

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S463.002	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited	SPORT AND RECREATION FACILITY	Oppose	<p>The resource consenting implications of the exclusion of "major sports facilities" from this definition are unclear, as the Proposed Plan does not define "Major sports facilities".</p> <p>With respect to Kauri Cliffs golf course, Rule KCZ-R6 PER-3 appropriately permits recreational activities and facilities associated with golf. This would presumably permit the development of further golf-related facilities defined as a "Sport and Recreation Facility".</p> <p>If, however, Council defined Kauri Cliffs golf course as a "Major sports facility" then the implications for consenting further golf course development are unknown.</p> <p>The matter does not appear to be discussed in the Overview, KCZ or Open Space and Recreation Zones s32 reports.</p>	<p>Amend the definition of 'Sport and recreation facility' as follows: means any facility and associated structures used for organised sport, recreation activities, tournaments and sports education. It includes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. parks;</li> <li>2. playgrounds;</li> <li>3. sportsgrounds;</li> </ol> <p><del>It excludes:</del></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <del>major sports facilities.</del></li> </ol>		Accept
S454.122	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	Objectives	Not Stated	<p>Critical infrastructure such as the National Grid sometimes has a functional or operational need to locate in the Natural Open Space Zone and needs to be provided for. Due to its linear nature and the requirement to connect new electricity generation to the National Grid, regardless of where the new generation facilities are located, transmission lines may need to traverse any zone within the Far North District. A new objective is required to address this.</p>	<p>Insert new objective NOSZ-Ox as follows:<b>The Natural Open Space zone is used by compatible activities and infrastructure, that enhance community wellbeing and have a functional or operational need to locate in the zone.</b></p>		Reject
FS111.118	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)		Support	<p>PHTTCCT support inclusion of a new objective to enable infrastructure in the Natural Open Space Zone where there is a functional or operational need to.</p>	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS243.162	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose	<p>Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, as it is inconsistent with its primary submission. The amendment is unnecessary</p>	Disallow	(similar relief sought to above submission - numerous points)	Reject
FS346.043	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	<p>The amendment sought is too enabling to ensure adequate management of effects in this zone</p>	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS369.513	Top Energy		Support	Top Energy supports the objective to provide for infrastructure that has a functional or operational need to locate in the zone.	Allow		Reject
S182.034	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association	NOSZ-O1	Support	support the protection and enhancement of the Natural Open Space zone	Retain NOSZ-O1		Accept
S331.090	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	NOSZ-O1	Support	The submitter supports objective NOSZ-O2, to support land use of a scale that complements and is consistent with the conservation values of the Natural Open Space Zone.	Retain objective NOSZ-O2, as proposed.		Accept
S554.039	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited	NOSZ-O1	Support	KFO supports Objective NO SZ-O1 as providing an appropriate overall objective for the Natural Open Space zone.	Retain the objective as notified.		Accept
FS32.042	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 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.	Reject
FS389.045	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	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				future access point through the Further Submitters land			
<b>S511.122</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	NOSZ-O1	Support in part	This and every other objective should use consistent language. This is one of few spots if not only spot where the term ecological values is used. Various other terms are used throughout the plan such as environmental values, natural values, indigenous biodiversity values and natural environment values. The plan should pick one term and stick with it. Even within this chapter itself it uses multiple variations such as ecological, natural and indigenous biodiversity.	Amend NOSZ-O1 The <b>natural environment, ecological ...</b> Other Objectives and Policies throughout the plan may require amendment to reflect a consistent message and language.		Accept
<b>FS164.122</b>	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
<b>FS570.1693</b>	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
<b>FS566.1707</b>	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
<b>FS569.1729</b>	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
<b>S529.170</b>	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	NOSZ-O1	Support	The PDP replaces the Conservation zone with the term Natural Open Space zone (as specified in National Planning Standards). The PDP Overview section states that 'The Natural Open Space zone generally applies to public land ... and includes a	Retain NOSZ-O1		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				variety of parks and historic reserves. In most cases these areas have a high degree of biodiversity requiring active management.' We support, in particular, objective NOSZ-01 and policy NOSZ-P1 which state - 'The ecological, historic heritage, cultural and natural character values of the Natural Open Space zone are protected and enhanced for the benefit of current and future generations' 'Enable land use that conserves, protects and enhances the natural, ecological, historic heritage, cultural and natural character values of the zone'.			
<b>FS570.2058</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
<b>FS566.2072</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
<b>FS569.2094</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
<b>S442.141</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust	NOSZ-01	Support in part	This and every other objective should use consistent language. This is one of few spots if not only spot where the term ecological values is used. Various other terms are used throughout the plan such as environmental values, natural values, indigenous biodiversity values and natural environment values. The plan should pick one term and stick with it. Even within this chapter itself it uses multiple variations such as ecological, natural and indigenous biodiversity.	Amend NOSZ-01 The natural environment, <b>ecological...</b> <b>Other objectives and Policies throughout the plan may require amendment to reflect a consistent message and language.</b>		Accept
<b>FS346.752</b>	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
<b>S527.032</b>	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	NOSZ-01	Support	not stated	Retain NOSZ-01 as notified (inferred)		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.1894	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S554.040	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited	NOSZ-O2	Support	KFO supports Objective NO SZ-O2 as recognising the need to manage the scale and type of land use in the zone.	Retain the objective as notified.		Accept
FS32.043	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.	Reject
FS389.046	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
S331.091	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	NOSZ-O3	Support	The submitter supports objective NOSZ-O3, to provide public access to the Natural Open Space zone for leisure activities, such as school sports activities.	Retain objective NOSZ-O3, as proposed.		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S554.041	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited	NOSZ-O3	Support	KFO supports the recognition in Objective NO SZ-O3 that the natural open spaces should be available for the public to use and appreciate.	Retain the objective as notified.		Accept
FS32.044	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.	Reject
FS389.047	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
S182.035	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association	Policies	Not Stated	seek recognition in the Plan that vegetation may need to be removed for weed, pest, biosecurity, and biodiversity purposes	Insert new policy NOSZ-PXX Provide for the clearance of weeds and pests for biosecurity and biosecurity purposes.		Reject
S454.123	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	Policies	Not Stated	NOSZ-P1 sets out the land uses that are to be enabled in the Natural Open Space zone. Transpower supports the intent of this policy, however critical infrastructure, such as the National Grid, is not clearly provided for. Due to its linear nature and the requirement to connect new electricity	Insert new policy NOSZ-Px as follows: <b>Enable compatible activities and infrastructure, that have a functional or operational</b>		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				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 Natural Open Space zone.	<b>need to locate in the Natural Open Space zone.</b>		
<b>FS111.119</b>	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)		Support	PHTTCCT support inclusion of a new policy to enable infrastructure in the Natural Open Space Zone where there is a functional or operational need to.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept
<b>FS243.173</b>	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
<b>FS346.044</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendment sought is too enabling to ensure adequate management of effects in this zone	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept
<b>FS369.514</b>	Top Energy		Support	Top Energy supports the objective to provide for infrastructure that has a functional or operational need to locate in the zone.	Allow		Accept
<b>S554.042</b>	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited	NOSZ-P1	Support	KFO supports the guidance in Policy NO SZ-P1 on the land uses that are contemplated in the zone.	Retain the policy as notified.		Accept
<b>FS32.045</b>	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</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.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				and the link through to Waipapa Road a secondary route.  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.			
<b>FS389.048</b>	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
<b>S529.171</b>	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	NOSZ-P1	Support	The PDP replaces the Conservation zone with the term Natural Open Space zone (as specified in National Planning Standards). The PDP Overview section states that 'The Natural Open Space zone generally applies to public land ... and includes a variety of parks and historic reserves. In most cases these areas have a high degree of biodiversity requiring active management.' We support, in particular, objective NOSZ-01 and policy NOSZ-P1 which state - 'The ecological, historic heritage, cultural and natural character values of the Natural Open Space zone are protected and enhanced for the benefit of current and future generations' 'Enable land use that conserves, protects and enhances the natural, ecological, historic heritage, cultural and natural character values of the zone'.	Retain NOSZ-P1		Accept
<b>FS570.2059</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
<b>FS566.2073</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
<b>FS569.2095</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
<b>S527.033</b>	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for	NOSZ-P1	Support	not stated	Retain NOSZ-P1 as notified (inferred)		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)						
FS566.1895	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S554.043	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited	NOSZ-P2	Support	KFO supports the guidance in Policy NO SZ-P2 on the land uses that are contemplated in the zone.	Retain the policy as notified.		Accept
FS32.046	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.	Reject
FS389.049	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
S554.044	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited	NOSZ-P3	Oppose	While KFO generally supports the intention of the Policy, KFO seeks that a pathway is provided to enable works to support a subdivision or land use that are required within the Natural Open Space	Amend Policy NO SZ-P3 as follows" Avoid land use and subdivision that is incompatible with the ecological, historic heritage, cultural and natural character values of the zone <b>where the</b>		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				zone, such as water or wastewater infrastructure connections, pedestrian pathways and minor earthworks. Subject to those works being undertaken in a way that protects the Open Space values and does not adversely affect them.	<b>effects of the land use or subdivision cannot be adequately mitigated or remedied.</b>		
<b>FS32.047</b>	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
<b>FS47.006</b>	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose		Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept in part
<b>FS569.030</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	We oppose the proposed addition that weakens the protection of natural open space	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept in part
<b>FS389.050</b>	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
<b>S554.045</b>	Kiwi Fresh Orange	NOSZ-P4	Support	KFO supports Policy NO SZ-P4 as it appropriately recognises the need to manage development,	Retain the policy as notified.		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Company Limited			including managing various competing activities to ensure a well-functioning urban environment.			
FS32.048	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
FS389.051	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
S416.053	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	NOSZ-P4	Support in part	Policies in each zone provide for managing land use and subdivision to address the effects of the activity at zone interfaces by requiring the provision of 'setbacks, fencing, screening or landscaping required to address potential conflicts'. KiwiRail seeks an amendment to provide for the consideration of setbacks to the railway corridor or transport network, thus supporting safety and the railway setback rule sought	Insert additional matter as follows: <b>the location and design of buildings adjacent to the railway corridor</b>		Accepted in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS243.139	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	Accepted in part
S438.023	New Zealand Motor Caravan Association	Rules	Support in part	The proposed amendments would see compatible treatment of camping sites to camping grounds as amended in the submission. Camping sites are also unlikely to take place in the Natural Open Space Zone.	Amend the Natural Open Space Zone rules to provide for camping sites as discretionary activities.		Reject
S425.045	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust	Rules	Not Stated	The purpose of these zones is to enable and provide for recreation, PHTTCCT consider that cycling and walking is an important form of recreation, therefore, tracks for cyclists and pedestrians should be enabled.	Amend rules to enable cycling trails		Accept
S512.057	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Rules	Not Stated	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. Fire and Emergency request that emergency service facilities are included as a permitted activity in all zones. The draft Plan currently only includes emergency services facilities as an activity in some zones and with varying activity status. In addition, fire stations have specific requirements with relation to setback distances and vehicle crossings. Fire and Emergency request that emergency service facilities are exempt from these standards	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S512.080	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Rules	Not Stated	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 <b>Building setback requirements are further controlled by the Building Code. This includes the provision for firefighter access to buildings and egress from buildings. Plan users should refer to the applicable controls within the Building Code to ensure compliance can be achieved at the building consent stage. Issuance of a resource consent does not imply that waivers of Building Code requirements will be considered/granted</b>		Reject
S524.024	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	Rules	Not Stated	Seek to ensure that tracks for cyclists and pedestrians are enabled within this zone.	Amend rules to enable tracks for cycling and walking		Accept
FS88.70	Stephanie Lane		Support in part	Ensure dog walkers are able to enjoy these walkways too.	Allow in part		Reject
FS111.123	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)		Support	PHTTCCT supports the enablement of leisure activities as a permitted activity which would include tracks for cyclists and pedestrians. Definitions are to be amended to ensure consistency of this.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS277.64	Jenny Collison		Support	I agree	Allow		Reject
FS566.1842	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S271.024	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	Rules	Not Stated	Seek to ensure that tracks for cyclists and pedestrians are enabled within this zone.	Amend rules to enable tracks for cycling and walking		Accept
FS111.120	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail		Support	PHTTCCT supports that tracks for cyclists and pedestrians are enabled within this zone.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)						
FS534.050	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited		Support	WBFL agrees that it is appropriate to make a modest allowance for walking and cycling paths in this zone. As NOSZ-O3 indicates, enabling trail development within this zone is likely to foster the community's appreciation for, and support for the protection of, the values present in NOSZ areas.	Allow	Amend rules to enable tracks for cycling and walking	Reject
FS277.63	Jenny Collison		Support	I agree	Allow		Reject
FS570.747	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.761	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.783	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
S446.025	Kapiro Conservation Trust	Rules	Not Stated	Seek to ensure that tracks for cyclists and pedestrians are enabled within this zone.	Amend rules to allow Enablement of tracks for cycling and walking		Accept
FS111.121	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)		Support	PHTTCCT supports that tracks for cyclists and pedestrians are enabled within this zone.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.1784	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Reject
FS570.1784	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Reject
S529.089	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	Rules	Not Stated	Seek to ensure that tracks for cyclists and pedestrians are enabled within this zone.	Amend rules to provide for enablement of tracks for cycling and walking		Accept
FS111.122	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)		Support	PHTTCCT supports that tracks for cyclists and pedestrians are enabled within this zone.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS570.1977	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.1991	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.2013	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S529.173	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	Rules	Not Stated	Planting exotic vegetation in this zone should be a non-complying activity. Conservation land, in particular, should be planted only with indigenous species, and even for parks there is a range of suitable indigenous plant species.	Insert rule to make planting exotic vegetation a noncomplying activity		Reject
FS570.2061	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS566.2075	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS569.2097	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
S368.073	Far North District Council	NOSZ-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 NOSZ-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 in part
S425.048	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust	NOSZ-R1	Support in part	Support the enablement of leisure activities as a permitted activity which would include tracks for cyclists and pedestrians, and as a result permit (subject to bulk and locating controls) associated buildings and structures e.g. bridges, boardwalks and gates. However, such an activity could also fit the definition of recreation activity which is not permitted in this zone. Clarity is needed in terms of the interrelationship between definitions noting that the definition of	amend plan to ensure consistency in terms of how definitions are used within/between chapters to ensure consistencies and avoid unintended consenting requirements.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				recreation activity includes reference to use of land for the purpose of leisure.			
<b>S512.104</b>	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	NOSZ-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
<b>S482.009</b>	House Movers Section of New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc	NOSZ-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 NOSZ-R1 to: provide for relocated building as a permitted activity whenrelocated 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		Accepted in part
<b>FS23.156</b>	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	Accepted in part
<b>S431.130</b>	John Andrew Riddell	NOSZ-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
<b>FS332.130</b>	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
<b>S271.027</b>	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	NOSZ-R1	Support	Clarity is needed in terms of the interrelationship between definitions noting that the definition of recreation activity includes reference to use of land for the purpose of leisure.	Amend to provide clarify around definitions, specifically in terms of recreation activity and leisure activity, and that Council carefully considers how definitions are used within/between chapters to ensure consistencies and avoid unintended consenting requirements		Accept
<b>FS570.750</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
<b>FS566.764</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
<b>FS569.786</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
<b>S529.092</b>	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	NOSZ-R1	Support	Clarity is needed in terms of the interrelationship between definitions noting that the definition of recreation activity includes reference to use of land for the purpose of leisure.	Amend to provide clarify around definitions, specifically in terms of recreation activity and leisure activity, and that Council carefully considers how definitions are used within/between chapters to ensure consistencies and avoid unintended consenting requirements		Accept
<b>FS570.1980</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
<b>FS566.1994</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
<b>FS569.2016</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
<b>S524.027</b>	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	NOSZ-R1	Support	Clarity is needed in terms of the interrelationship between definitions noting that the definition of recreation activity includes reference to use of land for the purpose of leisure.	Amend to provide clarify around definitions, specifically in terms of recreation activity and leisure activity, and that Council carefully considers how definitions are used within/between chapters to ensure consistencies and avoid unintended consenting requirements		Accept
<b>FS566.1845</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
<b>S446.028</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust	NOSZ-R1	Support	Support the enablement of leisure activities as a permitted activity which would include tracks for cyclists and pedestrians, and as a result permit	Amend definitions, specifically in terms of recreation activity and leisure activity, and that Council carefully considers how definitions are used within/between		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				(subject to bulk and locating controls) associated buildings and structures e.g. bridges, boardwalks and gates. However, such an activity could also fit the definition of recreation activity which is not permitted in this zone. Clarity is needed in terms of the interrelationship between definitions noting that the definition of recreation activity includes reference to use of land for the purpose of leisure	chapters to ensure consistencies and avoid unintended consenting requirements	
FS569.1787	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Reject
FS570.1787	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Reject
S481.008	Puketotara Lodge Ltd	NOSZ-R2	Not Stated	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. 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,	Amend point c of the matters of discretion as follows: c. the availability of land for disposal of effluent and stormwater on the site without adverse effects on <del>adjoining</del> adjacent waterbodies (including groundwater and aquifers) or on <del>adjoining</del> adjacent sites; Insert the following as additional matters of discretion:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Avoiding nuisance or damage to adjacent or downstream properties;</b></li> <li>• <b>The extent to which the diversion and discharge maintains pre-development stormwater run-off flows and volumes;</b></li> <li>• <b>The extent to which the diversion and discharge mimics natural run-off patterns.</b></li> </ul>	Accept in part
S511.123	Royal Forest and Bird	NOSZ-R2	Oppose	It is difficult to envision how an impermeable surface that covers 10% or 1000 square meter whichever is	Amend to be a controlled activity enabling the Council to at least control where the surface is	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Protection Society of New Zealand			the lesser of a site in a Natural Open Space Zone does not cause some sort of adverse effect	located in the very least but recommend restricted discretionary.		
<b>FS164.123</b>	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).	Accept in part
<b>FS570.1694</b>	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
<b>FS566.1708</b>	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
<b>FS569.1730</b>	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
<b>S442.142</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust	NOSZ-R2	Oppose	It is difficult to envision how an impermeable surface that covers 10% or 1000 square meter whichever is the lesser of a site in a Natural Open Space Zone does not cause some sort of adverse effect.	Amend to be a controlled activity enabling the Council to at least control where the surface is located in the very least but recommend restricted discretionary.		Accept in part
<b>FS346.753</b>	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
<b>S283.018</b>	Trent Simpkin	NOSZ-R3	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	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		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				require a TP10/Stormwater report from an engineer (already). This is a detailed design of the stormwater management onsite and shouldn't require FNDC to look at it and tick the box to say its acceptable. 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.	says if a TP10 report is provided by an engineer, the activity is permitted (inferred)		
<b>FS570.832</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
<b>FS566.846</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
<b>FS569.868</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
<b>S182.036</b>	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association	NOSZ-R4	Support in part	support conservation activities as a permitted activity subject to the inclusion of the amendments sought to the definition	Amend the definition of Conservation Activity as sought by this submission		Accept
<b>S283.032</b>	Trent Simpkin	NOSZ-R5	Oppose	This submission applies to all Building Coverage rules within all zones. Amend to be larger, considering the size of allotments allowed for in the zone.	Amend the maximum building or structure coverage to be larger or offer an alternative pathway around this rule, by inserting a PER-2 which says if a building is above the maximum, it is permitted if a visual assessment and landscape plan is provided as part of the building consent.		Reject
<b>FS570.846</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
<b>FS566.860</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS569.882	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
S425.049	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust	NOSZ-R6	Support in part	Support the enablement of leisure activities as a permitted activity which would include tracks for cyclists and pedestrians, and as a result permit (subject to bulk and locating controls) associated buildings and structures e.g. bridges, boardwalks and gates. However, such an activity could also fit the definition of recreation activity which is not permitted in this zone. Clarity is needed in terms of the interrelationship between definitions noting that the definition of recreation activity includes reference to use of land for the purpose of leisure.	amend plan to ensure consistency in terms of how definitions are used within/between chapters to ensure consistencies and avoid unintended consenting requirements		Accept
S446.029	Kapiro Conservation Trust	NOSZ-R6	Support	Support the enablement of leisure activities as a permitted activity which would include tracks for cyclists and pedestrians, and as a result permit (subject to bulk and locating controls) associated buildings and structures e.g. bridges, boardwalks and gates. However, such an activity could also fit the definition of recreation activity which is not permitted in this zone. Clarity is needed in terms of the interrelationship between definitions noting that the definition of recreation activity includes reference to use of land for the purpose of leisure.	Amend definitions, specifically in terms of recreation activity and leisure activity, and that Council carefully considers how definitions are used within/between chapters to ensure consistencies and avoid unintended consenting requirements		Accept
FS111.124	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)		Support	PHTTCCT supports the enablement of leisure activities as a permitted activity which would include tracks for cyclists and pedestrians. Definitions are to be amended to ensure consistency of this	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.1788	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Reject
FS570.1788	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Reject
S511.124	Royal Forest and Bird Protection	NOSZ-R6	Oppose	Not clear what a leisure facility is and why it should be permitted. It is not defined in the Plan. If leisure facilities includes the likes of shelters these can be quite large and have effects. If it does these should	Amend so make is clear that leisure facilities such as shelters come under the permitted rule for buildings and structures		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Society of New Zealand			likely comply with the new building rule and standards			
<b>FS164.124</b>	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).	Accept in part
<b>FS570.1695</b>	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
<b>FS566.1709</b>	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
<b>FS569.1731</b>	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
<b>S524.028</b>	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	NOSZ-R6	Support	Clarity is needed in terms of the interrelationship between definitions noting that the definition of recreation activity includes reference to use of land for the purpose of leisure.	Amend to provide clarify around definitions, specifically in terms of recreation activity and leisure activity, and that Council carefully considers how definitions are used within/between chapters to ensure consistencies and avoid unintended consenting requirements		Accept
<b>FS277.65</b>	Jenny Collison		Support	I agree	Allow		Reject
<b>FS566.1846</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
<b>S271.028</b>	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	NOSZ-R6	Support	Clarity is needed in terms of the interrelationship between definitions noting that the definition of recreation activity includes reference to use of land for the purpose of leisure.	Amend to provide clarify around definitions, specifically in terms of recreation activity and leisure activity, and that Council carefully considers how definitions are used within/between chapters to		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					ensure consistencies and avoid unintended consenting requirements		
FS570.751	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.765	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.787	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
S529.093	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	NOSZ-R6	Support	Clarity is needed in terms of the interrelationship between definitions noting that the definition of recreation activity includes reference to use of land for the purpose of leisure.	Amend to provide clarify around definitions, specifically in terms of recreation activity and leisure activity, and that Council carefully considers how definitions are used within/between chapters to ensure consistencies and avoid unintended consenting requirements		Accept
FS570.1981	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.1995	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.2017	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S442.143	Kapiro Conservation Trust	NOSZ-R6	Oppose	Not clear what a leisure facility is and why it should be permitted. It is not defined in the Plan. If leisure facilities includes the likes of shelters these can be quite large and have effects. If it does these should likely comply with the new building rule and standards.	Amend so to make it clear that leisure facilities such as shelters come under the permitted rule for buildings and structures.		Accept in part
FS346.754	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
S529.172	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	NOSZ-R7	Support in part	the rule on vegetation planting (rule NOSZ-R7, permitted activity) states that 'planting of indigenous species is preferred'. When planting takes place in reserves and the Natural Open Space zone,	Amend NOSZ-R7 to ensure indigenous species are planted		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				indigenous species should be required, in order to conserve and enhance indigenous biodiversity.			
<b>FS570.2060</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
<b>FS566.2074</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
<b>FS569.2096</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
<b>S527.034</b>	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	NOSZ-R7	Oppose	The rule on vegetation planting (rule NOSZ-R7, permitted activity) states that 'planting of indigenous species is preferred'. When planting takes place in reserves and the Natural Open Space zone, indigenous species should be required, in order to conserve and enhance indigenous biodiversity. Planting exotic vegetation in this zone should be a non-complying activity. Conservation land, in particular, should be planted only with indigenous species, and even for parks there is a range of suitable indigenous plant species	Amend to make planting exotic vegetation a non-complying activity (inferred)		Reject
<b>FS566.1896</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
<b>S214.009</b>	Airbnb	NOSZ-R10	Support in part	The proposed district plan allows for visitor accommodation as a permitted activity for less than or equal to 6-10 guests on site. If these conditions are not met, the activity is discretionary except in the settlement zone where it is restricted discretionary. Airbnb supports the overall approach to allow visitor accommodation to occur in 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.	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Airbnb strongly believes that consistency for guests and hosts is important and that a national approach is the most effective way to address these concerns. Kiwis agree with 64% expressing support for national regulation. One example of this type of standardised approach across councils is the Code of Conduct approach as piloted in New South Wales (NSW), Australia (with a robust compliance and enforcement mechanism, operating on a 'two strike' basis whereby bad actors are excluded from participating in the industry for a period of 5 years after repeated breaches of the Code).			
<b>FS23.071</b>	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Support standardizing the number applying to permitted visitor accommodation activities across all zones. Taking a consistent approach will make it easier for the plan provisions to be applied and understood. The effects are not likely to differ significantly in residential zones	Allow	allow relief sought	Accept
<b>S331.092</b>	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	NOSZ-R11	Support	The submitter supports rule NOSZ-R11 Educational facility, and the discretionary activity status of educational facilities to enable land use, such as educational facilities for outdoor education activities, of a scale that complements and is consistent with the conservation values of the Natural Open Space Zone.	Retain rule NOSZ-R11 Educational facility, as proposed.		Accept
<b>S438.022</b>	New Zealand Motor Caravan Association	NOSZ-R12	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. There may however be possible effects on ecological values which need closer assessment, hence permitted with conditions.	Amend NOSZ-R12 to provide for camping grounds as permitted activities with conditions or restricted discretionary activities.		Reject
<b>S431.189</b>	John Andrew Riddell	NOSZ-S2	Not Stated	Not stated	Retain the approach varying the required height to boundary depending on the orientation of the relevant boundary.		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S416.065	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	NOSZ-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.</p> <p>KiwiRail considers that a matter of discretion directing consideration of impacts on the safety and efficiency of the rail corridor is appropriate in situations where the 5m setback standard is not complied with in all zones adjacent to the railway corridor.</p> <p>Building setbacks are essential to address significant safety hazards associated with the operational rail corridor. The Proposed Plan enables a 1m setback from side and rear boundaries shared with the rail corridor, increasing the risk that poles, ladders, or even ropes for abseiling equipment, could protrude into the rail corridor and increasing the risk of collision with a train or electrified overhead lines. Further, there is a 600mm eave allowance within side and rear yards which restricts potential access to roofs from of buildings even further and results in an effective yard setback of 400mm.</p> <p>KiwiRail consider that a 5m setback is appropriate in providing for vehicular access to the rear of buildings (e.g. a cherry picker) and allowing for scaffolding to be erected safely. This setback provides for the unhindered operation of buildings, including higher 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.</p> <p>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</p>	<p>Insert a railway setback (refer to submission for examples) Insert the following matters of discretion into the standard:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>the location and design of the building as it relates to the ability to safely use, access and maintain buildings without requiring access on, above or over the rail corridor</b></li> <li>• <b>the safe and efficient operation of the rail network</b></li> </ul>	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				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. It is noted that some zones (Heavy Industrial, Rural production)) have wider yards than sought by KiwiRail. This is supported, but the yard purpose is not linked to safety matters relating to a site's proximity to the railway and therefore any applications for reductions may not consider this requirement.			
FS243.151	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
S179.086	Russell Protection Society (INC)	Objectives	Support in part	in some instances open space also serves the important function of preserving sight line corridors that strategically link public places with views of the sea, prominent geologic features, significant trees or historic sites	Insert a requirement in the objectives around the importance of sight lines a		Reject
FS23.043	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Preservation of sightlines is important to retain the character of Kororāreka and the connection between significant places onshore and offshore.	Allow	allow original submission	Accept
S454.124	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	Objectives	Not Stated	Critical infrastructure such as the National Grid sometimes has a functional or operational need to locate in the Open Space Zone and needs to be provided for. Due to its linear nature and the requirement to connect new electricity generation to the National Grid, regardless of where the new generation facilities are located, transmission lines may need to traverse any zone within the Far North District. A new objective is required to address this.	Insert new objective OSZ-O3 as follows: <b>The Open Space zone is used by compatible activities and infrastructure, that enhance community well-being and have a functional or operational need to locate in the zone.</b>		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS111.125	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)		Support	PHTTCCT support inclusion of a new objective to enable infrastructure in the Natural Open Space Zone where there is a functional or operational need to.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept
FS243.163	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
FS369.515	Top Energy		Support	Top Energy supports the objective to provide for infrastructure that has a functional or operational need to locate in the zone.	Allow		Accept
S186.001	Aksel Danger Bech	OSZ-01	Support in part	<p>The FNDC operates many open spaces and reserves around the district, however the recreational reserve located at 455 Opito Bay Road and the parking in Road Reserve/Coastal set-back area opposite (along the beach) is one of the more important, loved and highly utilised community assets that give access to what is effectively the "town beach" for Kerikeri as well as a public boat ramp at the mouth of the inlet for convenient access to the bay for recreational boating for both visitors and residents alike. I support Objective OSZ-01 that is consistent with these purposes. Further Policies OSZ-P1, OSZ-P2 and OSZ-P3 seek to give effect to the above Objective and support their intent.</p> <p>My submission is to give better effect to these by prioritising developing an area specific Reserve Management Plan for this specific area, given its importance and high usage. Specific consideration of vehicle parking (incl. cars, cars with boat trailers, campers whether self-contained or not, and any commercial vehicles) must be included including restrictions on duration of permitted parking, overnighting etc</p>	Amend the PDP to identify the open space and recreational areas that must have an area specific Reserve Management Plan. Secondly allocate appropriate resources and funding in the next LTP to complete such a Reserve Management Plan, including this as a priority for Years 1- 3 of that LTP		Accept in part
S331.093	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	OSZ-02	Support	The submitter supports objective OSZ-02, as it provides for land use that is consistent with the natural, ecological, historic heritage and cultural values of the zone and provides for social and cultural wellbeing, such as educational facilities for outdoor education activities.	Retain objective OSZ-02, as proposed.		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS51.44	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support	HNZPT also supports the retention of Objective OSZ-O2.	Allow		Reject
S179.087	Russell Protection Society (INC)	Policies	Support in part	in some instances open space also serves the important function of preserving sight line corridors that strategically link public places with views of the sea, prominent geologic features, significant trees or historic sites	Insert a policy around the important function of preserving sightline corridors		Reject
FS23.044	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Preservation of sightlines is important to retain the character of Kororāreka and the connection between significant places onshore and offshore.	Allow	allow original submission	Accept
S454.125	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	Policies	Not Stated	OSZ-P3 sets out the activities that are to be enabled in the Open Space zone. Transpower supports the intent of this policy, however critical infrastructure, such as the National Grid, is not clearly provided for. Due to its linear nature and the requirement to connect new electricity generation to the National Grid, regardless of where the new generation facilities are located, transmission lines may need to traverse any zone within the Far North District. A new policy is required to make it explicit that infrastructure such as the National Grid is enabled in the Open Space zone.	Insert new policy OSZ-Px as follows: <b>Enable compatible activities and infrastructure, that have a functional or operational need to locate in the Open Space zone.</b>		Reject
FS243.174	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
FS369.516	Top Energy		Support	Top Energy supports the objective to provide for infrastructure that has a functional or operational need to locate in the zone.	Allow		Accept
S331.094	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	OSZ-P3	Support	The submitter supports policy OSZ-P3, as it provides for activities and their associated buildings or structures where they provide for the social well-being and benefit of the community, such as educational facilities for outdoor education activities.	Retain policy OSZ-P3, as proposed.		Accept
S416.054	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	OSZ-P4	Support in part	Policies in each zone provide for managing land use and subdivision to address the effects of the activity at zone interfaces by requiring the provision of 'setbacks, fencing, screening or landscaping required	Insert additional matter as follows: <b>the location and design of buildings adjacent to the</b>		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				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	<b>railway corridor</b>		
<b>FS243.140</b>	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the requested 5m setback; a considerably reduced set back would provide adequate space for maintenance activities within sites adjacent to the rail network. In doing so, it will continue to protect the safe, 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 in part
<b>S425.046</b>	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust	Rules	Not Stated	The purpose of these zones is to enable and provide for recreation, PHTTCCT consider that cycling and walking is an important form of recreation, therefore, tracks for cyclists and pedestrians should be enabled.	amend to enable cycling trails		Accept
<b>S512.058</b>	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Rules	Not Stated	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. Fire and Emergency request that emergency service facilities are included as a permitted activity in all zones. The draft Plan currently only includes emergency services facilities as an activity in some zones and with varying activity status. In addition, fire stations have specific requirements with relation to setback distances and vehicle crossings. Fire and Emergency request that emergency service facilities are exempt from these standards	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
<b>S179.088</b>	Russell Protection Society (INC)	Rules	Not Stated	in some instances open space also serves the important function of preserving sight line corridors that strategically link public places with views of the sea, prominent geologic features, significant trees or historic sites	Insert a rule to preserve important sight lines.		Reject
<b>FS23.045</b>	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Preservation of sightlines is important to retain the character of Kororāreka and the connection between significant places onshore and offshore.	Allow	allow original submission	Accept
<b>S271.025</b>	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	Rules	Not Stated	Seek to ensure that tracks for cyclists and pedestrians are enabled within this zone.	Amend rules to enable tracks for cycling and walking		Accept
<b>FS111.126</b>	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)		Support	PHTTCCT supports that tracks for cyclists and pedestrians are enabled within this zone.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
<b>FS277.66</b>	Jenny Collison		Support	I agree	Allow		Reject
<b>FS570.748</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
<b>FS566.762</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
<b>FS569.784</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
<b>S529.090</b>	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	Rules	Not Stated	Seek to ensure that tracks for cyclists and pedestrians are enabled within this zone.	Amend rules to provide for enablement of tracks for cycling and walking		Accept
<b>FS111.127</b>	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)		Support	PHTTCCT supports that tracks for cyclists and pedestrians are enabled within this zone	Allow	allow original submission	Reject
<b>FS111.133</b>	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)		Support	PHTTCCT supports that tracks for cyclists and pedestrians are enabled within this zone.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS570.1978	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.1992	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.2014	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S524.025	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	Rules	Not Stated	Seek to ensure that tracks for cyclists and pedestrians are enabled within this zone.	Amend rules to enable tracks for cycling and walking		Accept
FS111.128	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)		Support	PHTTCCT supports that tracks for cyclists and pedestrians are enabled within this zone.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS111.134	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)		Support	PHTTCCT supports that tracks for cyclists and pedestrians are enabled within this zone.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS277.67	Jenny Collison		Support	I agree	Allow		Reject
FS566.1843	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S438.025	New Zealand Motor Caravan Association	Rules	Support in part	The proposed amendments would see compatible treatment of camping sites to camping grounds as amended in the submission. Camping sites are also unlikely to take place in the Open Space Zone.	Amend Open Space Zone rules to provide for camping sites as restricted discretionary activities.		Reject
S446.026	Kapiro Conservation Trust	Rules	Not Stated	Seek to ensure that tracks for cyclists and pedestrians are enabled within this zone.	Amend rules to enable tracks for cycling and walking		Accept
FS569.1785	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Reject
FS570.1785	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
<b>S257.028</b>	Te Hiku Community Board	OSZ-R1	Oppose	We would like the parks and reserves in our district with new zoning rules that don't require minimum bulk/height and location rules. Rules should be limited to activities that are not for public facilities or playgrounds or open space areas. We would like the parks and reserves in our district with new zoning rules that don't require impermeable surface rules for playgrounds and other parks. Rules should be limited to activities that are not for public facilities or playgrounds or open space areas.	Amend rule OSZ-R1 by deleting the reference to OSZ-S1 (maximum height) and OSZ-S5 (building coverage), OR at least amend the rule so that those standards do not apply to public facilities or playgrounds.	Accept in part
<b>S541.032</b>	Elbury Holdings	OSZ-R1	Oppose	We would like the parks and reserves in our district with new zoning rules that don't require minimum bulk/height and location rules. If there are to be some rules, these should be limited to activities that are not for public facilities or playgrounds or open space areas.	Amend rule OSZ-R1 by deleting the reference to OSZ-S1 (maximum height) and OSZ-S5 (building coverage), OR at least amend the rule so that those standards do not apply to public facilities or playgrounds.	Accept in part
<b>S485.036</b>	Elbury Holdings	OSZ-R1	Oppose	We would like the parks and reserves in our district with new zoning rules that don't require minimum bulk/height and location rules. If there are to be some rules, these should be limited to activities that are not for public facilities or playgrounds or open space areas.	Amend OSZ-R1 to delete reference to OSZ-S1 (maximum height) and OSZ-S5 (building coverage), or amend OSZ-R1 so OSZ-S1 and OSZ-S5 do not apply to public facilities or playgrounds.	Accept in part
<b>S519.036</b>	Elbury Holdings	OSZ-R1	Oppose	We would like the parks and reserves in our district with new zoning rules that don't require minimum bulk/height and location rules. If there are to be some rules, these should be limited to activities that are not for public facilities or playgrounds or open space areas.	Amend rule OSZ-R1 by deleting the reference to OSZ-S1 (maximum height) and OSZ-S5 (building coverage), OR at least amend the rule so that those standards do not apply to public facilities or playgrounds.	Accept in part
<b>S368.074</b>	Far North District Council	OSZ-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 OSZ-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 in part
<b>S358.034</b>	Leah Frieling	OSZ-R1	Oppose	We would like the parks and reserves in our district with new zoning rules that don't require minimum	Amend rule OSZ-R1 by deleting the reference to OSZ-S1 (maximum height) and OSZ-S5 (building	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				bulk/height and location rules. If there are to be some rules, these should be limited to activities that are not for public facilities or playgrounds or open space areas.	coverage), OR at least amend the rule so that those standards do not apply to public facilities or playgrounds	
<b>S357.027</b>	Sean Frieling	OSZ-R1	Oppose	We would like the parks and reserves in our district with new zoning rules that don't require minimum bulk/height and location rules. If there are to be some rules, these should be limited to activities that are not for public facilities or playgrounds or open space areas.	Amend rule OSZ-R1 by deleting the reference to OSZ-S1 (maximum height) and OSZ-S5 (building coverage), OR at least amend the rule so that those standards do not apply to public facilities or playgrounds.	Accept in part
<b>S425.050</b>	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust	OSZ-R1	Support in part	This rule permits buildings (subject to bulk and location controls) where they are associated with a permitted activity. However, leisure activities are not permitted in this Zone but recreation activities are.	amend plan to ensure consistency in terms of how definitions are used within/between chapters to ensure consistency and avoid unintended consenting requirements	Accept in part
<b>S472.035</b>	Michael Foy	OSZ-R1	Support in part	We would like the parks and reserves in our district with new zoning rules that don't require minimum bulk/height and location rules. If there are to be some rules, these should be limited to activities that are not for public facilities or playgrounds or open space areas.	Amend rule OSZ-R1 by deleting the reference to OSZ-S1 (maximum height) and OSZ-S5 (building coverage), OR at least amend the rule so that those standards do not apply to public facilities or playgrounds	Accept in part
<b>S512.105</b>	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	OSZ-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
<b>S547.033</b>	LJ King Limited	OSZ-R1	Oppose	We would like the parks and reserves in our district with new zoning rules that don't require minimum bulk/height and location rules. If there are to be some rules, these should be limited to activities that are not for public facilities or playgrounds or open space areas	Amend OSZ-R1 to delete reference to OSZ-S1 (maximum height) and OSZ-S5 (building coverage), or amend OSZ-R1 so OSZ-S1 and OSZ-S5 do not apply to public facilities or playgrounds	Accept in part
<b>S482.010</b>	House Movers Section of New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc	OSZ-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	amend OSZ-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)	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				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	restricted discretionary activity status for relocated buildings that do not meet the permitted activity status standards		
FS23.157	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
S446.030	Kapiro Conservation Trust	OSZ-R1	Support in part	This rule permits buildings (subject to bulk and location controls) where they are associated with a permitted activity. However, leisure activities are not permitted in this Zone but recreation activities are.	Amend definitions, specifically in terms of recreation activity and leisure activity, and that Council carefully considers how definitions are used within/between chapters to ensure consistencies and avoid unintended consenting requirements		Accept
FS111.129	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)		Support	PHTTCCT supports the enablement of leisure activities as a permitted activity which would include tracks for cyclists and pedestrians. Definitions are to be amended to ensure consistency of this.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.1789	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Reject
FS570.1789	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Reject
S431.131	John Andrew Riddell	OSZ-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
FS332.131	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
S524.029	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	OSZ-R1	Support in part	This rule permits buildings (subject to bulk and location controls) where they are associated with a permitted activity. However, leisure activities are not permitted in this Zone but recreation activities are.	Amend to provide clarify around definitions, specifically in terms of recreation activity and leisure activity, and that Council carefully considers how definitions are used within/between chapters to		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					ensure consistencies and avoid unintended consenting requirements.		
FS277.68	Jenny Collison		Support	I agree	Allow		Reject
FS566.1847	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S271.029	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	OSZ-R1	Support in part	This rule permits buildings (subject to bulk and location controls) where they are associated with a permitted activity. However, leisure activities are not permitted in this Zone but recreation activities are.	Amend to provide clarify around definitions, specifically in terms of recreation activity and leisure activity, and that Council carefully considers how definitions are used within/between chapters to ensure consistencies and avoid unintended consenting requirements.		Accept
FS570.752	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.766	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.788	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
S529.094	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	OSZ-R1	Support in part	This rule permits buildings (subject to bulk and location controls) where they are associated with a permitted activity. However, leisure activities are not permitted in this Zone but recreation activities are.	Amend to provide clarify around definitions, specifically in terms of recreation activity and leisure activity, and that Council carefully considers how definitions are used within/between chapters to ensure consistencies and avoid unintended consenting requirements.		Accept
FS570.1982	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.1996	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.2018	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S464.035	LJ King Ltd	OSZ-R1	Oppose	We would like the parks and reserves in our district with new zoning rules that don't require minimum bulk/height and location rules. If there are to be some rules, these should be limited to activities that are not for public facilities or playgrounds or open space areas.	Amend OSZ-R1 to delete reference to OSZ-S1 (maximum height) and OSZ-S5 (building coverage), or amend OSZ-R1 so OSZ-S1 and OSZ-S5 do not apply to public facilities or playgrounds.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.1578	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent 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
S543.033	LJ King Limited	OSZ-R1	Oppose	We would like the parks and reserves in our district with new zoning rules that don't require minimum bulk/height and location rules. If there are to be some rules, these should be limited to activities that are not for public facilities or playgrounds or open space areas	Amend OSZ-R1 to delete reference to OSZ-S1 (maximum height) and OSZ-S5 (building coverage), or amend OSZ-R1 so OSZ-S1 and OSZ-S5 do not apply to public facilities or playgrounds		Accept in part
FS566.2194	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent 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
S257.029	Te Hiku Community Board	OSZ-R2	Oppose	We would like the parks and reserves in our district with new zoning rules that don't require minimum bulk/height and location rules. Rules should be limited to activities that are not for public facilities or playgrounds or open space areas. We would like the parks and reserves in our district with new zoning rules that don't require impermeable surface rules for playgrounds and other parks. Rules should be limited to activities that are not for public facilities or playgrounds or open space areas.	Delete rule OSZ-R2 (impermeable surface) OR at least amend the rule so that impermeable surface restrictions do not apply to public facilities or playgrounds.		Accept in part
S541.033	Elbury Holdings	OSZ-R2	Oppose	We would like the parks and reserves in our district with new zoning rules that don't require impermeable surface rules for playgrounds and other parks. If there are to be some rules, these should be limited to activities that are not for public facilities or playgrounds or open space areas.	Delete rule OSZ-R2 (impermeable surface) OR at least amend the rule so that impermeable surface restrictions do not apply to public facilities or playgrounds.		Accept in part
S485.037	Elbury Holdings	OSZ-R2	Oppose	We would like the parks and reserves in our district with new zoning rules that don't require impermeable surface rules for playgrounds and other parks. If there are to be some rules, these should be limited to activities that are not for public facilities or playgrounds or open space areas.	Delete OSZ-R2 or amend OSZ-R2 so that impermeable surface restrictions do not apply to public facilities or playgrounds.		Accept in part
S519.037	Elbury Holdings	OSZ-R2	Oppose	We would like the parks and reserves in our district with new zoning rules that don't require impermeable surface rules for playgrounds and other parks. If there are to be some rules, these should be limited to	Delete rule OSZ-R2 (impermeable surface) OR at least amend the rule so that impermeable surface restrictions do not apply to public facilities or playgrounds.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				activities that are not for public facilities or playgrounds or open space areas.		
<b>S358.035</b>	Leah Frieling	OSZ-R2	Oppose	We would like the parks and reserves in our district with new zoning rules that don't require impermeable surface rules for playgrounds and other parks. If there are to be some rules, these should be limited to activities that are not for public facilities or playgrounds or open space areas	Delete rule OSZ-R2 (impermeable surface) OR at least amend the rule so that impermeable surface restrictions do not apply to public facilities or playgrounds	Accept in part
<b>S357.028</b>	Sean Frieling	OSZ-R2	Oppose	We would like the parks and reserves in our district with new zoning rules that don't require impermeable surface rules for playgrounds and other parks. If there are to be some rules, these should be limited to activities that are not for public facilities or playgrounds or open space areas.	Delete rule OSZ-R2 (impermeable surface) OR at least amend the rule so that impermeable surface restrictions do not apply to public facilities or playgrounds.	Accept in part
<b>S472.036</b>	Michael Foy	OSZ-R2	Support in part	We would like the parks and reserves in our district with new zoning rules that don't require impermeable surface rules for playgrounds and other parks. If there are to be some rules, these should be limited to activities that are not for public facilities or playgrounds or open space areas	Delete rule OSZ-R2 (impermeable surface) OR at least amend the rule so that impermeable surface restrictions do not apply to public facilities or playgrounds	Accept in part
<b>S547.034</b>	LJ King Limited	OSZ-R2	Oppose	We would like the parks and reserves in our district with new zoning rules that don't require impermeable surface rules for playgrounds and other parks. If there are to be some rules, these should be limited to activities that are not for public facilities or playgrounds or open space areas	Delete OSZ-R2 or amend OSZ-R2 so that impermeable surface restrictions do not apply to public facilities or playgrounds	Accept in part
<b>S481.009</b>	Puketotara Lodge Ltd	OSZ-R2	Not Stated	<p>The submitter seeks to ensure that the PDP adequately controls effects from stormwater discharge, particularly between sites or adjacent sites.</p> <p>The Operative Far North Plan contains a stormwater management rule in each zone, along with matters of discretion which Council can consider where the impermeable surface area exceeds what is allowed under the permitted activity rule.</p> <p>There is no specific "stormwater management" rule in the Rural Production zone in the PDP, however there is a rule relating to impermeable surface coverage.</p> <p>It is submitted that additional matters should be added to the list of relevant matters for discretion in the impermeable coverage rule in all zones, in order</p>	Amend point c of the matters of discretion as follows: c. the availability of land for disposal of effluent and stormwater on the site without adverse effects on <b>adjoining adjacent</b> waterbodies (including groundwater and aquifers) or on <b>adjoining adjacent</b> sites; Insert the following as additional matters of discretion:	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				to better control effects between sites or adjacent sites,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Avoiding nuisance or damage to adjacent or downstream properties;</b></li> <li>• <b>The extent to which the diversion and discharge maintains pre-development stormwater run-off flows and volumes;</b></li> <li>• <b>The extent to which the diversion and discharge mimics natural run-off patterns.</b></li> </ul>		
<b>S283.019</b>	Trent Simpkin	OSZ-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 detailed design of the stormwater management onsite and shouldn't require FNDC to look at it and tick the box to say its acceptable. Why don't we have a PER-2 which says that if a TP10 report is provided by an engineer, it's permitted? (one solution to reduce the number of RC's for Council to process, and assist with getting back to realistic processing times). This submission point applies to all zones.	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
<b>FS570.833</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
<b>FS566.847</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
<b>FS569.869</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
						inconsistent with our original submission	
<b>S464.036</b>	LJ King Ltd	OSZ-R2	Oppose	We would like the parks and reserves in our district with new zoning rules that don't require impermeable surface rules for playgrounds and other parks. If there are to be some rules, these should be limited to activities that are not for public facilities or playgrounds or open space areas.	Delete OSZ-R2 or amend OSZ-R2 so that impermeable surface restrictions do not apply to public facilities or playgrounds.		Accept in part
<b>FS566.1579</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
<b>S543.034</b>	LJ King Limited	OSZ-R2	Oppose	We would like the parks and reserves in our district with new zoning rules that don't require impermeable surface rules for playgrounds and other parks. If there are to be some rules, these should be limited to activities that are not for public facilities or playgrounds or open space areas	Delete OSZ-R2 or amend OSZ-R2 so that impermeable surface restrictions do not apply to public facilities or playgrounds.		Accept in part
<b>FS566.2195</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
<b>S283.033</b>	Trent Simpkin	OSZ-R5	Oppose	This submission applies to all Building Coverage rules within all zones. Amend to be larger, considering the size of allotments allowed for in the zone.	Amend the maximum building or structure coverage to be larger or offer an alternative pathway around this rule, by inserting a PER-2 which says if a building is above the maximum, it is permitted if a visual assessment and landscape plan is provided as part of the building consent.		Reject
<b>FS570.847</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
<b>FS566.861</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
<b>FS569.883</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
						inconsistent with our original submission	
<b>S425.051</b>	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust	OSZ-R6	Support in part	This rule permits buildings (subject to bulk and location controls) where they are associated with a permitted activity. However, leisure activities are not permitted in this Zone but recreation activities are.	amend plan to ensure consistency in terms of how definitions are used within/between chapters to ensure consistencies and avoid unintended consenting requirements		Accept
<b>S446.031</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust	OSZ-R6	Support in part	This rule permits buildings (subject to bulk and location controls) where they are associated with a permitted activity. However, leisure activities are not permitted in this Zone but recreation activities are.	Amend definitions, specifically in terms of recreation activity and leisure activity, and that Council carefully considers how definitions are used within/between chapters to ensure consistencies and avoid unintended consenting requirements		Accept
<b>FS111.130</b>	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)		Support	PHTTCCT supports the enablement of leisure activities as a permitted activity which would include tracks for cyclists and pedestrians. Definitions are to be amended to ensure consistency of this.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
<b>FS569.1790</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Reject
<b>FS570.1790</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Reject
<b>S271.030</b>	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	OSZ-R6	Support in part	This rule permits buildings (subject to bulk and location controls) where they are associated with a permitted activity. However, leisure activities are not permitted in this Zone but recreation activities are.	Amend to provide clarify around definitions, specifically in terms of recreation activity and leisure activity, and that Council carefully considers how definitions are used within/between chapters to ensure consistencies and avoid unintended consenting requirements.		Accept
<b>FS277.69</b>	Jenny Collison		Support	I agree	Allow		Reject
<b>FS570.753</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
<b>FS566.767</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
<b>FS569.789</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
<b>S524.030</b>	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	OSZ-R6	Support in part	This rule permits buildings (subject to bulk and location controls) where they are associated with a permitted activity. However, leisure activities are not permitted in this Zone but recreation activities are.	Amend to provide clarify around definitions, specifically in terms of recreation activity and leisure activity, and that Council carefully considers how definitions are used within/between chapters to		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					ensure consistencies and avoid unintended consenting requirements.		
<b>FS277.70</b>	Jenny Collison		Support	I agree	Allow		Reject
<b>FS566.1848</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
<b>FS569.1870</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
<b>S529.095</b>	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	OSZ-R6	Support in part	This rule permits buildings (subject to bulk and location controls) where they are associated with a permitted activity. However, leisure activities are not permitted in this Zone but recreation activities are.	Amend to provide clarify around definitions, specifically in terms of recreation activity and leisure activity, and that Council carefully considers how definitions are used within/between chapters to ensure consistencies and avoid unintended consenting requirements.		Accept
<b>FS570.1983</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
<b>FS566.1997</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
<b>FS569.2019</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
<b>S186.002</b>	Aksel Danger Bech	OSZ-R11	Support in part	Significant tensions and frustrations have arisen in recent years over the operation of commercial oyster barge/forklift/truck activities at Opito Bay where residents have provided multiple examples and evidence (photos, videos and witness statements) of non-compliances with the operator's resource consents. This activity appears inconsistent with Further, significant tensions and frustrations have arisen in recent years over the operation of commercial oyster barge/forklift/truck activities where residents have provided multiple examples and evidence (photos, videos and witness statements) of non-compliances with the operator's resource consents. This activity appears inconsistent with Objective OSZ-01 and Policies OSZ-PI, OSZ-P2 and OSZ-P3. My submission is to change OPZ-R11 from the proposed Activity status: Discretionary to Activity	Amend the activity status for Rule OSZ-R11 from discretionary to non-complying. Further to this FNDC should submit against any resource consents sought by commercial operators from Regional Council as such activities are inconsistent with the zone's objectives and purposes.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				status: Noncomplying to give better effect to the Objective OSZ-01 for this section as well as consistency with Policies OSZ-PI, OSZ-P2 and OSZ-P3.			
<b>S214.010</b>	Airbnb	OSZ-R12	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. Airbnb strongly believes that consistency for guests and hosts is important and that a national approach is the most effective way to address these concerns. Kiwis agree with 64% expressing support for national regulation. One example of this type of standardised approach across councils is the Code of Conduct approach as piloted in New South Wales (NSW), Australia (with a robust compliance and enforcement mechanism, 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).</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
<b>FS23.072</b>	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Support standardizing the number applying to permitted visitor accommodation activities across all zones. Taking a consistent approach will make it easier for the plan provisions to be applied and understood. The effects are not likely to differ significantly in residential zones	Allow	Allow relief sought.	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S438.024	New Zealand Motor Caravan Association	OSZ-R13	Oppose	The NZMCA operates a number of campgrounds and park over properties that are present in a variety of zones. Allowing for more permissive rules around the establishment of campgrounds will make it easier to establish sites for self-contained vehicle-based camping in the Far North District. This will also create positive social and economic benefits for the community. Camping is also compatible with expected activities in the Open Space Zone.	Amend OSZ-R13 to provide for camping grounds as permitted activities with conditions or restricted discretionary activities.	Reject
S331.095	Ministry of Education Te Tahuu o Te Mātauranga	OSZ-R14	Support	The submitter supports rule OSZ-R14 Educational facility, as it provides for activities and their associated buildings or structures where they provide for the social well-being and benefit of the community, such as educational facilities for outdoor education activities.	Retain rule OSZ-R14 Educational facility, as proposed.	Accept
S179.089	Russell Protection Society (INC)	Standards	Not Stated	in some instances open space also serves the important function of preserving sight line corridors that strategically link public places with views of the sea, prominent geologic features, significant trees or historic sites	Insert a standard to address a requirement to preserve important sight lines	Reject
FS23.046	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Preservation of sightlines is important to retain the character of Kororāreka and the connection between significant places onshore and offshore.	Allow allow original submission	Accept
S431.190	John Andrew Riddell	OSZ-S2	Not Stated	Not stated	Retain the approach varying the required height to boundary depending on the orientation of the relevant boundary.	Accept
S512.081	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	OSZ-S3	Not Stated	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 noteto setback standard <b>Building setback requirements are further controlled by the Building Code. This includes the provision for firefighter access to buildings and egress from buildings. Plan users should refer to the applicable controls within the Building Code to ensure compliance can be achieved at the building consent stage.</b>	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					<b>Issuance of a resource consent does not imply that waivers of Building Code requirements will be considered/granted</b>	
<b>S416.066</b>	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	OSZ-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.</p> <p>KiwiRail considers that a matter of discretion directing consideration of impacts on the safety and efficiency of the rail corridor is appropriate in situations where the 5m setback standard is not complied with in all zones adjacent to the railway corridor.</p> <p>Building setbacks are essential to address significant safety hazards associated with the operational rail corridor. The Proposed Plan enables a 1m setback from side and rear boundaries shared with the rail corridor, increasing the risk that poles, ladders, or even ropes for abseiling equipment, could protrude into the rail corridor and increasing the risk of collision with a train or electrified overhead lines. Further, there is a 600mm eave allowance within side and rear yards which restricts potential access to roofs from 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.</p> <p>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</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"> <li>• <b>the location and design of the building as it relates to the ability to safely use, access and maintain buildings without requiring access on, above or over the rail corridor</b></li> <li>• <b>the safe and efficient operation of the rail network</b></li> </ul>	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>replicate it in each zone.</p> <p>The provision of a setback can ensure that all buildings on a site can be accessed and maintained for the life of that structure, without the requirement to gain access to rail land, including by aspects such as ladders, poles or abseil ropes. This ensures that a safe amenity is provided on the adjacent sites for the occupants, in line with delivery policy direction such as GRZ-O2, clause 4 whereby safety is a specific objective for achieving zone appropriate character and amenity values.</p> <p>It is noted that some zones (Heavy Industrial, Rural production)) have wider yards than sought by KiwiRail. This is supported, but the yard purpose is not linked to safety matters relating to a site's proximity to the railway and therefore any applications for reductions may not consider this requirement.</p>			
FS243.152	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
S454.126	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	Objectives	Not Stated	<p>Critical infrastructure such as the National Grid sometimes has a functional or operational need to locate in the Sport and Active Recreation Zone and needs to be provided for. Due to its linear nature and the requirement to connect new electricity generation to the National Grid, regardless of where the new generation facilities are located, transmission lines may need to traverse any zone within the Far North District.</p> <p>A new objective is required to address this.</p>	<p>Insert new objective SARZ-Ox as follows:<b>The Sport and Active Recreation zone is used by compatible activities and infrastructure, that enhance community wellbeing and have a functional or operational need to locate in the zone.</b></p>		Reject
FS111.131	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)		Support	PHTTCCT support inclusion of a new objective to enable infrastructure in the Natural Open Space Zone where there is a functional or operational need to	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS243.164	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
FS369.517	Top Energy		Support	Top Energy supports the objective to provide for infrastructure that has a functional or operational need to locate in the zone.	Allow		Accept
S331.096	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	SARZ-O2	Support	The submitter supports objective SARZ-O2 to provide for buildings and structures in the Sport and Active Recreation zone complement and are consistent with the purpose of the zone and provide for social and cultural wellbeing, such as educational facilities for outdoor education activities.	Retain objective SARZ-O2, as proposed.		Accept
S454.127	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	Policies	Not Stated	The policies for this zone set out the activities that are to be enabled in the Sport and Active Recreation zone. Transpower supports the intent of this policy, however critical infrastructure, such as the National Grid, is not clearly provided for. Due to its linear nature and the requirement to connect new electricity generation to the National Grid, regardless of where the new generation facilities are located, transmission lines may need to traverse any zone within the Far North District. A new policy is required to make it explicit that infrastructure such as the National Grid is enabled in the Sport and Active Recreation zone.	Insert new policy SARZ-Px as follows: <b>Enable compatible activities and infrastructure, that have a functional or operational need to locate in the Sport and Active Recreation zone.</b>		Reject
FS243.175	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
FS369.518	Top Energy		Support	Top Energy supports the objective to provide for infrastructure that has a functional or operational need to locate in the zone.	Allow		Accept
S331.097	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	SARZ-P1	Support	The submitter supports policy SARZ-P1 to enable indoor and outdoor activities that are compatible with the purpose and predominant character of the Sport and Active Recreation zone, such as educational facilities for outdoor education activities.	Retain policy SARZ-P1, as proposed.		Accept
S297.001	Bay of Islands Kerikeri Golf Club	SARZ-P3	Support	The Bay of Islands Kerikeri Golf Club is adjacent to land at 1828 and 1878 State Highway 10, Waipapa. The submitter understands that the owners of that land have made a submission to rezone the land and	Retain SARZ-P3 and enforce this when considering re-zoning submission for land at 1828 and 1878 State Highway 10, Waipapa by refusing to consider material that compromises the establishment and		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				submitted material showing transport network options through land owned by the Bay of Islands Kerikeri Golf Club which contain aspects which would significantly affect the golf activities on site. The Bay of Islands Kerikeri Golf Club have no opinion on the rezoning but strongly object to the proposed transport network provisions through the Club's land.	continuing use of the land for sport and recreation purposes.		
S416.055	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	SARZ-P4	Support in part	Policies in each zone provide for managing land use and subdivision to address the effects of the activity at zone interfaces by requiring the provision of 'setbacks, fencing, screening or landscaping required to address potential conflicts'. KiwiRail seeks an amendment to provide for the consideration of setbacks to the railway corridor or transport network, thus supporting safety and the railway setback rule sought	Insert additional matter as follows: <b>the location and design of buildings adjacent to the railway corridor</b>		Accept in part
FS243.141	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 in part
S274.004	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	SARZ-P4	Support in part	This requires rules to bolster points c and f regarding urban design protocols. Urban Design protocols can influence factors that either motivate or provide barriers to participation and ALL members of the community accessing sports and recreational facilities	Amend SARZ-P4 to explicitly include inclusion principles for all members of the public and CPTED principles to encourage social protection measures and safety for all.		Accept in part
FS570.794	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.808	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.830	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
S528.004	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for	SARZ-P4	Support in part	The SARZ-P4 policy specifies key matters when assessing proposals, SUPPORT In-part, but this requires rules to bolster points c and f regarding urban design protocols.	amend SARZ-P4 policy should explicitly include inclusion principles for all members of the public and		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)			Urban Design protocols can influence factors that either motivate or provide barriers to participation and ALL members of the community accessing sports and recreational facilities.	CPTED principles to encourage social protection measures and safety for all.		
<b>FS566.1903</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
<b>S51.004</b>	Jeff and Robby Kemp	Rules	Oppose	SARZ-R12 Visitor accommodation, SARZ- R13 Camping Ground and SARZ-R14 Educational facility fall within the same regime as that applying to Community Facility. These should only be assessed as a Discretionary Activity when they have a direct correlation to sport and active recreation activities.	Amend Rules SARZ-R12, SARZ-R13 and SARZ-R14 so they can only be assessed as a Discretionary Activity when they have a direct correlation to sport and active recreation activities (inferred)		Accept
<b>S438.021</b>	New Zealand Motor Caravan Association	Rules	Support in part	The proposed amendments would see compatible treatment of camping sites to camping grounds as amended in the submission.	Amend the Open Space Zone rules to provide for camping sites as a restricted discretionary activity.		Reject
<b>S425.047</b>	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust	Rules	Not Stated	The purpose of these zones is to enable and provide for recreation, PHTTCCT consider that cycling and walking is an important form of recreation, therefore, tracks for cyclists and pedestrians should be enabled.	amend to enable cycle trails		Accept
<b>S512.059</b>	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Rules	Not Stated	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. 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	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				requirements with relation to setback distances and vehicle crossings. Fire and Emergency request that emergency service facilities are exempt from these standards			
<b>S271.026</b>	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	Rules	Not Stated	Seek to ensure that tracks for cyclists and pedestrians are enabled within this zone.	Amend rules to enable tracks for cycling and walking		Accept
<b>FS111.132</b>	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)		Support	PHTTCCT supports that tracks for cyclists and pedestrians are enabled within this zone	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
<b>FS570.749</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
<b>FS566.763</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
<b>FS569.785</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
<b>S446.027</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust	Rules	Not Stated	Seek to ensure that tracks for cyclists and pedestrians are enabled within this zone.	Amend rules to enable tracks for cycling and walking		Accept
<b>FS111.135</b>	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)		Support	PHTTCCT supports that tracks for cyclists and pedestrians are enabled within this zone.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
<b>FS569.1786</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Reject
<b>FS570.1786</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Reject
<b>S529.091</b>	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	Rules	Not Stated	Seek to ensure that tracks for cyclists and pedestrians are enabled within this zone	Amend rules to ensure that tracks for cyclists and pedestrians are enabled within this zone		Accept
<b>FS570.1979</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
<b>FS566.1993</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS569.2015	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S524.026	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	Rules	Not Stated	Seek to ensure that tracks for cyclists and pedestrians are enabled within this zone.	Amend rules to enable tracks for cycling and walking		Accept
FS566.1844	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S489.040	Radio New Zealand	Notes	Support in part	Part of the zone is within 1,000m of RNZ's facilities and RNZ seeks the addition of a note	Insert a note as follows: <b>There is a risk that significant tall structures (ie. higher than 40m) within 1,000m of Radio New Zealand's Facilities at Waipapakauri or Ōhaeawai, could present a safety risk from electro magnetic coupling. Developers of such structures should consult with Radio New Zealand at the planning stage to ensure such risks are avoided</b>		Accept in part
S257.030	Te Hiku Community Board	SARZ-R1	Oppose	We would like the parks and reserves in our district with new zoning rules that don't require minimum bulk/height and location rules. Rules should be limited to activities that are not for public facilities or playgrounds or open space areas. We would like the parks and reserves in our district with new zoning rules that don't require impermeable surface rules for playgrounds and other parks. Rules should be limited to activities that are not for public facilities or playgrounds or open space areas.	Amend rule SARZ-R1 by deleting the reference to SARZ-S1 (maximum height) and SARZ-S5 (building coverage), OR at least amend the rule so that those standards do not apply to public facilities or playgrounds.		Accept in part
S541.034	Elbury Holdings	SARZ-R1	Oppose	We would like the parks and reserves in our district with new zoning rules that don't require minimum bulk/height and location rules. If there are to be some rules, these should be limited to activities that are not for public facilities or playgrounds or open space areas.	Amend rule SARZ-R1 by deleting the reference to SARZ-S1 (maximum height) and SARZ-S5 (building coverage), OR at least amend the rule so that those standards do not apply to public facilities or playgrounds.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
<b>S485.038</b>	Elbury Holdings	SARZ-R1	Oppose	We would like the parks and reserves in our district with new zoning rules that don't require minimum bulk/height and location rules. If there are to be some rules, these should be limited to activities that are not for public facilities or playgrounds or open space areas.	Amend SARZ-R1 to delete reference to SARZ-S1 (maximum height) and SARZ-S5 (building coverage) or amend SARZ-R1 so that SARZ-S1 and SARZ-S5 do not apply to public facilities or playgrounds.	Accept in part
<b>S519.038</b>	Elbury Holdings	SARZ-R1	Oppose	We would like the parks and reserves in our district with new zoning rules that don't require minimum bulk/height and location rules. If there are to be some rules, these should be limited to activities that are not for public facilities or playgrounds or open space areas.	Amend rule SARZ-R1 by deleting the reference to SARZ-S1 (maximum height) and SARZ-S5 (building coverage), OR at least amend the rule so that those standards do not apply to public facilities or playgrounds.	Accept in part
<b>S368.075</b>	Far North District Council	SARZ-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 SARZ-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
<b>S358.036</b>	Leah Frieling	SARZ-R1	Oppose	We would like the parks and reserves in our district with new zoning rules that don't require minimum bulk/height and location rules. If there are to be some rules, these should be limited to activities that are not for public facilities or playgrounds or open space areas	Amend rule SARZ-R1 by deleting the reference to SARZ-S1 (maximum height) and SARZ-S5 (building coverage), OR at least amend the rule so that those standards do not apply to public facilities or playgrounds	Accept in part
<b>S357.029</b>	Sean Frieling	SARZ-R1	Oppose	We would like the parks and reserves in our district with new zoning rules that don't require minimum bulk/height and location rules. If there are to be some rules, these should be limited to activities that are not for public facilities or playgrounds or open space areas.	Amend rule SARZ-R1 by deleting the reference to SARZ-S1 (maximum height) and SARZ-S5 (building coverage), OR at least amend the rule so that those standards do not apply to public facilities or playgrounds.	Accept in part
<b>S472.037</b>	Michael Foy	SARZ-R1	Support in part	We would like the parks and reserves in our district with new zoning rules that don't require minimum bulk/height and location rules. If there are to be some rules, these should be limited to activities that are not	Amend rule SARZ-R1 by deleting the reference to SARZ-S1 (maximum height) and SARZ-S5 (building coverage), OR at least amend the rule so that those	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				for public facilities or playgrounds or open space areas.	standards do not apply to public facilities or playgrounds.		
<b>S512.106</b>	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	SARZ-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
<b>S547.035</b>	LJ King Limited	SARZ-R1	Oppose	We would like the parks and reserves in our district with new zoning rules that don't require minimum bulk/height and location rules. If there are to be some rules, these should be limited to activities that are not for public facilities or playgrounds or open space areas	Amend SARZ-R1 to delete reference to SARZ-S1 (maximum height) and SARZ-S5 (building coverage) or amend SARZ-R1 so that SARZ-S1 and SARZ-S5 do not apply to public facilities or playgrounds		Accept in part
<b>S464.037</b>	LJ King Ltd	SARZ-R1	Oppose	We would like the parks and reserves in our district with new zoning rules that don't require minimum bulk/height and location rules. If there are to be some rules, these should be limited to activities that are not for public facilities or playgrounds or open space areas.	Amend SARZ-R1 to delete reference to SARZ-S1 (maximum height) and SARZ-S5 (building coverage) or amend SARZ-R1 so that SARZ-S1 and SARZ-S5 do not apply to public facilities or playgrounds.		Accept in part
<b>FS259.1</b>	Leah Frieling		Support		Allow		Accept in part
<b>FS566.1580</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
<b>S482.011</b>	House Movers Section of New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc	SARZ-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 SARZ-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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS23.158	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
S431.132	John Andrew Riddell	SARZ-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
FS332.132	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
S271.031	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	SARZ-R1	Support in part	This rule permits buildings (subject to bulk and location controls) where they are associated with a permitted activity. However, leisure activities are not permitted in this Zone but recreation activities are.	Amend to provide clarify around definitions, specifically in terms of recreation activity and leisure activity, and that Council carefully considers how definitions are used within/between chapters to ensure consistencies and avoid unintended consenting requirements		Accept
FS570.754	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.768	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.790	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
S529.096	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	SARZ-R1	Support in part	This rule permits buildings (subject to bulk and location controls) where they are associated with a permitted activity. However, leisure activities are not permitted in this Zone but recreation activities are.	Amend to provide clarify around definitions, specifically in terms of recreation activity and leisure activity, and that Council carefully considers how definitions are used within/between chapters to ensure consistencies and avoid unintended consenting requirements		Accept
FS570.1984	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.1998	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.2020	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S524.031	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	SARZ-R1	Support in part	This rule permits buildings (subject to bulk and location controls) where they are associated with a permitted activity. However, leisure activities are not permitted in this Zone but recreation activities are.	Amend to provide clarify around definitions, specifically in terms of recreation activity and leisure activity, and that Council carefully considers how definitions are used within/between chapters to ensure consistencies and avoid unintended consenting requirement		Accept
FS566.1849	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.1871	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S543.035	LJ King Limited	SARZ-R1	Oppose	We would like the parks and reserves in our district with new zoning rules that don't require minimum bulk/height and location rules. If there are to be some rules, these should be limited to activities that are not for public facilities or playgrounds or open space areas.	Amend SARZ-R1 to delete reference to SARZ-S1 (maximum height) and SARZ-S5 (building coverage) or amend SARZ-R1 so that SARZ-S1 and SARZ-S5 do not apply to public facilities or playgrounds		Accept in part
FS566.2196	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent 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
S446.032	Kapiro Conservation Trust	SARZ-R1	Support in part	This rule permits buildings (subject to bulk and location controls) where they are associated with a permitted activity. However, leisure activities are not permitted in this Zone but recreation activities are.	Amend definitions, specifically in terms of recreation activity and leisure activity, and that Council carefully considers how definitions are used within/between chapters to ensure consistencies and avoid unintended consenting requirements.		Accept
FS569.1791	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Reject
FS570.1791	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Reject
S257.031	Te Hiku Community Board	SARZ-R2	Support	We would like the parks and reserves in our district with new zoning rules that don't require minimum bulk/height and location rules. Rules should be	Delete rule SASZ-R2 (impermeable surface) OR at least amend the rule so that impermeable		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				limited to activities that are not for public facilities or playgrounds or open space areas. We would like the parks and reserves in our district with new zoning rules that don't require impermeable surface rules for playgrounds and other parks. Rules should be limited to activities that are not for public facilities or playgrounds or open space areas.	surface restrictions do not apply to public facilities or playgrounds.	
<b>S541.035</b>	Elbury Holdings	SARZ-R2	Oppose	We would like the parks and reserves in our district with new zoning rules that don't require impermeable surface rules for playgrounds and other parks. If there are to be some rules, these should be limited to activities that are not for public facilities or playgrounds or open space areas.	Delete rule SASZ-R2 (impermeable surface) OR at least amend the rule so that impermeable surface restrictions do not apply to public facilities or playgrounds.	Accept in part
<b>S485.039</b>	Elbury Holdings	SARZ-R2	Oppose	We would like the parks and reserves in our district with new zoning rules that don't require impermeable surface rules for playgrounds and other parks. If there are to be some rules, these should be limited to activities that are not for public facilities or playgrounds or open space areas.	Delete SARZ-R2 or amend SARZ-R2 so impermeable surface restrictions do not apply to public facilities or playgrounds.	Accept in part
<b>S519.039</b>	Elbury Holdings	SARZ-R2	Oppose	We would like the parks and reserves in our district with new zoning rules that don't require impermeable surface rules for playgrounds and other parks. If there are to be some rules, these should be limited to activities that are not for public facilities or playgrounds or open space areas.	Delete rule SASZ-R2 (impermeable surface) OR at least amend the rule so that impermeable surface restrictions do not apply to public facilities or playgrounds.	Accept in part
<b>S358.037</b>	Leah Frieling	SARZ-R2	Oppose	We would like the parks and reserves in our district with new zoning rules that don't require impermeable surface rules for playgrounds and other parks. If there are to be some rules, these should be limited to activities that are not for public facilities or playgrounds or open space areas	Delete rule SASZ-R2 (impermeable surface) OR at least amend the rule so that impermeable surface restrictions do not apply to public facilities or playgrounds	Accept in part
<b>S357.030</b>	Sean Frieling	SARZ-R2	Oppose	We would like the parks and reserves in our district with new zoning rules that don't require impermeable surface rules for playgrounds and other parks. If there are to be some rules, these should be limited to activities that are not for public facilities or playgrounds or open space areas.	Delete rule SASZ-R2 (impermeable surface) OR at least amend the rule so that impermeable surface restrictions do not apply to public facilities or playgrounds.	Accept in part
<b>S472.038</b>	Michael Foy	SARZ-R2	Support in part	We would like the parks and reserves in our district with new zoning rules that don't require impermeable surface rules for playgrounds and other parks. If	Delete rule SASZ-R2 (impermeable surface) OR at least amend the rule so that impermeable surface	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				there are to be some rules, these should be limited to activities that are not for public facilities or playgrounds or open space areas.	restrictions do not apply to public facilities or playgrounds	
S547.036	LJ King Limited	SARZ-R2	Oppose	We would like the parks and reserves in our district with new zoning rules that don't require impermeable surface rules for playgrounds and other parks. If there are to be some rules, these should be limited to activities that are not for public facilities or playgrounds or open space areas	Delete SARZ-R2 or amend SARZ-R2 so impermeable surface restrictions do not apply to public facilities or playgrounds	Accept in part
S481.010	Puketotara Lodge Ltd	SARZ-R2	Not Stated	<p>The submitter seeks to ensure that the PDP adequately controls effects from stormwater discharge, particularly between sites or adjacent sites.</p> <p>The Operative Far North Plan contains a stormwater management rule in each zone, along with matters of discretion which Council can consider where the impermeable surface area exceeds what is allowed under the permitted activity rule.</p> <p>There is no specific "stormwater management" rule in the Rural Production zone in the PDP, however there is a rule relating to impermeable surface coverage. 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:                      c. the availability of land for disposal of effluent and stormwater on site without adverse effects on <b>adjoining adjacent</b> waterbodies (including groundwater and aquifers) or on <b>adjoining adjacent</b> sites;                      Insert the following as additional matters of discretion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Avoiding nuisance or damage to adjacent or downstream properties;</b></li> <li>• <b>The extent to which the diversion and discharge maintains pre-development stormwater run-off flows and volumes;</b></li> <li>• <b>The extent to which the diversion and discharge mimics natural run-off patterns.</b></li> </ul>	Accept in part
S283.020	Trent Simpkin	SARZ-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	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				(already). This is a detailed design of the stormwater management onsite and shouldn't require FNDC to look at it and tick the box to say its acceptable. 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.			
<b>FS570.834</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
<b>FS566.848</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
<b>FS569.870</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
<b>S464.038</b>	LJ King Ltd	SARZ-R2	Oppose	We would like the parks and reserves in our district with new zoning rules that don't require impermeable surface rules for playgrounds and other parks. If there are to be some rules, these should be limited to activities that are not for public facilities or playgrounds or open space areas.	Delete SARZ-R2 or amend SARZ-R2 so impermeable surface restrictions do not apply to public facilities or playgrounds.		Accept in part
<b>FS566.1581</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
<b>S543.036</b>	LJ King Limited	SARZ-R2	Oppose	We would like the parks and reserves in our district with new zoning rules that don't require impermeable surface rules for playgrounds and other parks. If there are to be some rules, these should be limited to activities that are not for public facilities or playgrounds or open space areas	Delete SARZ-R2 or amend SARZ-R2 so impermeable surface restrictions do not apply to public facilities or playgrounds		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.2197	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent 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
S271.032	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	SARZ-R3	Support in part	This rule permits buildings (subject to bulk and location controls) where they are associated with a permitted activity. However, leisure activities are not permitted in this Zone but recreation activities are.	Amend to provide clarify around definitions, specifically in terms of recreation activity and leisure activity, and that Council carefully considers how definitions are used within/between chapters to ensure consistencies and avoid unintended consenting requirements		Accept
FS570.755	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.769	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.791	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
S529.097	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	SARZ-R3	Support in part	This rule permits buildings (subject to bulk and location controls) where they are associated with a permitted activity. However, leisure activities are not permitted in this Zone but recreation activities are	Amend to provide clarify around definitions, specifically in terms of recreation activity and leisure activity, and that Council carefully considers how definitions are used within/between chapters to ensure consistencies and avoid unintended consenting requirements		Accept
FS570.1985	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.1999	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.2021	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S524.032	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	SARZ-R3	Support in part	This rule permits buildings (subject to bulk and location controls) where they are associated with a permitted activity. However, leisure activities are not permitted in this Zone but recreation activities are.	Amend to provide clarify around definitions, specifically in terms of recreation activity and leisure activity, and that Council carefully considers how definitions are used within/between chapters to ensure consistencies and avoid unintended consenting requirement		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.1850	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S446.033	Kapiro Conservation Trust	SARZ-R3	Support in part	This rule permits buildings (subject to bulk and location controls) where they are associated with a permitted activity. However, leisure activities are not permitted in this Zone but recreation activities are.	Amend definitions, specifically in terms of recreation activity and leisure activity, and that Council carefully considers how definitions are used within/between chapters to ensure consistencies and avoid unintended consenting requirements.		Accept
FS569.1792	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Reject
FS570.1792	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Reject
S283.034	Trent Simpkin	SARZ-R5	Oppose	This submission applies to all Building Coverage rules within all zones. Amend to be larger, considering the size of allotments allowed for in the zone.	Amend the maximum building or structure coverage to be larger or offer an alternative pathway around this rule, by inserting a PER-2 which says if a building is above the maximum, it is permitted if a visual assessment and landscape plan is provided as part of the building consent.		Reject
FS570.848	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
FS566.862	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS569.884	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
S51.003	Jeff and Robby Kemp	SARZ-R6	Support in part	The definition provides for a wide range of activities and interpretation and allows for activities which do not sit within the realm of sport and recreation. The body of the activity itself is appropriate however these activities must have a focus on sport and recreation.	Amend Rule SARZ-R6 (permitted activity for community facilities) so that it only applies to community activities with that fit within the realm of sport and recreation (inferred)		Accept
S274.003	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	SARZ-R11	Oppose	Commercial activities will be ancillary to recreation activity (PER-3) and may include a gym, childcare, café, physio, and education - all places that increasingly cater for people beyond traditional	Amend SARZ-R11 to increase commercial activity hours to 6am-9pm Monday to Friday		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				daylight hours. These hours of operation could restrict access for people who are unable to attend appointments during these hours due to work or childcare commitments. These times could also limit service providers when there is demand.			
<b>FS570.793</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
<b>FS566.807</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
<b>FS569.829</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
<b>S528.003</b>	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	SARZ-R11	Support in part	SARZ-R11 OPPOSE commercial activity PER-2 hours of operation between 8am-6pm Monday to Friday. Commercial activities will be ancillary to recreation activity (PER-3) and may include a gym, childcare, café, physio, and education - all places that increasingly cater for people beyond traditional daylight hours. These hours of operation could restrict access for people who are unable to attend appointments during these hours due to work or childcare commitments, and participants who would benefit from accessing the commercial activity following or in conjunction with their physical activity (i.e. Physiotherapy). These times could also limit service providers when there is demand. Request an amendment to increase operating hours in alignment with recreational hours 6am - 9pm Monday to Friday where this is supported by the local community. With adherence to rules around noise.	amend SARZ-R11 increase commercial activity hours from 8am-6pm to 6am-pm Monday to Friday.		Accept
<b>FS566.1902</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
<b>S214.011</b>	Airbnb	SARZ-R12	Support in part	The proposed district plan allows for visitor accommodation as a permitted activity for less than or equal to 6-10 guests on site. If these conditions are not met, the activity is discretionary except in the settlement zone where it is restricted discretionary. Airbnb supports the overall approach to allow visitor accommodation to occur in all zones and commends	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>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. Airbnb strongly believes that consistency for guests and hosts is important and that a national approach is the most effective way to address these concerns. Kiwis agree with 64% expressing support for national regulation. One example of this type of standardised approach across councils is the Code of Conduct approach as piloted in New South Wales (NSW), Australia (with a robust compliance and enforcement mechanism, 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).</p>			
<b>FS23.073</b>	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Support standardizing the number applying to permitted visitor accommodation activities across all zones. Taking a consistent approach will make it easier for the plan provisions to be applied and understood. The effects are not likely to differ significantly in residential zones.	Allow	Allow relief sought.	Accept
<b>S438.020</b>	New Zealand Motor Caravan Association	SARZ-R13	Oppose	The NZMCA operates a number of campgrounds and park over properties that are present in a variety of zones. Allowing for more permissive rules around the establishment of campgrounds will make it easier to establish sites for self-contained vehicle-based camping in the Far North District. This will also create positive social and economic benefits for the community. Camping is also compatible with expected activities in the Sport and Active Recreation Zone.	Amend SARZ-R13 to provide for camping grounds as a permitted activity with conditions or a restricted discretionary activity.		Reject
<b>S331.098</b>	Ministry of Education Te	SARZ-R14	Support	The submitter supports rule SARZ-R14 Educational facility, as a discretionary activity status of	Retain rule SARZ-R14 Educational facility, as proposed.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga			educational facilities to enable activities that are compatible with the purpose and predominant character of the Sport and Active Recreation zone, such as educational facilities for outdoor education activities.			
<b>S502.080</b>	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	SARZ-R14	Support in part	At times a Sport and Recreational facility such as a Rugby Clubroom or a community hall may be hired out for an educational programme. Activities such as this are temporary in nature and assist local clubs and community groups with additional funding to help with the upkeep of their facilities. These activities should continue to be enabled rather than being a Discretionary activity, especially if they are temporary in nature. We seek relief that temporary occupation of existing facilities for educational purposes is enabled as a permitted activity.	Amend SARZ-R14 to make Educational Facility a permitted activity		Accept
<b>S274.005</b>	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	SARZ-R14	Oppose	Research shows that women disproportionately experience family/caring responsibilities, as a barrier to participation, future-proofing sports and recreational sites to easily include the development of childcare facilities in 'hub' environments.	Amend to make Educational facilities permitted		Accept
<b>FS570.795</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
<b>FS566.809</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
<b>FS569.831</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
<b>S51.005</b>	Jeff and Robby Kemp	SARZ-R15	Oppose	Allowing this to remain as a Discretionary Activity defeats the purpose of scheduling land use activities in this new PDP format.	Amend rule SARZ-R15 to make it a non-complying activity.		Reject
<b>S51.006</b>	Jeff and Robby Kemp	SARZ-R16	Support	Supported SARZ-R16 as a Non Complying Activity	Retain SARZ-R16 as a Non Complying Activity.		Accept
<b>S274.001</b>	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	SARZ-S1	Support in part	Consider increasing to 10m as an exception for specific cases where there is a requirement that competition halls must have a minimum height of eight (8) meters for competitive events, for activities such as Indoor Rock Climbing and sports like Diving, Trampoline and Acrobatic Gymnastics.	Amend to include exceptions to 8m maximum height		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS570.791	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.805	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.827	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
S528.001	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	SARZ-S1	Support in part	SARZ-S1 the maximum height of a building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure is 8m above ground level. SUPPORT In-Part Consider increasing to 10m as an exception for specific cases where there is a requirement that competition halls must have a minimum height of eight (8) meters for competitive events, for activities such as Indoor Rock Climbing and sports like Trampoline and Acrobatic Gymnastics	amend SARZ-S1 to allow exceptions to this 8m height restriction for specific cases where there is a requirement that competition halls must have a minimum height of 8m for competitive events.		Accept in part
FS566.1900	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S431.191	John Andrew Riddell	SARZ-S2	Not Stated	Not stated	Retain the approach varying the required height to boundary depending on the orientation of the relevant boundary.		Accept in part
S51.007	Jeff and Robby Kemp	SARZ-S3	Oppose	The rule only relates to buildings or structures and does not accommodate the nature and scale of activities that are commonly located within sport and active recreation areas. By example playing fields are common and this is not managed by the rule. As such adjoining property owners can receive the off site effects of such fields being located in close proximity of the common boundary. This includes the presence of spectators and players walking along the sideline, balls being kicked or thrown across the common boundary. While this may be trite it can become annoying and can interfere with security and privacy.	Amend SARZ-S3 to ensure all activities are located no less than 10.0m from a common boundary.		Accept in part
S512.082	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	SARZ-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	Insert advice note to setback standard <b>Building setback requirements are further controlled by the Building Code. This includes the provision for firefighter</b>		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				consent process that there is further control of building setbacks and firefighting access through the New Zealand Building Code (NZBC).	<b>access to buildings and egress from buildings. Planusers should refer to the applicable controls within the Building Code to ensure compliance can be achieved at the building consent stage. Issuance of a resource consent does not imply that waivers of Building Code requirements will be considered/granted</b>	
S416.067	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	SARZ-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 overhead lines. Further, there is a 600mm eave allowance within side and rear yards which restricts potential access to roofs from buildings even further and results in an effective yard setback of 400mm. 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</p>	<p>Insert a railway setback (refer to submission for examples) Insert the following matters of discretion into the standard:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>the location and design of the building as it relates to the ability to safely use, access and maintain buildings without requiring access on, above or over the rail corridor</b></li> <li>• <b>the safe and efficient operation of the rail network</b></li> </ul>	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>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 therefore any applications for reductions may not consider this requirement.</p>			
<b>FS243.153</b>	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose	<p>Kāinga Ora opposes the requested 5m setback; a considerably reduced set back would provide adequate space for maintenance activities within sites adjacent to the rail network. In doing so, it will continue to protect the safe, efficient, and effective operation of the rail infrastructure while balancing the cost on landowners. The amendments are unnecessary.</p>	Disallow	<p>Insert a railway setback (refer to submission for examples) Insert the following matters of discretion into the standard:</p>	Accept in part
<b>S274.002</b>	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	SARZ-S5	Oppose	<p>Increasingly places of recreation benefit from grouping many indoor activities to provide people with better access for all ages and abilities in addition to being financially sustainable 'hubs'. This shift in focus places emphasis on wellbeing and inclusion. A good example is the plan for the new Te Hiku Recreation Centre.</p>	Amend SARZ-S5 to increase building or structure coverage of sports and recreation 'hub' development sites		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
<b>FS570.792</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept
<b>FS566.806</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept
<b>FS569.828</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept
<b>S528.002</b>	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	SARZ-S5	Support in part	SARZ-S5 Building or structure coverage OPPOSE the building or structure coverage of the site is no more than 8% This requirement assumes that outdoor recreational activities dominate the landscape. However, increasingly places of recreation benefit from grouping many indoor activities to provide people with better access for all ages and abilities in addition to being financially sustainable 'hubs'. This shift in focus places emphasis on wellbeing and inclusion. A good example is the plan for the new Te Hiku Recreation Centre (being described as a 'catalyst for community connection, empowerment and unity'), the building features spaces for community recreation, education, and performing arts as well as an e-sports studio, storage facility, and commercial kitchen. A rule that allows for increasing the percentage of building or structure coverage to support the development of community 'hub' environments is required.	amend SARZ-S5 to increase in building or structure of sports and recreation 'hub' development sites		Reject
<b>FS566.1901</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept