General Comments
FS570.1690	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Objectives and Policies – General Comments
FS566.1704	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Objectives and Policies – General Comments
FS569.1726	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Objectives and Policies – 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
S358.030	Leah Frieling	Policies	Oppose	The Plan redefines the Rural Production zone so that it is based on its ability to produce food but can accommodate things other than rural production i.e. Rural Production zoning on poor soils is wrong. That is the right place to put smaller areas for housing i.e. 2,000 m ² .	Amend the Rural Production zone policies so that productive land is defined based on its ability to produce food but can accommodate things other than rural production; OR amend planning maps to remove the Rural Production zone from urban areas (as separately submitted).		Reject	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Objectives and Policies – General Comments
FS368.003	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support in part	Amend the Rural Production zone rules so that productive land is defined based on its ability to produce food but can accommodate things other than rural production.	Allow in part	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Objectives and Policies – General Comments
S340.003	Rosemorn Industries Limited	Policies	Support in part	The policies in the Rural Production Zone chapter do not provide any clear direction on when, or under what circumstances it is appropriate for existing commercial and industrial activities to be extended. Clear direction is required given the level of investment associated with purchasing properties and establishing the existing activities, and the implications that the PFNDP could have with respect to any future plans for those sites and activities.	Amend policies of the Rural Production Zone to include more specific direction on when it is appropriate to extend existing commercial and/or industrial activities.		Reject	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Objectives and Policies – General Comments
FS354.201	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	Commercial and industrial activities do not require a rural location so should not be located in the rural production zone. While this may have occurred historically the PDP is providing a new direction consistent with the National Planning Standards.	Disallow	Disallow S340.003	Accept	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Objectives and Policies – General Comments
S427.032	Kapiro Residents Association	Policies	Support in part	Land that is regarded as highly productive (LUC Classes 1,2 and 3) is a strictly finite resource, essential for future food production for a growing population here and worldwide, and important for jobs and economic development. The recently issued	Amend to include specific policies/rules to prevent fragmentation and loss of land in rural and horticulture zones [inferred].		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land requires councils to protect LUC Class 1-3 land from fragmentation and loss (outside of identified urban zones) and allows councils to protect other types of productive land in similar manner.				
FS354.202	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	HortNZ supports policies to prevent fragmentation and loss of rural land, particularly highly productive land.	Allow	Allow S427.032	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
S529.155	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	Policies	Not Stated	We consider that all zones, except urban zones, need to be covered by firm PDP policies and rules to protect a key natural resource - productive land - now and for future generations. This means preventing fragmentation and loss of productive land from productive use, especially LUC Class 1-3 land and productive types of soil/land suitable for horticulture. It is not necessary to wait until the regional council has implemented the NPS-HPL.	Amend policies to have firm policy around protecting a key natural resource - productive land - now and for future generations.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS354.204	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	The submitter supports protection of productive land especially LUC Class 1- 3 land and productive types of soil/land suitable for horticulture. It is not necessary to wait until the regional council has implemented the NPS-HPL. HortNZ agrees that the district plan can implement the NPSHPL to protect land through the current district plan process.	Allow	Allow S529.155	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS570.2043	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 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS566.2057	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS569.2079	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
S442.138	Kapiro Conservation Trust	Policies	Support in part	This chapter covers mineral extraction activities and farm quarries. However, there is no policy direction in the Chapter to reflect the rules to mineral extraction.	Insert policies to reflect the rule status of mineral extraction activities in accordance with the relief set out below.		Reject	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Objectives and Policies – General Comments
FS346.749	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS and Part 2 of the RMA and the NPS IB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Objectives and Policies – General Comments
S230.012	Mataka Residents' Association Inc	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Rural production chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS566.571	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: General Submissions
S449.065	Kapiro Conservation Trust	Policies	Support in part	Land that is regarded as highly productive (LUC Classes 1,2 and 3) is a strictly finite resource, essential for future food production for a growing	Amend to include specify policies/rules to prevent fragmentation and loss of land in rural and horticulture zones [inferred].		Accept in part	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
				population here and worldwide, and important for jobs and economic development. The recently issued National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land requires councils to protect LUC Class 1-3 land from fragmentation and loss (outside of identified urban zones) and allows councils to protect other types of productive land in similar manner.				Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS569.1864	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS570.1881	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
S55.026	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	RPROZ-P1	Support	Support policy to enable primary production activities and recognition that typical adverse effects associated with such activities should be anticipated and accepted within the rural zone.	Retain as proposed		Accept	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: Policies RPROZ-P1, P4 and P7
S143.014	Ballance Agri-Nutrients Limited	RPROZ-P1	Support	Ballance supports the enabling of primary production and recognition that typical adverse effects should be anticipated and expected within the Rural production Zone	Retain the policy RPROZ-P1		Accept	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: Policies RPROZ-P1, P4 and P7
S213.003	Timothy and Dion Spicer	RPROZ-P1	Support		Retain policies		Accept	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: Policies RPROZ-P1, P4 and P7
S421.218	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	RPROZ-P1	Support	Federated Farmers supports policies RPZOZ-P1 and RPZOZ-P7 as they are currently drafted in the proposed district plan.	Retain Policy RPZOZ-P1 (inferred) or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent.		Accept	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: Policies RPROZ-P1, P4 and P7

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS196.109	Joe Carr		Support		Allow		Accept	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: Policies RPROZ-P1, P4 and P7
FS570.1450	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 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: Policies RPROZ-P1, P4 and P7
FS346.452	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: Policies RPROZ-P1, P4 and P7
FS566.1464	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 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: Policies RPROZ-P1, P4 and P7
FS569.1486	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 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: Policies RPROZ-P1, P4 and P7
S463.091	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited	RPROZ-P1	Support	WBF supports recognition of the typical effects of primary production, which cannot necessarily be internalised.	Retain Policy RPROZ-P1		Accept	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: Policies RPROZ-P1, P4 and P7
FS91.21	Moana Kiff		Oppose	Oppose; we consider that primary production producers should be wholly responsible for all adverse effects caused by primary production activities, and not 'where practicable'. Making primary production producers wholly responsible for their activities, without limiting this responsibility to what is practicable, as this promotes accountability, prevents the	Disallow		Reject	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: Policies RPROZ-P1, P4 and P7

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				externalization of costs, incentivizes innovation, protects public goods, ensures legal clarity, builds consumer confidence, and supports long-term sustainability. This approach aligns with the principles of responsible and ethical production, benefiting both producers and society.				
FS66.161	Bentzen Farm Limited		Support	The policy provides appropriate recognition of typical farming activities.	Allow		Accept	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: Policies RPROZ-P1, P4 and P7
S182.028	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association	RPROZ-P1	Support	Support the enabling of primary production and recognition that typical adverse effects should be anticipated and expected	Retain RPROZ-P1		Accept	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: Policies RPROZ-P1, P4 and P7
FS354.205	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	HortNZ supports the enabling of primary production and recognition that typical adverse effects should be anticipated and expected	Allow	Allow S182.028	Accept	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: Policies RPROZ-P1, P4 and P7
S160.035	Manulife Forest Management (NZ) Ltd	RPROZ-P1	Support	The submitter supports policy RPROZ-P1	Retain policy RPROZ-P1 as it is written.		Accept	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: Policies RPROZ-P1, P4 and P7
FS346.605	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS. Loss of natural character, coastal environment values and the values of outstanding landscapes could also result.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: Policies RPROZ-P1, P4 and P7
S55.027	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	RPROZ-P2	Support	Support enabling primary production activities as the predominant land use,	Retain as proposed		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
				on the understanding that this includes intensive primary production activities.			Key Issue 11: Policy RPROZ-P2
S182.029	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association	RPROZ-P2	Support in part	Support enabling and recognising primary production as the predominant land use. Seek to have agricultural aviation acknowledged as part of the rural character	Retain RPROZ-P2 and amend to add: b. enabling a range of compatible activities that support primary production activities, including ancillary activities, agricultural aviation , rural produce manufacturing, rural produce retail, visitor accommodation and home businesses.	Reject	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Policy RPROZ-P2
S489.027	Radio New Zealand	RPROZ-P2	Support	RNZ support the direction to primarily use land in the rural production zone for primary production	Retain Policy RPROZ-P2	Accept in part	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Policy RPROZ-P2
S421.213	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	RPROZ-P2	Oppose	Federated Farmers opposes policies RPZOZ-P2 RPZOZ-P3, RPROZ-4, RPRPZ-P5 and RPROZ-P6 as they are drafted in the proposed district plan. The policies have no regard for the private property rights of landowners and are promoting the absolute protection of the rural production zone and highly productive land through removing the ability of landowners to control the use of their land. The National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land sets out the requirements for the management of highly productive land. Policy 8 requires the protection of highly productive land from inappropriate use and development. Clause 3.8 provides for the subdivision of highly productive land provided certain matters are met. Clause 3.11 states that territorial authorities must include objectives, policies, and rules in their district plans to enable the maintenance, operation, or upgrade of any existing activities on	Amend Policy RPZOZ-P2 to achieve consistency with the requirements of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land and to recognise and provide for the rights of private landowners.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Policy RPROZ-P2

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				highly productive land; and ensure that any loss of highly productive land from those activities is minimised. The proposed district plan needs to be consistent with the requirements of the National Policy Statement as well as acknowledging the rights of landowners.				
FS24.30	Lynley Newport		Support in part	policies are inconsistent with NPS HPL - too much emphasis on HPL and blinkered assumption all land in the rural zone is HPL and has same characteristics. Council totally out of touch with its rural community	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Policy RPROZ-P2
FS172.322	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons stated in this primary submission.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Policy RPROZ-P2
FS196.114	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Policy RPROZ-P2
FS570.1445	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: Policy RPROZ-P2
FS346.447	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Policy RPROZ-P2
FS566.1459	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: Policy RPROZ-P2
S143.015	Ballance Agri-Nutrients Limited	RPROZ-P2	Support	Ballance supports the enabling and recognition of primary production as the predominant land use in the Rural Production Zone as well as the	Retain the Policy RPROZ- P2		Accept in part	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Policy RPROZ-P2

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				importance of enabling ancillary activities (such as agricultural aviation).				
FS109.27	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association		Support in part	It is important to have agricultural aviation acknowledged as part of the rural character as sought in S182.029	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Policy RPROZ-P2
S159.099	Horticulture New Zealand	RPROZ-P2	Support	Enabling primary production and ancillary activities and those with a functional need to support primary production is supported.	Retain Policy RPROZ-P2		Accept in part	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Policy RPROZ-P2
FS151.268	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Policy RPROZ-P2
FS570.261	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: Policy RPROZ-P2
FS566.275	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: Policy RPROZ-P2
FS569.297	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: Policy RPROZ-P2
S103.001	Lynley Newport	RPROZ-P2	Oppose	<p>The intent of the policies is made abundantly clear by their wording. I disagree with that intent and oppose strongly the punitive and restrictive wording of the policies.</p> <p>There will be existing property and land use in the Rural Production Zone already contrary to the policies. There are permitted activities listed in the zone rules that will be contrary to some of the policies - which is illogical and not consistent with the Resource Management Act.</p> <p>The problem with some of the policies as written is that they attempt to stop</p>	<p>Amend the Rural Production Zone policy RPROZ-P2 by adding a part (c):</p> <p>c. Enabling activities that do not support primary production activities but where they do not adversely affect the ability of the site to continue with primary production use.</p>		Reject	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Policy RPROZ-P2

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				almost any activity in the zone except farming. This is not effects based, is an inconsistent approach when compared with other zones, is overly stifling of the rural community's ability to remain vibrant and viable; and not consistent with the zone's own rule suite. RPROZ-P2 should also provide for/enable a range of compatible activities that may not support primary production but which might establish without adversely affecting the ability to continue with primary production. This would be more consistent with the rule framework.				
FS172.184	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Policy RPROZ-P2
FS196.49	Joe Carr		Support	provides for the sustainable use of land that otherwise has limited use	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Policy RPROZ-P2
FS28.028	Dr John L Craig		Support	There are permitted activities listed in the Rural Production Zone rules that will be contrary to some of the policies which is illogical and not consistent with the RMA. The proposed policies stop almost all activity in the zone except for farming. This is not effects based and is an inconsistent approach in comparison to other zones. The policy will restrict rural communities' ability to remain vibrant and viable which is inconsistent with the zoning rules. The provisions of the FNDP could severely restrict future potential activities within reforestation areas or require resource consent for activities. The policy should provide for enable a	Allow	Amend RPROZ-P2 as follows: 'c) Enabling activities that do not support primary production activities but where they do not adversely affect the ability of the site to continue with primary production use'.	Reject	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Policy RPROZ-P2

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				range of compatible activities that may not support primary production but which might establish without adversely affecting the ability to continue with primary production. This would be more consistent with the rule framework.				
FS548.025	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	The amendments sought are not supported. Productive land in the rural production zone is a finite resource which must be managed in a way to ensure its ongoing productive capacity. The amendments sought are inconsistent with the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land.	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Accept	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Policy RPROZ-P2
S199.001	Thomson Survey Ltd	RPROZ-P2	Oppose	The submitter opposes the intent and restrictive wording of RPROZ-P2 and contends that there are permitted activities listed in the zone rules that will be contrary to the policies.	Amend RPROZ-2 as follows: Add (c): c. Enabling activities that do not support primary production activities but where they do not adversely affect the ability of the site to continue with primary production use.		Reject	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Policy RPROZ-P2
FS172.254	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Policy RPROZ-P2
FS548.065	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	Rural production activities have limited resource on which they can be established. To provide for other unnecessary activities to establish in the zone is inappropriate and will be detrimental to existing, lawfully established activities on the zone.	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Accept	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Policy RPROZ-P2
FS354.206	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	Activities that are not primary production, service primary production or require a rural location should not be enabled in the rural production zone.	Disallow	Disallow S199.001	Accept	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Policy RPROZ-P2

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S463.092	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited	RPROZ-P2	Oppose	WBF seeks the inclusion of reference to 'staff accommodation' in this policy to clarify that this activity is ancillary to farming.	Amend point b. of Policy RPROZ-P2 as follows: b. enabling a range of compatible activities that support primary production activities, including ancillary activities (including staff accommodation), rural produce manufacturing, rural produce retail, visitor accommodation and home businesses.		Reject	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Policy RPROZ-P2
FS91.22	Moana Kiff		Support	Support accommodating workers.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Policy RPROZ-P2
S331.066	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	RPROZ-P2	Support in part	The submitter supports in part policy RPROZ-P2 as it provides for a range of compactible activities that require a rural location such as educational facilities.	Amend policy RPROZ-P2 as follows: Ensure the Rural Production zone provides for activities that require a rural location by: a. enabling primary production activities as the predominant land use; b. enabling a range of compatible activities that support primary production activities, including ancillary activities, rural produce manufacturing, rural produce retail, visitor accommodation, educational facilities , and home businesses.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan Wide or Rural Wide Submissions
FS548.072	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	Federated Farmers supports the development and maintenance of vibrant rural communities. However, sensitive activities such as educational facilities need to be carefully considered to ensure that they do not impact on existing, lawfully established rural activities. Rural activities are not able to be packaged up and moved elsewhere to deal with any negative effects from other activities.	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan Wide or Rural Wide Submissions
FS354.207	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	Educational facilities do not necessarily directly support primary production so	Disallow	Disallow S331.066	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
				should not be included in RPROZ-P2 b).				Key Issue 4: Plan Wide or Rural Wide Submissions
S160.036	Manulife Forest Management (NZ) Ltd	RPROZ-P2	Support	The submitter supports RPROZ-P2.	Retain RPROZ-P2 as it is written.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Policy RPROZ-P2
FS346.606	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS. Loss of natural character, coastal environment values and the values of outstanding landscapes could also result.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Policy RPROZ-P2
S55.028	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	RPROZ-P3	Support	Support requirement to avoid or mitigate reverse sensitivity effects on primary production activities.	Retain as proposed		Accept in part	Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: Policies RPROZ-P3 and RPROZ-P5
S143.016	Ballance Agri-Nutrients Limited	RPROZ-P3	Support	Ballance supports ensuring that reverse sensitivities and non-productive activities do not impact on primary production and associated ancillary activities	Retain the Policy RPROZ -P3		Accept in part	Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: Policies RPROZ-P3 and RPROZ-P5
S182.030	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association	RPROZ-P3	Support	Support ensuring that reverse sensitivities and non-productive activities do not impact on primary production	Retain RPROZ-P3		Accept in part	Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: Policies RPROZ-P3 and RPROZ-P5
S331.067	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	RPROZ-P3	Support	The submitter supports policy RPROZ-P3 to manage the establishment, design and location of new sensitive activities such as educational facilities in the Rural Production zone to avoid where possible, or otherwise mitigate reverse sensitivity effects on primary production activities.	Retain policy RPROZ-P3, as proposed.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: Policies RPROZ-P3 and RPROZ-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
S489.028	Radio New Zealand	RPROZ-P3	Support	RNZ supports policy direction limiting the potential for new sensitive activities to have reverse sensitivity effects on established activities in the rural production zone	Retain Policy RPROZ-P3 (inferred)		Accept in part	Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: Policies RPROZ-P3 and RPROZ-P5
S159.100	Horticulture New Zealand	RPROZ-P3	Oppose	Policy RPROZ-P5 seeks to avoid land uses for a number of reasons. It is considered that Policy RPROZ-P3 could be combined with Policy RPROZ-P5 by an additional clause	Delete Policy RPROZ-P3		Reject	Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: Policies RPROZ-P3 and RPROZ-P5
FS151.269	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: Policies RPROZ-P3 and RPROZ-P5
FS570.262	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: Policies RPROZ-P3 and RPROZ-P5
FS566.276	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: Policies RPROZ-P3 and RPROZ-P5
FS569.298	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: Policies RPROZ-P3 and RPROZ-P5
S421.214	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	RPROZ-P3	Oppose	Federated Farmers opposes policies RPZOZ-P2 RPZOZ-P3, RPROZ-4, RPRPZ-P5 and RPROZ-P6 as they are drafted in the proposed district plan. The policies have no regard for the private property rights of landowners and are promoting the absolute protection of the rural production zone and highly productive land through removing the ability of landowners to control the use of their land.	Amend Policy RPZOZ-P3 to achieve consistency with the requirements of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land and to recognise and provide for the rights of private landowners.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: Policies RPROZ-P3 and RPROZ-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
				<p>The National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land sets out the requirements for the management of highly productive land. Policy 8 requires the protection of highly productive land from inappropriate use and development. Clause 3.8 provides for the subdivision of highly productive land provided certain matters are met. Clause 3.11 states that territorial authorities must include objectives, policies, and rules in their district plans to enable the maintenance, operation, or upgrade of any existing activities on highly productive land; and ensure that any loss of highly productive land from those activities is minimised.</p> <p>The proposed district plan needs to be consistent with the requirements of the National Policy Statement as well as acknowledging the rights of landowners.</p>				
FS172.323	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons stated in this primary submission.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: Policies RPROZ-P3 and RPROZ-P5
FS196.113	Joe Carr		Support	Tautoko	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: Policies RPROZ-P3 and RPROZ-P5
FS570.1446	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 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: Policies RPROZ-P3 and RPROZ-P5
FS346.448	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: Policies RPROZ-P3 and RPROZ-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
				RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.				
FS566.1460	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 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: Policies RPROZ-P3 and RPROZ-P5
FS569.1482	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 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: Policies RPROZ-P3 and RPROZ-P5
S160.037	Manulife Forest Management (NZ) Ltd	RPROZ-P3	Support	The submitter supports policy RPROZ-P3.	Retain policy RPROZ-P3 as it is written.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: Policies RPROZ-P3 and RPROZ-P5
FS346.607	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS. Loss of natural character, coastal environment values and the values of outstanding landscapes could also result.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: Policies RPROZ-P3 and RPROZ-P5
S55.029	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	RPROZ-P4	Support	Support land use and subdivision being undertaken in a manner that reflects character and amenity of the RPZ.	Retain as proposed		Accept	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: Policies RPROZ-P1, P4 and P7
S143.017	Ballance Agri-Nutrients Limited	RPROZ-P4	Support	Ballance supports ensuring that subdivision maintains or enhances the rural character of the Rural production Zone including noise and dust associated with the rural environment	Retain the Policy RPROZ -P4		Accept	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: Policies RPROZ-P1, P4 and P7
S182.031	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association	RPROZ-P4	Support	Support ensuring that subdivision maintains or enhances the rural character of the RPROZ including	Retain RPROZ-P4		Accept	Section 5.2.10

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
				noise and dust associated with the rural environment			Key Issue 10: Policies RPROZ-P1, P4 and P7
S333.083	P S Yates Family Trust	RPROZ-P4	Support	The policy is supported because it recognises that the rural character and amenity of the zone includes "a diverse range of rural environments, rural character and amenity values throughout the District	Retain Policy RPROZ-P4	Accept	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: Policies RPROZ-P1, P4 and P7
S168.091	Setar Thirty Six Limited	RPROZ-P4	Support	The policy is supported because it recognises that the rural character and amenity of the zone includes "a diverse range of rural environments, rural character and amenity values throughout the District".	Retain Policy RPROZ-P4	Accept	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: Policies RPROZ-P1, P4 and P7
S187.082	The Shooting Box Limited	RPROZ-P4	Support	The policy is supported because it recognises that the rural character and amenity of the zone includes "a diverse range of rural environments, rural character and amenity values throughout the District".	Retain Policy RPROZ-P4.	Accept	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: Policies RPROZ-P1, P4 and P7
S222.087	Wendover Two Limited	RPROZ-P4	Support	The policy is supported because it recognises that the rural character and amenity of the zone includes "a diverse range of rural environments, rural character and amenity values throughout the District".	Retain Policy RPROZ-P4	Accept	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: Policies RPROZ-P1, P4 and P7
S489.029	Radio New Zealand	RPROZ-P4	Support	RNZ support this policy, particularly the direction to maintain low density development.	Retain Policy RPROZ-P4	Accept	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: Policies RPROZ-P1, P4 and P7
S421.215	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	RPROZ-P4	Oppose	Federated Farmers opposes policies RPZOZ-P2 RPZOZ-P3, RPROZ-4, RPRPZ-P5 and RPROZ-P6 as they are drafted in the proposed district plan. The policies have no regard for the private property rights of landowners and are promoting the absolute protection of the rural production zone	Amend Policy RPZOZ-P4 to achieve consistency with the requirements of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land and to recognise and provide for the rights of private landowners.	Reject	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: Policies RPROZ-P1, P4 and P7

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>and highly productive land through removing the ability of landowners to control the use of their land.</p> <p>The National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land sets out the requirements for the management of highly productive land. Policy 8 requires the protection of highly productive land from inappropriate use and development. Clause 3.8 provides for the subdivision of highly productive land provided certain matters are met. Clause 3.11 states that territorial authorities must include objectives, policies, and rules in their district plans to enable the maintenance, operation, or upgrade of any existing activities on highly productive land; and ensure that any loss of highly productive land from those activities is minimised.</p> <p>The proposed district plan needs to be consistent with the requirements of the National Policy Statement as well as acknowledging the rights of landowners.</p>				
FS172.324	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons stated in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: Policies RPROZ-P1, P4 and P7
FS196.112	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: Policies RPROZ-P1, P4 and P7
FS570.1447	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: Policies RPROZ-P1, P4 and P7
FS346.449	Royal Forest and Bird Protection		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.10

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
	Society of New Zealand Inc.			functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.				Key Issue 10: Policies RPROZ-P1, P4 and P7
FS566.1461	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: Policies RPROZ-P1, P4 and P7
FS569.1483	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: Policies RPROZ-P1, P4 and P7
S159.102	Horticulture New Zealand	RPROZ-P4	Support	The description of rural character reflects the nature of the rural environment although there may be site coverage for orchard structures	Retain Policy RPROZ-P4		Accept	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: Policies RPROZ-P1, P4 and P7
FS570.264	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 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: Policies RPROZ-P1, P4 and P7
FS566.278	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 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: Policies RPROZ-P1, P4 and P7
FS569.300	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 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: Policies RPROZ-P1, P4 and P7
S243.112	Matauri Trustee Limited	RPROZ-P4	Support	The policy is supported because it recognises that the rural character and amenity of the zone includes "a diverse range of rural environments, rural character and amenity values throughout the District".	Retain Policy RPROZ-P4		Accept	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: Policies RPROZ-P1, P4 and P7

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS570.670	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 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: Policies RPROZ-P1, P4 and P7
FS566.684	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 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: Policies RPROZ-P1, P4 and P7
FS569.706	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 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: Policies RPROZ-P1, P4 and P7
S160.038	Manulife Forest Management (NZ) Ltd	RPROZ-P4	Support	The submitter supports policy RPROZ-P4.	Retain policy RPROZ-P4 as it is written.		Accept	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: Policies RPROZ-P1, P4 and P7
FS346.608	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS. Loss of natural character, coastal environment values and the values of outstanding landscapes could also result.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: Policies RPROZ-P1, P4 and P7
S167.094	Bentzen Farm Limited	RPROZ-P4	Support	The policy is supported because it recognises that the rural character and amenity of the zone includes "a diverse range of rural environments, rural character and amenity values throughout the District".	Retain Policy RPROZ-P4		Accept	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: Policies RPROZ-P1, P4 and P7
FS566.456	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow		Reject	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: Policies RPROZ-P1, P4 and P7

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S55.030	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	RPROZ-P5	Support	Support policy to avoid land use that is incompatible with the purpose, character and amenity of the RPZ and does not have a functional need to locate there. Intensive primary production, while not directly dependent on the soil resource, has a functional and locational need to operate in the rural production zone. Indoor pig farms are often part of a larger farming enterprise incorporating either an arable or pastoral operation. Effluent from the piggery is applied to the land as a natural fertiliser. The land can, in turn, grow feed or bedding for the pigs. For this reason, pig farms are often situated by necessity on highly productive land, as they are integrated with operations that do rely on the productive capacity of the soil.	Retain as proposed	Accept in part	Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: Policies RPROZ-P3 and P5
S333.084	P S Yates Family Trust	RPROZ-P5	Oppose	Reference to "functional need" in this policy potentially negates the ability for other activities to establish which may be a sustainable use of land and also contribute to the economic and social development of the district, or bring environmental benefit such as residential activities, Visitor accommodation, Educational facilities, Conservation activities, Recreational activities, Cemeteries / Urupā and Minor residential units. The zone purpose presumably is from the overview. Sub clause a. is only supported with the amendment to that overview sought in this submission. Similarly, reference to Highly Productive Land in subclause c. is only supported with the amendments to the definition of Highly Productive Land also sought in this submission.	Delete Policy RPROZ-P5 Or alternatively Amend Policy RPROZ-P5 as follows: Avoid land use that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. is incompatible with the purpose, character and amenity of the Rural Production zone; b. does not have a functional need to locate in the Rural Production zone and is more appropriately located in another zone; e-b. would result in the loss of productive capacity of highly productive land; ec. would exacerbate natural hazards; and ed. cannot provide appropriate on-site infrastructure. 	Reject	Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: Policies RPROZ-P3 and 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
S168.092	Setar Thirty Six Limited	RPROZ-P5	Oppose	<p>Reference to "functional need" in this policy potentially negates the ability for other activities to establish which may be a sustainable use of land and also contribute to the economic and social development of the district, or bring environmental benefit such as residential activities, Visitor accommodation, Educational facilities, Conservation activities, Recreational activities, Cemeteries/Urupā and Minor residential units.</p> <p>The zone purpose presumably is from the overview. Sub clause a. is only supported with the amendment to that overview sought in this submission. Similarly, reference to Highly Productive Land in subclause c. is only supported with the amendments to the definition of Highly Productive Land also sought in this submission.</p>	<p>Delete Policy RPROZ-P5</p> <p>Or alternatively</p> <p>Amend Policy RPROZ-P5 as follows:</p> <p>Avoid land use that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. is incompatible with the purpose, character and amenity of the Rural Production zone; b. does not have a functional need to locate in the Rural Production zone and is more appropriately located in another zone; ... 	Reject	Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: Policies RPROZ-P3 and P5
S187.083	The Shooting Box Limited	RPROZ-P5	Oppose	<p>Refer to submission for detailed reasons for decision(s) requested relating, but not limited to, to the following: reference to "functional need" in this policy potentially negates the ability for other activities to establish which may be a sustainable use of land; sub clause (a) is only supported with the amendment to that overview sought in this submission; and subclause (c) is only supported with the amendments to the definition of Highly Productive Land also sought in this submission.</p>	<p>Delete Policy RPROZ-P5</p> <p>Or alternatively</p> <p>Amend Policy RPROZ-P5 as follows:</p> <p>Avoid land use that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. is incompatible with the purpose, character and amenity of the Rural Production zone; b. does not have a functional need to locate in the Rural Production zone and is more appropriately located in another zone; b. would result in the loss of productive capacity of highly productive land; c. would exacerbate natural hazards; and d. cannot provide appropriate on-site infrastructure. 	Reject	Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: Policies RPROZ-P3 and 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
S222.088	Wendover Two Limited	RPROZ-P5	Oppose	<p>Reference to "functional need" in this policy potentially negates the ability for other activities to establish which may be a sustainable use of land and also contribute to the economic and social development of the district, or bring environmental benefit such as residential activities, Visitor accommodation, Educational facilities, Conservation activities, Recreational activities, Cemeteries / Urupā and Minor residential units.</p> <p>The zone purpose presumably is from the overview. Sub clause a. is only supported with the amendment to that overview sought in this submission. Similarly, reference to Highly Productive Land in subclause c. is only supported with the amendments to the definition of Highly Productive Land also sought in this submission.</p>	<p>Delete Policy RPROZ-P5</p> <p>Or alternatively</p> <p>Amend Policy RPROZ-P5 as follows:</p> <p>Avoid land use that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> c. is incompatible with the purpose, character and amenity of the Rural Production zone; b. does not have a functional need to locate in the Rural Production zone and is more appropriately located in another zone; e-b. would result in the loss of productive capacity of highly productive land; ed. would exacerbate natural hazards; and ed. cannot provide appropriate on-site infrastructure. 	Reject	Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: Policies RPROZ-P3 and P5
S167.095	Bentzen Farm Limited	RPROZ-P5	Oppose	<p>Reference to "functional need" in this policy potentially negates the ability for other activities to establish which may be a sustainable use of land and also contribute to the economic and social development of the district, or bring environmental benefit such as residential activities, Visitor accommodation, Educational facilities, Conservation activities, Recreational activities, Cemeteries / Urupā and Minor residential units.</p>	<p>Delete Policy RPROZ-P5</p> <p>Or alternatively</p> <p>Amend Policy RPROZ-P5 as follows:</p> <p>Avoid land use that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. is incompatible with the purpose, character and amenity of the Rural Production zone; b. does not have a functional need to locate in the Rural Production zone and is more appropriately located in another zone; e-b. would result in the loss of productive capacity of highly productive land; ed. would exacerbate natural hazards; and ed. cannot provide appropriate on-site infrastructure. 	Reject	Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: Policies RPROZ-P3 and 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
FS143.39	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support	As above, reference to "functional need" in this policy potentially negates the ability for other activities to establish which may be a sustainable use of land and also contribute to the economic and social development of the district, or bring environmental benefit.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: Policies RPROZ-P3 and P5
FS354.208	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	The submitter seeks to delete the policy or delete clause b. does not have a functional need to locate in the Rural Production zone and is more appropriately located in another zone. HortNZ considers that the policy is important for ensuring that primary production activities can operate without the potential for reverse sensitivity effects and impacts on primary production activities.	Disallow	Disallow S167.095	Accept	Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: Policies RPROZ-P3 and P5
FS566.457	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: Policies RPROZ-P3 and P5
S159.101	Horticulture New Zealand	RPROZ-P5	Oppose	Policy RPROZ-P5 seeks to avoid land uses for a number of reasons. It is considered that Policy RPROZ-P3 could be combined with RPROZ-P5 by an additional clause	Amend Policy RPROZ-P5 to incorporate reverse sensitivity effects, add: f) could result in reverse sensitivity effects		Reject	Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: Policies RPROZ-P3 and P5
FS151.270	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: Policies RPROZ-P3 and P5
FS304.016	Radio New Zealand		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject	Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: Policies RPROZ-P3 and P5
FS570.263	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: Policies RPROZ-P3 and 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
FS566.277	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: Policies RPROZ-P3 and P5
FS569.299	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: Policies RPROZ-P3 and P5
S159.103	Horticulture New Zealand	RPROZ-P5	Support in part	The approach of Policy RPROZ-P5 is supported but an additional clause is supported for reverse sensitivity effects.	Amend Policy RPROZ-P5 by adding: f) could result in reverse sensitivity effects		Reject	Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: Policies RPROZ-P3 and P5
FS151.271	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: Policies RPROZ-P3 and P5
FS570.265	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: Policies RPROZ-P3 and P5
FS566.279	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: Policies RPROZ-P3 and P5
FS569.301	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: Policies RPROZ-P3 and P5
S103.002	Lynley Newport	RPROZ-P5	Oppose	The intent of the policies is made abundantly clear by their wording. I disagree with that intent and oppose strongly the punitive and restrictive wording of the policies. There will be existing property and land use in the Rural Production Zone already contrary to the policies. There are permitted activities listed in the zone rules that will be contrary to some of the policies - which is illogical and not consistent with the Resource Management Act. The problem with some of the policies	Amended Policy RPROZ-P5 to read: Manage land use so that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. It is compatible with the purpose, character and amenity of the Rural Production Zone; b. It enables activities with a functional need to locate in the Rural Production Zone; c. Does not result in a more than minor loss of productive capacity of highly productive land; 		Reject	Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: Policies RPROZ-P3 and 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
				as written is that they attempt to stop almost any activity in the zone except farming. This is not effects based, is an inconsistent approach when compared with other zones, is overly stifling of the rural community's ability to remain vibrant and viable; and not consistent with the zone's own rule suite.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> d. Does not exacerbate natural hazards; and e. Can provide appropriate on-site infrastructure. 			
FS172.185	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: Policies RPROZ-P3 and P5
FS196.50	Joe Carr		Support	per the submitter's reasons	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: Policies RPROZ-P3 and P5
FS28.029	Dr John L Craig		Support	The submitter agrees that the wording is punitive and restrictive.	Allow	Delete RPROZ-P6 or if it is retained amend as follows: 'Manage subdivision so that: a. the loss of highly productive land [or use by [arming activities is avoided, where possible, and were avoidance is not possible, the loss has only minor impact on the availability of highly productive land for productive purposes. b. the land is not fragmented into parcel sizes that are no longer able to support farming activities, taking into account.... c. smaller lot sizes and rural lifestyle living is encouraged where there is an environmental benefit.	Reject	Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: Policies RPROZ-P3 and P5
FS548.026	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	The amendments sought are not supported. Productive land in the rural production zone is a finite resource which must be managed in a way to ensure its ongoing productive capacity. The amendments sought are	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Accept	Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: Policies RPROZ-P3 and 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
				inconsistent with the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land.				
S199.002	Thomson Survey Ltd	RPROZ-P5	Oppose	The submitter opposes the intent and restrictive wording of RPROZ-P5 and contends that there are permitted activities listed in the zone rules that will be contrary to the policies.	Amend RPROZ-P5 to read as follows: Manage land use so that: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. it is compatible with the purpose, character and amenity of the Rural Production zone; 2. it enables activities with a functional need to locate in the Rural Production zone and is more appropriately located in another zone; 3. does not result in a more than minor loss of productive capacity of highly productive land; 4. does not exacerbate natural hazards; and 5. can provide appropriate on-site infrastructure. 		Reject	Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: Policies RPROZ-P3 and P5
FS172.255	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: Policies RPROZ-P3 and P5
FS548.066	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	Rural production activities have limited resource on which they can be established. To provide for other unnecessary activities to establish in the zone is inappropriate and will be detrimental to existing, lawfully established activities on the zone.	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Accept	Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: Policies RPROZ-P3 and P5
FS354.209	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	The submitter opposes the intent and restrictive wording of RPROZ-P5 and contends that there are permitted activities listed in the zone rules that will be contrary to the policies. HortNZ considers that such activities currently located in the rural production zone will have existing use rights if they are	Disallow	Disallow S199.002	Accept	Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: Policies RPROZ-P3 and 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
				lawfully established. The changes sought weaken the policy which will compromise primary production activities and is contrary to the NPSHPL.			
S216.001	Errol McIntyre	RPROZ-P5	Oppose	Any regulations infringe on a property owners right. Existing use has not been accounted for and future development and maintenance of any use has now become subject to restriction. Council must consider the property owners right to own and use their land. A disproportionate amount of rates are paid for the services we get.	Amend policy to consider existing uses and property owners rights to use their land (inferred)	Accept in part	Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: Policies RPROZ-P3 and P5
FS172.267	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow	Accept in part	Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: Policies RPROZ-P3 and P5
S421.216	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	RPROZ-P5	Oppose	Federated Farmers opposes policies RPZOZ-P2 RPZOZ-P3, RPROZ-4, RPRPZ-P5 and RPROZ-P6 as they are drafted in the proposed district plan. The policies have no regard for the private property rights of landowners and are promoting the absolute protection of the rural production zone and highly productive land through removing the ability of landowners to control the use of their land. The National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land sets out the requirements for the management of highly productive land. Policy 8 requires the protection of highly productive land from inappropriate use and development. Clause 3.8 provides for the subdivision of highly productive land provided certain matters are met. Clause 3.11 states that territorial authorities must include objectives, policies, and rules in their district plans to enable the maintenance, operation,	Amend Policy RPZOZ-P5 to achieve consistency with the requirements of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land and to recognise and provide for the rights of private landowners	Accept in part	Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: Policies RPROZ-P3 and 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
				or upgrade of any existing activities on highly productive land; and ensure that any loss of highly productive land from those activities is minimised. The proposed district plan needs to be consistent with the requirements of the National Policy Statement as well as acknowledging the rights of landowners.				
FS196.111	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: Policies RPROZ-P3 and P5
FS570.1448	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 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: Policies RPROZ-P3 and P5
FS346.450	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: Policies RPROZ-P3 and P5
FS566.1462	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 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: Policies RPROZ-P3 and P5
FS569.1484	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 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: Policies RPROZ-P3 and P5
S243.113	Matauri Trustee Limited	RPROZ-P5	Oppose	Reference to "functional need" in this policy potentially negates the ability for other activities to establish which may be a sustainable use of land and also contribute to the economic and social development of the district, or bring environmental benefit such as residential activities, Visitor accommodation, Educational facilities, Conservation activities, Recreational	Delete Policy RPROZ-P5 Or, alternatively, amend Policy RPROZ-P5 as follows: a. Avoid land use that is incompatible with the purpose, character and amenity of the Rural Production zone; b. b. does not have a functional need to locate in the Rural Production zone and		Reject	Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: Policies RPROZ-P3 and 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
				activities, Cemeteries/Urupā and Minor residential units.	<p>is more appropriately located in another zone;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> c. would result in the loss of productive capacity of highly productive land; d. would exacerbate natural hazards; and e. cannot provide appropriate on-site infrastructure. 			
FS570.671	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: Policies RPROZ-P3 and P5
FS566.685	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: Policies RPROZ-P3 and P5
FS569.707	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: Policies RPROZ-P3 and P5
S160.039	Manulife Forest Management (NZ) Ltd	RPROZ-P5	Support	The submitter supports policy RPROZ-P5.	Retain policy RPROZ-P5 as it is written.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: Policies RPROZ-P3 and P5
FS346.609	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS. Loss of natural character, coastal environment values and the values of outstanding landscapes could also result.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: Policies RPROZ-P3 and P5
S333.085	P S Yates Family Trust	RPROZ-P6	Oppose	Policy RPROZ-P6 seeks to avoid subdivision except in the limited circumstances specified. This fails to recognise the forms and subdivision otherwise enabled by the Proposed Plan in rural environment	Delete Policy RPROZ-P6 and replace with the following: Provide limited opportunities for subdivision in the general rural zone while ensuring that:		Reject	Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: Policy RPROZ-P6

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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>(Management Plan and Environmental benefit subdivisions). The zone should recognise and provide for these opportunities on the basis that they may represent the only viable pathway to achieve sustainable land use change on a rural block and that they actively promote the biodiversity/natural character enhancement policies of the Proposed Plan, the RPS and the NZCPS. Other features of the rural environment can be appropriately managed in the manner sought in the relief.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. there will be significant environmental protection of indigenous vegetation including restoration, or wetlands b. subdivision avoids the inappropriate proliferation and dispersal of development by limiting the number of sites created; c. subdivision avoids inappropriate development within areas of the Outstanding Natural Landscape Overlay, Outstanding Natural Character Overlay, High Natural Character Overlay and the coastal environment; d. adverse effects on rural and coastal character are avoided, remedied or mitigated; e. sites are of sufficient size to absorb and manage adverse effects within the site; and f. reverse sensitivity effects are managed in a way that does not compromise the viability of rural sites for continued production. <p>The fragmentation of highly productive land is avoided.</p>		
S168.093	Setar Thirty Six Limited	RPROZ-P6	Oppose	<p>Policy RPROZ-P6 seeks to avoid subdivision except in the limited circumstances specified. This fails to recognise the forms and subdivision otherwise enabled by the Proposed Plan in rural environment (Management Plan and Environmental benefit subdivisions). The zone should recognise and provide for these opportunities on the basis that they may represent the only viable pathway</p>	<p>Delete Policy RPROZ-P6 and replace with the following:</p> <p>Provide limited opportunities for subdivision in the general rural zone while ensuring that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> g. there will be significant environmental protection of indigenous vegetation including restoration, or wetlands 	Reject	Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: Policy RPROZ-P6

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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 achieve sustainable land use change on a rural block and that they actively promote the biodiversity/natural character enhancement policies of the Proposed Plan, the RPS and the NZCPS. Other features of the rural environment can be appropriately managed in the manner sought in the relief.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> h. subdivision avoids the inappropriate proliferation and dispersal of development by limiting the number of sites created; i. subdivision avoids inappropriate development within areas of the Outstanding Natural Landscape Overlay, Outstanding Natural Character Overlay, High Natural Character Overlay and the coastal environment; j. adverse effects on rural and coastal character are avoided, remedied or mitigated; k. sites are of sufficient size to absorb and manage adverse effects within the site; and l. reverse sensitivity effects are managed in a way that does not compromise the viability of rural sites for continued production. <p>The fragmentation of highly productive land is avoided.</p>		
S187.084	The Shooting Box Limited	RPROZ-P6	Oppose	Policy RPROZ-P6 seeks to avoid subdivision except in the limited circumstances specified. This fails to recognise the forms and subdivision otherwise enabled by the Proposed Plan in rural environment (Management Plan and Environmental benefit subdivisions). The zone should recognise and provide for these opportunities on the basis that they may represent the only viable pathway to achieve sustainable land use change on a rural block and that they actively promote the biodiversity/natural	Delete Policy RPROZ-P6 and replace with the following: Provide limited opportunities for subdivision in the general rural zone while ensuring that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> m. there will be significant environmental protection of indigenous vegetation including restoration, or wetlands n. subdivision avoids the inappropriate proliferation and dispersal of development by limiting the number of sites created; 	Reject	Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: Policy RPROZ-P6 Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: Policy RPROZ-P6

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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>character enhancement policies of the Proposed Plan, the RPS and the NZCPS. Other features of the rural environment can be appropriately managed in the manner sought in the relief.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o. subdivision avoids inappropriate development within areas of the Outstanding Natural Landscape Overlay, Outstanding Natural Character Overlay, High Natural Character Overlay and the coastal environment; p. adverse effects on rural and coastal character are avoided, remedied or mitigated; q. sites are of sufficient size to absorb and manage adverse effects within the site; and r. reverse sensitivity effects are managed in a way that does not compromise the viability of rural sites for continued production. s. The fragmentation of highly productive land is avoided. 		
<p>S386.019</p>	<p>Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew</p>	<p>RPROZ-P6</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>Ballantyne & Agnew consider this policy to be too narrow, focusing too heavily on farming activities, rather than the productive capability of the zone. It is considered that this policy should be broadened to encompass all primary production activities.</p>	<p>Amend RPROZ-P6 as follows: "Avoid subdivision that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. results in the loss of highly productive land for use primary production by farming activities; b. fragments land into parcel sizes that are no longer able to support farming activities productive capacity of the rural environment, taking into account: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the productive capability of soils type of farming proposed; and 2. whether smaller land parcels can support more productive activities forms of farming due to the presence of highly productive land. c. provides for rural lifestyle living 	<p>Accept in part</p>	<p>Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: Policy RPROZ-P6</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
					unless there is an environmental benefit."		
S222.089	Wendover Two Limited	RPROZ-P6	Oppose	Policy RPROZ-P6 seeks to avoid subdivision except in the limited circumstances specified. This fails to recognise the forms and subdivision otherwise enabled by the Proposed Plan in rural environment (Management Plan and Environmental benefit subdivisions). The zone should recognise and provide for these opportunities on the basis that they may represent the only viable pathway to achieve sustainable land use change on a rural block and that they actively promote the biodiversity/natural character enhancement policies of the Proposed Plan, the RPS and the NZCPS. Other features of the rural environment can be appropriately managed in the manner sought in the relief.	Delete Policy RPROZ-P6 and insert with the following: Provide limited opportunities for subdivision in the general rural zone while ensuring that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. there will be significant environmental protection of indigenous vegetation including restoration, or wetlands; b. subdivision avoids the inappropriate proliferation and dispersal of development by limiting the number of sites created; c. subdivision avoids inappropriate development within areas of the Outstanding Natural Landscape Overlay, Outstanding Natural Character Overlay, High Natural Character Overlay and the coastal environment; d. adverse effects on rural and coastal character are avoided, remedied or mitigated; e. sites are of sufficient size to absorb and manage adverse effects within the site; and f. reverse sensitivity effects are managed in a way that does not compromise the viability of rural sites for continued production. g. The fragmentation of highly productive land is avoided. 	Reject	Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: Policy RPROZ-P6
S159.104	Horticulture New Zealand	RPROZ-P6	Support	Fragmentation of rural land is a concern, so the policy approach is supported.	Retain Policy RPROZ-P6	Accept in part	Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: Policy RPROZ-P6

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS151.272	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: Policy RPROZ-P6
FS172.244	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	Does not recognise existing fragmentation.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: Policy RPROZ-P6
FS570.266	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: Policy RPROZ-P6
FS566.280	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: Policy RPROZ-P6
FS569.302	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: Policy RPROZ-P6
S103.003	Lynley Newport	RPROZ-P6	Oppose	<p>The intent of the policies is made abundantly clear by their wording. I disagree with that intent and oppose strongly the punitive and restrictive wording of the policies.</p> <p>There will be existing property and land use in the Rural Production Zone already contrary to the policies. There are permitted activities listed in the zone rules that will be contrary to some of the policies - which is illogical and not consistent with the Resource Management Act.</p> <p>The problem with some of the policies as written is that they attempt to stop almost any activity in the zone except farming. This is not effects based, is an inconsistent approach when compared with other zones, is overly stifling of the rural community's ability to remain vibrant and viable; and not consistent with the zone's own rule suite. RPROZ-P6 relates to subdivision only and</p>	<p>Deleted RPROZ-P6 from the zone policies. If it is to remain, Amend as follows (removing the concept of "avoid" and associated negative, restrictive connotations):</p> <p>Manage subdivision so that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. the loss of highly productive land [or use by [arming activities is avoided, where possible, and were avoidance is not possible, the loss has only minor impact on the availability of highly productive land for productive purposes. b. the land is not fragmented into parcel sizes that are no longer able to support farming activities, taking into account. ... {remainder unchanged); c. smaller lot sizes and rural lifestyle living is encouraged where there is an environmental benefit. 		Reject	Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: Policy RPROZ-P6

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				probably has no place in the Zone policies.				
FS172.186	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support in part	Support deletion for the reasons set out in this primary submission, but not the wording for the alternative relief amendments.	Allow in part		Reject	Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: Policy RPROZ-P6
FS196.51	Joe Carr		Support	as above	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: Policy RPROZ-P6
FS548.028	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	The amendments sought are not supported. Productive land in the rural production zone is a finite resource which must be managed in a way to ensure its ongoing productive capacity. The amendments sought are inconsistent with the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land.	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Accept	Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: Policy RPROZ-P6
S199.003	Thomson Survey Ltd	RPROZ-P6	Oppose	The submitter opposes the intent and restrictive wording of RPROZ-P6 and contends that there are permitted activities listed in the zone rules that will be contrary to the policies.	Amend RPROZ-P6 to read as follows: Manage subdivision so that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. the loss of highly productive land for use by farming activities is avoided, where possible, and where avoidance is not possible, the loss has minor impact on the availability of highly productive land for productive purposes; b. the land is not fragmented into parcel sizes that are no longer able to support farming activities, taking into account: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3. the type of farming proposed; and 4. whether smaller land parcels can support more productive forms of farming due to the presence of highly productive land. 		Reject	Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: Policy RPROZ-P6

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					c. smaller lot sizes and rural lifestyle living is encouraged where there is an environmental benefit.			
FS172.256	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: Policy RPROZ-P6
FS548.067	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	Rural production activities have limited resource on which they can be established. To provide for other unnecessary activities to establish in the zone is inappropriate and will be detrimental to existing, lawfully established activities on the zone.	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Accept	Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: Policy RPROZ-P6
FS354.210	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	The changes sought by the submitter do not give effect to the NPSHPL or implement the National Planning Standards.	Disallow	Disallow S199.003	Accept	Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: Policy RPROZ-P6
S421.217	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	RPROZ-P6	Oppose	Federated Farmers opposes policies RPZOZ-P2 RPZOZ-P3, RPROZ-4, RPRPZ-P5 and RPROZ-P6 as they are drafted in the proposed district plan. The policies have no regard for the private property rights of landowners and are promoting the absolute protection of the rural production zone and highly productive land through removing the ability of landowners to control the use of their land. The National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land sets out the requirements for the management of highly productive land. Policy 8 requires the protection of highly productive land from inappropriate use and development. Clause 3.8 provides for the subdivision of highly productive land provided certain matters are met. Clause 3.11 states that territorial authorities must include objectives, policies, and rules in their district plans	Amend Policy RPZOZ-P6 to achieve consistency with the requirements of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land and to recognise and provide for the rights of private landowners		Accept in part	Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: Policy RPROZ-P6

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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 enable the maintenance, operation, or upgrade of any existing activities on highly productive land; and ensure that any loss of highly productive land from those activities is minimised. The proposed district plan needs to be consistent with the requirements of the National Policy Statement as well as acknowledging the rights of landowners.				
FS172.325	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons stated in this primary submission.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: Policy RPROZ-P6
FS196.110	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: Policy RPROZ-P6
FS570.1449	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: Policy RPROZ-P6
FS346.451	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: Policy RPROZ-P6
FS566.1463	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: Policy RPROZ-P6
FS569.1485	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: Policy RPROZ-P6
S148.046	Summit Forests New Zealand Limited	RPROZ-P6	Support in part	In general, SFNZ supports the objectives and policies of this zone except where they seek to grandparent existing land use in favour of one form of primary production over others. Land	Amend any reference to "farming activities" in the Rural Production policies to "primary production activities" and any reference to "farming" to		Accept in part	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Objectives and

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				use in the rural production zone needs to be able to adapt to changing economic and climatic conditions to ensure long term sustainability.	"primary production" and any other changes to like effect.			<p>Policies – General Comments</p> <p>Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: Policy RPROZ-P6</p>
FS405.083	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support in part	Ballantyne & Agnew supports in part the requested amendments in relation to the amendment of the reference 'farming activities', but notes that it has requested the amendment to reference 'primary production' and 'the productive capacity of the rural environment' as opposed to 'primary production.'	Allow in part	Allow in part the original submission	Accept in part	<p>Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Objectives and Policies – General Comments</p> <p>Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: Policy RPROZ-P6</p>
FS361.066	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support in part	Willowridge Developments Limited supports in part the requested amendments in relation to the amendment of the reference 'farming activities', but notes that it has requested the amendment to reference 'primary production' and 'the productive capacity of the rural environment' as opposed to 'primary production'.	Allow in part	Allow in part the original submission	Accept in part	<p>Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Objectives and Policies – General Comments</p> <p>Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: Policy RPROZ-P6</p>
FS346.552	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS. Loss of natural character, coastal environment values and the values of outstanding landscapes could also result.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	<p>Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Objectives and Policies – General Comments</p> <p>Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: Policy RPROZ-P6</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
FS566.158	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: Objectives and Policies – General Comments Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: Policy RPROZ-P6
S243.114	Matauri Trustee Limited	RPROZ-P6	Oppose	Policy RPROZ-P6 seeks to avoid subdivision except in the limited circumstances specified. This fails to recognise the forms and subdivision otherwise enabled by the Proposed Plan in rural environment (Management Plan and Environmental benefit subdivisions). The zone should recognise and provide for these opportunities on the basis that they may represent the only viable pathway to achieve sustainable land use change on a rural block and that they actively promote the biodiversity/natural character enhancement policies of the Proposed Plan, the RPS and the NZCPS. Other features of the rural environment can be appropriately managed in the manner sought in the relief.	Delete Policy RPROZ-P6 and replace with the following: Provide limited opportunities for subdivision in the general rural zone while ensuring that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. there will be significant environmental protection of indigenous vegetation including restoration, or wetlands; b. subdivision avoids the inappropriate proliferation and dispersal of development by limiting the number of sites created; c. subdivision avoids inappropriate development within areas of the Outstanding Natural Landscape Overlay, Outstanding Natural Character Overlay, High Natural Character Overlay and the coastal environment; d. adverse effects on rural and coastal character are avoided, remedied or mitigated; e. sites are of sufficient size to absorb and manage adverse effects within the site; and f. reverse sensitivity effects are managed in a way that does not compromise the 		Reject	Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: Policy RPROZ-P6

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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>viability of rural sites for continued production.</p> <p>g. The fragmentation of highly productive land is avoided.</p>			
FS570.672	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: Policy RPROZ-P6
FS566.686	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: Policy RPROZ-P6
FS569.708	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: Policy RPROZ-P6
S250.019	Willowridge Developments Limited	RPROZ-P6	Support in part	This policy to be too narrow, focusing too heavily on farming activities, rather than the productive capability of the zone. This policy should be broadened to encompass all primary production activities.	<p>Amend RPROZ-P6 to avoid subdivision that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. results in the loss of highly productive land for use primary production by farming activities; b. fragments land into parcel sizes that are no longer able to support farming activities productive capacity of the rural environment, taking into account: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. the productive capability of soils type of farming proposed; and b. whether smaller land parcels can support more productive activities forms of farming due to the presence of highly productive land. c. provides for rural lifestyle living unless there is an environmental benefit. 		Accept in part	Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: Policy RPROZ-P6
FS570.705	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: Policy RPROZ-P6

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS566.719	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: Policy RPROZ-P6
FS569.741	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: Policy RPROZ-P6
S167.096	Bentzen Farm Limited	RPROZ-P6	Oppose	Policy RPROZ-P6 fails to recognise the forms and subdivision otherwise enabled by the Proposed Plan in rural environment (Management Plan and Environmental benefit subdivisions).	Delete Policy RPROZ-P6 and replace with the following: Provide limited opportunities for subdivision in the general rural zone while ensuring that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> h. there will be significant environmental protection of indigenous vegetation including restoration, or wetlands; i. subdivision avoids the inappropriate proliferation and dispersal of development by limiting the number of sites created; j. subdivision avoids inappropriate development within areas of the Outstanding Natural Landscape Overlay, Outstanding Natural Character Overlay, High Natural Character Overlay and the coastal environment; k. adverse effects on rural and coastal character are avoided, remedied or mitigated; l. sites are of sufficient size to absorb and manage adverse effects within the site; and m. reverse sensitivity effects are managed in a way that does not compromise the viability of rural sites for continued production. 		Reject	Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: Policy RPROZ-P6

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					n. The fragmentation of highly productive land is avoided.		
FS566.458	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow	Accept	Section 5.2.13 Key Issue 13: Policy RPROZ-P6
S333.086	P S Yates Family Trust	RPROZ-P7	Oppose	<p>Policy RPROZ-P7 seeks to manage land use and subdivision to address the effects of the activity requiring resource consent, including (but not limited to) consideration of matters listed.</p> <p>This is not a policy but a method of assessment, and therefore more appropriately an assessment criterion. Non-complying and discretionary activity applications should be assessed against objectives and policies which should be a clear expression of a desired outcome - not a way to achieve an unspecified outcome as is this policy.</p>	Delete Policy RPROZ-P7	Reject	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: Policies RPROZ-P1, P4 and P7
S168.094	Setar Thirty Six Limited	RPROZ-P7	Oppose	<p>Policy RPROZ-P7 seeks to manage land use and subdivision to address the effects of the activity requiring resource consent, including (but not limited to) consideration of matters listed.</p> <p>This is not a policy but a method of assessment, and therefore more appropriately an assessment criterion. Noncomplying and discretionary activity applications should be assessed against objectives and policies which should be a clear expression of a desired outcome - not a way to achieve an unspecified outcome as is this policy.</p>	Delete Policy RPROZ-P7	Reject	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: Policies RPROZ-P1, P4 and P7

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S187.085	The Shooting Box Limited	RPROZ-P7	Oppose	This is not a policy but a method of assessment, and therefore more appropriately an assessment criterion. Non-complying and discretionary activity applications should be assessed against objectives and policies which should be a clear expression of a desired outcome - not a way to achieve an unspecified outcome as is this policy.	Delete Policy RPROZ-P7.	Reject	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: Policies RPROZ-P1, P4 and P7
S222.090	Wendover Two Limited	RPROZ-P7	Oppose	Policy RPROZ-P7 seeks to manage land use and subdivision to address the effects of the activity requiring resource consent, including (but not limited to) consideration of matters listed. This is not a policy but a method of assessment, and therefore more appropriately an assessment criterion. Noncomplying and discretionary activity applications should be assessed against objectives and policies which should be a clear expression of a desired outcome - not a way to achieve an unspecified outcome as is this policy.	Delete Policy RPROZ-P7	Reject	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: Policies RPROZ-P1, P4 and P7
S489.030	Radio New Zealand	RPROZ-P7	Support	RNZ supports recognition that a proposed land use ought to consider potentially reverse sensitivity effects on existing infrastructure.	Retain Policy PROZ-P7	Accept in part	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: Policies RPROZ-P1, P4 and P7
S421.219	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	RPROZ-P7	Support	Federated Farmers supports policies RPZOZ-P1 and RPZOZ-P7 as they are currently drafted in the proposed district plan.	Retain Policy RPZOZ-P7 (inferred) or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent	Accept in part	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: Policies RPROZ-P1, P4 and P7
FS196.108	Joe Carr		Support		Allow	Accept in part	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: Policies RPROZ-P1, P4 and P7

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS570.1451	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 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: Policies RPROZ-P1, P4 and P7
FS346.453	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: Policies RPROZ-P1, P4 and P7
FS566.1465	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 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: Policies RPROZ-P1, P4 and P7
FS569.1487	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 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: Policies RPROZ-P1, P4 and P7
S463.093	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited	RPROZ-P7	Oppose	Sub-clauses (a) to (j) are a list of assessment matters that are inappropriate to be included in a policy. They do not provide direction about how to achieve the overarching objectives of the zone. WBF recommends deletion of the policy and reliance on the remaining policies instead. If necessary, the assessment criteria can be relocated to rules and standards later in this chapter.	Delete Policy RPROZ-P7		Reject	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: Policies RPROZ-P1, P4 and P7
FS91.23	Moana Kiff		Oppose	Oppose; RPROZ-P7 is supported that it remains in its entirety, particularly para (j) pertaining to Tangata whenua. The Section 32 Report on Tangata Whenua is a significant document in New Zealand that addresses the relationship between Māori people/Tangata Whenua and various policy or development proposals. It is a	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: Policies RPROZ-P1, P4 and P7

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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>requirement under the Resource Management Act 1991, and it serves as a critical assessment tool for decision-makers when considering the social, cultural, and economic impacts of proposed projects.</p> <p>In essence, this report aims to strike a balance between development and the protection of Māori cultural and environmental interests. The Section 32 Report concludes with recommendations for decision-makers, including whether the proposal should proceed, be amended, or declined based on its findings.</p> <p>Overall, the Section 32 Report on Tangata Whenua serves as a critical tool in the decision-making process by ensuring that the concerns and interests of Māori communities are taken into account when considering developments or policies that may affect their cultural, social, and economic well-being. It reflects New Zealand's commitment to honoring the Treaty of Waitangi and recognizing the importance of Māori perspectives and resource management and policy development.</p>			
S416.047	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	RPROZ-P7	Support in part	<p>Policies in each zone provide for managing land use and subdivision to address the effects of the activity at zone interfaces by requiring the provision of 'setbacks, fencing, screening or landscaping required to address potential conflicts'. KiwiRail seeks an amendment to provide for the consideration of setbacks to the railway corridor or transport network, thus supporting safety and the railway setback rule sought</p>	<p>Insert additional matter as follows: the location and design of buildings adjacent to the railway corridor</p>	Reject	<p>Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan Wide or Rural Wide Submissions</p>

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS243.133	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the requested 5m setback; a considerably reduced set back would provide adequate space for maintenance activities within sites adjacent to the rail network. In doing so, it will continue to protect the safe, efficient, and effective operation of the rail infrastructure while balancing the cost on landowners. The amendments are unnecessary.	Disallow	Insert additional matter as follows: the location and design of buildings adjacent to the railway corridor	Accept	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan Wide or Rural Wide Submissions
S159.105	Horticulture New Zealand	RPROZ-P7	Support	The matters for consideration are relevant and appropriate	Retain Policy RPROZ-P7		Accept in part	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: Policies RPROZ-P1, P4 and P7
FS570.267	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 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: Policies RPROZ-P1, P4 and P7
FS566.281	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 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: Policies RPROZ-P1, P4 and P7
FS569.303	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 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: Policies RPROZ-P1, P4 and P7
S243.115	Matauri Trustee Limited	RPROZ-P7	Oppose	Policy RPROZ-P7 seeks to manage land use and subdivision to address the effects of the activity requiring resource consent, including (but not limited to) consideration of matters listed. This is not a policy but a method of assessment, and therefore more appropriately an assessment criterion. Non-complying and discretionary activity applications should be assessed against objectives and	Delete Policy RPROZ-P7		Reject	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: Policies RPROZ-P1, P4 and P7

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				policies which should be a clear expression of a desired outcome - not a way to achieve an unspecified outcome as is this policy.				
FS570.673	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: Policies RPROZ-P1, P4 and P7
FS566.687	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: Policies RPROZ-P1, P4 and P7
FS569.709	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: Policies RPROZ-P1, P4 and P7
S167.097	Benzen Farm Limited	RPROZ-P7	Oppose	RPROZ-P7 is not a policy but a method of assessment, and therefore more appropriately an assessment criterion. Noncomplying and discretionary activity applications should be assessed against objectives and policies which should be a clear expression of a desired outcome - not a way to achieve an unspecified outcome as is this policy.	Delete Policy RPROZ-P7		Reject	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: Policies RPROZ-P1, P4 and P7
FS566.459	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: Policies RPROZ-P1, P4 and P7
S183.013	MLP LLC	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Landing Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).			
S226.013	Tryphena Trustees Limited, David Haythornwaite	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S227.013	Isles Casey Trustee Services Limited, WWC Trustee Company Limited	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S228.013	Jayesh Govind and Others	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S229.013	Laurie Pearson	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.		
S231.012	Ovisnegra Limited	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S232.013	Tobias Groser	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S233.013	Whale Bay Limited	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S352.013	Philibert Jean-G Frick	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S213.004	Timothy and Dion Spicer	Rules	Support		Retain rules	Accept in part	Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
S234.013	Whale Bay Limited	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S235.013	WW Trustee Services 2016 Limited, Eloise Caroline Caswell, Donald Gordon Chandler	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S236.013	Connemara Black Limited	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	required to give effect to this submission.		
S237.013	Evan Williams and Katherine Williams	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S238.013	John Gowing and Miriam Van Lith	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S239.013	John Gowing, Miriam Van Lith, Ellis Gowing, James Gowing, Byron Gowing	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S240.013	Matthew Watson, Kaylene Watson, D R Thomas Limited	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S241.013	Matthew Draper and Michaela Jannard	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S257.027	Te Hiku Community Board	Rules	Oppose	The Planning Maps show the Rural Production Zone in some areas e.g. Awanui that are serviced by sewerage, footpaths, refuse collection etc. If this zoning continues, it will severely constrain future urban development, and this should be corrected by amending RPROZ objectives, policies and rules zones to accommodate things other than rural production.	Amend the Rural Production Zone rules so that productive land is defined based on its ability to produce food but can accommodate things other than rural production; OR amend Planning Maps to remove RPROZ from urban areas as separately submitted.	Reject	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Objectives and Policies – General Comments
S422.013	Maurice Dabbah	Rules	Oppose	The Proposed Plan, if approved, will directly affect members of the [Mataka Residents'] Association by imposing undue restrictions on the construction of residential dwellings on the Site through the application of specified overlays and rules.	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S423.013	Bernard Sabrier	Rules	Oppose	The Proposed Plan, if approved, will directly affect members of the [Mataka Residents'] Association by imposing undue restrictions on the construction of residential dwellings on the Site through the application of specified overlays and rules.	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S345.003	Nicole Way and Christopher Huljich as Trustees of the Trssh Birnie Settlement Trust	Rules	Oppose	<p>The Resource Consents at Mataka Station enable development, and completion of the Mataka Station development, notwithstanding the provisions of the Proposed District Plan.</p> <p>The Proposed District Plan fails to recognise, have regard to, or provide for the development and subdivision enabled by the Resource Consents. The Proposed District Plan provisions will restrict development of the Property, and Mataka Station more generally, in a manner that is inconsistent with the Resource Consents and the integrated and comprehensive development authorised by those. The Council's s32 analysis does not mention or consider approved but unimplemented developments within the Property and Mataka Station more generally, nor elsewhere. The "low intensity" development controls and height limits proposed within the Coastal Environment are given very little analysis.</p> <p>The proposed provisions are inconsistent with the Act and relevant planning instruments.</p>	<p>Amend to explicitly, and specifically provide for, and preserve the activities and land uses authorised under the Resource Consents at Mataka Station.</p> <p>and/or</p> <p>Insert a new special purpose zone and/or structure plan together with appropriate provisions (objectives, policies and rules) enabling the residential activity and development as is authorised by the Resource Consents as a permitted activity (where they are in general accordance with the Resource Consents) as well as appropriate activities within the Rural Production Zone, regardless of the provisions of the CE, ONL or HNC.</p> <p>and/or</p> <p>Amend the provisions of the Proposed District Plan to preserve the activities and buildings authorised by the Resource Consents on the Property.</p>	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S360.010	Waste Management NZ Limited	Rules	Oppose	It is critical that the Proposed Plan provide for 'waste management facilities' in a broader range of zones to reflect the functional and operational	Amend the rules to provide for waste management facilities	Accept	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				requirements of such activities, and to provide a framework within which the effects of such activities can be appropriately managed. In this respect, it is appropriate that the Proposed Plan provides for waste management facilities at the 'strategic direction' level, as well as specifically within the Light Industrial, Heavy Industrial and Rural Production zones.			
S512.050	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Rules	Not Stated	<p>Fire and Emergency support an activity for emergency service facilities being listed as an activity in zones. Please see Table 1 of the submission for the location of existing fire stations. Note that these are found in a range of zones. New fire stations may be necessary in order to continue to achieve emergency response time commitments in situations where development occurs, and populations change. In this regard it is noted that Fire and Emergency is not a requiring authority under section 166 of the RMA, and therefore does not have the ability to designate land for the purposes of fire stations. Provisions within the rules of the district plan are therefore, the best way to facilitate the development of any new fire stations within the district as urban development progresses.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency request that emergency service facilities are included as a permitted activity in all zones. The draft Plan currently only includes emergency services facilities as an activity in some zones and with varying activity status. In addition, fire stations have specific requirements with relation to setback distances and vehicle crossings. Fire and Emergency</p>	Insert new rule for Emergency service facilities included as a permitted activity Emergency service facilities are exempt from standards relating to setback distances, vehicle crossings	Reject	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan Wide or Rural Wide Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				request that emergency service facilities are exempt from these standards			
S434.013	Francois Dotta	Rules	Oppose	The Proposed Plan, if approved, will directly affect members of the [Mataka Residents] Association by imposing undue restrictions on the construction of residential dwellings on the Site through the application of specified overlays and rules.	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S435.013	Elka Gouzer	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S421.207	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Rules	Support in part	<p>Federated Farmers supports the recognition in the overview of the fact it is important to differentiate the rural production zone from the rural lifestyle and rural residential zones. We also support the strong recognition that has been given to rural land as an important resource.</p> <p>The concern Federated Farmers has is that the overview is focused on the absolute protection of highly productive from any activities other than primary production. The approach taken by the Council to prevent the fragmentation of rural production land is support but acknowledgement is also needed that all highly productive may not be profitable for the landowner. It would be unequitable for the Council to prohibit a rural landowner who has cared for the</p>	Amend the Rules to recognise and provide for private property rights and allow landowners to subdivide land in the rural production zone for specific purposes such as creating lifestyle lots and lots for family members (amongst other matters)	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>land for many years from achieving the real potential value of that land. The proposed district plan has strayed into private property rights through dictating what can and cannot be done on rural production land.</p> <p>Returns from farming are variable due to a variety of factors including weather conditions, economic conditions, individual property circumstances and market demands. Like any business, diversification, flexibility, responsiveness, and cash flow are critically important to retaining their viability.</p> <p>Farmers undertake low impact subdivision for a variety of reasons. These vary from diversifying their business into tourism operations (luxury lodges and or associated tourism development and infrastructure), providing for disposing of a surplus dwelling on the property where a neighbouring farm is purchased, providing for a family member or staff member to live on the farm or to implement a succession plan for multiple siblings through small lot subdivision. The proposed chapter has taken away any flexibility for farmers to subdivide their land for specific purposes without undermining the primary production or life-style value of the remaining land.</p> <p>The chapter as drafted, adds another layer complexity on top of the regulations and provisions that exist in regional council planning documents and in National Policy Statements. The Council seems intent of duplicating provisions which may have already</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
				been dealt with at regional and national levels.				
FS24.31	Lynley Newport		Support in part	Agree in sentiment. too much emphasis on HPL and in treating all rural land the same when it is not. no scope for diversity and initiative.	Allow in part		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS172.318	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons stated in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS196.120	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS332.240	Russell Protection Society		Oppose	Subdivision of Rural production zone land for lifestyle blocks should not be an automatic right.	Disallow in part	Disallow the original submission in part.	Accept	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS368.004	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support in part	Amend the Rules to recognise and provide for private property rights and allow landowners to subdivide land in the rural production zone for specific purposes such as creating lifestyle lots and lots for family members (amongst other matters).	Allow in part	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS570.1439	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: General Submissions
FS346.441	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS566.1453	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: General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS569.1475	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: General Submissions
S472.032	Michael Foy	Rules	Support in part	<p>A separate alternative submission is to ask that the Plan redefines the RPROZ so that productive land is defined based on its ability to produce food but can accommodate things other than rural production.ie. Rural production zoning on poor soils is wrong. That is the right place to put smaller areas for housing ie.2000sq metres.</p> <p>The Planning Maps show the Rural Production Zone in some areas e.g. Awanui/wireless road kaitaia that are serviced by sewerage, footpaths, etc, and it is submitted that these areas are re-zoned to reflect the existing infrastructure available and be re-zoned to allow for intensification. This should be corrected by amending RPROZ objectives, policies and rules zones to accommodate things other than rural production.</p>	Amend the Rural Production Zone rules zones so that productive land is defined based on its ability to produce food but can accommodate things other than rural production; OR amend Planning Maps to remove RPROZ from urban areas as separately submitted		Reject	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Objectives and Policies – General Comments
FS155.93	Fiona King		Support		Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Objectives and Policies – General Comments
FS259.11	Leah Frieling		Support		Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Objectives and Policies – 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
S424.011	Ventia Ltd	Rules	Support	Sufficient protection is required for new and existing quarrying and mining activities from new sensitive activities.	Retain the existing rule found in many underlying zones (refer RPROZ-S7) Sensitive activities setback from boundaries of a Mineral Extraction Overlay to apply to all underlying zones.		Accept	Section 5.2.27 Key Issue 27: Standards RPROZ-S1, S2 and S7
FS94.8	Bellingham Quarries Ltd		Support	Ventia has submitted numerous points applying to the preservation and utilization of mineral extraction overlays. These are rational improvements to the proposed district plan, which will help all of the Far North to benefit from these essential resources. S424.011 - Ventia have highlighted that a sensitive boundary in the surrounding area of an extraction zone needs to be in place for the protection of the ability to extract the resource, due to the nature of the work .Hence we support their relief measure.	Allow		Accept	Section 5.2.27 Key Issue 27: Standards RPROZ-S1, S2 and S7
FS346.138	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought seek to expand the Mineral Extraction Overlay. It also seeks to weaken some of the provisions applying to mineral extraction activities, including the expansion of the existing mining activities undertaken by the submitter. The submission is opposed, as it would not give effect to the requirement to recognise and provide for s6 matters or allow the Council to appropriately manage mineral extraction activities. F&B does agree that there is some	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.27 Key Issue 27: Standards RPROZ-S1, S2 and S7

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				uncertainty in the way that the overlay provisions work, and has addressed this in our primary submission.			
S159.108	Horticulture New Zealand	Rules	Support	Include specific rule for artificial crop protection structure	<p>Insert a new rule:</p> <p>RPROZ-RX Artificial Crop Protection Structures and Crop Protection Structures</p> <p>Activity status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>PER-1</p> <p>The establishment of a new, or expansion of an existing artificial crop protection structure or crop support structure, where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The height of the structure does not exceed 6m; 2. green or black cloth is used on any vertical faces within 30m of a property boundary, including a road boundary, except that a different colour may be used if written approval of the owner(s) of the immediately adjoining property or the road controlling authority (in the case of a road) is obtained and provided to the Council; or the structure is setback 1m from the boundary 3. The activity complies with standards: <p>RPROZ-S1 Maximum height RPROZ-S4 Setbacks from MHWS</p> <p>Activity status when compliance not achieved: Restricted Discretionary</p> <p>Matters of discretion are restricted to: Assessment of the potential glare on neighbouring properties (or road users) from the colour of the cloth.</p>	Accept in part	<p>Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: RPROZ Rules – General Comments</p> <p>Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions</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
					Where compliance with any rule requirement is not achieved: Refer to relevant Rule Requirement.			
FS151.275	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: RPROZ Rules – General Comments Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS570.270	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: RPROZ Rules – General Comments Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS566.284	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: RPROZ Rules – General Comments Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS569.306	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: RPROZ Rules – General Comments Section 5.2.5

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
							Key Issue 5: Definitions
S159.129	Horticulture New Zealand	Rules	Not Stated	The provision of seasonal worker accommodation is becoming a necessary supporting activity to horticultural operations. Seek a suite of provisions to provide for this activity. Seeks that where seasonal worker accommodation does not meet the permitted activity standards, that this default to a Restricted Discretionary rule	<p>Include a permitted activity rule for Seasonal Worker Accommodation as follows:</p> <p>RPROZ-RX - Seasonal Worker Accommodation</p> <p>Activity Status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>PER-1</p> <p>The establishment of a new, or expansion of existing seasonal worker accommodation where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The seasonal worker accommodation is associated with horticultural activity The accommodation comprises of a combination of communal kitchen and eating areas and sleeping and ablution facilities The accommodation provides for no more than 12 workers It complies with Code of Practice for Able Bodied Seasonal Workers, published by Dept of Building and Housing 2008. <p>PER-2</p> <p>The activity complies with standards:</p> <p>RPROZ-S1 Maximum height</p> <p>RPROZ-S2 Height in relation to boundary</p> <p>RPROZ-S3 Setbacks</p> <p>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-1 or PER-2: Restricted Discretionary</p> <p>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Methods to avoid, remedy or mitigate the effects on existing activities, including the provision of screening, 	Accept in part	Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: RPROZ 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>landscaping and methods for noise control.</p> <p>2. The extent to which the application complies with the Code of Practice for Able Bodied Seasonal Workers, published by Dept of Building and Housing 2008</p> <p>Where compliance with any rule requirement is not achieved: Refer to relevant Rule requirement.</p> <p>Note: Elsewhere in their submission, the submitter has sought a definition for Seasonal Worker Accommodation.</p>			
FS151.295	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: RPROZ Rules – General Comments
FS548.056	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Support	Federated Farmers supports the inclusion of a permitted activity for seasonable worker accommodation. Seasonal workers are a critical component of rural production activities.	Allow	Grant the relief sought.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: RPROZ Rules – General Comments
FS570.291	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: RPROZ Rules – General Comments
FS566.305	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: RPROZ Rules – General Comments
FS569.327	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

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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 14: RPROZ Rules – General Comments
S529.161	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	Rules	Not Stated	We consider that all zones, except urban zones, need to be covered by firm PDP policies and rules to protect a key natural resource - productive land - now and for future generations. This means preventing fragmentation and loss of productive land from productive use, especially LUC Class 1-3 land and productive types of soil/land suitable for horticulture. It is not necessary to wait until the regional council has implemented the NPS-HPL.	Amend rules to protect a key natural resource - productive land - now and for future generations.		Accept in part	
FS66.162	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The relief sought does not properly give effect to the NPS: Highly Productive Land	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS570.2049	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 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS566.2063	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS569.2085	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
S427.033	Kapiro Residents Association	Rules	Support in part	Land that is regarded as highly productive (LUC Classes 1,2 and 3) is a strictly finite resource, essential for future food production for a growing population here and worldwide, and important for jobs and economic development. The recently issued	Amend to include specific policies/rules to prevent fragmentation and loss of land in rural and horticulture zones [inferred].		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land requires councils to protect LUC Class 1-3 land from fragmentation and loss (outside of identified urban zones) and allows councils to protect other types of productive land in similar manner.				
FS66.163	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The relief sought does not properly give effect to the NPS: Highly Productive Land	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS354.214	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	Protection of highly productive land is supported and important for horticulture in the Far North.	Allow	Allow S427.033	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
S522.048	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	Rules	Support in part	Land that is regarded as highly productive (LUC Classes 1,2 and 3) is a strictly finite resource, essential for future food production for a growing population here and worldwide, and important for jobs and economic development. The recently issued National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land requires councils to protect LUC Class 1-3 land from fragmentation and loss (outside of identified urban zones) and allows councils to protect other types of productive land in similar manner.	Amend to include specific policies/rules to prevent fragmentation and loss of land in rural and horticulture zones [inferred].		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS66.164	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The relief sought does not properly give effect to the NPS: Highly Productive Land	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS550.023	Lloyd Anderson		Support	It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons -	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore, it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided 				

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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>because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site. • There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. • Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. <p>Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse</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
				effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi& ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.				
FS333.008	Maree Hart		Support	<p>The submitter supports relief sought to prevent fragmentation or loss of productive land, to avoid urban/residential sprawl in rural areas and protect amenity values. Residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons. It would be contrary to the NPS-UD in enabling urban sprawl and not protecting rural land. Government reports have found that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided as it leads to permanent loss of productive capability.</p> <p>Residential development on Lot 1001 would also create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities in the area.</p> <p>Lot 1001 is one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil in the district which is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential providing food, local jobs and economic well-being. FNDC submission to MPI recognised that large areas of horticultural land in Kerikeri have been converted to residential and therefore it is vital to protect the remaining rural land that is highly productive.</p>	Allow	Amend zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 to Horticulture zone or Rural Production zone; Amend Rural Production, Horticulture and Rural Lifestyle zone provisions to prevent urban sprawl, and protect productive soil, rural character and amenity values; Amend the District Plan to strengthen provisions for assessing and preventing cumulative and long-term adverse effects on productive areas, rural areas, areas visible from public land, ecological values and freshwater.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. There are alternative sites in the area which could provide a compact urban footprint and improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. Lot 1001 is also adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline which is a valuable economic asset for the area.</p> <p>Residential development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects. The surrounding rural environment lacks the appropriate infrastructure, school capacity and existing safety and traffic issues on Landing Road such as a one lane bridge. There would also be effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.</p>				
FS354.220	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	Protection of highly productive land is supported and important for horticulture in the Far North.	Allow	Allow S522.048	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS566.1787	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS549.023	Vanessa Anderson		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Policy Standards recognise the need for 	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore, it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the 				

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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>permanent loss of productive capability.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site. • There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. • Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. <p>Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks</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
				appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi& ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.				
FS443.023	Peter O'Neil Donnellon		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle 	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>activities over the last 20 years. Therefore, it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). 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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site. • There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that 			

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. <p>Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.</p>				
FS390.023	Tracey Schubert		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one 	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

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

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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. In legal terms, there is no 'functional need 'to build residential development on this particular site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. • Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. <p>Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi& ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.</p>				
FS353.023	AI Panckhurst		Support	It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons -	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore, it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided 				

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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>because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site. • There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. • Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. <p>Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse</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
				effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi& ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.				
FS352.023	Kathryn Panckhurst		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large 	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

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

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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>noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. <p>Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.</p>				
FS342.023	Chris Baker		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. 	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore, it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. Lot 				

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. • Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. <p>Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.</p>				
FS338.023	Pearl Mahoney		Support	It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

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

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.				
FS337.023	Kevin Mahoney		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and 	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

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

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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"> There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. <p>Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi& ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.</p>				
FS336.023	Roger Holman		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, 	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore, it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. 				

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. • Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. <p>Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.</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
FS335.023	Craig and Mary Sawers		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, 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 	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site. • There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. • Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully 				

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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>established activities and neighbouring producers.</p> <p>Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.</p>				
FS334.023	Fiona Clarke		Support	<p>It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. • Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in 	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

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

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>residential development on this particular site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. • Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. <p>Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi& ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.</p>			
S505.003	Dr Lynn Kincla	Rules	Support in part	<p>The properties bordering Henderson Bay Road are only 4 hectare blocks - and rural production requires a minimum of 40 hectares. I have concerns that some permissible rural production activities would possibly have a negative impact on the local environment and the small sizes of the blocks would also compound these effects. For example, intensive cropping of avocados or raising of some types of animals like pigs or</p>	<p>Amend to exclude certain intensive farming activities from the proposed Rural production zone at Henderson Bay.</p>	Reject	<p>Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions</p>

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				chickens would impact on neighbouring properties and would put added pressures in the Roding infrastructure. I think certain intensive farming activities should be excluded from the proposed Rural production zoning at Henderson Bay to protect this coastal environment.			
FS283.4	Mark Spaans		Support in part	I agree in part. Henderson Bay has its own natural character and the current zone changes has not allowed for the status quo that was seen under the previous zoning of General Coastal Zone. Therefore, I support either a special zoning like that of the previous General Coastal or for Rural Production to have tighter control on permissible activities in Henderson Bay that protect the natural character of the area/coastline.	Allow in part	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS276.3	Antoinette Pot		Support in part	I agree in part. Henderson Bay has its own natural character and the current zone changes has not allowed for the status quo that was seen under the previous zoning of General Coastal Zone. Therefore, I support either a special zoning like that of the previous General Coastal or for Rural Production to have tighter control on permissible activities in Henderson Bay that protect the natural character of the area/coastline.	Allow in part	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S402.002	Mark Spaans	Rules	Oppose	Henderson Bay has now been assigned to the Rural Production Zone. I believe the uncontrolled permissible activities of the Rural Production Zone will have adverse effects on the natural character of Henderson Bay. What occurs on the land at Henderson Bay has an effect on the coastline due to the contour of the land and streams	Amend, for Henderson Bay to remain in Rural Production Zone, to have tighter restrictions on any primary production that will have adverse effects on the natural character of the coastline and those living in it.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				that run off onto the beach. I would like to see Henderson Bay have exclusions that restrict and limit any primary production to what doesn't have adverse effects on those living in the Bay and the natural character of the Bay.			
FS311.3	Warren McKay		Support in part	The Rural production zone is not really the right zone for many properties in Henderson Bay Most blocks are bush blocks and they are not suitable for farming activities The rural production zoning takes away some of the permitted activities covered by the Coastal General zone I am concerned that other activities will now be permitted that are not in keeping with the unique character of the land	Allow in part	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS276.6	Antoinette Pot		Support in part	I agree in part. Henderson Bay has its own natural character and the current zone changes has not allowed for the status quo that was seen under the previous zoning of General Coastal Zone- especially related to further subdivision. Therefore, I support either a special zoning like that of the previous General Coastal or for Rural Production to have tighter control on permissible activities in Henderson Bay that protect the natural character of the area/ coastline.	Allow in part	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
S357.026	Sean Frieling	Rules	Oppose	The PDP needs to redefine the RPROZ so that productive land is defined based on its ability to produce food but can accommodate things other than rural production.ie. Rural production zoning on poor soils is wrong. That is the right place to put smaller areas for housing ie.2000sq metres. This should be corrected by amending RPROZ	Amend Rural Production Zone objectives, policies and rules as separately submitted and allow smaller blocks of land i.e., 2000 sq metres. Amend the Rural Production Zone objectives, policies and rules zones so that productive land is defined based on its ability to produce food but can accommodate things other than rural production;	Reject	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Objectives and Policies – 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
				objectives, policies and rules zones to accommodate things other than rural production. Support the development bonus provisions for allow for smaller lot sizes in the rural production zone for any subdivision that provides protection of indigenous vegetation.				
FS368.001	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Amend Rural Production Zone objectives, policies and rules as separately submitted and allow smaller blocks of land ie.2000 sq mtrs Amend the Rural Production Zone objectives, policies and rules zones so that productive land is defined based on its ability to produce food but can accommodate things other than rural production	Allow	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Objectives and Policies – General Comments
FS354.213	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	The submitter seeks small subdivision in the rural production zone but does not consider the impact on primary production activities.	Disallow	Disallow S357.026	Accept	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Objectives and Policies – General Comments
S358.031	Leah Frieling	Rules	Oppose	The Plan redefines the Rural Production zone so that it is based on its ability to produce food but can accommodate things other than rural production i.e. Rural Production zoning on poor soils is wrong. That is the right place to put smaller areas for housing i.e. 2,000 m ² .	Amend the Rural Production zone rules so that productive land is defined based on its ability to produce food but can accommodate things other than rural production; OR amend planning maps to remove the Rural Production zone from urban areas (as separately submitted).		Reject	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Objectives and Policies – General Comments
FS368.002	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support in part	Amend the Rural Production zone rules so that productive land is defined based on its ability to produce food but can accommodate things other than rural production.	Allow in part	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Objectives and Policies – 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
S45.005	Puketona Business Park Limited	Rules	Not Stated	<p>The PDP proposes that industrial activities within the Rural Production zone become non-complying, whereas the ODP allows such activities as permitted within the zone where they comply with relevant bulk and location standards.</p> <p>Should the Rural Production zone be retained for 759 State Highway 10, Oromahoe, PBPL suggests the zone provisions should account for industrial activities as restricted discretionary or discretionary activities where they meet certain criteria - for example, existing site size, soil classification and proximity to other non-productive uses.</p> <p>Failing that, PBPL suggests a site-specific rule enabling industrial activities on the site would suffice, for the reasons set out earlier in their submission.</p>	Amend the Rural Production zone provisions to provide for industrial activities as restricted discretionary or discretionary activities where they meet certain criteria. Any such bespoke provisions regarding activity status should be accompanied by associated reconsideration of relevant permitted activity standards within the Rural Production zone of the PDP as notified. Namely, the limited impervious area and building coverage permitted thresholds.		Reject	Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS354.211	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	<p>The submitter seeks industrial activity as restricted discretionary activity. Existing industrial activity in the Rural Production Zone that is lawfully established under the Operative District Plan will have existing use rights so is provided for in the RMA, even though the district plan is proposed to change.</p>	Disallow	Disallow S45.005	Accept	Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: 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
S338.051	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	Rules	Not Stated	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour. Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish. 		Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS354.212	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	The submitter seeks additional controls on artificial crop protection structures, including a non-complying rule. Artificial crop protection structures are critical to horticulture in the Far North and contribute to the economic and social wellbeing of the community.	Disallow	Disallow S338.051	Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS570.989	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: Definitions Section 5.2.14

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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 14: Rules – General Comments
FS566.1003	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS569.1025	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
S427.063	Kapiro Residents Association	Rules	Support in part	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour. Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not 		Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: 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
					restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish.			
FS354.215	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	The submitter seeks additional controls on artificial crop protection structures, including a non-complying rule. Artificial crop protection structures are critical to horticulture in the Far North and contribute to the economic and social wellbeing of the community.	Disallow	Disallow S427.063	Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
S438.009	New Zealand Motor Caravan Association	Rules	Support in part	The NZMCA operates a number of campgrounds and park over properties that are present in a variety of zones. Allowing for more permissive rules around the establishment of campgrounds will make it easier to establish sites for self-contained vehicle-based camping in the Far North District. This will also create positive social and economic benefits for the community. The scale of camping sites proposed is also unlikely to compromise rural production activities.	Amend Rural Production Zone rules to provide for camping sites of 20 vehicles and under as a permitted activity and require a resource consent for camping sites over 20 vehicles (inferred).		Reject	Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS354.216	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	Camping grounds are a form of visitor accommodation so are a sensitive activity. Therefore there needs to be consideration of the effects of the activity, including reverse sensitivity effects on adjacent activities.	Disallow	Disallow S438.009	Accept	Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
S449.047	Kapiro Conservation Trust	Rules	Support	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or 		Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: 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
					residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish. 			
FS354.217	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	The submitter seeks additional controls on artificial crop protection structures, including a non-complying rule. Artificial crop protection structures are critical to horticulture in the Far North and contribute to the economic and social wellbeing of the community.	Disallow	Disallow S449.047	Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS569.1846	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS570.1863	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: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S449.060	Kapiro Conservation Trust	Rules	Support	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour. Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish. 		Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS354.218	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	The submitter seeks additional controls on artificial crop protection structures, including a non-complying rule. Artificial crop protection structures are critical to horticulture in the Far North and contribute to the economic and social wellbeing of the community.	Disallow	Disallow S449.060	Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS569.1859	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: 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
FS570.1876	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: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
S449.066	Kapiro Conservation Trust	Rules	Support in part	Land that is regarded as highly productive (LUC Classes 1,2 and 3) is a strictly finite resource, essential for future food production for a growing population here and worldwide, and important for jobs and economic development. The recently issued National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land requires councils to protect LUC Class 1-3 land from fragmentation and loss (outside of identified urban zones) and allows councils to protect other types of productive land in similar manner.	Amend to include specify policies/rules to prevent fragmentation and loss of land in rural and horticulture zones [inferred].		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS354.219	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	Protection of highly productive land is supported and important for horticulture in the Far North.	Allow	Allow S449.066	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS569.1865	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
FS570.1882	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Giving Effect to the NPS-HPL
S436.027	Northland Fish and Game Council	Rules	Not Stated	Existing game bird hunting activities are often constrained by surrounding land use, and generally becomes untenable when this land use changes;	Insert provisions for recreational hunting as a permitted activity in the Rural Production zone (inferred)		Reject	Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: 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>for example, when urban and lifestyle encroachment occurs near traditionally hunted sites.</p> <p>Recreational game bird hunting is a very popular activity in the rural environment. The game bird season involves the discharge of shotgun noise. This is not like other constant noises rather it is very brief in duration. Game bird hunting begins at 6:30am in the morning and concludes at 6:30pm at night for the length of the season.</p> <p>Introducing new dwelling areas near areas of recreational significance to hunters can have implications on the future of hunting in these areas. For example, complaints can be made under the Arms Act 1983 which makes clear that anyone discharging a firearm in a public place so as to deliberately endanger, frighten or annoy any other person is guilty of an offence. Shotgun noise may also be a particular issue for public places such as any equestrian arena in the vicinity of maimai used during the game bird hunting season.</p>				
FS570.1491	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 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS346.113	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS and Part 2 of the RMA and the NPS IB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission of Fish and Game other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS566.1505	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 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS569.1527	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 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
S529.211	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	Rules	Support in part	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour. Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish. 		Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS570.2098	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: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS566.2112	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
								Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS569.2134	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
S230.013	Mataka Residents' Association Inc	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS566.572	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: General Submissions
S395.012	Sean Jozef Vercammen	Notes	Support in part	The final sentence reads "The Natural Character chapter should ...". Something has been omitted from this rule and needs to be completed.	Amend to complete the note wording.... The Natural Character chapter should ...".		Accept	Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
S439.015	John Joseph and Jacqueline Elizabeth Matthews	Notes	Not Stated	The final sentence of 'Note 2' reads "The Natural Character chapter should ...". Something has been omitted and needs to be completed.	Amend the final sentence of 'Note 2' in the Rural Production Chapter, as it appears incomplete.		Accept	Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
S45.006	Puketona Business Park Limited	RPROZ-R1	Support	Supports the requirement for a restricted discretionary activity where zone standards are infringed.	Retain restricted discretionary activity status where zone standards are infringed.		Accept	Section 5.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rule RPROZ-R1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S368.067	Far North District Council	RPROZ-R1	Support in part	The 'New buildings or structures, and extensions or alterations to existing buildings or structures' rule in each zone needs to be amended to include activities that are permitted, controlled and restricted discretionary, where applicable within the zone. As currently drafted a breach of this rule makes the activity 'discretionary', which was not the intent if the activity itself is permitted, controlled or restricted discretionary ... the standards in PER-2 should apply.	Amend RPROZ -R1 " ... New buildings or structures, and extensions or alterations to existing buildings or structures Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The new building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure, will accommodate a permitted (where applicable, words to the effect...'or controlled, or restricted discretionary') activity ... "	Accept	Section 5.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rule RPROZ-R1
S512.097	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	RPROZ-R1	Support in part	Many zones hold objectives and policies related to servicing developments with appropriate infrastructure. Noting that NH-R5 requires adequate firefighting water supply for vulnerable activities (including residential), Fire and Emergency consider that inclusion of an additional standard on infrastructure servicing within individual zone chapters may be beneficial.	Insert new standard and/or matter of discretion across zones on infrastructure servicing (including emergency response transport/access and adequate water supply for firefighting)	Reject	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan Wide or Rural Wide Submissions
S489.031	Radio New Zealand	RPROZ-R1	Support	RNZ support a permitted activity status for structures that comply with standards and a restricted discretionary status for activities that do not. As RNZ has the technical expertise and operational ability to assist applicants in ensuring the risk of EMR coupling is addressed, RNZ seeks the following note is added (similar to the note applying to subdivision applications noting the importance of considering effects on the airport operator). Notification to RNZ of any applications for tall structures within 1,000m will ensure safety risks to the applicant, and reverse sensitivity	Insert the following note to Rule RPROZ-R1: NOTE: If a resource consent application is made under this rule on land that is within 1,000m of Radio New Zealand's Facilities at Waipapakauri or Ōhaeawai, and the proposed building does not comply with RPROZ-S1, Radio New Zealand will be considered an affected person for the activity.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rule RPROZ-R1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				effects on RNZ can be considered collaboratively.				
S159.106	Horticulture New Zealand	RPROZ-R1	Support in part	There is not a specific rule for artificial crop protection structures so Rule RPROZ-R1 would apply. Seeks changes to some of the Standards to ensure that such structures are adequately provided for.	Seeks changes to some of the Standards to ensure that structures such as artificial crop protection structures are adequately provided for		Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.26 Key Issue 26: Standards – General Comments
FS151.273	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.26 Key Issue 26: Standards – General Comments
FS570.268	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 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.26 Key Issue 26: Standards – General Comments
FS566.282	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 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.26 Key Issue 26: 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
FS569.304	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 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.26 Key Issue 26: Standards – General Comments
S463.094	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited	RPROZ-R1	Support	WBF supports the permitted activity performance standards for development in the RPROZ, which, in its view, adequately provide for the type of buildings common to rural areas.	Retain Rule RPROZ-R1		Accept in part	Section 5.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rule RPROZ-R1
FS91.24	Moana Kiff		Support in part	Partly support; on the basis that it pertains to farming related buildings and the like, that does not include a residential housing development.	Disallow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rule RPROZ-R1
FS66.165	Bentzen Farm Limited		Support	The rule supported as appropriate permitted activity performance standards for development in the RPROZ	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rule RPROZ-R1
S482.002	House Movers Section of New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc	RPROZ-R1	Support in part	The Proposed Plan definition of "building" does not clearly include relocated buildings, and the existence of a separate definition of relocate buildings in the Proposed Plan appears to create a distinction between "buildings" and "relocated buildings". It is not clear that the permitted activity status applied in most zones to "new buildings and structures" also applies to the relocation of buildings. It is submitted that relocated buildings should have the same status as new buildings, and subject to the same performance standards unless there is any specific overlay or control which applies e.g. historic heritage	Amend RPROZ-R1 to provide for relocated building as a permitted activity when relocated buildings meet performance standards and criteria (see schedule 1). Insert a performance standard for use of a pre inspection report (schedule 2) restricted discretionary activity status for relocated buildings that do not meet the permitted activity status standards.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan Wide or Rural Wide Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS23.148	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	It is important that provision is made in all zones for relocatable buildings to enable choice, reuse of existing housing, and to make it clear what the activity status is for such buildings. This is particularly the case in urban zones.	Allow	allow the relief sought	Accept in part	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan Wide or Rural Wide Submissions
S431.123	John Andrew Riddell	RPROZ-R1	Not Stated	The amendment is necessary in order to achieve the purpose of the Act.	Amend the rule so that any proposal to set a building or structure less than 20 metres back from the coastal marine area, or from rivers and banks is a non-complying activity		Reject	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan Wide or Rural Wide Submissions
FS332.123	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan Wide or Rural Wide Submissions
S338.052	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	RPROZ-R1	Not Stated	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour. Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local 		Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: 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
					community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish.			
FS354.221	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	The submitter seeks additional controls on artificial crop protection structures, including a non-complying rule. Artificial crop protection structures are critical to horticulture in the Far North and contribute to the economic and social wellbeing of the community.	Disallow	Disallow S338.052	Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS570.990	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: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS566.1004	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS569.1026	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
S427.060	Kapiro Residents Association	RPROZ-R1	Support in part	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are	Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows		Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour. Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish. 			Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS354.222	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	The submitter seeks additional controls on artificial crop protection structures, including a non-complying rule. Artificial crop protection structures are critical to horticulture in the Far North and contribute to the economic and social wellbeing of the community.	Disallow	Disallow S427.060	Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
S449.035	Kapiro Conservation Trust	RPROZ-R1	Support	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; 		Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: 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
					suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish. 			
FS354.223	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	The submitter seeks additional controls on artificial crop protection structures, including a non-complying rule. Artificial crop protection structures are critical to horticulture in the Far North and contribute to the economic and social wellbeing of the community.	Disallow	Disallow S449.035	Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS569.1834	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS570.1851	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: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
S529.208	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	RPROZ-R1	Support in part	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other	Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries,		Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour. Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish. 			Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS570.2095	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: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS566.2109	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS569.2131	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		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
							Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
S267.001	Brad Hedger	RPROZ-R2	Support in part	<p>Unable to determine how effects from climate change has been considered for maintaining this level of impermeable surface coverage. The changes in regards to rainfall are significant currently designers are adding an additional 20% to intensities for climate change, this will increase stormwater run off from entire catchments and the effects will increase especially in regards to ground water recharge and overland flow paths. This is also supported from the work that NRC has done on river/stream catchments which show the effects from flooding increasing due to development and effects from climate change. The NRC assessment is limited to stream flows and flooding, the effects from development and overland flow paths to streams and rivers does not seem to be considered. In my opinion properties downstream of development will be receiving between 5-10% more stormwater flows over the next 10 years and 20% over the next 30 years.</p> <p>Currently impermeable surfaces coverage is linked to % of area, these areas can be quite large in rural areas i.e., 100ha farm can have 15ha of impermeable surfaces before triggering a consent or using mitigation measures that may be located right on a boundary discharging to a downstream</p>	<p>Amend PER-1 of RPROZ-R2 to: The impermeable surface coverage of any site is no more than 15% or 3000m², whichever is the lesser.</p>	Reject	Section 5.2.16 Key Issue 16: Rule RPROZ-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
				property or stream, it would be assumed that this may be spread out over there would be a buffer with permeable areas, but my observation is that commercial activity in these zones occurs at the boundary due to access obviously the runoff volume from the 15ha property will have a much larger effect on downstream properties.			
S463.095	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited	RPROZ-R2	Support	WBF considers the allotted 15% site coverage performance standard and fallback restricted discretionary consenting pathway for proposals that exceed this standard, to be an adequate allowance for the RPROZ.	Retain Rule RPROZ-R2	Accept in part	Section 5.2.16 Key Issue 16: Rule RPROZ-R2
S481.003	Puketotara Lodge Ltd	RPROZ-R2	Not Stated	<p>The submitter seeks to ensure that the PDP adequately controls effects from stormwater discharge, particularly between sites or adjacent sites. The Operative Far North Plan contains a stormwater management rule in each zone, along with matters of discretion which Council can consider where the impermeable surface area exceeds what is allowed under the permitted activity rule.</p> <p>There is no specific "stormwater management" rule in the Rural Production zone in the PDP, however there is a rule relating to impermeable surface coverage. It is submitted that additional matters should be added to the list of relevant matters for discretion in the impermeable coverage rule in all zones, in order to better control effects between sites or adjacent sites,</p>	<p>Amend point c of the matters of discretion as follows:</p> <p>c. the availability of land for disposal of effluent and stormwater on the site without adverse effects on adjoining adjacent waterbodies (including groundwater and aquifers) or on adjoining adjacent sites;</p> <p>Insert the following as additional matters of discretion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoiding nuisance or damage to adjacent or downstream properties; • The extent to which the diversion and discharge maintains pre-development stormwater run-off flows and volumes; • The extent to which the diversion and discharge mimics natural run-off patterns. 	Accept in part	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan Wide or Rural Wide Submissions
S215.054	Haigh Workman Limited	RPROZ-R2	Support in part	The impermeable surfaces permitted activity thresholds of 15% for Rural Production and Horticulture zones are excessive and would result in significant adverse effects if	Amend RPROZ-R2 impermeable surfaces permitted activity thresholds from 15% to 5% of the site area	Reject	Section 5.2.16 Key Issue 16: Rule RPROZ-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>development were to occur at these levels. A site developed with 15% impermeable surfaces will typically have 20% to 30% higher peak stormwater runoff compared with an undeveloped site and will result in increased flooding and erosion downstream. As these zones comprise most of the District, cumulative adverse effects are also likely to be significant.</p> <p>Northland Regional Council flood hazard maps have been developed on the basis of impermeable coverage as permitted under District Plan rules for urban areas, whilst existing impermeable coverage has been adopted for rural areas. Development to the permitted activity coverage in rural areas has not been anticipated in the flood hazard mapping. The 15% permitted activity threshold for Rural Production and Horticulture zones is inconsistent with the objectives and policies of the zonings, for example Rural Production Objective RPROZ-O3 and Policies RPROZ-P2 and P5.</p> <p>We recommend that the maximum impermeable surfaces permitted activity thresholds in the Rural Production and Horticulture zones be reduced to 5% (500m² per hectare). This would permit normal rural buildings, yards, races and roads while minimising cumulative adverse effects.</p>				
FS44.54	Northland Planning & Development 2020 Ltd		Oppose	The rural production zone covers the majority of the Far North District. This zone contains varying site sizes, from residential within rural township areas through to large scale farms and forestry blocks. It is generally only on smaller sites where consent for a breach of this rule is necessary. For	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.2.16 Key Issue 16: Rule RPROZ-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
				larger sites, where the site has alot of coverage, generally there are other rules which will trigger the need for resource consent. These rules are proposed to default to a discretionary activity status such that stormwater management can form part of the activity assessment.				
FS88.8	Stephanie Lane		Support in part	Agree that 15% is too much. 5% may be overly restrictive.	Allow in part		Reject	Section 5.2.16 Key Issue 16: Rule RPROZ-R2
FS570.543	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 5.2.16 Key Issue 16: Rule RPROZ-R2
FS566.557	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 5.2.16 Key Issue 16: Rule RPROZ-R2
FS569.579	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 5.2.16 Key Issue 16: Rule RPROZ-R2
S67.010	Michael John Winch	RPROZ-R2	Oppose	I oppose the permitted activity threshold of 15% impermeable surface coverage in the Rural Production zone. The impermeable surfaces permitted activity threshold of 15% for Rural Production is excessive and would result in significant adverse effects on stormwater runoff if development were to occur at these levels. A site developed with 15% impermeable surfaces will typically have 20% to 30% higher peak stormwater runoff compared with an undeveloped site, and will result in increased flooding and erosion downstream. As this zone comprises a large proportion of the District, cumulative adverse effects are also likely to be significant.	Amend the permitted activity threshold for impermeable surfaces coverage in the Rural Production zone to 5%.		Reject	Section 5.2.16 Key Issue 16: Rule RPROZ-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>The 15% permitted activity threshold for the Rural Production zone is inconsistent with the objectives and policies of the zone, for example Rural Production Objective RPROZ-O3 and Policies RPROZ-P2 and P5. The maximum impermeable surfaces permitted activity thresholds in the Rural Production zone should be reduced to 5%. On a typical 200 ha farm or forestry block, this would allow 10 ha of impermeable surfaces, permitting normal rural buildings, yards, races and roads while minimising cumulative adverse effects.</p> <p>The matters of discretion do not include assessing adverse effects of impermeable surface coverage on the life-supporting capacity of the soil, even highly productive soils, as required by Policies RPROZ-P5 and P7. There are no other rules in the District Plan that protect the life-supporting capacity of the soil and highly productive soils from inappropriate use unless the land is being subdivided</p>				
FS548.017	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	The amendment sought is impractical and would create issues for everyday farming activities needing to obtain resource consent for exceeding the much smaller threshold that has been sought.	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Accept	Section 5.2.16 Key Issue 16: Rule RPROZ-R2
FS354.224	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	The submitter seeks to decrease the impermeable surface coverage of any site to no more than 5%. Such a limit is very restrictive for small sites.	Disallow	Disallow S67.010	Accept	Section 5.2.16 Key Issue 16: Rule RPROZ-R2
FS346.833	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	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.16 Key Issue 16: Rule RPROZ-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
				sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.				
FS566.059	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 5.2.16 Key Issue 16: Rule RPROZ-R2
S67.011	Michael John Winch	RPROZ-R2	Oppose	The matters of discretion do not include assessing adverse effects of impermeable surface coverage on the life-supporting capacity of the soil, even highly productive soils, as required by Policies RPROZ-P5 and P7. There are no other rules in the District Plan that protect the life-supporting capacity of the soil and highly productive soils from inappropriate use unless the land is being subdivided.	Insert a further matter of discretion: the adverse effects on the life-supporting capacity of soil and the protection of highly productive land.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.16 Key Issue 16: Rule RPROZ-R2
FS354.225	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	The submitter seeks to include HPL as a matter of discretion in RPROZ-R2. This is supported.	Allow	Allow S67.011	Accept in part	Section 5.2.16 Key Issue 16: Rule RPROZ-R2
FS346.834	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.16 Key Issue 16: Rule RPROZ-R2
FS566.060	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 5.2.16 Key Issue 16: Rule RPROZ-R2
S283.014	Trent Simpkin	RPROZ-R2	Oppose	The impermeable surfaces rule is one of the most common rules breached when designing homes. The low thresholds means therefore means many homes will still require a resource consent for Impermeable surfaces. all RC's breaching impermeable surfaces require a TP10/Stormwater report from an engineer (already). This is a	Amend to increase impermeable surface coverage maximum to be realistic based on the site of lots allowed for the zone and/or insert a PER-2 which says if a TP10 report is provided by an engineer, the activity is permitted (inferred)		Reject	Section 5.2.16 Key Issue 16: Rule RPROZ-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
				detailed design of the stormwater management onsite and shouldn't require FNDC to look at it and tick the box to say it's acceptable. Why don't we have a PER-2 which says that if a TP10 report is provided by an engineer, it's permitted? (one solution to reduce the number of RC's for Council to process and assist with getting back to realistic processing times). This submission point applies to all zones.				
FS570.828	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 5.2.16 Key Issue 16: Rule RPROZ-R2
FS566.842	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 5.2.16 Key Issue 16: Rule RPROZ-R2
FS569.864	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 5.2.16 Key Issue 16: Rule RPROZ-R2
S55.032	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	RPROZ-R3	Not Stated	Residential activities are defined as a sensitive activity and therefore have the potential to cause reverse sensitivity effects on established intensive primary production activities	Insert new standard for new sensitive activity setback from an existing intensive primary production activity, as per RPROZ-R1		Accept	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3 Section 5.2.26 Key Issue 26: Standards – General Comments
S368.080	Far North District Council	RPROZ-R3	Support in part	The 'Residential activity' rule in zones that provide for a minor residential unit need to provide an exclusion for a 'minor residential unit'. The intent of the rule is to provide for a minor residential unit in addition to a principal residential unit on a site, it is not meant to be captured by PER-1 within the rule	Amend RPROZ-R3 to make the following amendments (the area ² will be relative to the zone) to the 'Residential activity' rule within the Rural Production zone, Rural Lifestyle zone, Rural Residential zone and the Settlement zone in the PDP:		Accept	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					<p>PER-1 The site area per residential unit is at least xxxm².</p> <p>PER-1 does not apply to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. a single residential unit located on a site less than xxxm². ii. a minor residential unit constructed in accordance with rule Rxx-Rxx 		
S355.025	Wakaiti Dalton	RPROZ-R3	Support in part	<p>The RPROZ limits residential development to one unit per 40ha of site area, up to a maximum of 6 per site and requires a discretionary activity resource consent for non-compliance with either of these standards. This is considered to be an overly restrictive rule framework.</p> <p>The section 32 has some brief commentary regarding the 40ha size limit at it relates to subdivision and considers this to be a response to manage fragmentation effects. We note that this density control has been proposed to align with the controlled activity subdivision threshold (which is discussed separately), however, aside from this there is little evaluation within the section 32 of the appropriateness of threshold.</p> <p>Further, it is noted that the Whangārei District Plan and Kaipara's Exposure Draft Plan each have rule frameworks that would provide for two residential units per 40ha. It is considered that these provisions should be amended to align with adjacent Councils to provide a more consistent region wide approach to the management of RPROZ land.</p>	Amend PROZ-R3-PER-1 to allow for at a minimum, one residential unit per 20ha.	Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S386.020	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew	RPROZ-R3	Support in part	<p>The RPROZ limits residential development to one unit per 40ha of site area, up to a maximum of 6 per site and requires a discretionary activity resource consent for non-compliance with either of these standards. This is considered to be an overly restrictive rule framework.</p> <p>The section 32 has some brief commentary regarding the 40ha size limit at it relates to subdivision and considers this to be a response to manage fragmentation effects. Ballantyne & Agnew note that this density control has been proposed to align with the controlled activity subdivision threshold (which is discussed separately), however, aside from this there is little evaluation within the section 32 of the appropriateness of threshold.</p> <p>Further, it is noted that the Whangārei District Plan and Kaipara's Exposure Draft Plan each have rule frameworks that would provide for two residential units per 40ha. It is considered that these provisions should be amended to align with adjacent Councils to provide a more consistent region wide approach to the management of RPROZ land.</p>	Amend RPROZ-R3-PER-1 to allow for at a minimum, one residential unit per 20ha.	Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
S463.096	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited	RPROZ-R3	Oppose	<p>Given the large size of lots in the RPROZ WBF proposes an amendment to exempt farm staff accommodation from this rule.</p>	Amend the title of Rule RPROZ-R3 as follows: RPROZ-R3 Residential activity (excluding staff accommodation)	Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3 Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: 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
S339.050	Te Aupōuri Commercial Development Ltd	RPROZ-R3	Not Stated	<p>The RPROZ limits residential development to one unit per 40ha of site area, up to a maximum of 6 per site and requires a discretionary activity resource consent for non-compliance with either of these standards. This is considered to be an overly restrictive rule framework.</p> <p>The section 32 has some brief commentary regarding the 40ha size limit at it relates to subdivision and considers this to be a response to manage fragmentation effects. TACDL note that this density control has been proposed to align with the controlled activity subdivision threshold (which is discussed separately), however, aside from this there is little evaluation within the section 32 of the appropriateness of threshold.</p> <p>Further, it is noted that the Whangārei District Plan and Kaipara's Exposure Draft Plan each have rule frameworks that would provide for two residential units per 40ha. It is considered that these provisions should be amended to align with adjacent Councils to provide a more consistent region wide approach to the management of RPROZ land.</p>	Amend PER-1 of Rule PROZ-R3 to allow for at a minimum, one residential unit per 20ha.	Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
S502.046	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	RPROZ-R3	Support in part	<p>In most cases sites generally do not exceed 40ha. However, on larger farming units where the site does exceed 40ha additional housing is required to provide living accommodation for workers. The larger and more diverse the site, the more workers which are required. As PER-1 still restricts residential intensity to 1 dwelling per 40ha this is considered sufficient to ensure that the impact of residential intensity on these larger</p>	Delete RPROZ-R3 PER-2	Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3 Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: 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
				sites will be no more than minor. As such, we seek relief that PER-2 is deleted in its entirety				
S503.030	Waitangi Limited	RPROZ-R3	Not Stated	In most cases sites generally do not exceed 40ha. However, on larger farming units where the site does exceed 40ha additional housing is required to provide living accommodation for workers. The larger and more diverse the site, the more workers which are required. In the case of the Waitangi Estate there are a number of dwellings which either house staff working at the treaty grounds or staff working at the Copthorne. In the future if any further activities are established on site where affordable workers accommodation is needed this will likely trigger consent. Further restrictions on housing for workers is not considered to assist with the affordable housing shortages in the country. As such, we seek relief that PER-2 is deleted in its entirety.	Delete PER-2 of Rule RPROZ-R3, as follows: The number of residential units on a site does not exceed six. In the event this is not accepted we seek an exemption be put in place specifically for the Waitangi Estate similar to what has been put in place under Rule MPZ-R5 Māori Purpose Zone - Rural for Matauri X		Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3 Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
S310.002	Lianne Kennedy	RPROZ-R3	Oppose	There is a housing crisis and whanau are coming home to live on the land. 12ha is a huge area to have one dwelling and all that will happen will be the Far North becomes full of unpermitted and unsafe dwellings as this rule change will not stop family living on their land. There should be no limit to the number. This should be based on land size so owners on larger blocks are not disadvantaged but only being allowed a maximum of 6 regardless of their land size.	Amend rule RPROZ-R3 to retain the current rule allowing residential development of one unit per 12 ha of land with no maximum number per site.		Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS297.3	Wilson Hookway		Support	Imposing such restrictions on residential intensity will only contribute further to the current housing crisis that	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				is being observed both locally and nationwide.				
FS100.13	Allen Hookway		Support	Imposing such restrictions on residential intensity will only contribute further to the current housing crisis that is being observed both locally and nationwide.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS172.282	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS293.3	Danielle Hookway		Support	Imposing such restrictions on residential intensity will only contribute further to the current housing crisis that is being observed both locally and nationwide.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS257.3	Amber Hookway		Support	Imposing such restrictions on residential intensity will only contribute further to the current housing crisis that is being observed both locally and nationwide	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS256.14	Lianne Kennedy		Support	Imposing such restrictions on residential intensity will only contribute further to the current housing crisis that is being observed both locally and nationwide.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS350.044	Puketona Lodge Ltd		Support	<p>The reasons given in the primary submission of the submitter.</p> <p>There is a housing crisis and whanau are coming home to live on the land. 12ha is a huge area to have one dwelling and all that will happen will be the Far North becomes full of unpermitted and unsafe dwellings as this rule change will not stop family living on their land. There should be no limit to the number. This should be based on land size so owners on larger blocks are not disadvantaged bu only</p>	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				being allowed a maximum of 6 regardless of their land size.				
FS368.019	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Amend rule RPROZ-R3 to retain the current rule allowing residential development of one unit per 12 ha of land with no maximum number per site	Allow	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS441.039	Adrian and Sue Knight		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission	Allow	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS570.901	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 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS566.915	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 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS569.937	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 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
S261.002	Amber Hookway	RPROZ-R3	Oppose	Submitter opposes change from "Residential development shall be limited to one unit per 12ha of land" to "The site area per residential unit is at least 40ha". There is a housing crisis and whanau are coming home to live on the land. 12ha is a huge area to be able to have one dwelling and all that will happen will be the Far North becomes full of unpermitted unsafe dwellings as this rule change will not stop family living on their land. There should be no limit to the number. This should be based on land size so owners of larger blocks are not disadvantaged by only being allowed a maximum of 6 regardless of their land size.	Amend to reinstate the equivalent operative District Plan rule (one residential unit per 12ha of land, with no maximum number per site)		Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS297.24	Wilson Hookway		Support	Imposing such restrictions on residential intensity will only contribute further to the current housing crisis that is being observed both locally and nationwide.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS100.9	Allen Hookway		Support	Imposing such restrictions on residential intensity will only contribute further to the current housing crisis that is being observed both locally and nationwide.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS293.23	Danielle Hookway		Support	Imposing such restrictions on residential intensity will only contribute further to the current housing crisis that is being observed both locally and nationwide.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS293.24	Danielle Hookway		Support	Imposing such restrictions on residential intensity will only contribute further to the current housing crisis that is being observed both locally and nationwide.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS257.23	Amber Hookway		Support	Imposing such restrictions on residential intensity will only contribute further to the current housing crisis that is being observed both locally and nationwide.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS256.10	Lianne Kennedy		Support	Imposing such restrictions on residential intensity will only contribute further to the current housing crisis that is being observed both locally and nationwide.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS256.15	Lianne Kennedy		Support	Imposing such restrictions on residential intensity will only contribute further to the current housing crisis that is being observed both locally and nationwide.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS368.016	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Amend to reinstate the equivalent operative District Plan rule (one	Allow	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.17

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				residential unit per 12ha of land, with no maximum number per site)				Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
S264.002	Wilson Hookway	RPROZ-R3	Oppose	Submitter opposes change from "Residential development shall be limited to one unit per 12ha of land" to "The site area per residential unit is at least 40ha". There is a housing crisis and whanau are coming home to live on the land. 12ha is a huge area to be able to have one dwelling and all that will happen will be the Far North becomes full of unpermitted unsafe dwellings as this rule change will not stop family living on their land. There should be no limit to the number. This should be based on land size so owners of larger blocks are not disadvantaged by only being allowed a maximum of 6 regardless of their land size.	Amend to reinstate the equivalent operative District Plan rule (one residential unit per 12ha of land, with no maximum number per site).		Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS297.25	Wilson Hookway		Support	Imposing such restrictions on residential intensity will only contribute further to the current housing crisis that is being observed both locally and nationwide.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS100.10	Allen Hookway		Support	Imposing such restrictions on residential intensity will only contribute further to the current housing crisis that is being observed both locally and nationwide.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS293.25	Danielle Hookway		Support	Imposing such restrictions on residential intensity will only contribute further to the current housing crisis that is being observed both locally and nationwide.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS257.24	Amber Hookway		Support	Imposing such restrictions on residential intensity will only contribute further to the current housing crisis that is being observed both locally and nationwide.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS256.11	Lianne Kennedy		Support	Imposing such restrictions on residential intensity will only contribute further to the current housing crisis that is being observed both locally and nationwide.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS368.017	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Amend to reinstate the equivalent operative District Plan rule (one residential unit per 12ha of land, with no maximum number per site	Allow	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
S309.002	Danielle Hookway	RPROZ-R3	Oppose	There is a housing crisis and whanau are coming home to live on the land. 12ha is a huge area to have one dwelling and all that will happen will be the Far North becomes full of unpermitted and unsafe dwellings as this rule change will not stop family living on their land. There should be no limit to the number. This should be based on land size so owners on larger blocks are not disadvantaged bu only being allowed a maximum of 6 regardless of their land size.	Amend rule RPROZ-R3 to retain the current rule allowing residential development of one unit per 12 ha of land with no maximum number per site.		Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS297.26	Wilson Hookway		Support	Imposing such restrictions on residential intensity will only contribute further to the current housing crisis that is being observed both locally and nationwide.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS100.11	Allen Hookway		Support	Imposing such restrictions on residential intensity will only contribute further to the current housing crisis that is being observed both locally and nationwide.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS293.26	Danielle Hookway		Support	Imposing such restrictions on residential intensity will only contribute further to the current housing crisis that is being observed both locally and nationwide.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS257.25	Amber Hookway		Support	Imposing such restrictions on residential intensity will only contribute	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.17

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				further to the current housing crisis that is being observed both locally and nationwide.				Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS256.12	Lianne Kennedy		Support	Imposing such restrictions on residential intensity will only contribute further to the current housing crisis that is being observed both locally and nationwide.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS368.018	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Amend rule RPROZ-R3 to retain the current rule allowing residential development of one unit per 12 ha of land with no maximum number per site	Allow	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
S311.002	Allen Hookway	RPROZ-R3	Oppose	There is a housing crisis and whanau are coming home to live on the land. 12ha is a huge area to have one dwelling and all that will happen will be the Far North becomes full of unpermitted and unsafe dwellings as this rule change will not stop family living on their land. There should be no limit to the number. This should be based on land size so owners on larger blocks are not disadvantaged bu only being allowed a maximum of 6 regardless of their land size.	Amend rule RPROZ-R3 to retain the current rule allowing residential development of one unit per 12 ha of land with no maximum number per site.		Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS297.27	Wilson Hookway		Support	Imposing such restrictions on residential intensity will only contribute further to the current housing crisis that is being observed both locally and nationwide.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS100.12	Allen Hookway		Support	Imposing such restrictions on residential intensity will only contribute further to the current housing crisis that is being observed both locally and nationwide.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS172.284	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS293.27	Danielle Hookway		Support	Imposing such restrictions on residential intensity will only contribute further to the current housing crisis that is being observed both locally and nationwide.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS257.26	Amber Hookway		Support	Imposing such restrictions on residential intensity will only contribute further to the current housing crisis that is being observed both locally and nationwide.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS256.13	Lianne Kennedy		Support	Imposing such restrictions on residential intensity will only contribute further to the current housing crisis that is being observed both locally and nationwide.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS368.020	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Amend rule RPROZ-R3 to retain the current rule allowing residential development of one unit per 12 ha of land with no maximum number per site	Allow	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
S421.220	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	RPROZ-R3	Support in part	Federated Farmers does not support performance standard PER-1 in the rule. PER-1 requires that the site area per residential unit is a minimum of 40 hectares. It is inappropriate to imply that the impact of a residential activity on the environment will be greater simply because the site is less than 40 hectares in size. We do support the permitted activity classifications status for residential activities in the rural production zone.	Delete the site area requirements from Rule RPROZ-R3		Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS24.32	Lynley Newport		Support in part	40ha is arbitrary at best. rule needs to relate to adjusted minimum lot size (20ha sought) or even a smaller area.	Allow in part		Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS172.326	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons stated in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS196.107	Joe Carr		Support	agree. What is needed is an effective reverse sensitivity policy that ensures that primary producers in the aptly named Rural Production Zone are not compromised.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS570.1452	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 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS346.454	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS566.1466	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 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS569.1488	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 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
S519.040	Elbury Holdings	RPROZ-R3	Oppose	We do not support the new permitted residential intensity rule density (multiple dwellings per title) and submit that it be retained at the 1 dwelling per 12ha intensity, as per the existing operative district plan. This is requested as still allows for a relatively low density of housing relative to land area, but still allows for the provision of housing in a rural setting.	Retain Rule 8.6.5.1.1 'Residential Intensity' under the operative district plan.		Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS155.80	Fiona King		Support	i house on 12 ha is ridiculous, other dwellings should be allowed. ie. t small dwelling for other family members -kids or older parents.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS368.024	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Retain Rule 8.6.5.1.1 'Residential Intensity' under the operative district plan.	Allow	Retain Rule	Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
S485.041	Elbury Holdings	RPROZ-R3	Oppose	We do not support the new permitted residential intensity rule density (multiple dwellings per title) and submit that it be retained at the 1 dwelling per 12ha intensity, as per the existing operative district plan. This is requested as still allows for a relatively low density of housing relative to land area, but still allows for the provision of housing in a rural setting. It is submitted that that the rule is currently effective, and should remain the same, to ensure that housing can still be provided in the general rural zone as a permitted activity as long as the subject site has a minimum of 12 hectares of land, and the minimum area of 3000m ² of exclusive use surrounding the dwelling	Amend to ensure that housing can still be provided in the general rural zone as a permitted activity as long as the subject site has a minimum of 12 hectares of land, and the minimum area of 3000m ² of exclusive use surrounding the dwelling.		Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS100.6	Allen Hookway		Support	There is a housing crisis and all that will happen will be the Far North becomes full of unpermitted, unsafe dwellings. Retain the current rule of Residential development shall be limited to one unit per 12ha of land with no maximum number per site.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS256.6	Lianne Kennedy		Support	There is a housing crisis and all that will happen will be the Far North becomes full of unpermitted, unsafe dwellings. Retain the current rule of Residential development shall be limited to one unit per 12ha of land with no maximum number per site.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS368.023	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Amend to ensure that housing can still be provided in the general rural zone	Allow	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.17

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				as a permitted activity as long as the subject site has a minimum of 12 hectares of land, and the minimum area of 3000m ² of exclusive use surrounding the dwelling.				Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
S358.044	Leah Frieling	RPROZ-R3	Oppose	We do not support the new permitted residential intensity rule density (multiple dwellings per title) and submit that it be retained at the 1 dwelling per 12ha intensity, as per the existing operative district plan. This is requested as still allows for a relatively low density of housing relative to land area, but still allows for the provision of housing in a rural setting. It is submitted that that the rule is currently effective, and should remain the same, to ensure that housing can still be provided in the General Rural zone as a permitted activity as long as the subject site has a minimum of 12 hectares of land, and the minimum area of 3,000m ² of exclusive use surrounding the dwelling.	Amend Rule RPROZ-R3 to reflect the requirements in the Operative District Plan, i.e. 1 dwelling per 12ha		Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS100.7	Allen Hookway		Support	There is a housing crisis and all that will happen will be the Far North becomes full of unpermitted, unsafe dwellings. Retain the current rule of Residential development shall be limited to one unit per 12ha of land with no maximum number per site.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS256.7	Lianne Kennedy		Support	There is a housing crisis and all that will happen will be the Far North becomes full of unpermitted, unsafe dwellings. Retain the current rule of Residential development shall be limited to one unit per 12ha of land with no maximum number per site.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS368.014	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Amend to retain the operative district plan rule to ensure that housing can still be provided in the general rural zone as a permitted activity as long as the subject site has a minimum of 12 hectares of land, and the minimum area of 3000m ² of exclusive use surrounding the dwelling. ...Amend Rule RPROZ-R3 to reflect the requirements in the Operative District Plan, i.e. 1 dwelling per 12ha	Allow	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
S357.041	Sean Frieling	RPROZ-R3	Oppose	We do not support the new permitted residential intensity rule density (multiple dwellings per title) and submit that it be retained at the 1 dwelling per 12ha intensity, as per the existing operative district plan. This is requested as still allows for a relatively low density of housing relative to land area, but still allows for the provision of housing in a rural setting. It is submitted that that the rule is currently effective, and should remain the same, to ensure that housing can still be provided in the general rural zone as a permitted activity as long as the subject site has a minimum of 12 hectares of land, and the minimum area of 3000m ² of exclusive use surrounding the dwelling.	Amend to retain the operative district plan rule to ensure that housing can still be provided in the general rural zone as a permitted activity as long as the subject site has a minimum of 12 hectares of land, and the minimum area of 3000m ² of exclusive use surrounding the dwelling.		Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS100.8	Allen Hookway		Support	There is a housing crisis and all that will happen will be the Far North becomes full of unpermitted, unsafe dwellings. Retain the current rule of Residential development shall be limited to one unit per 12ha of land with no maximum number per site.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS256.8	Lianne Kennedy		Support	There is a housing crisis and all that will happen will be the Far North becomes full of unpermitted, unsafe	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.17

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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>dwellings. Retain the current rule of Residential development shall be limited to one unit per 12ha of land with no maximum number per site.</p>				Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS368.013	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	<p>Amend to retain the operative district plan rule to ensure that housing can still be provided in the general rural zone as a permitted activity as long as the subject site has a minimum of 12 hectares of land, and the minimum area of 3000m² of exclusive use surrounding the dwelling. ...Amend Rule RPROZ-R3 to reflect the requirements in the Operative District Plan, i.e. 1 dwelling per 12ha</p>	Allow	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
S159.109	Horticulture New Zealand	RPROZ-R3	Support in part	<p>Rule RPROZ-R3 does not state the Standards that will apply. The Standards relating to buildings should be included in the rule.</p>	<p>Amend Rule RPROZ-R3 to insert the following: PER-3 The new building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure complies with standards: RPROZ-S1 Maximum height; RPROZ-S2 Height in relation to boundary; RPROZ-S3 Setback (excluding from MHWS or wetland, lake and river margins) RPROZ-S4 Setback from MHWS RPROZ-S5 Building or structure coverage}; RPROZ-S6 Buildings or structures used to house, milk or feed stock (excluding buildings or structures used for an intensive indoor primary production activity)}. RPROZ-S7 Sensitive activities setback from boundaries of a Mineral extraction overlay</p>		Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS151.276	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS570.271	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 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS566.285	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 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS569.307	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 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
S104.001	Lynley Newport	RPROZ-R3	Oppose	The discretionary activity minimum lot size should remain at four hectares and, as such, the discretionary residential intensity ratio in Rule RPROZ-R3 DIS-1 should similarly be four hectares.	Amend Rule RPROZ-R3 DIS-1 as follows: The site area per residential unit is at least 8ha 4ha.		Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS172.187	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS196.52	Joe Carr		Support	per submitter's reasoning	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS305.012	Dempsey Family Trust		Support in part	Further residential opportunities within the Rural Production zone should be provided for.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS368.012	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Amend Rule RPROZ-R3 DIS-1 as follows - The site area per residential unit is at least 8ha 4ha.	Allow	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
S200.001	Thomson Survey Ltd	RPROZ-R3	Oppose	The discretionary activity residential activity site area per residential unit should be reduced from at least 8ha to at least 4ha.	Amend RPROZ-3 DIS-1 to read as follows: DIS-1 The site area per residential unit is at least 4ha.		Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS172.257	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow	Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
S348.002	Sapphire Surveyors Limited	RPROZ-R3	Oppose	<p>The new subdivision rules, requiring a minimum lot size of 8ha (without a Management Plan) will severely restrict the ability to create small rural lots in the Rural Production zone. The reason given for this rule is to protect the productive potential of the rural area, in particular, highly productive land. However, the majority of land in the Far North District does not come under this category, and the PDP does not distinguish between highly productive land and less productive land when it comes to subdivision.</p> <p>With Council struggling to provide urban amenities (sewerage, water supply and stormwater) and people wanting to live independent of these services in the rural areas without too much land to care for, it makes sense to allow small rural blocks.</p> <p>It is correct to protect rural productive potential, but this can be achieved without imposing a total restriction on rural lifestyle properties. Previously blocks down to 4000sqm were allowed under the Operative District Plan. Perhaps the new District Plan could reconsider allotment sizes, perhaps with a limited number of allotments of a minimum of 8000sqm or 1ha, then 4ha generally after that. Smaller lot sizes should apply for properties (or parts thereof) that do not consist of highly productive land. This would give effect to Policy SUB-P8.</p> <p>Perhaps there should be more focus on the size of the balance parcel -</p>	Amend Rule RPROZ-R3 to align with changes sought by submitter to Standard SUB-S1 as it relates to subdivision in the Rural Production zone	Reject	<p>Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3</p> <p>Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Production Zone</p>

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>subdividing off 4ha to leave a 10ha balance parcel does not protect productivity, while subdividing 1ha off a 200ha block has next to no effect, especially if the smaller block consists of bush.</p> <p>This would provide vitality in rural areas, opportunities for farmers to develop their land, relief for urban services, continued local jobs, lifestyle blocks for those that want them, and all while still protecting the productive capacity of the land.</p>				
FS172.288	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject	<p>Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3</p> <p>Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Production Zone</p>
FS368.0010	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Amend Rule RPROZ-R3 to align with changes sought by submitter to Standard SUB-S1 as it relates to subdivision in the Rural Production zone.	Allow	Amend	Reject	<p>Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3</p> <p>Section 5.2.30 Key Issue 30: Subdivision SUB-S1 as it applies to the Rural Production Zone</p>
S479.020	Tracy and Kenneth Dalton	RPROZ-R3	Oppose	The RPROZ limits residential development to one unit per 40ha of site area, up to a maximum of 6 per site and requires a discretionary activity resource consent for non-compliance	Amend PROZ-R3-PER-1 to allow for at a minimum, one residential unit per 20ha.		Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>with either of these standards. This is considered to be an overly restrictive rule framework. The section 32 has some brief commentary regarding the 40ha size limit at it relates to subdivision and considers this to be a response to manage fragmentation effects. We note that this density control has been proposed to align with the controlled activity subdivision threshold (which is discussed separately), however, aside from this there is little evaluation within the section 32 of the appropriateness of threshold.</p> <p>Further, it is noted that the Whangārei District Plan and Kaipara's Exposure Draft Plan each have rule frameworks that would provide for two residential units per 40ha. It is considered that these provisions should be amended to align with adjacent Councils to provide a more consistent region wide approach to the management of RPROZ land.</p>				
FS196.182	Joe Carr		Support	Tautoko	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
S464.041	LJ King Ltd	RPROZ-R3	Oppose	We do not support the new permitted residential intensity rule density (multiple dwellings per title), and submit that it be retained at the 1 dwelling per 12ha intensity, as per the existing operative district plan. This is requested as still allows for a relatively low density of housing relative to land area, but still allows for the provision of housing in a rural setting. It is submitted that that the rule is currently effective, and should remain the same, to ensure that housing can still be	Amend to ensure that housing can still be provided in the general rural zone as a permitted activity as long as the subject site has a minimum of 12 hectares of land, and the minimum area of 3000m ² of exclusive use surrounding the dwelling.		Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				provided in the general rural zone as a permitted activity as long as the subject site has a minimum of 12 hectares of land, and the minimum area of 3000m ² of exclusive use surrounding the dwelling				
FS256.9	Lianne Kennedy		Support	Imposing such restrictions on residential intensity will only contribute further to the current housing crisis that is being observed both locally and nationwide.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS368.015	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Amend to retain the operative district plan rule to ensure that housing can still be provided in the general rural zone as a permitted activity as long as the subject site has a minimum of 12 hectares of land, and the minimum area of 3000m ² of exclusive use surrounding the dwelling. ...Amend Rule RPROZ-R3 to reflect the requirements in the Operative District Plan, i.e. 1 dwelling per 12ha	Allow	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS566.1584	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 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
S167.098	Bentzen Farm Limited	RPROZ-R3	Oppose	Amend the rule to align with the minimum lot size of 20ha sought in this submission, with a consequent pro-rata amendment to PER-2. The provision that PER-1 does not apply to: a single residential unit located on a site less than 20ha (as sought) is supported because it recognises existing and potential new sites provided for in the zone with smaller lot sizes.	Amend Rule RPROZ-R3 as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The site area per residential unit is at least 40ha 20ha . PER-2 The number of residential units on a site does not exceed six three . PER-1 does not apply to: a single residential unit located on a site less than 40 20ha .		Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS405.084	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support in part	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the requested amendments as they relate to the site area per residential unit being at least 20ha. It is considered that these provisions should be amended to align with adjacent Councils to provide a more consistent region wide approach to the management of RPZ land.	Allow in part	Allow in part the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS361.067	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support in part	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the requested amendments as they relate to the site area per residential unit being at least 20ha. It is considered that these provisions should be amended to align with adjacent Councils to provide a more consistent region wide approach to the management of RPZ land.	Allow in part	Allow in part the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS566.460	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow		Accept	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
S168.095	Setar Thirty Six Limited	RPROZ-R3	Oppose	Amend the rule to align with the minimum lot size of 20ha sought in this submission, with a consequent pro-rata amendment to PER-2. The provision that PER-1 does not apply to: a single residential unit located on a site less than 20ha (as sought) is supported because it recognises existing and potential new sites provided for in the zone with smaller lot sizes.	Amend Rule RPROZ-R3 as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The site area per residential unit is at least 40ha 20ha . PER-2 The number of residential units on a site does not exceed six three . PER-1 does not apply to: a single residential unit located on a site less than 40 20ha .		Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS405.085	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support in part	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the requested amendments as they relate to the site area per residential unit being at least 20ha. But notes that in	Allow in part	Allow in part the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				the original submission it sought to amend these provisions to align with adjacent Councils.				
FS361.068	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support in part	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the requested amendments as they relate to the site area per residential unit being at least 20ha. But notes that in the original submission it sought to amend these provisions to align with adjacent Councils.	Allow in part	Allow in part the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
S187.086	The Shooting Box Limited	RPROZ-R3	Oppose	Amend the rule to align with the minimum lot size of 20ha, with a consequent pro-rata amendment to PER-2. The provision that PER-1 does not apply to: a single residential unit located on a site less than 20ha (as sought) is supported because it recognises existing and potential new sites provided for in the zone with smaller lot sizes.	Amend Rule RPROZ-R3 as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The site area per residential unit is at least 40ha 20ha . PER-2 The number of residential units on a site does not exceed six three . PER-1 does not apply to: a single residential unit located on a site less than 40 20ha .		Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS405.086	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support in part	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the requested amendments as they relate to the site area per residential unit being at least 20ha. But notes that in the original submission it sought to amend these provisions to align with adjacent Councils.	Allow in part	Allow in part the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS361.069	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support in part	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the requested amendments as they relate to the site area per residential unit being at least 20ha. But notes that in the original submission it sought to amend these provisions to	Allow in part	Allow in part the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				align with adjacent Councils.				
S222.091	Wendover Two Limited	RPROZ-R3	Oppose	Amend the rule to align with the minimum lot size of 20ha sought in this submission, with a consequent pro-rata amendment to PER-2. The provision that PER-1 does not apply to: a single residential unit located on a site less than 20ha (as sought) is supported because it recognises existing and potential new sites provided for in the zone with smaller lot sizes .	Amend Rule RPROZ-R3 as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The site area per residential unit is at least 40ha 20ha . PER-2 The number of residential units on a site does not exceed six three . PER-1 does not apply to: a single residential unit located on a site less than 40 20ha .		Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS405.087	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support in part	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the requested amendments as they relate to the site area per residential unit being at least 20ha. But notes that in the original submission it sought to amend these provisions to align with adjacent Councils	Allow in part	Allow in part the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS368.025	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Amend RPROZ-3 DIS-1 to read as follows: DIS-1 The site area per residential unit is at least 4ha	Allow	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS361.070	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support in part	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the requested amendments as they relate to the site area per residential unit being at least 20ha. But notes that in the original submission it sought to amend these provisions to align with adjacent Councils.	Allow in part	Allow in part the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
S243.116	Matauri Trustee Limited	RPROZ-R3	Oppose	Amend the rule to align with the minimum lot size of 20ha sought in this submission, with a consequent pro-rata amendment to PER-2. The provision that PER-1 does not apply to: a single residential unit located on a site less	Amend Rule RPROZ-R3 as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1		Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				than 20ha (as sought) is supported because it recognises existing and potential new sites provided for in the zone with smaller lot sizes .	The site area per residential unit is at least 40ha 20ha . PER-2 The number of residential units on a site does not exceed six three . PER-1 does not apply to: a single residential unit located on a site less than 40 20ha .			
FS405.088	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support in part	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the requested amendments as they relate to the site area per residential unit being at least 20ha. But notes that in the original submission it sought to amend these provisions to align with adjacent Councils.	Allow in part	Allow in part the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS361.071	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support in part	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the requested amendments as they relate to the site area per residential unit being at least 20ha. But notes that in the original submission it sought to amend these provisions to align with adjacent Councils.	Allow in part	Allow in part the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS570.674	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 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS566.688	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 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS569.710	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 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S333.087	P S Yates Family Trust	RPROZ-R3	Support in part	<p>Amend the rule to align with the minimum lot size of 20ha, with a consequent pro-rata amendment to PER- 2.</p> <p>The provision that PER-1 does not apply to: a single residential unit located on a site less than 20ha (as sought) is supported because it recognises existing and potential new sites provided for in the zone with smaller lot sizes .</p>	<p>Amend Rule RPROZ-R3 as follows:</p> <p>Activity status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>PER-1 The site area per residential unit is at least 40ha 20ha.</p> <p>PER-2 The number of residential units on a site does not exceed six three.</p> <p>PER-1 does not apply to: a single residential unit located on a site less than 40 20ha.</p>	Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS405.089	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support in part	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the requested amendments as they relate to the site area per residential unit being at least 20ha. But notes that in the original submission it sought to amend these provisions to align with adjacent Councils.	<p>Allow in part</p> <p>Allow in part the original submission</p>	Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS361.072	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support in part	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the requested amendments as they relate to the site area per residential unit being at least 20ha. But notes that in the original submission it sought to amend these provisions to align with adjacent Councils.	<p>Allow in part</p> <p>Allow in part the original submission</p>	Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
S415.002	LMD Planning Consultancy	RPROZ-R3	Oppose	Residential density standards proposed for the Rural Production zone are too restrictive, particularly as applicable to Sacred Heart Catholic Church premises at 867 State Highway 10, Waitaruke (Part Waihapa 3A1 Blk).	<p>Amend PER-1 of Rule RPROZ-R3 as follows:</p> <p>PER-1 The site area per residential unit is at least 40ha 20ha.</p> <p>PER-1 does not apply to: a single residential unit located on a site less than 40ha 20ha.</p> <p>Amend DIS-1 of Rule RPROZ-R3 as follows - The site area per residential unit is at least 8ha 4ha.</p>	Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS405.090	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support in part	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the requested amendments as they relate to the site area per residential unit being at least 20ha. But notes that in the original submission it sought to amend these provisions to align with adjacent Councils.	Allow in part	Allow in part the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS361.073	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support in part	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the requested amendments as they relate to the site area per residential unit being at least 20ha. But notes that in the original submission it sought to amend these provisions to align with adjacent Councils.	Allow in part	Allow in part the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
S250.020	Willowridge Developments Limited	RPROZ-R3	Support in part	Willowridge are generally supportive of the intent of the approach. The section 32 does not provide sufficient assessment regarding the density controls primarily focusing on allotment sizes for subdivision. The approach fails to recognise the functional need to accommodate multiple residential units on a single site for activities such as farming or horticulture where workers may be required to reside on site or where there is a need to provide housing for family.	Amend PROZ-R3-PER-1 to allow for at a minimum, one residential unit per 20ha.		Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS332.266	Russell Protection Society		Oppose	Limiting housing development in the Rural production zone is desirable, especially in coastal areas.	Disallow in part	Disallow the original submission in part.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS570.706	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 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS566.720	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 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report	
FS569.742	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 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3	
S40.015	Martin John Yuretich	RPROZ-R3	Oppose	<p>The new subdivision rules, requiring a minimum lot size of 8ha (without a Management Plan) will severely restrict the ability to create small rural lots in the rural production zone.</p> <p>The reason given for this rule is to protect the productive potential of the rural area, in particular, highly productive land. However, the majority of land in the Far North District does not come under this category, and the PDP does not distinguish between highly productive land and less productive land when it comes to subdivision.</p> <p>With Council struggling to provide urban amenities (sewerage, water supply and stormwater) and people wanting to live independent of these services in the rural areas without too much land to care for, it makes sense to allow small rural blocks.</p> <p>It is correct to protect rural productive potential, but this can be achieved without imposing a total restriction on rural lifestyle properties.</p>	Amend allotment sizes, perhaps with a limited number of allotments of a minimum of 8000m ² or 1ha, then 4ha generally after that. Smaller lot sizes should apply for properties (or parts thereof) that do not consist of highly productive land.	Perhaps there should be more focus on the size of the balance parcel - subdividing off 4ha to leave a 10ha balance parcel does not protect productivity, while subdividing 1ha off a 200ha block has next to no effect, especially if the smaller block consists of bush.	Consequential amendments to RPROZ-R3 Residential activity and SUB-R7 Management plan subdivision.	Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS305.0010	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	Further subdivision opportunities within the Rural Production zone should be provided for.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3	
FS368.008	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	RPROZ-R3 - Amend allotment sizes, perhaps with a limited number of allotments of a minimum of 8000m ² or 1ha, then 4ha generally after that. Smaller lot sizes should apply for properties (or parts thereof) that do not consist of highly productive land.	Allow	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3	

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				...Consequential amendments to RPROZ-R3 Residential activity and SUB-R7 Management plan subdivision.				
S334.001	FNR Properties Limited	RPROZ-R3	Oppose	<p>The PDP does not provide for any subdivision in the RPZ as a Restricted Discretionary Activity, and that the Discretionary Activity thresholds have been significantly reduced.</p> <p>The substantial reduction in the permitted residential intensity threshold in the RPZ is extremely heavy-handed and will result in significant adverse effects on the socio-economic wellbeing of the Far North District. Imposing such restrictions on residential intensity will only contribute further to the current housing crisis that is being observed both locally and nationwide.</p> <p>Further, the RPZ objectives and policies as notified primarily provide for primary production activities in the RPZ and do not recognise that some properties are no longer suitable for production, or never have been suitable or used for production.</p> <p>Providing more options for residential intensity as a Controlled, Restricted Discretionary, and Discretionary Activity would be more appropriate as this will enable such development to occur in the RPZ while providing for case by case consideration of any proposed residential activity within the context of the subject site and immediate surrounding environment (as opposed to a 'one size fits all' approach).</p>	Amend the RPZ provisions to allow for a higher residential intensity in the RPZ and/or to provide for more options for residential intensity as a Controlled, Restricted Discretionary, and Discretionary Activity.		Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS305.013	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	Further residential opportunities within the Rural Production zone should be provided for.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS368.022	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Amend the RPZ provisions to allow for a higher residential intensity in the RPZ and/or to provide for more options for residential intensity as a Controlled, Restricted Discretionary, and Discretionary Activity	Allow	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
S41.015	Joel Vieviorka	RPROZ-R3	Oppose	<p>The new subdivision rules, requiring a minimum lot size of 8ha (without a Management Plan) will severely restrict the ability to create small rural lots in the rural production zone.</p> <p>The reason given for this rule is to protect the productive potential of the rural area, in particular, highly productive land. However, the majority of land in the Far North District does not come under this category, and the PDP does not distinguish between highly productive land and less productive land when it comes to subdivision.</p> <p>With Council struggling to provide urban amenities (sewerage, water supply and stormwater) and people wanting to live independent of these services in the rural areas without too much land to care for, it makes sense to allow small rural blocks.</p> <p>It is correct to protect rural productive potential, but this can be achieved without imposing a total restriction on rural lifestyle properties.</p>	<p>Amend allotment sizes in the Rural Production zone, perhaps with a limited number of allotments with minimum areas of 8000m² or 1ha, then 4ha generally after that. Smaller lot sizes should apply for properties (or parts thereof) that do not consist of highly productive land.</p> <p>Perhaps there should be more focus on the size of the balance parcel - subdividing off 4ha to leave a 10ha balance parcel does not protect productivity, while subdividing 1ha off a 200ha block has next to no effect, especially if the smaller block consists of bush.</p> <p>Consequential amendments to RPROZ-R3 Residential activity and SUB-R7 Management plan subdivision.</p>	Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3	
FS368.009	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	RPROZ-R3 - Amend allotment sizes, perhaps with a limited number of allotments of a minimum of 8000m ² or 1ha, then 4ha generally after that. Smaller lot sizes should apply for properties (or parts thereof) that do not consist of highly productive land. ...Consequential amendments to	Allow	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				RPROZ-R3 Residential activity and SUB-R7 Management plan subdivision.				
S319.002	FNR Properties Limited	RPROZ-R3	Oppose	The submitter considers that as RPROZ-R3 will be reducing the permitted threshold from one residential unit per 12ha to one residential unit per 40ha and limiting the total number of residential units on one site in the Rural Production Zone to six is overall a substantial reduction in the permitted residential intensity threshold in the zone and is heavy handed.	Amend RPZ-R3 to allow for a higher residential intensity and/or provide for more options for residential intensity as a controlled, restricted discretionary and discretionary activity.		Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS368.021	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Amend RPZ-R3 to allow for a higher residential intensity and/or provide for more options for residential intensity as a controlled, restricted discretionary and discretionary activity	Allow	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
S477.016	Te Waka Pupuri Putea Trust	RPROZ-R3	Support	As the proprietors of significant holdings within the Rural Production Zone, we are broadly supportive of the proposed changes. We support the preservation of the character of the zone in its restriction on intensification and development and the protection from reverse sensitivity related issues that can arise from activities of this kind. More specifically and for example, we support Rules like RPROZ-R3, RPROZ-R10 and RPROZ-R20 in providing for not only the living environment for our workforce but also the opportunity for rural produce retail and Papakainga housing respectively - the latter being of increasing importance to our whanau, hapu into the future.	Retain Rule RPROZ-R3		Accept in part	Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS354.226	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	The submitter supports the proposed rule as it provides for the preservation	Allow	Allow S477.016	Accept in part	Section 5.2.17

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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 character of the zone in its restriction on intensification and development and the protection from reverse sensitivity related issues that can arise. HortNZ supports that approach.			Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
S55.033	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	RPROZ-R4	Oppose	Visitor accommodation is defined as a sensitive activity and therefore have the potential to cause reverse sensitivity effects on established intensive primary production activities. The potential impact of sensitive activities within the rural production zone should be thoroughly assessed via a consenting process	Amend activity status to RD.	Reject	Section 5.2.18 Key Issue 18: Rule RPROZ-R4
S55.034	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	RPROZ-R4	Oppose	Visitor accommodation is defined as a sensitive activity and therefore have the potential to cause reverse sensitivity effects on established intensive primary production activities. The potential impact of sensitive activities within the rural production zone should be thoroughly assessed via a consenting process	Insert condition for new sensitive activity setback from an existing intensive primary production activity, as per RPROZ-R1	Accept in part	Section 5.2.18 Key Issue 18: Rule RPROZ-R4 Section 5.2.26 Key Issue 26: Standards – General Comments
S355.026	Wakaiti Dalton	RPROZ-R4	Support	We support the intention of this rule.	Retain RPROZ-R4	Accept	Section 5.2.18 Key Issue 18: Rule RPROZ-R4
S386.021	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew	RPROZ-R4	Support	Ballantyne & Agnew support the enablement of visitor accommodation in the PRZ.	Retain as notified.	Accept	Section 5.2.18 Key Issue 18: Rule RPROZ-R4
S425.052	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust	RPROZ-R4	Support in part	PHTTCCT support the provision for visitor accommodation in zones. It is considered that providing for this activity, particularly throughout the Zones that adjoin the Trail as a permitted activity will help activate the Trail and ensure that that the potential in terms of social and economic impact can be realised (noting the comments	Amend RPROZ-R4 "Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The visitor accommodation is within a residential unit, accessory building or minor residential unit.	Reject	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan Wide or Rural Wide Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				made in the Transport Chapter in regards to parking). PHTTCCT acknowledged the rationale behind the inclusion of PER-1 in the Rural Production, Rural Residential, Rural Living and Settlement Zone but considers that this is too blunt given the number of shared access ways within the District and has suggested wording that uses a setback to manage any likely noise or dust effects that could be experienced as a result of sharing an access.	PER-2 The occupancy does not exceed 10 guests per night. PER-3 The site does not share access with another site. Where the site shares access with a The access to the site is set back more than 20m from any residential unit, or minor residential unit on any site that shares the access."		
S479.021	Tracy and Kenneth Dalton	RPROZ-R4	Support	We support the intention of this rule.	Retain as notified.	Accept	Section 5.2.18 Key Issue 18: Rule RPROZ-R4
S159.110	Horticulture New Zealand	RPROZ-R4	Oppose	Ten guests as a permitted activity with a setback of 10m from a boundary is not considered appropriate to manage potential reverse sensitivity effects. The rule does not state the Standards that will apply. The Standards relating to buildings should be included in the rule.	Amend Rule RPROZ-R4 to six guests per night Insert: PER-4 The new building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure complies with standards: RPROZ-S1 Maximum height; RPROZ-S2 Height in relation to boundary; RPROZ-S3 Setback (excluding from MHWS or wetland, lake and river margins) RPROZ-S4 Setback from MHWS RPROZ-S5 Building or structure coverage); RPROZ-S6 Buildings or structures used to house, milk or feed stock (excluding buildings or structures used for an intensive indoor primary production activity)); RPROZ-S7 Sensitive activities setback from boundaries of a Mineral extraction overlay	Reject	Section 5.2.18 Key Issue 18: Rule RPROZ-R4 Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS151.277	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.18 Key Issue 18: Rule RPROZ-R4 Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS570.272	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 5.2.18 Key Issue 18: Rule RPROZ-R4 Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS566.286	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 5.2.18 Key Issue 18: Rule RPROZ-R4 Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS569.308	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 5.2.18 Key Issue 18: Rule RPROZ-R4 Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
S503.031	Waitangi Limited	RPROZ-R4	Not Stated	The Waitangi Treaty grounds has a marae on site which at times could accommodate more than 10 guests per night. Accommodation is not currently offered however, if it was to be offered, we seek that there be no restrictions be imposed in terms of visitor numbers.	Amend PER-1 and PER-2 of Rule RPROZ-R4 as follows: PER-1 The visitor accommodation is within a residential unit, accessory building, or minor residential unit, or marae.		Reject	Section 5.2.18 Key Issue 18: Rule RPROZ-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
					PER-2 The occupancy does not exceed 10 guests per night. With the exception of the Waitangi Estate.		
FS51.284	Heritage New Zealand Pouere Taonga		Support	HNZPT is supportive of these proposed amendments that reflect the management of the Waitangi Estate and Waitangi Treaty Grounds.	Allow	Reject	Section 5.2.18 Key Issue 18: Rule RPROZ-R4
S214.002	Airbnb	RPROZ-R4	Support in part	<p>The proposed district plan allows for visitor accommodation as a permitted activity for less than or equal to 6-10 guests on site. If these conditions are not met, the activity is discretionary except in the settlement zone where it is restricted discretionary. Airbnb supports the overall approach to allow visitor accommodation to occur in all zones and commends the Council's leadership in this space. We would, however, recommend that restrictions around the number of guests be standardised to 10 across the district to account for the range of families that tend to stay in this type of accommodation and would also recommend that properties that do not meet permitted status default to restricted discretionary as opposed to discretionary. This would increase certainty for our Hosts and unlock the full potential of residential visitor accommodation in the district.</p> <p>Airbnb strongly believes that consistency for guests and hosts is important and that a national approach is the most effective way to address these concerns. Kiwis agree with 64% expressing support for national regulation. One example of this type of standardised approach across councils is the Code of Conduct approach as</p>	Amend rules to standardise the guest limit cap for permitted visitor accommodation to 10 across all zones and make the default non-permitted status restricted discretionary (as opposed to Discretionary) across all zones.	Reject	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan Wide or Rural Wide Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				piloted in New South Wales (NSW), Australia (with a robust compliance and enforcement mechanism, perating on a 'two strike' basis whereby bad actors are excluded from participating in the industry for a period of 5 years after repeated breaches of the Code).				
FS23.064	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Support standardizing the number applying to permitted visitor accommodation activities across all zones. Taking a consistent approach will make it easier for the plan provisions to be applied and understood. The effects are not likely to differ significantly in residential zones.	Allow	Allow relief sought.	Reject	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan Wide or Rural Wide Submissions
FS354.227	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	HortNZ does not support a default activity status of restricted discretionary as it does not enable an adequate assessment of effects.	Disallow	Disallow S214.002	Accept	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan Wide or Rural Wide Submissions
S250.021	Willowridge Developments Limited	RPROZ-R4	Support	Support the enablement of visitor accommodation.	Retain as notified.		Accept	Section 5.2.18 Key Issue 18: Rule RPROZ-R4
FS570.707	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 5.2.18 Key Issue 18: Rule RPROZ-R4
FS566.721	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 5.2.18 Key Issue 18: Rule RPROZ-R4
FS569.743	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 5.2.18 Key Issue 18: Rule RPROZ-R4
S425.057	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust	RPROZ-R5	Support	PHTTCCT support the provision for home business in zones. It is considered that providing for this activity as a permitted activity, particularly throughout the zones that adjoin the Trail, will help activate the	Retain as notified		Accept	Section 5.2.19 Key Issue 19: Rule RPROZ-R5

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				Trail and ensure that that the potential in terms of social and economic impact can be realised (noting the comments made in the Transport Chapter in regards to parking).				
S283.030	Trent Simpkin	RPROZ-R5	Oppose	This submission applies to all Building Coverage rules within all zones. Amend to be larger, considering the size of allotments allowed for in the zone.	Amend the maximum building or structure coverage from 12.5% to 20% or offer an alternative pathway around this rule, by inserting a PER-2 which says if a building is above 20% or 2500m2, it is permitted if a visual assessment and landscape plan is provided as part of the building consent.		Reject	Section 5.2.29 Key Issue 29: Standard RPROZ-S5
FS45.18	Tristan Simpkin		Support	Support as per Reasons given in submission	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.29 Key Issue 29: Standard RPROZ-S5
FS570.844	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 5.2.29 Key Issue 29: Standard RPROZ-S5
FS566.858	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 5.2.29 Key Issue 29: Standard RPROZ-S5
FS569.880	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 5.2.29 Key Issue 29: Standard RPROZ-S5
S159.112	Horticulture New Zealand	RPROZ-R5	Support in part	Rule RPROZ-R5 does not state the Standards that will apply. The standards relating to buildings should be included in the rule.	Amend Rule RPROZ-R5 to insert: PER-5 The new building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure complies with standards: RPROZ-S1 Maximum height; RPROZ-S2 Height in relation to boundary; RPROZ-S3 Setback (excluding from MHWS or wetland, lake and river margins) RPROZ-S4 Setback from MHWS		Reject	Section 5.2.19 Key Issue 19: Rule RPROZ-R5 Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					<p>RPROZ-S5 Building or structure coverage}; RPROZ-S6 Buildings or structures used to house, milk or feed stock (excluding buildings or structures used for an intensive indoor primary production activity)}. RPROZ-S7 Sensitive activities setback from boundaries of a Mineral extraction overlay.</p>			
FS151.279	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject	<p>Section 5.2.19 Key Issue 19: Rule RPROZ-R5</p> <p>Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3</p>
FS570.274	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	<p>Section 5.2.19 Key Issue 19: Rule RPROZ-R5</p> <p>Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3</p>
FS566.288	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	<p>Section 5.2.19 Key Issue 19: Rule RPROZ-R5</p> <p>Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3</p>
FS569.310	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	<p>Section 5.2.19 Key Issue 19: Rule RPROZ-R5</p> <p>Section 5.2.17</p>

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
								Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
S502.047	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	RPROZ-R5	Support in part	A home business could be utilizing an existing farm shed on site which may be larger than 40m2. A business may only utilize a portion of that building where the rest is set aside as private space. Utilizing an existing building which exceeds 40m2 should not be a trigger for consent. Moreover, even if a business was utilizing a space greater than 40m2 other standards such as PER-2 & 3 are in place to control the effects such that the effects will be no more than minor on the surrounding environment.	Amend RPROZ-R5 PER-1 The home business is undertaken within:		Reject	Section 5.2.19 Key Issue 19: Rule RPROZ-R5
FS172.217	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.19 Key Issue 19: Rule RPROZ-R5
FS354.228	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	There needs to be a limit on the size of an accessory building otherwise a home business could be significantly larger than anticipated in the rule. If the business exceeds the threshold a consent can be sought.	Disallow	Disallow S502.047	Accept	Section 5.2.19 Key Issue 19: Rule RPROZ-R5
S431.140	John Andrew Riddell	RPROZ-R5	Not Stated	The amendment is necessary in order to achieve the purpose of the Act.	Amend PER-4 of Rule RPROZ-R5 so that the hours of operation apply to when the business is open to the public		Accept	Section 5.2.19 Key Issue 19: Rule RPROZ-R5
FS332.140	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	Section 5.2.19 Key Issue 19: Rule RPROZ-R5
S55.036	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	RPROZ-R6	Oppose	Educational facilities are defined as a sensitive activity and therefore have the potential to cause reverse	Insert condition for new sensitive activity setback from an existing intensive primary production activity, as per RPROZ-R1		Accept in part	Section 5.2.20 Key Issue 20: Rule RPROZ-R6

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				sensitivity effects on established intensive primary production activities. The potential impact of sensitive activities within the rural production zone should be thoroughly assessed via a consenting process			Section 5.2.26 Key Issue 26: Standards – General Comments
S502.048	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	RPROZ-R6	Support in part	It appears that a museum, marae, town hall, community center or similar would not fall under the definition of an accessory building. Buildings of this nature host educational programs often and should be allowed to continue to do so without triggering consent. We seek relief that provision is made such that museums, maraes and other similar buildings could accommodate an educational facility.	Amend RPROZ-R6 PER-1 The educational facility is within a residential unit, accessory building or, minor residential unit- Museum, marae or other similar facility. PER-2 Hours of operation are between; 1. 7am-8pm Monday to Friday. 2. 8am-8pm Weekends and public holidays. PER-3 The number of students attending at one time does not exceed four within a residential unit, accessory building or minor residential unit, excluding those who reside onsite. PER-4 The number of students attending at one time does not exceed the number of people for which a museum, marae or other similar facility has been designed for.	Reject	Section 5.2.20 Key Issue 20: Rule RPROZ-R6
S503.032	Waitangi Limited	RPROZ-R6	Not Stated	It appears that a museum, marae, town hall, or community center may not fall under the definition of an accessory building. Buildings of this nature host educational programs often and should be allowed to continue to do so without triggering consent. We seek relief that provision is made such that museums, maraes and other similar buildings can	Amend PER-1 and PER-3 of Rule RPROZ-R6 as follows: PER-1 The educational facility is within a residential unit, accessory building or, minor residential unit, Museum, marae or other similar facility. PER-3 The number of students attending at one time does not exceed four within a residential unit,	Reject	Section 5.2.20 Key Issue 20: Rule RPROZ-R6

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				accommodate an educational facility as a permitted activity.	<p>accessory building or minor residential unit, excluding those who reside onsite.</p> <p>Insert new PER-4 as follows:</p> <p>PER-4</p> <p>The number of students attending at one time does not exceed the number of people for which a museum, marae or other similar facility has been designed for.</p>			
FS51.14	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support	HNZPT is supportive of these proposed amendments that reflect the management of the Waitangi Estate and Waitangi Treaty Grounds.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.20 Key Issue 20: Rule RPROZ-R6
S159.113	Horticulture New Zealand	RPROZ-R6	Support in part	Educational facilities limited to four students in a residential unit as a permitted activity will ensure that the effects are minor. The rule does not state the Standards that will apply	<p>Amend Rule RPROZ-R6 to insert:</p> <p>PER-4</p> <p>The new building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure complies with standards:</p> <p>RPROZ-S1 Maximum height;</p> <p>RPROZ-S2 Height in relation to boundary;</p> <p>RPROZ-S3 Setback (excluding from MHWS or wetland, lake and river margins)</p> <p>RPROZ-S4 Setback from MHWSRPROZ-S5 Building or structure coverage};</p> <p>RPROZ-S6 Buildings or structures used to house, milk or feed stock (excluding buildings or structures used for an intensive indoor primary production activity)}.</p> <p>RPROZ-S7 Sensitive activities setback from boundaries of a Mineral extraction overlay.</p>		Reject	Section 5.2.20 Key Issue 20: Rule RPROZ-R6 Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS151.280	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.20 Key Issue 20: Rule RPROZ-R6

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
								Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS375.003	Ministry of Education		Oppose	The Proposed District Plan provides for educational facilities as a Permitted activity in the Rural Production Zone where the student roll does not exceed four students. The Ministry's original submission requested this permitted threshold to be increased to 30 to align with the Ministry's pre-school licenses. With regard to additional permitted activity standards for educational facilities (as per RPROZ-R1 PER-2), the Ministry has no concerns with this as they are reasonable and appropriate standards for educational facilities to comply with.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.20 Key Issue 20: Rule RPROZ-R6 Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS570.275	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 5.2.20 Key Issue 20: Rule RPROZ-R6 Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS566.289	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 5.2.20 Key Issue 20: Rule RPROZ-R6 Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
FS569.311	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 5.2.20 Key Issue 20: Rule RPROZ-R6

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
							Section 5.2.17 Key Issue 17: Rule RPROZ-R3
S331.068	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	RPROZ-R6	Support in part	<p>The submitter supports in part RPROZ-R6 Educational Facility, however, in the first instance recommends the inclusion of a new provision (see submission #S331.017) to provide for educational facilities as a permitted activity in the Rural Production zone in the Infrastructure Chapter. In conjunction with this relief, the Ministry seeks the removal of this rule from the Rural Production zone to limit rule duplication.</p> <p>However, if this relief is not granted, the Ministry supports the permitted activity standards to provide for day care facilities in the Rural Production Zone. However, educational facilities with student attendance higher than four will likely be required to support the rural lifestyle environment and suggest student attendance not exceeding 30 to align with Ministry pre-school licenses.</p> <p>The Ministry requests that all educational facilities are enabled in the Rural Production zone to serve the education needs of the rural community and suggest a restricted discretionary activity status where compliance with the permitted standards cannot be achieved, and the following matters of discretion.</p>	<p>Delete RPROZ-R6 Educational Facility Or Amend RPROZ-R6 Educational Facility, as follows: Educational facility Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The educational facility is within a residential unit, accessory building or minor residential unit. PER-2 Hours of operation are between; 1. 7am-8pm Monday to Friday. 2. 8am-8pm Weekends and public holidays. PER-3 The number of students attending at one time does not exceed 30four, excluding those who reside onsite. Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-1, PER-2 or PER-3: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion are restricted to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Design and layout. b. Transport safety and efficiency. c. Scale of activity and hours of operation. d. Infrastructure servicing. e. Potential reverse sensitivity effects on rural production operations. f. Contribution to community cohesiveness. 	Accept in part	<p>Section 5.2.20 Key Issue 20: Rule RPROZ-R6</p> <p>Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan Wide and Rural Wide Submissions</p>

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS548.073	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	Federated Farmers supports the development and maintenance of vibrant rural communities. However, sensitive activities such as educational facilities need to be carefully considered to ensure that they do not impact on existing, lawfully established rural activities. Rural activities are not able to be packaged up and moved elsewhere to deal with any negative effects from other activities.	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.20 Key Issue 20: Rule RPROZ-R6 Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan Wide and Rural Wide Submissions
FS354.229	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	The submitter seeks to increase the size to 30 students as a permitted activity and the default status to restricted discretionary. This is a significant increase in scale and potential effects in the Rural production zone and is not supported.	Disallow	Disallow S331.068	Accept in part	Section 5.2.20 Key Issue 20: Rule RPROZ-R6 Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan Wide and Rural Wide Submissions
S55.035	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	RPROZ-R6	Oppose	Educational facilities are defined as a sensitive activity and therefore have the potential to cause reverse sensitivity effects on established intensive primary production activities. The potential impact of sensitive activities within the rural production zone should be thoroughly assessed via a consenting process	Amend activity status to RD.		Reject	Section 5.2.20 Key Issue 20: Rule RPROZ-R6
FS375.001	Ministry of Education		Oppose	The Ministry understands the submitter's concerns and agree building requirements such as setbacks for sensitive activities are appropriate when siting a school next to existing intensive farming activities to manage reverse sensitivity effects. The Ministry agrees with the adoption of the additional permitted activity standard for educational facilities in the Rural Production Zone. However, the Ministry opposes the	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.20 Key Issue 20: Rule RPROZ-R6

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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>removal of the permitted activity status as it would prevent smaller schools from establishing as permitted in the Rural Production Zone.</p> <p>In the Ministry's original submission, the Ministry requested that educational facilities remain as a Permitted activity (as proposed in the plan) and, where compliance with permitted activity standards are not met, educational facilities become a Restricted Discretionary activity. The Ministry's submission set out matters of discretion relating to the management of reverse sensitivity effects in the Rural Production Zone (one of which is 'potential reverse sensitivity effects on rural production operations'), which is considered to adequately address the submitter's concerns.</p>				
S55.037	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	RPROZ-R6	Oppose	<p>Educational facilities are defined as a sensitive activity and therefore have the potential to cause reverse sensitivity effects on established intensive primary production activities. The potential impact of sensitive activities within the rural production zone should be thoroughly assessed via a consenting process</p>	Insert new standard for new sensitive activity setback from an existing intensive primary production activity, as per RPROZ-R1		Accept in part	<p>Section 5.2.20 Key Issue 20: Rule RPROZ-R6</p> <p>Section 5.2.26 Key Issue 26: Standards – General Comments</p>
FS375.002	Ministry of Education		Oppose	<p>The Ministry understands the submitter's concerns and agree building requirements such as setbacks for sensitive activities are appropriate when siting a school next to existing intensive farming activities to manage reverse sensitivity effects. The Ministry agrees with the adoption of the additional permitted activity standard for educational facilities in the Rural Production Zone.</p>	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	<p>Section 5.2.20 Key Issue 20: Rule RPROZ-R6</p> <p>Section 5.2.26 Key Issue 26: Standards – General Comments</p>

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>However, the Ministry opposes the removal of the permitted activity status as it would prevent smaller schools from establishing as permitted in the Rural Production Zone.</p> <p>In the Ministry's original submission, the Ministry requested that educational facilities remain as a Permitted activity (as proposed in the plan) and, where compliance with permitted activity standards are not met, educational facilities become a Restricted Discretionary activity. The Ministry's submission set out matters of discretion relating to the management of reverse sensitivity effects in the Rural Production Zone (one of which is 'potential reverse sensitivity effects on rural production operations'), which is considered to adequately address the submitter's concerns.</p>			
S55.038	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	RPROZ-R7	Oppose	Support extensive farming activities as permitted without restriction in the rural production zone. Support separate rules for intensive primary production.	Amend rule structure as required to account for the definition of farming including intensive primary production (as per previous submission points).	Reject	Section 5.2.21 Key Issue 21: Rule RPROZ-R7
S182.032	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association	RPROZ-R7	Support in part	Support farming activities as a permitted activity subject to the inclusion of the amendments sought to the definition	Add to the definition of Farming Activity sought by this submission	Reject	Section 5.2.21 Key Issue 21: Rule RPROZ-R7
S355.027	Wakaiti Dalton	RPROZ-R7	Support	We support the intention of this rule.	Retain RPROZ-R7	Accept	Section 5.2.21 Key Issue 21: Rule RPROZ-R7
S479.022	Tracy and Kenneth Dalton	RPROZ-R7	Support	We support the intention of this rule.	Retain as notified.	Accept	Section 5.2.21 Key Issue 21: Rule RPROZ-R7
S222.092	Wendover Two Limited	RPROZ-R7	Support	Rule RPROZ-R7 is supported because it effectively and efficiently enables	Retain Rule RPROZ-R7	Accept	Section 5.2.21

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				farming activities in the zone giving direct effect to the zone's objectives.				Key Issue 21: Rule RPROZ-R7
S339.051	Te Aupōuri Commercial Development Ltd	RPROZ-R7	Support	TACDL supports the intention of this rule.	Retain Rule RPROZ-R7		Accept	Section 5.2.21 Key Issue 21: Rule RPROZ-R7
S421.221	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	RPROZ-R7	Support	Federated Farmers supports farming activity being classified as a permitted activity in the rural production zone.	Retain the permitted activity classification status for farming activities in Rule RPROZ-R7		Accept	Section 5.2.21 Key Issue 21: Rule RPROZ-R7
FS196.106	Joe Carr		Support	farming and forestry are the main stays of the District regional and national economy by earning over 60% of the nation's foreign exchange	Allow		Accept	Section 5.2.21 Key Issue 21: Rule RPROZ-R7
FS570.1453	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 5.2.21 Key Issue 21: Rule RPROZ-R7
FS346.455	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.21 Key Issue 21: Rule RPROZ-R7
FS566.1467	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 5.2.21 Key Issue 21: Rule RPROZ-R7
FS569.1489	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 5.2.21 Key Issue 21: Rule RPROZ-R7
S243.117	Matauri Trustee Limited	RPROZ-R7	Support	Rule RPROZ-R7 is supported because it effectively and efficiently enables farming activities in the zone giving direct effect to the zone's objectives.	Retain Rule RPROZ-R7		Accept	Section 5.2.21 Key Issue 21: Rule RPROZ-R7

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS570.675	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 5.2.21 Key Issue 21: Rule RPROZ-R7
FS566.689	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 5.2.21 Key Issue 21: Rule RPROZ-R7
FS569.711	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 5.2.21 Key Issue 21: Rule RPROZ-R7
S167.099	Bentzen Farm Limited	RPROZ-R7	Support	Rule RPROZ-R7 is supported because it effectively and efficiently enables farming activities in the zone giving direct effect to the zone's objectives.	Retain Rule RPROZ-R7		Accept	Section 5.2.21 Key Issue 21: Rule RPROZ-R7
FS566.461	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 5.2.21 Key Issue 21: Rule RPROZ-R7
S182.033	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association	RPROZ-R8	Support in part	Support conservation activities as a permitted activity subject to the inclusion of the amendments sought to the definition	Retain subject to adding to the definition of Conservation Activity as sought by this submission		Accept in part	Section 5.2.22 Key Issue 22: Rules RPROZ-R8 – R12
S333.088	P S Yates Family Trust	RPROZ-R8	Support	Rule RPROZ-R8 is supported because it enables conservation activities, thereby giving effect to wider. District Plan objectives and policies such as "CE-P8 Encourage the restoration and enhancement of the natural character of the coastal environment".	Retain Rule RPROZ-R8		Accept	Section 5.2.22 Key Issue 22: Rules RPROZ-R8 – R12
S355.028	Wakaiti Dalton	RPROZ-R8	Support	We support the intention of this rule.	Retain RPROZ-R8		Accept	Section 5.2.22 Key Issue 22: Rules RPROZ-R8 – R12
S168.096	Setar Thirty Six Limited	RPROZ-R8	Support	Rule RPROZ-R8 is supported because it enables conservation activities, thereby giving effect to wider District Plan objectives and policies such as "CE-P8 Encourage the restoration and	Retain Rule RPROZ-R8		Accept	Section 5.2.22 Key Issue 22: Rules RPROZ-R8 – R12

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				enhancement of the natural character of the coastal environment".				
S187.087	The Shooting Box Limited	RPROZ-R8	Support	Rule RPROZ-R8 is supported because it enables conservation activities, thereby giving effect to wider District Plan objectives and policies such as "CE-P8 Encourage the restoration and enhancement of the natural character of the coastal environment".	Retain Rule RPROZ-R8.		Accept	Section 5.2.22 Key Issue 22: Rules RPROZ-R8 – R12
S479.023	Tracy and Kenneth Dalton	RPROZ-R8	Support	We support the intention of this rule.	Retain as notified.		Accept	Section 5.2.22 Key Issue 22: Rules RPROZ-R8 – R12
S222.093	Wendover Two Limited	RPROZ-R8	Support	Rule RPROZ-R8 is supported because it enables conservation activities, thereby giving effect to wider District Plan objectives and policies such as "CE-P8 Encourage the restoration and enhancement of the natural character of the coastal environment".	Retain Rule RPROZ-R8		Accept	Section 5.2.22 Key Issue 22: Rules RPROZ-R8 – R12
S339.052	Te Aupōuri Commercial Development Ltd	RPROZ-R8	Support	TACDL supports the intention of this rule.	Retain Rule RPROZ-R8		Accept	Section 5.2.22 Key Issue 22: Rules RPROZ-R8 – R12
S243.118	Matauri Trustee Limited	RPROZ-R8	Support	Rule RPROZ-R8 is supported because it enables conservation activities, thereby giving effect to wider District Plan objectives and policies such as "CE-P8 Encourage the restoration and enhancement of the natural character of the coastal environment".	Retain Rule RPROZ-R8		Accept	Section 5.2.22 Key Issue 22: Rules RPROZ-R8 – R12
FS570.676	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 5.2.22 Key Issue 22: Rules RPROZ-R8 – R12
FS566.690	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 5.2.22 Key Issue 22: Rules RPROZ-R8 – R12

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS569.712	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 5.2.22 Key Issue 22: Rules RPROZ-R8 – R12
S167.100	Benzen Farm Limited	RPROZ-R8	Support	Rule RPROZ-R8 is supported because it enables conservation activities, thereby giving effect to wider District Plan objectives and policies such as "CE-P8 Encourage the restoration and enhancement of the natural character of the coastal environment".	Retain Rule RPROZ-R8		Accept	Section 5.2.22 Key Issue 22: Rules RPROZ-R8 – R12
FS566.462	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow		Reject	Section 5.2.22 Key Issue 22: Rules RPROZ-R8 – R12
S386.022	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew	RPROZ-R9	Support in part	As outlined above, the rule title is inconsistent with the defined term 'Recreation Activity' in the Definitions Chapter. It is considered that this should be revised to improve consistency and legibility.	Amend to be consistent with definition.		Accept	Section 5.2.22 Key Issue 22: Rules RPROZ-R8 – R12
S250.022	Willowridge Developments Limited	RPROZ-R9	Support in part	The rule title is inconsistent with the defined term 'Recreation Activity' in the Definitions Chapter, should be revised to improve consistency and legibility.	Amend RPROZ-R9 to be consistent with definition.		Accept	Section 5.2.22 Key Issue 22: Rules RPROZ-R8 – R12
FS570.708	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 5.2.22 Key Issue 22: Rules RPROZ-R8 – R12
FS566.722	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 5.2.22 Key Issue 22: Rules RPROZ-R8 – R12
FS569.744	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 5.2.22 Key Issue 22: Rules RPROZ-R8 – R12
S355.029	Wakaiti Dalton	RPROZ-R10	Support in part	We support the intention of this rule, however, it is unclear why a 30m setback from any 'internal' boundary is required. Particularly as 'internal	Amend RPROZ-R10 to delete the 30m setback in RPROZ-R10-PER-1.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.22 Key Issue 22: Rules RPROZ-R8 – R12

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				boundary' is not a defined term and it is unclear what this relates to. Further, there are already appropriate setbacks in place by RPROZ-S3.				
S479.024	Tracy and Kenneth Dalton	RPROZ-R10	Support in part	We support the intention of this rule, however, it is unclear why a 30m setback from any 'internal' boundary is required. Particularly as 'internal boundary' is not a defined term and it is unclear what this relates to. Further, there are already appropriate setbacks in place by RPROZ-S3.	Amend RPROZ-R10 to delete the 30m setback in RPROZ-R10-PER-1.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.22 Key Issue 22: Rules RPROZ-R8 – R12
S421.222	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	RPROZ-R10	Support in part	While Federated Farmers supports the permitted activity classification for rural produce retail, we question the requirement in performance standard PER-1 for this to be set back a minimum of 30m from any internal boundaries. Stands and stalls for farm produce need to be located where they are visible from the road. A 30m setback is onerous and unrealistic.	Amend PER-1 of Rule RPROZ-R10 to delete the 30m setback requirement, or if Council is not inclined to accept the above relief, amend to reduce the setback from 30m to 5m		Accept in part	Section 5.2.22 Key Issue 22: Rules RPROZ-R8 – R12
FS172.327	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons stated in this primary submission.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.22 Key Issue 22: Rules RPROZ-R8 – R12
FS196.105	Joe Carr		Support	realistic	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.22 Key Issue 22: Rules RPROZ-R8 – R12
FS570.1454	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 5.2.22 Key Issue 22: Rules RPROZ-R8 – R12
FS346.456	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.22 Key Issue 22: Rules RPROZ-R8 – R12

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS566.1468	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 5.2.22 Key Issue 22: Rules RPROZ-R8 – R12
FS569.1490	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 5.2.22 Key Issue 22: Rules RPROZ-R8 – R12
S477.017	Te Waka Pupuri Putea Trust	RPROZ-R10	Support	<p>As the proprietors of significant holdings within the Rural Production Zone, we are broadly supportive of the proposed changes. We support the preservation of the character of the zone in its restriction on intensification and development and the protection from reverse sensitivity related issues that can arise from activities of this kind.</p> <p>More specifically and for example, we support Rules like RPROZ-R3, RPROZ-R10 and RPROZ-R20 in providing for not only the living environment for our workforce but also the opportunity for rural produce retail and Papakainga housing respectively - the latter being of increasing importance to our whanau, hapu into the future.</p>	Retain Rule RPROZ-R10		Accept	Section 5.2.22 Key Issue 22: Rules RPROZ-R8 – R12
FS354.230	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	HortNZ supports the rule for rural produce retail.	Allow	Allow S477.017	Accept	Section 5.2.22 Key Issue 22: Rules RPROZ-R8 – R12
S355.030	Wakaiti Dalton	RPROZ-R11	Support	We support the intention of this rule.	Retain RPROZ-R11		Accept in part	Section 5.2.22 Key Issue 22: Rules RPROZ-R8 – R12
S479.025	Tracy and Kenneth Dalton	RPROZ-R11	Support	We support the intention of this rule.	Retain as notified.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.22 Key Issue 22: Rules RPROZ-R8 – R12
S339.053	Te Aupōuri Commercial	RPROZ-R11	Not Stated	TACDL supports rural produce manufacturing activities as this aligns	Amend PER-1 of Rule RPROZ-R11 to increase the GFA thresholds.		Accept	Section 5.2.22

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
	Development Ltd			with TACDL's development aspirations to provide economic and employment opportunities to improve the wellbeing of their people. In the absence of section 32 analysis of these provisions, TACDL seek increased thresholds to enable greater flexibility.			Key Issue 22: Rules RPROZ-R8 – R12
S159.114	Horticulture New Zealand	RPROZ-R11	Support in part	There should be provision for small scale rural industry as a permitted activity. Rural produce manufacturing is a rural industry so the rule would be better titled rural industry.	Amend the title of Rule RPROZ-R11 to 'Rural industry' and change all reference to 'rural produce manufacturing' in the rule to 'rural industry'. Amend default status to Restricted Discretionary activity and include matters of discretion as follows- Matters of discretion are restricted to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the character and appearance of the building(s) 2. the siting of the building(s) and outdoor areas including parking relative to adjoining sites; 3. whether the building(s) are visually dominant and create a loss of privacy for surrounding residential units and their associated outdoor areas; 4. ability of the supporting roading network to cater for the additional traffic; 5. servicing requirements and any constraints of the site; 6. whether the location of the building(s) and the rural industry is compatible with adjacent and surrounding primary production activities; 7. whether the layout of the development maintains the existing rural character of the surrounding area; 8. any lighting or noise effects; 	Accept in part	Section 5.2.22 Key Issue 22: Rules RPROZ-R8 – R12

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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>9. the frequency of the use, hours and days of operation and the number of people employed;</p> <p>10. any natural hazard affecting the site or surrounding area.</p>			
FS151.281	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.22 Key Issue 22: Rules RPROZ-R8 – R12
FS570.276	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 5.2.22 Key Issue 22: Rules RPROZ-R8 – R12
FS566.290	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 5.2.22 Key Issue 22: Rules RPROZ-R8 – R12
FS569.312	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 5.2.22 Key Issue 22: Rules RPROZ-R8 – R12
S421.223	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	RPROZ-R11	Support in part	Federated Farmer supports the intent of rule RPZOZ-R11 but does not the proposed building gross floor area of 100m ² . The size is unrealistic for rural production activities and should be increased to a minimum of 250m ² .	Amend Rule RPROZ-R11 to reduce the gross floor area for rural produce manufacturing from 100m ² to 250m		Accept in part	Section 5.2.22 Key Issue 22: Rules RPROZ-R8 – R12
FS172.328	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons stated in this primary submission.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.22 Key Issue 22: Rules RPROZ-R8 – R12
FS570.1455	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 5.2.22 Key Issue 22: Rules RPROZ-R8 – R12
FS346.457	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.22 Key Issue 22: Rules RPROZ-R8 – R12

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.				
FS566.1469	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 5.2.22 Key Issue 22: Rules RPROZ-R8 – R12
FS569.1491	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 5.2.22 Key Issue 22: Rules RPROZ-R8 – R12
S421.224	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	RPROZ-R12	Support	Federated Farmers supports farm quarries being classified as a permitted activity in the rural production zone.	Retain the permitted activity classification status for farming activities in Rule RPROZ-R12		Accept	Section 5.2.22 Key Issue 22: Rules RPROZ-R8 – R12
FS196.100	Joe Carr		Support		Allow		Accept	Section 5.2.22 Key Issue 22: Rules RPROZ-R8 – R12
FS196.104	Joe Carr		Support		Allow		Accept	Section 5.2.22 Key Issue 22: Rules RPROZ-R8 – R12
FS570.1456	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 5.2.22 Key Issue 22: Rules RPROZ-R8 – R12
FS346.458	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.22 Key Issue 22: Rules RPROZ-R8 – R12
FS566.1470	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 5.2.22 Key Issue 22: Rules RPROZ-R8 – R12
FS569.1492	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 5.2.22 Key Issue 22: Rules RPROZ-R8 – R12

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S148.047	Summit Forests New Zealand Limited	RPROZ-R12	Not Stated	Consistent with SFNZ's submission on the definition of "Farm Quarry", the rule needs to provide for quarrying for use within the same management unit and include production forestry subject to the provisions of the NES-PF.	Amend RPROZ-R12 to refer to "Farm/Forestry Quarry" and include a further clause under PER-1 that reads "subject to the provisions of the NES-PF".		Reject	Section 5.2.22 Key Issue 22: Rules RPROZ-R8 – R12
FS346.553	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS. Loss of natural character, coastal environment values and the values of outstanding landscapes could also result.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.22 Key Issue 22: Rules RPROZ-R8 – R12
FS566.159	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 5.2.22 Key Issue 22: Rules RPROZ-R8 – R12
S386.023	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew	RPROZ-R15	Support in part	There is an error in the rule title	Amend to delete the repeated 'and'.		Accept	Section 5.2.23 Key Issue 23: Rules RPROZ-R15, R16 and R18
S339.054	Te Aupōuri Commercial Development Ltd	RPROZ-R15	Not Stated	There is an error in the rule title. Otherwise, they are supportive of the intention of this rule.	Amend the title of Rule RPROZ-R15 to delete the repeated word 'and'.		Accept	Section 5.2.23 Key Issue 23: Rules RPROZ-R15, R16 and R18
S148.048	Summit Forests New Zealand Limited	RPROZ-R15	Oppose	SFNZ opposes the requirement that plantation forestry and plantation forestry activities do not occur on versatile soils. There are no provisions within the NES-PF that would allow Council to apply a more stringent rule in this regard. Specifically, "An NES prevails over district or regional plan rules except where the NES-PF specifically	Amend RPROZ-R15 by deleting PER-1 "It is not located on versatile soils" and change "Activity status where compliance not achieved" to "Not Applicable".		Accept in part	Section 5.2.23 Key Issue 23: Rules RPROZ-R15, R16 and R18 Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan Wide or Rural Wide Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				allows more stringent plan rules". The National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land does not support such an approach.				
FS85.43	PF Olsen Ltd		Support	PF Olsen supports SFNZL's submission to delete PER-1, as this does not take into account Policy 4 of the National Policy Statement of Highly Productive Land. According to NPS-HPL, land-based primary production means production, from agricultural, pastoral, horticultural, or forestry activities. There is no reason for forestry activity not to be allowed on LUC 1, 2, or 3 land. This should be a decision of the landowner, not the Council.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.23 Key Issue 23: Rules RPROZ-R15, R16 and R18 Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan Wide or Rural Wide Submissions
FS346.554	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS. Loss of natural character, coastal environment values and the values of outstanding landscapes could also result.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.23 Key Issue 23: Rules RPROZ-R15, R16 and R18 Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan Wide or Rural Wide Submissions
FS566.160	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 5.2.23 Key Issue 23: Rules RPROZ-R15, R16 and R18 Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan Wide or Rural Wide Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S160.040	Manulife Forest Management (NZ) Ltd	RPROZ-R15	Support in part	The submitter supports in part rule RPROZ-R15 and considers that versatile soils should be available to be used by all primary production as production forestry can be planted, harvested, and converted back to horticulture or farming land.	Amend rule RPROZ-R15 to delete PER-1		Accept	Section 5.2.23 Key Issue 23: Rules RPROZ-R15, R16 and R18 Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan Wide or Rural Wide Submissions
FS85.44	PF Olsen Ltd		Support	PF Olsen supports Manulife's submission to delete PER-1, as this does not take into account Policy 4 of the National Policy Statement of Highly Productive Land. According to NPS-HPL, land-based primary production means production, from agricultural, pastoral, horticultural, or forestry activities. There is no reason for forestry activity not to be allowed on LUC 1, 2, or 3 land. This should be a decision of the landowner, not the Council.	Allow		Accept	Section 5.2.23 Key Issue 23: Rules RPROZ-R15, R16 and R18 Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan Wide or Rural Wide Submissions
FS346.610	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS. Loss of natural character, coastal environment values and the values of outstanding landscapes could also result.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.23 Key Issue 23: Rules RPROZ-R15, R16 and R18 Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan Wide or Rural Wide Submissions
S250.023	Willowridge Developments Limited	RPROZ-R15	Support in part	There is an error in the rule title.	Amend RPROZ-R15 to delete the repeated 'and'.		Accept	Section 5.2.23 Key Issue 23: Rules RPROZ-R15, R16 and R18

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS570.709	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 5.2.23 Key Issue 23: Rules RPROZ-R15, R16 and R18
FS566.723	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 5.2.23 Key Issue 23: Rules RPROZ-R15, R16 and R18
FS569.745	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 5.2.23 Key Issue 23: Rules RPROZ-R15, R16 and R18
S91.021	PF Olsen Limited	RPROZ-R15	Oppose	<p>Regulation 6 of the National Environmental Standards for Plantation Forestry establishes where councils may have more stringent rules than the National Environmental Standard. There is no provision for the plan to contain rule RPROZ-R15.</p> <p>The section 32 analysis is flawed in its legal argument. Just because the NES-PF does not state which natural and physical resources are not regulated under its provisions, this does not mean that they are out of scope. The stated application of the NES-PF is very clear. There is no section 43(5)(b) of the RMA. Plantation forestry is not an irreversible land use and will not compromise the soil for other primary production activities.</p> <p>Perverse outcomes would be expected if certain primary production activities are segmented into Land Use Capability classes (versatile soils). Allowing all primary production activities in the Rural Production Zone enables the land manager to choose the appropriate use of the land.</p>	Amend Rule RPROZ-R15 by deleting PER-1		Accept	<p>Section 5.2.23 Key Issue 23: Rules RPROZ-R15, R16 and R18</p> <p>Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan Wide or Rural Wide Submissions</p>

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS566.110	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 5.2.23 Key Issue 23: Rules RPROZ-R15, R16 and R18 Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan Wide or Rural Wide Submissions
S502.049	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	RPROZ-R16	Support in part	This enables existing smaller scale marae outside of the Māori purpose zone to undertake a minor alteration to their buildings without triggering resource consent. This is considered to be a benefit to the local Māori community.	Amend the heading of RPROZ-R16 ROROZ-R16 Additions or alterations to an existing Community Facility or Marae		Reject	Section 5.2.23 Key Issue 23: Rules RPROZ-R15, R16 and R18
FS51.4	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support	HNZPT supports the benefit this will provide to both the wider community and the local Māori communities whose marae are not located within the Māori Purpose zone.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.23 Key Issue 23: Rules RPROZ-R15, R16 and R18
S316.001	FNR Properties Limited	RPROZ-R18	Support	FNR Properties support this provision as it specifically provides for such activity to occur within the RPZ and largely represents a positive change for existing activities occurring on site.	Retain Rule RPROZ-R18		Accept	Section 5.2.23 Key Issue 23: Rules RPROZ-R15, R16 and R18
S511.120	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	RPROZ-R18	Oppose	This activity should only be permitted in the Mineral Extraction Overlay. This rule covers the same thing as the ME rule on prospecting and exploration just not in the ME Overlay.	Amend to change activity status to Controlled (inferred reference to RPROZ-R18)		Reject	Section 5.2.23 Key Issue 23: Rules RPROZ-R15, R16 and R18
FS164.120	Scrumptious Fruit Trust		Support	Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and secondly as passive	Allow	Amend HNC overlay to include Taupo Bay; Amend provisions to require strong wildlife protection; Amend provisions to require dogs on leash in beach	Reject	Section 5.2.23 Key Issue 23: Rules RPROZ-R15, R16 and R18

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.		areas; Adopt SNA and HNC provisions (inferred).		
FS548.170	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	The Rural Production Zone is of great interest and importance to our member and Federated Farmers submitted on various provisions within the Rural Production Zone chapter. Given the lack of clarity in what provisions the submitter is addressing we wish to retain scope in the discussion in case the provisions are relevant to us.	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Accept	Section 5.2.23 Key Issue 23: Rules RPROZ-R15, R16 and R18
FS570.1691	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.23 Key Issue 23: Rules RPROZ-R15, R16 and R18
FS566.1705	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.23 Key Issue 23: Rules RPROZ-R15, R16 and R18
FS569.1727	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.23 Key Issue 23: Rules RPROZ-R15, R16 and R18
S442.139	Kapiro Conservation Trust	RPROZ-R18	Oppose	This activity should only be permitted in the Mineral Extraction Overlay. This rule covers the same thing as the ME rule on prospecting and exploration just not in the ME Overlay.	Amend to change activity status to Controlled (inferred reference to RPROZ-R18)		Reject	Section 5.2.23 Key Issue 23: Rules RPROZ-R15, R16 and R18

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS346.750	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS and Part 2 of the RMA and the NPS IB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.23 Key Issue 23: Rules RPROZ-R15, R16 and R18
S36.001	Glen Nathan	RPROZ-R19	Oppose	The proposed gross floor area for minor residential units is 65m2. Submitter considers that this should be increased to 75m2 for minor residential units which have been modified or built for wheelchair accessibility (wider doorways, accessible bathrooms, ramps, provision of lower benches in kitchens). Submitter also considers that Internal access garages should also be increased from 18m2 to 24m2 to allow for room to transfer from wheelchair to vehicle.	Amend the maximum GFA for minor residential units from 65m2 to 75m2 (specifically for minor residential units which have been modified or built for wheelchair accessibility) and increase maximum GFA for internal access garages from 18m2 to 24m2, to allow room to transfer from wheelchair to vehicle.		Reject	Section 5.2.24 Key Issue 24: Rule RPROZ-R19
S333.089	P S Yates Family Trust	RPROZ-R19	Support in part	This rule should be a permitted activity, and it is unclear from the drafting whether that was in fact the intent. The matters sought to be managed by the rules (density, access, separation distance and size) are easily controlled by the standards at CON-1 to CON-5. Council is able to ascertain compliance with these matters at building consent stage, with the requirement for a controlled activity resource consent unnecessary. The requirement that the separation distance between the minor residential unit and the principal residential unit does not exceed 15m should be deleted. There are many site-specific characterises which may necessitate a greater separation distance, including availability o a suitable building platform and the desirability of screening the minor unit. The size limit	Amend the activity status for minor residential units RPROZ-R19 from controlled to permitted, where the standards are complied with Amend CON to PER in the rule. Delete the requirement that the separation distance between the minor residential unit and the principal residential unit does not exceed 15m (CON-4) .		Accept in part	Section 5.2.24 Key Issue 24: Rule RPROZ-R19

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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 65m2 as proposed effectively controls the risk of the proliferation of minor units as de-facto gull dwellings			
S355.031	Wakaiti Dalton	RPROZ-R19	Support in part	We support the inclusion of a minor residential unit rule, however, considers this can be appropriately managed as a permitted activity with the same clauses applied. Further, it is noted that this rule does not contain any matters of control making it unclear which matters/effects require assessment and what the parameters of control are.	Amend activity status to make a permitted activity.	Accept	Section 5.2.24 Key Issue 24: Rule RPROZ-R19
S168.097	Setar Thirty Six Limited	RPROZ-R19	Oppose	This rule should be a permitted activity and it is unclear from the drafting whether that was in fact the intent. The matters sought to be managed by the rules (density, access, separation distance and size) are easily controlled by the standards at CON-1 to CON-5. Council is able to ascertain compliance with these matters at building consent stage, with the requirement for a controlled activity resource consent unnecessary. The requirement that the separation distance between the minor residential unit and the principal residential unit does not exceed 15m should be deleted. There are many site-specific characterises which may necessitate a greater separation distance, including availability of a suitable building platform and the desirability of screening the minor unit. The size limit of 65m ² as proposed effectively controls the risk of the proliferation of minor units as de-facto gull dwellings.	Amend the activity status for Minor residential units RPROZ-R19 from controlled to permitted, where the standards are complied with. Replace CON to PER in the rule. Delete the requirement that the separation distance between the minor residential unit and the principal residential unit does not exceed 15m (CON-4).	Accept in part	Section 5.2.24 Key Issue 24: Rule RPROZ-R19
S187.088	The Shooting Box Limited	RPROZ-R19	Oppose	Refer to submission for detailed reasons for decision(s) requested relating, but not limited to, to the	Amend the activity status for Minor residential units RPROZ-R19 from controlled to permitted, where the standards are complied with.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.24 Key Issue 24: Rule RPROZ-R19

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				following: this rule should be a permitted activity and it is unclear from the drafting whether that was in fact that intent; the matters sought to be managed by the rules are easily controlled by the standards at CON-1-CON-5 - Council able to ascertain compliance with these matters at building consent stage, with the requirement for a controlled activity resource consent unnecessary; and the requirement that the separation distance between the minor residential unit and the principal residential unit does not exceed 15m should be deleted.	Replace CON to PER in the rule. Delete the requirement that the separation distance between the minor residential unit and the principal residential unit does not exceed 15m (CON-4).		
S386.024	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew	RPROZ-R19	Support in part	Ballantyne & Agnew support the inclusion of a minor residential unit rule, however, considers this can be appropriately managed as a permitted activity with the same clauses applied. Further, it is noted that this rule does not contain any matters of control making it unclear which matters/effects require assessment and what the parameters of control are.	Amend activity status to make a permitted activity.	Accept	Section 5.2.24 Key Issue 24: Rule RPROZ-R19
S479.026	Tracy and Kenneth Dalton	RPROZ-R19	Support in part	We support the inclusion of a minor residential unit rule, however, considers this can be appropriately managed as a permitted activity with the same clauses applied. Further, it is noted that this rule does not contain any matters of control making it unclear which matters/effects require assessment and what the parameters of control are.	Amend activity status to make a permitted activity.	Accept	Section 5.2.24 Key Issue 24: Rule RPROZ-R19
S222.094	Wendover Two Limited	RPROZ-R19	Oppose	This rule should be a permitted activity and it is unclear from the drafting whether that was in fact the intent. The matters sought to be managed by the rules(density, access, separation	Amend the activity status for Minor residential units RPROZ-R19 from controlled to permitted, where the standards are complied with. Activity status: Controlled Delete CON-4The separation distance between	Accept in part	Section 5.2.24 Key Issue 24: Rule RPROZ-R19

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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>distance and size) are easily controlled by the standards at CON-1 to CON-5. Council is able to ascertain compliance with these matters at building consent stage, with the requirement for a controlled activity resource consent unnecessary.</p> <p>The requirement that the separation distance between the minor residential unit and the principal residential unit does not exceed 15m should be deleted. There are many site-specific characterises which may necessitate a greater separation distance, including availability o a suitable building platform and the desirability of screening the minor unit. The size limit of 65m² as proposed effectively controls the risk of the proliferation of minor units as de-facto gull dwellings.</p>	the minor residential unit and the principal residential unit does not exceed 15m.		
S310.003	Lianne Kennedy	RPROZ-R19	Oppose	<p>There needs to be a distance of at least 30m to ensure quiet enjoyment of the minor residential unit. As is seen at multiple properties close together, disputes arise where there is not a healthy amount of space between dwellings. The issue of sharing a driveway and then a distance between of no more than 15m raises safety concerns - how many children are run over in their/shared driveways each year in New Zealand?</p>	<p>Amend rule RPROZ-R19 to retain at least the existing rule: 'the separation distance of the minor dwelling unit is no greater than 30m from the principal dwelling'. The same should also apply:</p> <p>In considering an application under this provision, the Council will restrict the exercise of its control to the following matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) the extent of the separation between the principal dwelling and the minor residential unit; ii) the degree to which design is compatible with the principal dwelling; iii) the extent that services can be shared; iv) the ability to mitigate any adverse effects by way of provision of landscaping and screening; v) the location of the unit. 	Reject	Section 5.2.24 Key Issue 24: Rule RPROZ-R19
FS297.4	Wilson Hookway		Support	The separation distance of 15m is too restrictive. It should be at least 30m in	Allow	Reject	Section 5.2.24

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				order to provide for adequate space to accommodate shared gardening/ landscaping, and driveway turning and manoeuvring areas.				Key Issue 24: Rule RPROZ-R19
FS100.20	Allen Hookway		Support	The separation distance of 15m is too restrictive. It should be at least 30m in order to provide for adequate space to accommodate shared gardening/ landscaping, and driveway turning and manoeuvring areas.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.24 Key Issue 24: Rule RPROZ-R19
FS100.22	Allen Hookway		Support	The separation distance of 15m is too restrictive. It should be at least 30m in order to provide for adequate space to accommodate shared gardening/ landscaping, and driveway turning and manoeuvring areas.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.24 Key Issue 24: Rule RPROZ-R19
FS293.4	Danielle Hookway		Support	The separation distance of 15m is too restrictive. It should be at least 30m in order to provide for adequate space to accommodate shared gardening/ landscaping, and driveway turning and manoeuvring areas.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.24 Key Issue 24: Rule RPROZ-R19
FS257.4	Amber Hookway		Support	The separation distance of 15m is too restrictive. It should be at least 30m in order to provide for adequate space to accommodate shared gardening/ landscaping, and driveway turning and manoeuvring areas.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.24 Key Issue 24: Rule RPROZ-R19
FS256.20	Lianne Kennedy		Support	The separation distance of 15m is too restrictive. It should be at least 30m in order to provide for adequate space to accommodate shared gardening/ landscaping, and driveway turning and manoeuvring areas.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.24 Key Issue 24: Rule RPROZ-R19
FS570.902	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 5.2.24 Key Issue 24: Rule RPROZ-R19

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS566.916	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 5.2.24 Key Issue 24: Rule RPROZ-R19
FS569.938	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 5.2.24 Key Issue 24: Rule RPROZ-R19
S261.003	Amber Hookway	RPROZ-R19	Oppose	Opposes the change from: "the separation distance of the minor residential unit is no greater than 30m from the principal dwelling" to "The separation distance between the minor residential unit and the principal residential unit does not exceed 15m". There needs to be a distance of at least 30m to ensure quiet enjoyment of the minor residential unit. As is seen at multiple properties close together disputes arise where there is not a healthy amount of space between dwellings - noise etc. The issue of sharing a driveway and then a distance between of no more than 15 metres raises safety concerns - how many children are run over in their/shared driveways each year in NZ.	Amend to reinstate the equivalent Operative District Plan rule (the separation distance of the minor residential unit is no greater than 30m from the principal dwelling)		Reject	Section 5.2.24 Key Issue 24: Rule RPROZ-R19
FS297.28	Wilson Hookway		Support	The separation distance of 15m is too restrictive. It should be at least 30m in order to provide for adequate space to accommodate shared gardening/ landscaping, and driveway turning and manoeuvring areas.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.24 Key Issue 24: Rule RPROZ-R19
FS100.15	Allen Hookway		Support	The separation distance of 15m is too restrictive. It should be 30m in order to provide for adequate space to accommodate shared gardening/ landscaping, and driveway turning and manoeuvring areas.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.24 Key Issue 24: Rule RPROZ-R19
FS100.19	Allen Hookway		Support	The separation distance of 15m is too restrictive. It should be at least 30m in	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.24

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				order to provide for adequate space to accommodate shared gardening/ landscaping, and driveway turning and manoeuvring areas.				Key Issue 24: Rule RPROZ-R19
FS293.28	Danielle Hookway		Support	The separation distance of 15m is too restrictive. It should be at least 30m in order to provide for adequate space to accommodate shared gardening/ landscaping, and driveway turning and manoeuvring areas.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.24 Key Issue 24: Rule RPROZ-R19
FS257.27	Amber Hookway		Support	The separation distance of 15m is too restrictive. It should be at least 30m in order to provide for adequate space to accommodate shared gardening/ landscaping, and driveway turning and manoeuvring areas.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.24 Key Issue 24: Rule RPROZ-R19
FS256.16	Lianne Kennedy		Support	The separation distance of 15m is too restrictive. It should be at least 30m in order to provide for adequate space to accommodate shared gardening/ landscaping, and driveway turning and manoeuvring areas.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.24 Key Issue 24: Rule RPROZ-R19
S264.003	Wilson Hookway	RPROZ-R19	Oppose	Opposes the change from: "the separation distance of the minor residential unit is no greater than 30m from the principal dwelling" to "The separation distance between the minor residential unit and the principal residential unit does not exceed 15m". There needs to be a distance of at least 30m to ensure quiet enjoyment of the minor residential unit. As is seen at multiple properties close together disputes arise where there is not a healthy amount of space between dwellings - noise etc. The issue of sharing a driveway and then a distance between of no more than 15 metres raises safety concerns - how many	Amend to reinstate the equivalent Operative District Plan rule (the separation distance of the minor residential unit is no greater than 30m from the principal dwelling)		Reject	Section 5.2.24 Key Issue 24: Rule RPROZ-R19

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				children are run over in their/shared driveways each year in NZ.				
FS297.29	Wilson Hookway		Support	The separation distance of 15m is too restrictive. It should be at least 30m in order to provide for adequate space to accommodate shared gardening/ landscaping, and driveway turning and manoeuvring areas.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.24 Key Issue 24: Rule RPROZ-R19
FS100.16	Allen Hookway		Support	The separation distance of 15m is too restrictive. It should be 30m in order to provide for adequate space to accommodate shared gardening/ landscaping, and driveway turning and manoeuvring areas.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.24 Key Issue 24: Rule RPROZ-R19
FS100.18	Allen Hookway		Support	The separation distance of 15m is too restrictive. It should be at least 30m in order to provide for adequate space to accommodate shared gardening/ landscaping, and driveway turning and manoeuvring areas.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.24 Key Issue 24: Rule RPROZ-R19
FS293.29	Danielle Hookway		Support	The separation distance of 15m is too restrictive. It should be at least 30m in order to provide for adequate space to accommodate shared gardening/ landscaping, and driveway turning and manoeuvring areas.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.24 Key Issue 24: Rule RPROZ-R19
FS257.28	Amber Hookway		Support	The separation distance of 15m is too restrictive. It should be at least 30m in order to provide for adequate space to accommodate shared gardening/ landscaping, and driveway turning and manoeuvring areas.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.24 Key Issue 24: Rule RPROZ-R19
FS256.17	Lianne Kennedy		Support	The separation distance of 15m is too restrictive. It should be at least 30m in order to provide for adequate space to accommodate shared gardening/ landscaping, and driveway turning and manoeuvring areas.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.24 Key Issue 24: Rule RPROZ-R19

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S309.003	Danielle Hookway	RPROZ-R19	Oppose	There needs to be a distance of at least 30m to ensure quiet enjoyment of the minor residential unit. As is seen at multiple properties close together, disputes arise where there is not a healthy amount of space between dwellings. The issue of sharing a driveway and then a distance between of no more than 15m raises safety concerns - how many children are run over in their/shared driveways each year in New Zealand?	Amend rule RPROZ-R19 to retain at least the existing rule: 'the separation distance of the minor dwelling unit is no greater than 30m from the principal dwelling'. The same should also apply: In considering an application under this provision, the Council will restrict the exercise of its control to the following matters: vi) the extent of the separation between the principal dwelling and the minor residential unit; vii) the degree to which design is compatible with the principal dwelling; viii) the extent that services can be shared; ix) the ability to mitigate any adverse effects by way of provision of landscaping and screening; x) the location of the unit.	Reject	Section 5.2.24 Key Issue 24: Rule RPROZ-R19
FS297.30	Wilson Hookway		Support	The separation distance of 15m is too restrictive. It should be at least 30m in order to provide for adequate space to accommodate shared gardening/ landscaping, and driveway turning and manoeuvring areas.	Allow	Reject	Section 5.2.24 Key Issue 24: Rule RPROZ-R19
FS100.17	Allen Hookway		Support	The separation distance of 15m is too restrictive. It should be at least 30m in order to provide for adequate space to accommodate shared gardening/ landscaping, and driveway turning and manoeuvring areas.	Allow	Reject	Section 5.2.24 Key Issue 24: Rule RPROZ-R19
FS293.30	Danielle Hookway		Support	The separation distance of 15m is too restrictive. It should be at least 30m in order to provide for adequate space to accommodate shared gardening/ landscaping, and driveway turning and manoeuvring areas.	Allow	Reject	Section 5.2.24 Key Issue 24: Rule RPROZ-R19
FS257.29	Amber Hookway		Support	The separation distance of 15m is too restrictive. It should be at least 30m in	Allow	Reject	Section 5.2.24

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				order to provide for adequate space to accommodate shared gardening/ landscaping, and driveway turning and manoeuvring areas.				Key Issue 24: Rule RPROZ-R19
FS256.18	Lianne Kennedy		Support	The separation distance of 15m is too restrictive. It should be at least 30m in order to provide for adequate space to accommodate shared gardening/ landscaping, and driveway turning and manoeuvring areas.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.24 Key Issue 24: Rule RPROZ-R19
S311.003	Allen Hookway	RPROZ-R19	Oppose	There needs to be a distance of at least 30m to ensure quiet enjoyment of the minor residential unit. As is seen at multiple properties close together, disputes arise where there is not a healthy amount of space between dwellings. The issue of sharing a driveway and then a distance between of no more than 15m raises safety concerns - how many children are run over in their/shared driveways each year in New Zealand?	Amend rule RPROZ-R19 to retain at least the existing rule: 'the separation distance of the minor dwelling unit is no greater than 30m from the principal dwelling'. The same should also apply: In considering an application under this provision, the Council will restrict the exercise of its control to the following matters: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> xi) the extent of the separation between the principal dwelling and the minor residential unit; xii) the degree to which design is compatible with the principal dwelling; xiii) the extent that services can be shared; xiv) the ability to mitigate any adverse effects by way of provision of landscaping and screening; xv) the location of the unit. 		Reject	Section 5.2.24 Key Issue 24: Rule RPROZ-R19
FS297.31	Wilson Hookway		Support	The separation distance of 15m is too restrictive. It should be at least 30m in order to provide for adequate space to accommodate shared gardening/ landscaping, and driveway turning and manoeuvring areas.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.24 Key Issue 24: Rule RPROZ-R19
FS100.21	Allen Hookway		Support	The separation distance of 15m is too restrictive. It should be at least 30m in order to provide for adequate space to accommodate shared gardening/	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.24 Key Issue 24: Rule RPROZ-R19

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				landscaping, and driveway turning and manoeuvring areas.			
FS293.31	Danielle Hookway		Support	The separation distance of 15m is too restrictive. It should be at least 30m in order to provide for adequate space to accommodate shared gardening/ landscaping, and driveway turning and manoeuvring areas.	Allow	Reject	Section 5.2.24 Key Issue 24: Rule RPROZ-R19
FS257.30	Amber Hookway		Support	The separation distance of 15m is too restrictive. It should be at least 30m in order to provide for adequate space to accommodate shared gardening/ landscaping, and driveway turning and manoeuvring areas.	Allow	Reject	Section 5.2.24 Key Issue 24: Rule RPROZ-R19
FS256.19	Lianne Kennedy		Support	The separation distance of 15m is too restrictive. It should be at least 30m in order to provide for adequate space to accommodate shared gardening/ landscaping, and driveway turning and manoeuvring areas.	Allow	Reject	Section 5.2.24 Key Issue 24: Rule RPROZ-R19
S105.001	Lynley Newport	RPROZ-R19	Support in part	Support the rule but consider the separation distance of 15m too restrictive. It should be 30m in order to provide for adequate space to accommodate shared gardening/ landscaping, and driveway turning and manoeuvring areas.	Amend Rule RPROZ-R19 CON-4 to read: The separation distance between the minor residential unit and the principal residential unit does not exceed 15m 30m .	Reject	Section 5.2.24 Key Issue 24: Rule RPROZ-R19
FS100.14	Allen Hookway		Support	There needs to be a distance of at least 30m to ensure quiet enjoyment of the minor residential unit.	Allow	Reject	Section 5.2.24 Key Issue 24: Rule RPROZ-R19
FS196.53	Joe Carr		Support		Allow	Reject	Section 5.2.24 Key Issue 24: Rule RPROZ-R19
S105.002	Lynley Newport	RPROZ-R19	Support in part	To have at least 1ha of land is also overly restrictive noting the number of lots already in the zone less than 1ha in area.	Amend Rule RPROZ-R19 CON-2 to read: The site area per minor residential unit is at least one hectare 5000m² .	Reject	Section 5.2.24 Key Issue 24: Rule RPROZ-R19

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS196.54	Joe Carr		Support	As above	Allow	Reject	Section 5.2.24 Key Issue 24: Rule RPROZ-R19
S105.003	Lynley Newport	RPROZ-R19	Support in part	Non-compliance with Rule RPROZ-R19 CON-4 should not result in non-complying status. In terms of effects, I would consider it similar to access (Rule RPROZ-R19 CON-3).	Amend activity status column of Rule RPROZ-R19 to read: Activity status where compliance not achieved with CON-3 and/or CON-4: Discretionary; Activity status where compliance not achieved with CON-1, CON-2, CON-4 and/or CON-5: Non complying.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.24 Key Issue 24: Rule RPROZ-R19
FS196.55	Joe Carr		Support	As per submitter	Allow	Accept in part	Section 5.2.24 Key Issue 24: Rule RPROZ-R19
S167.101	Benzen Farm Limited	RPROZ-R19	Oppose	This rule should be a permitted activity and it is unclear from the drafting whether that was in fact the intent. The matters sought to be managed by the rules (density, access, separation distance and size) are easily controlled by the standards at CON-1 to CON-5. Council is able to ascertain compliance with these matters at building consent stage, with the requirement for a controlled activity resource consent unnecessary. The requirement that the separation distance between the minor residential unit and the principal residential unit does not exceed 15m should be deleted. There are many site-specific characterises which may necessitate a greater separation distance, including availability of a suitable building platform and the desirability of screening the minor unit. The size limit of 65m ² as proposed effectively controls the risk of the proliferation of minor units as de-facto gull dwellings.	Amend the activity status for Minor residential units RPROZ-R19 from controlled to: permitted , where the standards are complied with. Replace CON to PER in the rule. Delete the requirement that the separation distance between the minor residential unit and the principal residential unit does not exceed 15m (CON-4).	Accept in part	Section 5.2.24 Key Issue 24: Rule RPROZ-R19

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS354.231	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	HortNZ supports the proposed RPROZ-R19 for minor residential units as it seeks to ensure that there is not a proliferation of such units throughout the rural production zone with the potential to create reverse sensitivity effects.	Disallow	Disallow S167.101	Accept in part	Section 5.2.24 Key Issue 24: Rule RPROZ-R19
FS566.463	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 5.2.24 Key Issue 24: Rule RPROZ-R19
S243.119	Matauri Trustee Limited	RPROZ-R19	Oppose	<p>This rule should be a permitted activity and it is unclear from the drafting whether that was in fact the intent. The matters sought to be managed by the rules (density, access, separation distance and size) are easily controlled by the standards at CON-1 to CON-5. Council is able to ascertain compliance with these matters at building consent stage, with the requirement for a controlled activity resource consent unnecessary.</p> <p>The requirement that the separation distance between the minor residential unit and the principal residential unit does not exceed 15m should be deleted. There are many site-specific characterises which may necessitate a greater separation distance, including availability of a suitable building platform and the desirability of screening the minor unit. The size limit of 65m² as proposed effectively controls the risk of the proliferation of minor units as de-facto gull dwellings.</p>	<p>Amend the activity status for Minor residential units RPROZ-R19 from controlled to permitted, where the standards are complied with.</p> <p>Replace CON to PER in the rule.</p> <p>Delete the requirement that the separation distance between the minor residential unit and the principal residential unit does not exceed 15m (CON-4).</p>	Accept in part	Section 5.2.24 Key Issue 24: Rule RPROZ-R19	
FS570.677	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 5.2.24 Key Issue 24: Rule RPROZ-R19

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS566.691	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 5.2.24 Key Issue 24: Rule RPROZ-R19
FS569.713	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 5.2.24 Key Issue 24: Rule RPROZ-R19
S250.024	Willowridge Developments Limited	RPROZ-R19	Support in part	Willowridge support the inclusion of a minor residential unit rule in the RPROZ. It can be appropriately managed as a permitted activity with the same clauses applied. The rule does not contain any matters of control making it unclear whether this is supposed to be a permitted or a controlled activity or define the parameters over which Council limits its control.	Amend RPROZ-R19 activity status to make a permitted activity.		Accept	Section 5.2.24 Key Issue 24: Rule RPROZ-R19
FS570.710	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 5.2.24 Key Issue 24: Rule RPROZ-R19
FS566.724	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 5.2.24 Key Issue 24: Rule RPROZ-R19
FS569.746	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 5.2.24 Key Issue 24: Rule RPROZ-R19
S355.032	Wakaiti Dalton	RPROZ-R20	Support in part	We generally support the intention of these provisions. However, we consider that these would be best managed as a controlled activity, in line with the ODP's activity status.	Amend activity status to make a controlled activity.		Reject	Section 5.2.25 Key Issue 25: Rules RPROZ-R20, R21, R22, R23, R24 and R25
S479.027	Tracy and Kenneth Dalton	RPROZ-R20	Support in part	We generally support the intention of these provisions. However, we consider that these would be best managed as a controlled activity, in line with the ODP's activity status.	Amend activity status to make a controlled activity.		Reject	Section 5.2.25 Key Issue 25: Rules RPROZ-R20, R21,

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
							R22, R23, R24 and R25
S477.018	Te Waka Pupuri Putea Trust	RPROZ-R20	Support	<p>We support the provision for rules relating to accommodation for staff as imagined within the Rural Production Zone. As an employer of a significant number of workers, it is critical that we are enabled to provide for the living of a prospective workforce that provides value into the wider local and regional economies.</p> <p>More specifically and for example, we support Rules like RPROZ-R3, RPROZ-R10 and RPROZ-R20 in providing for not only the living environment for our workforce but also the opportunity for rural produce retail and Papakainga housing respectively - the latter being of increasing importance to our whanau, hapu into the future.</p>	Retain Rule RPROZ-R20	Accept in part	<p>Section 5.2.25</p> <p>Key Issue 25: Rules RPROZ-R20, R21, R22, R23, R24 and R25</p>
S339.055	Te Aupōuri Commercial Development Ltd	RPROZ-R20	Support	TACDL are supportive of the provision of papakāinga housing in the RPROZ.	Retain Rule RPROZ-R20	Accept in part	<p>Section 5.2.25</p> <p>Key Issue 25: Rules RPROZ-R20, R21, R22, R23, R24 and R25</p>
S316.002	FNR Properties Limited	RPROZ-R21	Support in part	<p>Contrary to the ODP, the PDP specifically provides for the expansion of existing mineral extraction activity in the Rural Production zone as a restricted discretionary activity. While this largely represents a positive change for the subject site, it is noted that the same activity is provided for as a controlled activity under Rule ME-R2 which conflicts/contradicts with Rule RPROZ-R21. This could lead to confusion and interpretation issues. It is therefore recommended that Rule</p>	Amend Rule RPROZ-R21 to be consistent with Rule ME-R2	Reject	<p>Section 5.2.25</p> <p>Key Issue 25: Rules RPROZ-R20, R21, R22, R23, R24 and R25</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
				RPROZ-R21 is amended to be consistent with Rule ME-R2.				
S442.140	Kapiro Conservation Trust	RPROZ-R21	Oppose	This activity should be a discretionary activity outside of the Mineral Extraction Overlay.	Amend activity status to discretionary (inferred reference to RPROZ-R21).		Reject	Section 5.2.25 Key Issue 25: Rules RPROZ-R20, R21, R22, R23, R24 and R25
FS346.751	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS and Part 2 of the RMA and the NPS IB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.25 Key Issue 25: Rules RPROZ-R20, R21, R22, R23, R24 and R25
S386.025	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew	RPROZ-R22	Support	Ballantyne & Agnew support this, as it provides for tourism activities within the rural environment which have a functional need to be located here.	Retain as notified.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.25 Key Issue 25: Rules RPROZ-R20, R21, R22, R23, R24 and R25
S502.050	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	RPROZ-R22	Support in part	Generally, we support the inclusion of this rule. However, we do seek to add in some minor matters of clarification. Item b we seek to add whether there is a link to that tourism activity being undertaken on that particular site. In Northland we have a number of natural features, landscapes and historic spaces which are located on certain sites. Tourism businesses associated with these features, landscapes and historic spaces are generally located on these subject sites and are not able to be located elsewhere. We have further enabled these particular activities on those specific sites by adding in an additional criteria m.	Amend RPROZ-R22 Matters of discretion are restricted to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. the character and appearance of the building(s); b. the link between the tourism activity and the rural environment and/or the site; c. the siting of the building(s), decks and outdoor areas including parking relative to adjoining sites; d. whether the building(s) are visually dominant and create a loss of privacy for surrounding residential units and their associated outdoor areas; e. ability of the supporting roading network to cater for the additional 		Reject	Section 5.2.25 Key Issue 25: Rules RPROZ-R20, R21, R22, R23, R24 and R25

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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>vehicular and if applicable cycling and pedestrian traffic;</p> <p>f. servicing requirements and any constraints of the site;</p> <p>g. whether the location of the building(s) and rural tourism activity could create reverse sensitivity effects on adjacent and surrounding primary production activities;</p> <p>h. whether the development will result in the site being unable to continue to undertake a primary production activity or undertake one in the future due to loss of productive land;</p> <p>i. whether the layout of the development maintains the existing rural character of the surrounding area;</p> <p>j. any lighting or noise effects;</p> <p>k. the frequency of the use, hours and days of operation and the number of people it can cater for;</p> <p>l. any natural hazard affecting the site or surrounding area.</p> <p>m. Whether the tourism activity could be operated on another site.</p>		
FS51.25	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support in part	<p>HNZPT's primary submission (409) sought a heritage area planning framework over Waitangi, specifically, the extent of Te Pitowhenua/Waitangi Treaty Grounds as identified through the National Historic Landmark/ Nga Manawhenua o Aotearoa me ona Korero Tuturu.</p> <p>However, if the decision was to retain the Rural Production zone, the addition of this proposed text would provide a degree of certainty for the tourism</p>	Allow in part	Reject	Section 5.2.25 Key Issue 25: Rules RPROZ-R20, R21, R22, R23, R24 and R25

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				activities generated by the Treaty Grounds.			
FS172.218	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission (with respect to the first amendment).	Allow in part	Reject	Section 5.2.25 Key Issue 25: Rules RPROZ-R20, R21, R22, R23, R24 and R25
S503.033	Waitangi Limited	RPROZ-R22	Not Stated	<p>Generally, we support the inclusion of this rule. However, we do seek to add in some minor matters of clarification. Item b we seek to add whether there is a link to that tourism activity being undertaken on that particular site. The Waitangi Treaty Grounds is a site in which both international and domestic travelers come to visit. There is opportunity to provide additional experiences associated with the historic site across the wider estate which could utilize this rule.</p> <p>As Waitangi is a site which cannot be moved or relocated elsewhere similar to other businesses which utilize the natural features, landscapes and historic spaces located on certain sites, it is fitting to include this as a criteria to further enable businesses of this nature. We have further enabled these particular activities on those specific sites by adding in an additional criteria m.</p>	<p>Amend point b of the matters of discretion as follows: the link between the tourism activity and the rural environment and/or the site</p> <p>Insert new point m within the matters of discretion as follows: Whether the tourism activity could be operated on another site.</p>	Reject	Section 5.2.25 Key Issue 25: Rules RPROZ-R20, R21, R22, R23, R24 and R25
FS51.38	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support	Under HNZPT's primary submission (409) seeks a planning framework over the Waitangi Treaty Grounds that represents and protects the heritage significance of the place. However, if the decision was to retain the Rural Production zone over the Grounds the addition of this proposed text would provide a degree of certainty for the	Allow	Reject	Section 5.2.25 Key Issue 25: Rules RPROZ-R20, R21, R22, R23, R24 and R25

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				tourism activities generated by the Treaty Grounds.				
S511.121	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	RPROZ-R22	Oppose	This activity should be a discretionary activity outside of the Mineral Extraction Overlay	Amend activity status to discretionary (inferred reference to R22)		Reject	Section 5.2.25 Key Issue 25: Rules RPROZ-R20, R21, R22, R23, R24 and R25
FS164.121	Scrumptious Fruit Trust		Support	Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and secondly as passive recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.	Allow	Amend HNC overlay to include Taupo Bay; Amend provisions to require strong wildlife protection; Amend provisions to require dogs on leash in beach areas; Adopt SNA and HNC provisions (inferred).	Reject	Section 5.2.25 Key Issue 25: Rules RPROZ-R20, R21, R22, R23, R24 and R25
FS548.171	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	The Rural Production Zone is of great interest and importance to our member and Federated Farmers submitted on various provisions within the Rural Production Zone chapter. Given the lack of clarity in what provisions the submitter is addressing we wish to retain scope in the discussion in case the provisions are relevant to us.	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Accept	Section 5.2.25 Key Issue 25: Rules RPROZ-R20, R21, R22, R23, R24 and R25
FS570.1692	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.25 Key Issue 25: Rules RPROZ-R20, R21, R22, R23, R24 and R25

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS566.1706	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.25 Key Issue 25: Rules RPROZ-R20, R21, R22, R23, R24 and R25
FS569.1728	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.25 Key Issue 25: Rules RPROZ-R20, R21, R22, R23, R24 and R25
S250.025	Willowridge Developments Limited	RPROZ-R22	Support	It provides for tourism activities within the rural environment which have a functional need to be located here.	Retain as notified.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.25 Key Issue 25: Rules RPROZ-R20, R21, R22, R23, R24 and R25
FS570.711	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 5.2.25 Key Issue 25: Rules RPROZ-R20, R21, R22, R23, R24 and R25
FS566.725	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 5.2.25 Key Issue 25: Rules RPROZ-R20, R21, R22, R23, R24 and R25
FS569.747	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 5.2.25 Key Issue 25: Rules RPROZ-R20, R21, R22, R23, R24 and R25
S55.039	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	RPROZ-R23	Oppose	Adverse effects on sensitive activities can arise from intensive farming areas other than buildings housing animals - such as effluent ponds or stock yards. Expanding the definition will encompass more of the farm operation and ensure it is appropriately located	Amend rule as follows: Buildings or structures Any hardstand areas, treatment systems, buildings housing animals and any other structures associated with an intensive primary production activity are set		Accept	Section 5.2.25 Key Issue 25: Rules RPROZ-R20, R21, R22, R23, R24 and R25

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				away from existing sensitive activities. The rule should apply to the broader definition of intensive primary production, which encompasses both intensive indoor and intensive outdoor operations.	back at least 300m from any sensitive activity on a site under separate ownership.		
S55.040	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	RPROZ-R23	Oppose	Intensive farming should not be a non-complying activity anywhere within the rural production zone. If a new operation seeks to locate within 300m of a sensitive activity, the effects of the activity along with appropriate remedying actions can be assessed and put in place via a discretionary consent process.	Amend Activity status where compliance not achieved with RDIS-1: Non-complying Discretionary.	Reject	Section 5.2.25 Key Issue 25: Rules RPROZ-R20, R21, R22, R23, R24 and R25
S503.034	Waitangi Limited	RPROZ-R24	Not Stated	On larger sites like the Waitangi Treaty Grounds which are diverse in what they offer there can be multiple rural industries operating on site. As a Rural Industry captures all businesses undertaken in a rural environment which are dependent on primary production it can include things such as the small scale selling of honey, vegetables, flowers or wine just to name a few. If these are run as separate businesses, this would technically require consent. We seek relief that RDIS-2 is deleted in its entirety. If this is not accepted, we seek that RDIS-2 does not apply to the Waitangi Estate.	Delete RDIS-2 of Rule RPROZ-R24, as follows: The number of rural industry activities per site does not exceed one.	Reject	Section 5.2.25 Key Issue 25: Rules RPROZ-R20, R21, R22, R23, R24 and R25
FS51.39	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	Under HNZPT's primary submission (409) seeks a planning framework over the Waitangi Treaty Grounds that represents and protects the heritage significance of the place. However, if the decision was to retain the Rural Production zone over the Grounds it is considered allowing Rural Industry as a permitted activity on the Treaty	Disallow in part	Accept in part	Section 5.2.25 Key Issue 25: Rules RPROZ-R20, R21, R22, R23, R24 and R25

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				Grounds may be detrimental to the significant heritage values of the place.				
S159.115	Horticulture New Zealand	RPROZ-R24	Oppose	Rural industry supports horticulture production and a discretionary activity status for all rural industry may prevent activities which support horticulture activities	Delete Rule RPROZ-R24		Reject	Section 5.2.25 Key Issue 25: Rules RPROZ-R20, R21, R22, R23, R24 and R25
FS151.282	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.25 Key Issue 25: Rules RPROZ-R20, R21, R22, R23, R24 and R25
FS172.245	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.25 Key Issue 25: Rules RPROZ-R20, R21, R22, R23, R24 and R25
FS570.277	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 5.2.25 Key Issue 25: Rules RPROZ-R20, R21, R22, R23, R24 and R25
FS566.291	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 5.2.25 Key Issue 25: Rules RPROZ-R20, R21, R22, R23, R24 and R25
FS569.313	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 5.2.25 Key Issue 25: Rules RPROZ-R20, R21, R22, R23, R24 and R25
S502.051	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	RPROZ-R24	Support in part	With subdivision in the Rural Production zone becoming more restrictive, as well as the price of land increasing, it is anticipated that co-	Delete RPROZ-R24 RDIS-2		Accept in part	Section 5.2.25 Key Issue 25: Rules RPROZ-R20, R21,

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				ownership of land will become more prevalent in the rural zones especially between families. As a result, a piece of land may contain more than one rural industry to cater for the co-ownership of the land. As a Rural Industry captures all businesses undertaken in a rural environment which are dependent on primary production it can include things such as rural tourism operators, rural contractors, the small scale selling of honey, vegetables or flowers in roadside stalls just to name a few. If these are run as separate businesses, this would technically require consent. We seek relief that RDIS-2 is deleted in its entirety. RDIS-1 provides control over the maximum GBA within a site such that restrictions on the number is not deemed necessary.				R22, R23, R24 and R25
FS172.219	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.25 Key Issue 25: Rules RPROZ-R20, R21, R22, R23, R24 and R25
S438.008	New Zealand Motor Caravan Association	RPROZ-R25	Oppose	The NZMCA operates a number of campgrounds and park over properties that are present in a variety of zones. Allowing for more permissive rules around the establishment of campgrounds will make it easier to establish sites for self-contained vehicle-based camping in the Far North District. This will also create positive social and economic benefits for the community.	Amend RPROZ-R25 to restricted discretionary activity status and include consent criteria which relates to visual impacts and protection of highly productive soils.		Reject	Section 5.2.25 Key Issue 25: Rules RPROZ-R20, R21, R22, R23, R24 and R25 Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
S159.116	Horticulture New Zealand	RPROZ-R25	Support	Discretionary activity or non-complying status for activities that are generally not anticipated in the Rural Production zone is supported	Retain activity status for Rule RPROZ-R25		Accept	Section 5.2.25 Key Issue 25: Rules RPROZ-R20, R21,

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
								R22, R23, R24 and R25
FS151.283	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept	Section 5.2.25 Key Issue 25: Rules RPROZ-R20, R21, R22, R23, R24 and R25
FS570.278	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 5.2.25 Key Issue 25: Rules RPROZ-R20, R21, R22, R23, R24 and R25
FS566.292	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 5.2.25 Key Issue 25: Rules RPROZ-R20, R21, R22, R23, R24 and R25
FS569.314	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 5.2.25 Key Issue 25: Rules RPROZ-R20, R21, R22, R23, R24 and R25
S425.064	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust	RPROZ-R25	Oppose	<p>PHTTCCT oppose campgrounds as a discretionary activity in the Rural Production Zone and considers this zone to be the most appropriate for such an activity.</p> <p>Camping grounds provide a low-cost way for tourists and locals to experience the District. PHHTTCCT consider that it is inequitable to provide for other accommodation activities as a permitted activity but not camp ground. PHTTCCT seek that Camping grounds are provided for as a permitted activity subject to compliance with performance standards in this zone, and it highlighted that noise and traffic</p>	Amend to provide for camping grounds as a permitted activity in the Rural Production Zone		Reject	<p>Section 5.2.25 Key Issue 25: Rules RPROZ-R20, R21, R22, R23, R24 and R25</p> <p>Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments</p>

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				will be managed through District Wide Chapters.				
FS548.129	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	It is not considered that it is appropriate for campgrounds to be a permitted activity in the rural production zone. Campgrounds are a sensitive activity as defined in the Proposed District Plan and have the potential to create reverse sensitivity effects for existing, lawfully established activities.	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Accept	Section 5.2.25 Key Issue 25: Rules RPROZ-R20, R21, R22, R23, R24 and R25 Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
S159.117	Horticulture New Zealand	RPROZ-R26	Support	Discretionary activity or non-complying status for activities that are generally not anticipated in the Rural Production zone is supported	Retain activity status for Rule RPROZ-R26		Accept	Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS151.284	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept	Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS570.279	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 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS566.293	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 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS569.315	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 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
S159.118	Horticulture New Zealand	RPROZ-R27	Support	Discretionary activity or non-complying status for activities that are generally not anticipated in the Rural Production zone is supported	Retain activity status for Rule RPROZ-R27		Accept	Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS151.285	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept	Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: 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
FS570.280	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 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS566.294	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 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS569.316	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 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
S159.119	Horticulture New Zealand	RPROZ-R28	Support	Discretionary activity or non-complying status for activities that are generally not anticipated in the Rural Production zone is supported	Retain activity status for Rule RPROZ-R28		Accept	Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS151.286	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept	Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS570.281	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 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS566.295	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 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS569.317	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 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
S159.120	Horticulture New Zealand	RPROZ-R29	Support	Discretionary activity or non-complying status for activities that are generally not anticipated in the Rural Production zone is supported	Retain activity status for Rule RPROZ-R29		Accept	Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS570.282	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 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS566.296	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 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS569.318	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 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
S159.121	Horticulture New Zealand	RPROZ-R30	Support	Discretionary activity or non-complying status for activities that are generally not anticipated in the Rural Production zone is supported	Retain activity status for Rule RPROZ-R30		Accept	Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS151.287	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept	Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS570.283	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 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS566.297	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 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS569.319	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 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
S159.122	Horticulture New Zealand	RPROZ-R31	Support	Discretionary activity or non-complying status for activities that are generally not anticipated in the Rural Production zone is supported	Retain activity status for Rule RPROZ-R31		Accept	Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS570.284	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 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS566.298	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 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS569.320	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 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
S159.123	Horticulture New Zealand	RPROZ-R32	Support	Discretionary activity or non-complying status for activities that are generally not anticipated in the Rural Production zone is supported	Retain activity status for Rule RPROZ-R32		Accept	Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS151.288	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept	Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS570.285	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 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS566.299	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 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS569.321	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 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
S159.124	Horticulture New Zealand	RPROZ-R33	Support	Discretionary activity or non-complying status for activities that are generally not anticipated in the Rural Production zone is supported	Retain activity status for Rule RPROZ-R33		Accept	Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS151.289	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept	Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS570.286	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 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS566.300	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 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS569.322	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 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
S159.125	Horticulture New Zealand	RPROZ-R34	Support	Discretionary activity or non-complying status for activities that are generally not anticipated in the Rural Production zone is supported	Retain activity status for Rule RPROZ-R34		Accept	Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS151.290	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept	Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS570.287	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 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS566.301	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 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS569.323	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 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
S159.126	Horticulture New Zealand	RPROZ-R35	Support	Discretionary activity or non-complying status for activities that are generally not anticipated in the Rural Production zone is supported	Retain activity status for Rule RPROZ-R35		Accept	Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS151.291	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept	Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS570.288	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 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS566.302	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 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS569.324	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 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
S159.127	Horticulture New Zealand	RPROZ-R36	Support	Discretionary activity or non-complying status for activities that are generally not anticipated in the Rural Production zone is supported	Retain activity status for Rule RPROZ-R36		Accept	Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS151.292	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept	Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS570.289	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 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS566.303	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 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS569.325	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 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
S159.128	Horticulture New Zealand	RPROZ-R37	Support	Discretionary activity or non-complying status for activities that are generally not anticipated in the Rural Production zone is supported	Retain activity status for Rule RPROZ-R37		Accept	Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS151.293	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept	Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS151.294	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept	Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS570.290	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 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS566.304	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 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS569.326	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 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
S55.031	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	Standards	Oppose	<p>There is no provision within the plan to address the impacts of new sensitive activities on existing indoor primary production (both indoor and outdoor) activities.</p> <p>RPRZOZ-P3 specifies a requirement to avoid or mitigate reverse sensitivity effects on primary production activities, but there is no associated rule or standard to give effect to the policy. Reverse sensitivity effects caused by new sensitivity activities establishing in close proximity to indoor pig farming activities are one of the leading causes of constraints on commercial pork production. To protect the legitimate operation of established primary production activities, standard should be put in place to restrict the location of new sensitive activities.</p>	<p>Insert new standard for new sensitive activity setback from an existing intensive primary production activity, as follows:</p> <p>RPROZ-S8 Sensitive activities setback from intensive primary production activities:</p> <p>All buildings used for new sensitive activities will be setback 300m from any hardstand areas, treatment systems, buildings housing animals and any other structures associated with an intensive primary production activity located on a separate site under separate ownership.</p>		Accept	Section 5.2.26 Key Issue 26: Standards – General Comments
S159.107	Horticulture New Zealand	Standards	Support in part	There is not a specific rule for artificial crop protection structures so Rule RPROZ-R1 would apply. Seeks changes to some of the Standards to ensure that such structures are adequately provided for.	Seeks changes to some of the Standards to ensure that structures such as artificial crop protection structures are adequately provided for		Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.26 Key Issue 26: Standards – General Comments
FS151.274	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
								Section 5.2.26 Key Issue 26: Standards – General Comments
FS570.269	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 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.26 Key Issue 26: Standards – General Comments
FS566.283	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 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.26 Key Issue 26: Standards – General Comments
FS569.305	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 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.26 Key Issue 26: Standards – General Comments
S421.208	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Standards	Support in part	Federated Farmers supports the recognition in the overview of the fact it is important to differentiate the rural production zone from the rural lifestyle and rural residential zones. We also support the strong recognition that has	Amend the Standards to recognise and provide for private property rights and allow landowners to subdivide land in the rural production zone for specific purposes such as creating lifestyle lots and lots for family members (amongst other matters)		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>been given to rural land as an important resource.</p> <p>The concern Federated Farmers has is that the overview is focused on the absolute protection of highly productive from any activities other than primary production. The approach taken by the Council to prevent the fragmentation of rural production land is support but acknowledgement is also needed that all highly productive may not be profitable for the landowner. It would be unequitable for the Council to prohibit a rural landowner who has cared for the land for many years from achieving the real potential value of that land.</p> <p>The proposed district plan has strayed into private property rights through dictating what can and cannot be done on rural production land.</p> <p>Returns from farming are variable due to a variety of factors including weather conditions, economic conditions, individual property circumstances and market demands. Like any business, diversification, flexibility, responsiveness, and cash flow are critically important to retaining their viability.</p> <p>Farmers undertake low impact subdivision for a variety of reasons. These vary from diversifying their business into tourism operations (luxury lodges and or associated tourism development and infrastructure), providing for disposing of a surplus dwelling on the property where a neighbouring farm is purchased, providing for a family member or staff member to live on the farm or to implement a succession plan for multiple siblings through small lot</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>subdivision. The proposed chapter has taken away any flexibility for farmers to subdivide their land for specific purposes without undermining the primary production or life-style value of the remaining land.</p> <p>The chapter as drafted, adds another layer complexity on top of the regulations and provisions that exist in regional council planning documents and in National Policy Statements. The Council seems intent of duplicating provisions which may have already been dealt with at regional and national levels.</p>				
FS172.319	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons stated in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS196.119	Joe Carr		Support	Tautoko	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS332.241	Russell Protection Society		Oppose	Subdivision of Rural production zone land for lifestyle blocks should not be an automatic right.	Disallow in part	Disallow the original submission in part.	Accept	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS305.015	Dempsey Family Trust		Support in part	Further residential / subdivision opportunities within the Rural Production zone should be provided for.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions
FS570.1440	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: General Submissions
FS346.442	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.				
FS566.1454	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: General Submissions
FS569.1476	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: General Submissions
S338.065	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	Standards	Not Stated	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour. Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish. 		Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS354.232	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	The submitter seeks additional controls on artificial crop protection structures, including a non-complying rule. Artificial crop protection structures are critical to horticulture in the Far North	Disallow	Disallow S338.065	Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				and contribute to the economic and social wellbeing of the community.				Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS570.1003	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: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS566.1017	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS569.1039	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
S427.066	Kapiro Residents Association	Standards	Support in part	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; 		Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: 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
					suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish. 			
FS354.233	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	The submitter seeks additional controls on artificial crop protection structures, including a non-complying rule. Artificial crop protection structures are critical to horticulture in the Far North and contribute to the economic and social wellbeing of the community.	Disallow	Disallow S427.066	Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
S449.061	Kapiro Conservation Trust	Standards	Support	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour. Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non- 		Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: 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
					complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish.			
FS354.234	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	The submitter seeks additional controls on artificial crop protection structures, including a non-complying rule. Artificial crop protection structures are critical to horticulture in the Far North and contribute to the economic and social wellbeing of the community.	Disallow	Disallow S449.061	Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS569.1860	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS570.1877	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: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
S529.214	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	Standards	Support in part	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be 		Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: 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
					setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish. 			
FS570.2101	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: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS566.2115	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS569.2137	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
S464.040	LJ King Ltd	Standards	Oppose	We do not support the 30m setback from roads and instead submit to having a 20m setback, and only a 5m	Amend the setback from the road boundary in this zone to 20 metres for a dwelling, and 5 metres for a non-habitable dwelling.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.28

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				setback if it is a garage or non-habitable building. This will provide for open space and rural amenity, while still allowing efficient and effective use of the rural site.				Key Issue 28: Standard RPROZ-3
FS566.1583	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 5.2.28 Key Issue 28: Standard RPROZ-3
S213.005	Timothy and Dion Spicer	RPROZ-S1	Support		Retain standards		Accept in part	Section 5.2.26 Key Issue 26: Standards – General Comments
S333.090	P S Yates Family Trust	RPROZ-S1	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain RPROZ-S1		Accept in part	Section 5.2.26 Key Issue 26: Standards – General Comments
S168.098	Setar Thirty Six Limited	RPROZ-S1	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain Standard RPROZ-S1.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.26 Key Issue 26: Standards – General Comments
S187.089	The Shooting Box Limited	RPROZ-S1	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain RPROZ-S1- RPROZ-S7.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.26 Key Issue 26: Standards – General Comments
S489.032	Radio New Zealand	RPROZ-S1	Support in part	RNZ is concerned that elevated structures near RNZ's facilities could experience EMR coupling which can present a safety risk to people on or near the structures. RNZ notes that the height limit proposed in the proposed district plan has been adopted as a trigger for considering EMR coupling, to allow for simpler administration of the standard. However, RNZ is open to higher trigger heights of 21m (within 1,000m of the Waipapakauri transmitter) and 16m (within 1,000m of the Ōhaeawai	Insert a new matter of discretion within Standard RPROZ-S1 as follows: g. for structures within 1,000m of Radio New Zealand's Facilities at Waipapakauri or Ōhaeawai, whether the safety risks of electromagnetic coupling have been considered and addressed effectively.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.27 Key Issue 27: Standards RPROZ-S1, S2 and S7

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				transmitter) being imposed in the District Plan if this would lead to better outcomes.				
S529.034	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	RPROZ-S1	Support in part	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour. Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish. 		Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS88.3	Stephanie Lane		Support	Agree these large covers should be disguised from view of the public, and particularly from any homes existing that look out on to these structures, at least if homes were in existence before the covers erected.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS570.1924	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: Definitions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
								Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS566.1938	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS569.1960	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
S159.130	Horticulture New Zealand	RPROZ-S1	Support	Standard RPROZ-S1 provides for artificial crop protection structures up to 6m	Retain Standard RPROZ-S1		Accept in part	Section 5.2.26 Key Issue 26: Standards – General Comments
FS151.296	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.26 Key Issue 26: Standards – General Comments
FS570.292	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 5.2.26 Key Issue 26: Standards – General Comments
FS566.306	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 5.2.26 Key Issue 26: 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
FS569.328	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 5.2.26 Key Issue 26: Standards – General Comments
S338.029	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	RPROZ-S1	Not Stated	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour. Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying 'activity' (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish. 		Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS354.235	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	The submitter seeks additional controls on artificial crop protection structures, including a non-complying rule. Artificial crop protection structures are critical to horticulture in the Far North and contribute to the economic and social wellbeing of the community.	Disallow	Disallow S338.029	Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS570.970	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: Definitions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
								Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS566.984	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS569.1006	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
S427.023	Kapiro Residents Association	RPROZ-S1	Support in part	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character. We support PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, however. the PDP needs additional specific rules/standard.	Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour. 		Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish. 			
FS354.236	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	The submitter seeks additional controls on artificial crop protection structures, including a non-complying rule. Artificial crop protection structures are critical to horticulture in the Far North and contribute to the economic and social wellbeing of the community.	Disallow	Disallow S427.023	Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
S449.048	Kapiro Conservation Trust	RPROZ-S1	Support	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour. Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish. 		Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: 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
FS354.237	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	The submitter seeks additional controls on artificial crop protection structures, including a non-complying rule. Artificial crop protection structures are critical to horticulture in the Far North and contribute to the economic and social wellbeing of the community.	Disallow	Disallow S449.048	Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS569.1847	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS570.1864	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: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
S243.120	Matauri Trustee Limited	RPROZ-S1	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain Standard RPROZ-S1		Accept in part	Section 5.2.26 Key Issue 26: Standards – General Comments
FS570.678	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 5.2.26 Key Issue 26: Standards – General Comments
FS566.692	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 5.2.26 Key Issue 26: 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
FS569.714	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 5.2.26 Key Issue 26: Standards – General Comments
S167.102	Bentzen Farm Limited	RPROZ-S1	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain RPROZ-S1 - RPROZ-S7		Accept in part	Section 5.2.26 Key Issue 26: Standards – General Comments
FS566.464	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.26 Key Issue 26: Standards – General Comments
S333.091	P S Yates Family Trust	RPROZ-S2	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain RPROZ-S2		Accept	Section 5.2.27 Key Issue 27: Standards RPROZ-S1, S2 and S7
S168.099	Setar Thirty Six Limited	RPROZ-S2	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain Standard RPROZ-S2.		Accept	Section 5.2.27 Key Issue 27: Standards RPROZ-S1, S2 and S7
S187.101	The Shooting Box Limited	RPROZ-S2	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain RPROZ-S1 - RPROZ-S7		Accept in part	Section 5.2.27 Key Issue 27: Standards RPROZ-S1, S2 and S7
S187.102	The Shooting Box Limited	RPROZ-S2	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain RPROZ-S1 - RPROZ-S7		Accept in part	Section 5.2.27 Key Issue 27: Standards RPROZ-S1, S2 and S7
S431.182	John Andrew Riddell	RPROZ-S2	Not Stated	Not stated	Retain the approach varying the required height to boundary depending on the orientation of the relevant boundary.		Accept	Section 5.2.27 Key Issue 27: Standards RPROZ-S1, S2 and S7
S159.131	Horticulture New Zealand	RPROZ-S2	Oppose	Standard RPROZ-S2 should not apply to artificial crop protection structures as	Amend the list of activities that Standard RPROZ-S2 does not apply to, to add:		Reject	Section 5.2.27

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				they are open in nature and let light through	v) artificial crop protection structures			Key Issue 27: Standards RPROZ-S1, S2 and S7 Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS151.297	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.27 Key Issue 27: Standards RPROZ-S1, S2 and S7 Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS570.293	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 5.2.27 Key Issue 27: Standards RPROZ-S1, S2 and S7 Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS566.307	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 5.2.27 Key Issue 27: Standards RPROZ-S1, S2 and S7 Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS569.329	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 5.2.27 Key Issue 27: Standards RPROZ-S1, S2 and S7

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
								Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
S243.121	Matauri Trustee Limited	RPROZ-S2	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain Standard RPROZ-S2		Accept	Section 5.2.27 Key Issue 27: Standards RPROZ-S1, S2 and S7
FS570.679	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 5.2.27 Key Issue 27: Standards RPROZ-S1, S2 and S7
FS566.693	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 5.2.27 Key Issue 27: Standards RPROZ-S1, S2 and S7
FS569.715	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 5.2.27 Key Issue 27: Standards RPROZ-S1, S2 and S7
S167.111	Bentzen Farm Limited	RPROZ-S2	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain RPROZ-S1 - RPROZ-S7		Accept in part	Section 5.2.27 Key Issue 27: Standards RPROZ-S1, S2 and S7
FS566.473	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 5.2.27 Key Issue 27: Standards RPROZ-S1, S2 and S7
FS569.495	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 5.2.27 Key Issue 27: Standards RPROZ-S1, S2 and S7
S37.001	Jono Corskie	RPROZ-S3	Support in part	The removal of the provision for 3m offset from sections under 5000sqm (from the Operative District Plan	Amend standard so that the 10m setback from site boundaries only applies to dwellings, 3m setback applies for all other structures for sections under		Reject	Section 5.2.28

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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>(inferred)) creates a large amount of parcels of land that have been created assuming a 3m setback to create a building platform. This affects 26% of parcels in the rural environment based on Section 32 Rural Environment Appendix Table 37.</p> <p>This approach creates additional resource consent requirements for someone who simply wants to add a shed, greenhouse, office or a building consent exempt structure to a parcel that has been created under the previous plan under 5000sqm rules. It also will lead to under utilisation of smaller land parcels, when the plan states it is important to protect this finite resource from inappropriate land use and subdivision to ensure it can be used for its primary purpose. Habitable dwellings adjacent to boundaries have a potential for reverse sensitivity which I assume is the main aim of this rule. With other structures the effect is negligible.</p> <p>Limiting the setback of dwellings to 10m, for sections under 5000sqm the effects of horticultural or rural activities is addressed. All other structures should be able to be built up to 3m setback as per previous plan to avoid unnecessary costs incurred for building and under utilisation of land. The subdivision rules prevent the creation of any more sections where this rule applies going forward, some transition is necessary or 26% of parcels will have significant under utilisation effects.</p>	<p>5000m2 and consider 3m setback for all other structures for sections over 5000m2.</p>		<p>Key Issue 28: Standard RPROZ-S3</p>
<p>S210.002</p>	<p>Paul Hayman</p>	<p>RPROZ-S3</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>Opposes the inclusion of 'that do not adjoin a road' in proposed rule #1 of this standard, and standard that</p>	<p>Amend the standard to read:</p>	<p>Reject</p>	<p>Section 5.2.28</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
				excludes houses being built with 3m setback on sites less than 5000m2. The reasons are that 3m can afford adequate screening if landscaped and planted to a height of 3m, and submitters property at 277 Wainui road is very narrow, and the current rule could exclude the building of a house on the site.	on sites less than 5000m2, accessory buildings can be setback to a minimum of 3m from boundaries that do not adjoin a road. 100% of the 3m setback is to be landscaped and planted to a minimum height of 3m.		Key Issue 28: Standard RPROZ-S3
S259.019	Nicole Wooster	RPROZ-S3	Support in part	<p>Beehives are not controlled by this rule as they are not a building or structure, however they can create health and safety issues when in close proximity to a road boundary or adjoining site. For example, when using the council cycle way a number of bee hives were right up against the road boundary and thousands of bees were swarming over the cycleway, which could not be avoided, this could have resulted in multiple stings or prevented a person with an allergy from using the cycleway.</p> <p>Setbacks should be considered to prevent swarming over a adjoining site or road. Bees fly up to 5km to access food, and do not need to be located right up against a boundary, in many cases this is simply done for the convenience of the bee keeper or an attempt to access adjoining sites resources. Consideration needs to be given to proximity to an adjoining site due to health and safety issues for people with allergies or do not want swarming bees right next to there boundary due to perhaps it adjoining an outdoor area they may use for example or adjoin a public road.</p> <p>In some instances, bee keepers will place hives right up against a boundary to get as close as possible to</p>	Amend standard to consider a setback for bee hives from adjoining sites and road boundaries.	Reject	Section 5.2.28 Key Issue 28: Standard RPROZ-S3

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				vegetation on an adjoining properties site, or to be located next to a public road for ease of access. This can result in health and safety issues.			
S333.092	P S Yates Family Trust	RPROZ-S3	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain RPROZ-S3	Accept in part	Section 5.2.26 Key Issue 26: Standards – General Comments
S485.040	Elbury Holdings	RPROZ-S3	Oppose	We do not support the 30m setback from roads and instead submit to having a 20m setback, and only a 5m setback if it is a garage or non-habitable building. This will provide for open space and rural amenity while still allowing efficient and effective use of the rural site.	Amend the setback from the road boundary in this zone to 20 metres for a dwelling, and 5 metres for a non-habitable dwelling.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.28 Key Issue 28: Standard RPROZ-S3
S168.100	Setar Thirty Six Limited	RPROZ-S3	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain Standard RPROZ-S3.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.26 Key Issue 26: Standards – General Comments
S358.043	Leah Frieling	RPROZ-S3	Oppose	We do not support the 30m setback from roads and instead submit to having a 20m setback, and only a 5m setback if it is a garage or non-habitable building. This will provide for open space and rural amenity, while still allowing efficient and effective use of the rural site.	Amend the setback from the road boundary to 20 metres for a dwelling, and 5 metres for a non-habitable dwelling	Accept in part	Section 5.2.28 Key Issue 28: Standard RPROZ-S3
S357.040	Sean Frieling	RPROZ-S3	Oppose	We do not support the 30m setback from roads and instead submit to having a 20m setback, and only a 5m setback if it is a garage or non-habitable building. This will provide for open space and rural amenity, while still allowing efficient and effective use of the rural site.	Amend the setback from the road boundary in this zone to 20 metres for a dwelling, and 5 metres for a non-habitable dwelling	Accept in part	Section 5.2.28 Key Issue 28: Standard RPROZ-S3

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S512.073	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	RPROZ-S3	Support in part	Setbacks play a role in reducing spread of fire as well as ensuring Fire and Emergency personnel can get to a fire source or other emergency. An advice note is recommended to raise to plan users (e.g. developers) early on in the resource consent process that there is further control of building setbacks and firefighting access through the New Zealand Building Code (NZBC).	Insert advice note to setback standard: Building setback requirements are further controlled by the Building Code. This includes the provision for firefighter access to buildings and egress from buildings. Plan users should refer to the applicable controls within the Building Code to ensure compliance can be achieved at the building consent stage. Issuance of a resource consent does not imply that waivers of Building Code requirements will be considered/granted		Reject	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan Wide or Rural Wide Submissions
S187.103	The Shooting Box Limited	RPROZ-S3	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain RPROZ-S1 - RPROZ-S7		Accept in part	Section 5.2.26 Key Issue 26: Standards – General Comments
S159.111	Horticulture New Zealand	RPROZ-S3	Oppose	Ten guests as a permitted activity with a setback of 10m from a boundary is not considered appropriate to manage potential reverse sensitivity effects. The rule does not state the Standards that will apply. The standards relating to buildings should be included in the rule.	Increase setbacks in Standard RPROZ-S3 to 20m from boundaries.		Reject	Section 5.2.28 Key Issue 28: Standard RPROZ-S3
FS151.278	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Oppose		Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.28 Key Issue 28: Standard RPROZ-S3
FS172.413	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	Support enabling visitor accommodation.	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.2.28 Key Issue 28: Standard RPROZ-S3
FS570.273	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 5.2.28 Key Issue 28: Standard RPROZ-S3
FS566.287	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 5.2.28 Key Issue 28: Standard RPROZ-S3

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS569.309	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 5.2.28 Key Issue 28: Standard RPROZ-S3
S159.132	Horticulture New Zealand	RPROZ-S3	Support in part	The standard provides for artificial crop protection structures with a 3m setback. The setbacks only provide for a 10m setback of habitable buildings from boundaries which is considered insufficient to address potential reverse sensitivity effects.	Amend Policy RPROZ-S3 as follows: The building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure must be setback at least 10m from all site boundaries, except: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. on sites less than 5,000m2 accessory buildings can be setback to a minimum of 3m for boundaries that do not adjoin a road; 2. artificial crop protection and support structures must be setback at least 3m 1m from all site boundaries; and 3. habitable buildings must be setback at least 30m from the boundary of an unsealed road and 20m from side and rear boundaries. 		Accept in part	Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS151.298	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in Part	Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS570.294	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: Rules – General Comments
FS566.308	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: Rules – General Comments
FS569.330	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: Rules – General Comments
S519.041	Elbury Holdings	RPROZ-S3	Oppose	We do not support the 30m setback from roads and instead submit to having a 20m setback, and only a 5m setback if it is a garage or non-habitable building. This will provide for	Amend RPROZ-S3 as follows: '1. on sites less than 5,000m2 accessory buildings can be setback to a minimum of 3m 5m for boundaries that do not adjoin a road; ... 3.		Reject	Section 5.2.28 Key Issue 28: Standard RPROZ-S3

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				open space and rural amenity, while still allowing efficient and effective use of the rural site.	habitable buildings must be setback at least 30m 20m from the boundary of an unsealed road.' (inferred)		
FS196.238	Joe Carr		Support	Makes good sense	Allow	Reject	Section 5.2.28 Key Issue 28: Standard RPROZ-S3
S416.058	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	RPROZ-S3	Support in part	<p>For health and safety reasons, KiwiRail seek a setback for structures from the rail corridor boundary. While KiwiRail do not oppose development on adjacent sites, ensuring the ability to access and maintain structures without requiring access to rail land is important.</p> <p>Parts of the KiwiRail network adjoin commercial, mixed use, industrial and open space zones. These zone chapters do not currently include provision for boundary setbacks for buildings and structures. KiwiRail seek a boundary setback of 5m from the rail corridor for all buildings and structures. KiwiRail considers that a matter of discretion directing consideration of impacts on the safety and efficiency of the rail corridor is appropriate in situations where the 5m setback standard is not complied with in all zones adjacent to the railway corridor.</p> <p>Building setbacks are essential to address significant safety hazards associated with the operational rail corridor. The Proposed Plan enables a 1m setback from side and rear boundaries shared with the rail corridor, increasing the risk that poles, ladders, or even ropes for abseiling equipment, could protrude into the rail corridor and increasing the risk of collision with a train or electrified</p>	<p>Insert a railway setback (refer to submission for examples).</p> <p>Insert the following matters of discretion into the standard:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the location and design of the building as it relates to the ability to safely use, access and maintain buildings without requiring access on, above or over the rail corridor • the safe and efficient operation of the rail network 	Accept in part	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan Wide or Rural Wide Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>overhead lines. Further, there is a 600mm eave allowance within side and rear yards which restricts potential access to roofs from of buildings even further and results in an effective yard setback of 400mm.</p> <p>KiwiRail consider that a 5m setback is appropriate in providing for vehicular access to the rear of buildings (e.g. a cherry picker) and allowing for scaffolding to be erected safely. This setback provides for the unhindered operation of buildings, including higher rise structures and for the safer use of outdoor deck areas at height. This in turn fosters visual amenity, as lineside properties can be regularly maintained. One option is a cross-reference between the standards of each zone to avoid repetition, or to create a standard rail corridor setback rule and replicate it in each zone.</p> <p>The provision of a setback can ensure that all buildings on a site can be accessed and maintained for the life of that structure, without the requirement to gain access to rail land, including by aspects such as ladders, poles or abseil ropes. This ensures that a safe amenity is provided on the adjacent sites for the occupants, in line with delivery policy direction such as GRZ-O2, clause 4 whereby safety is a specific objective for achieving zone appropriate character and amenity values.</p> <p>It is noted that some zones (Heavy Industrial, Rural production)) have wider yards than sought by KiwiRail. This is supported, but the yard purpose is not linked to safety matters relating to a site's proximity to the railway and</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
				therefore any applications for reductions may not consider this requirement.				
FS243.144	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the requested 5m setback; a considerably reduced set back would provide adequate space for maintenance activities within sites adjacent to the rail network. In doing so, it will continue to protect the safe, efficient, and effective operation of the rail infrastructure while balancing the cost on landowners. The amendments are unnecessary.	Disallow	Insert a railway setback (refer to submission for examples) Insert the following matters of discretion into the standard:	Accept in part	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Plan Wide or Rural Wide Submissions
S338.056	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	RPROZ-S3	Not Stated	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour. Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish. 		Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS354.238	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	The submitter seeks additional controls on artificial crop protection structures, including a non-complying rule.	Disallow	Disallow S338.056	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
				Artificial crop protection structures are critical to horticulture in the Far North and contribute to the economic and social wellbeing of the community.				Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS570.994	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: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS566.1008	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS569.1030	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
S427.041	Kapiro Residents Association	RPROZ-S3	Support in part	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 		Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: 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>1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish. 			
FS354.239	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	The submitter seeks additional controls on artificial crop protection structures, including a non-complying rule. Artificial crop protection structures are critical to horticulture in the Far North and contribute to the economic and social wellbeing of the community.	Disallow	Disallow S427.041	Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
S449.052	Kapiro Conservation Trust	RPROZ-S3	Support	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	<p>Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual 		Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: 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
					amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish. 			
FS354.240	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	The submitter seeks additional controls on artificial crop protection structures, including a non-complying rule. Artificial crop protection structures are critical to horticulture in the Far North and contribute to the economic and social wellbeing of the community.	Disallow	Disallow S449.052	Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS569.1851	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS570.1868	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: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
S243.122	Matauri Trustee Limited	RPROZ-S3	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain Standard RPROZ-S3		Accept in part	Section 5.2.26 Key Issue 26: Standards – General Comments
FS570.680	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 5.2.26

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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 26: Standards – General Comments
FS566.694	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 5.2.26 Key Issue 26: Standards – General Comments
FS569.716	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 5.2.26 Key Issue 26: Standards – General Comments
S529.200	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	RPROZ-S3	Support in part	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour. Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish. 		Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS570.2087	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: Definitions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
								Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS566.2101	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
FS569.2123	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions Section 5.2.14 Key Issue 14: Rules – General Comments
S148.049	Summit Forests New Zealand Limited	RPROZ-S3	Not Stated	The proposed Plan does not appear to provide for set backs for building and structures along a plantation forest boundary. The minimum setback along an existing plantation forest boundary should be at least 30m to account for shading and the risk of wind throw.	Amend RPROZ-S3 to provide for setbacks of at least 30m from existing plantation forest boundaries and make any consequential amendments required at all other applicable standards.		Accept	Section 5.2.28 Key Issue 28: Standard RPROZ-S3
FS346.555	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS. Loss of natural character, coastal environment values and the values of outstanding landscapes could also result.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.28 Key Issue 28: Standard RPROZ-S3

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS566.161	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 5.2.28 Key Issue 28: Standard RPROZ-S3
S160.041	Manulife Forest Management (NZ) Ltd	RPROZ-S3	Not Stated	The submitter considers that standard RPROZ-S3 should include a 30metre setback for buildings from production forestry land.	Amend standard RPROZ-S3 to include 30 metre setback for buildings from production forestry land.		Accept	Section 5.2.28 Key Issue 28: Standard RPROZ-S3
FS346.611	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS. Loss of natural character, coastal environment values and the values of outstanding landscapes could also result.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.28 Key Issue 28: Standard RPROZ-S3
S167.112	Bentzen Farm Limited	RPROZ-S3	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain RPROZ-S1 - RPROZ-S7		Accept in part	Section 5.2.26 Key Issue 26: Standards – General Comments
FS566.474	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.26 Key Issue 26: Standards – General Comments
S55.041	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	RPROZ-S5	Support in part	Mobile pig shelters a critical part of outdoor pig farming systems, and can come in a variety of forms and sizes (as per Section 2.4) Mobile farrowing huts used in outdoor systems are small - designed to accommodate one sow and her offspring every farrowing cycle. After each farrowing cycle, the huts are moved to fresh ground for biosecurity and environmental purposes. Mobile pig shelters should be exempted from this standard, owing to the small nature of the buildings (low amenity and	Amend standard to provide an exclusion for mobile pig shelters.		Reject	Section 5.2.29 Key Issue 29: Standard RPROZ-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
				environmental impact) and the necessity of moving them to various locations around the property.				
S333.094	P S Yates Family Trust	RPROZ-S5	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain RPROZ-S5		Accept in part	Section 5.2.26 Key Issue 26: Standards – General Comments
S168.102	Setar Thirty Six Limited	RPROZ-S5	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain Standard RPROZ-S5		Accept in part	Section 5.2.26 Key Issue 26: Standards – General Comments
S187.105	The Shooting Box Limited	RPROZ-S5	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain RPROZ-S1 - RPROZ-S7		Accept in part	Section 5.2.26 Key Issue 26: Standards – General Comments
S159.133	Horticulture New Zealand	RPROZ-S5	Oppose	Standard RPROZ-S5 provides for 12.5% site coverage by buildings or structures. There should be provision for a greater site coverage of artificial crop protection structures	Amend Standard RPROZ-S5 by adding: This Standard does not apply to: i) Artificial crop protection structures ii) Greenhouses		Accept in part	Section 5.2.29 Key Issue 29: Standard RPROZ-S5 Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS151.299	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.29 Key Issue 29: Standard RPROZ-S5 Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS151.300	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.29 Key Issue 29: Standard RPROZ-S5 Section 5.2.5

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
								Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS570.295	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 5.2.29 Key Issue 29: Standard RPROZ-S5 Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS566.309	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 5.2.29 Key Issue 29: Standard RPROZ-S5 Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
FS569.331	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 5.2.29 Key Issue 29: Standard RPROZ-S5 Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Definitions
S253.003	IDF Developments Limited	RPROZ-S5	Not Stated	There is no clear rationale within Council's analysis that supports a 12.5% building/structure coverage for the Rural Production zone. It is not clear what the difference in effect is from 2.5% between the Operative and PDP provisions. The operative provisions should be retained and this approach would also align with Rule RPROZ-R2 Impermeable surface coverage.	Amend the threshold in Standard RPROZ-S5 to 15%		Accept	Section 5.2.29 Key Issue 29: Standard RPROZ-S5
FS172.270	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Accept	Section 5.2.29

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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 29: Standard RPROZ-S5
S243.124	Matauri Trustee Limited	RPROZ-S5	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain Standard RPROZ-S5		Accept in part	Section 5.2.26 Key Issue 26: Standards – General Comments
FS570.682	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 5.2.26 Key Issue 26: Standards – General Comments
FS566.696	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 5.2.26 Key Issue 26: Standards – General Comments
FS569.718	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 5.2.26 Key Issue 26: Standards – General Comments
S167.114	Bentzen Farm Limited	RPROZ-S5	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain RPROZ-S1 - RPROZ-S7		Accept in part	Section 5.2.26 Key Issue 26: Standards – General Comments
FS566.476	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.26 Key Issue 26: Standards – General Comments
S333.095	P S Yates Family Trust	RPROZ-S6	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain RPROZ-S6		Accept in part	Section 5.2.26 Key Issue 26: Standards – General Comments
S168.103	Setar Thirty Six Limited	RPROZ-S6	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain Standard RPROZ-S6		Accept in part	Section 5.2.26 Key Issue 26: 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
S187.106	The Shooting Box Limited	RPROZ-S6	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain RPROZ-S1 - RPROZ-S7		Accept in part	Section 5.2.26 Key Issue 26: Standards – General Comments
S243.125	Matauri Trustee Limited	RPROZ-S6	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain Standard RPROZ-S6		Accept in part	Section 5.2.26 Key Issue 26: Standards – General Comments
FS570.683	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 5.2.26 Key Issue 26: Standards – General Comments
FS566.697	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 5.2.26 Key Issue 26: Standards – General Comments
FS569.719	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 5.2.26 Key Issue 26: Standards – General Comments
S167.115	Bentzen Farm Limited	RPROZ-S6	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain RPROZ-S1 - RPROZ-S7		Accept in part	Section 5.2.26 Key Issue 26: Standards – General Comments
FS566.477	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 5.2.26 Key Issue 26: Standards – General Comments
S333.096	P S Yates Family Trust	RPROZ-S7	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain RPROZ-S7		Accept	Section 5.2.26 Key Issue 26: 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
S168.104	Setar Thirty Six Limited	RPROZ-S7	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain Standard RPROZ-S7		Accept	Section 5.2.26 Key Issue 26: Standards – General Comments
S316.004	FNR Properties Limited	RPROZ-S7	Support in part	FNR Properties acknowledge the importance of avoiding reverse sensitivity issues, particularly where they relate to quarrying activities and residential activities. FNR Properties also acknowledge that a restricted discretionary status may be appropriate where sensitive activities are established within 100m of the Mineral Extraction overlay. However, Rule RPROZ-S7 does not recognise that previous technical reports may have been provided to, and approved by Council, where reverse sensitivity effects have already been satisfactorily addressed. Where this is the case, and to reduce unnecessary costs to the applicant/property owner, it is therefore recommended that a controlled activity status is provided for where the site contains an 'approved building platform' and where reverse sensitivity effects have already been addressed.	Amend Standard RPROZ-S7 to provide for such activity to occur as a controlled activity where the site contains an 'approved building platform' and where reverse sensitivity effects have already been addressed.		Reject	Section 5.2.27 Key Issue 27: Standards RPROZ-S1, S2 and S7
S187.107	The Shooting Box Limited	RPROZ-S7	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain RPROZ-S1 - RPROZ-S7		Accept in part	Section 5.2.26 Key Issue 26: Standards – General Comments
S243.126	Matauri Trustee Limited	RPROZ-S7	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain Standard RPROZ-S7		Accept	Section 5.2.26 Key Issue 26: Standards – General Comments
FS570.684	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 5.2.26 Key Issue 26: 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
FS566.698	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 5.2.26 Key Issue 26: Standards – General Comments
FS569.720	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 5.2.26 Key Issue 26: Standards – General Comments
S167.116	Bentzen Farm Limited	RPROZ-S7	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain RPROZ-S1 - RPROZ-S7		Accept in part	Section 5.2.26 Key Issue 26: Standards – General Comments
FS566.478	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.26 Key Issue 26: Standards – General Comments