

## Appendix 2.2 – Officer's Recommended Decisions on Submissions (Mixed Use)

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S560.008	Jane E Johnston	General / Process	Oppose	Areas such as Opuā, Paihia/Waitangi and Russell townships are in need of specific provisions to allow for tourism related activities and facilities to be further developed. There has been insufficient attention paid to the need to provide for 'dormitory' suburban/worker accommodation in the vicinity of these areas, that acknowledges the highly seasonal nature of the workforce which is similar to horticulture workers which are provided for.	Insert new Specific Purpose Zone applicable to the tourist resort townships around the Bay which applies specific provisions to allow for tourism related activities and facilities and acknowledges the significant investment in communal maritime facilities around the Bay.		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS44.48	Northland Planning & Development 2020 Ltd		Support in part	We agree that Waitangi needs its own special zone, as detailed within our original submission.	Allow in part		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS284.1	Waitangi Limited		Support in part	We agree that Waitangi needs its own special zone, as detailed within our original submission.	Allow in part		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS407.001	Far North Holdings Limited		Support	The submission is supported on the basis that it relates specifically to Opuā (and other townships) needing specific provisions to allow tourism related activities and that acknowledges the significant investment in maritime facilities in the Bay of Islands.	Allow	allow the original submission	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS348.087	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
S499.002	Turnstone Trust	General / Process	Support in part	The Proposed Plan uses only three main business zones - Heavy Industrial, Light Industrial and Mixed	Insert a broader suite of zones, if necessary, to secure business land requirements for the		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				Use. The range of zones is limited and in terms of commercial land uses the Mixed Use zone is a blunt tool. There is no Local Centre or Town Centre zoning.	Kerikeri-Waipapa area such as a Town Centre zoning.			
FS243.007	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Support	Kāinga Ora supports provisions that enable housing with good access to jobs, amenities and services and the co-location of activities to contribute to economic, social, environmental, and cultural wellbeing. Kāinga Ora supports provisions that align development with the provision of adequate climate-resilient services and infrastructure and that enable varied, higher density housing around existing towns.	Allow	Insert a broader suite of zones, if necessary, to secure business land requirements for the Kerikeri-Waipapa area such as a Town Centre zoning	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS47.008	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Support	The extension of the Mixed Zone will enable Kerikeri's residential and commercial area to expand next to the existing town centre and CBD facilities without creating urban sprawl. We envisage commercial shops/cafes/offices on the ground floor with terraced apartments on top up to a maximum of 3 floors (12m).	Allow	allow the original submission	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS406.001	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Support	McDonald's supports the use of a broader suite of zones for commercial land uses	Allow	allow the original submission	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS569.032	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	The extension of the Mixed Use Zone will enable Kerikeri's residential and commercial area to expand next to the existing town centre and CBD facilities without creating urban sprawl. We envisage commercial shops/cafes/offices on the ground floor with terraced apartments on top up to a maximum of 3 floors (12m).	Allow	allow the original submission	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S74.047	Brownie Family Trust	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	Some other methods or means of relief may achieve the outcomes sought.	Use other methods or means of relief that might achieve the same or similar results as the relief sought in the submission by Brownie Family Trust.		Accept in part	Various
S74.048	Brownie Family Trust	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support	Other provisions may need to be amended to achieve the relief sought overall.	Undertake consequential amendments if they are necessary to achieve the results or relief sought within the submission by Brownie Family Trust.		Accept in part	Various
S475.002	Robert Keith Beale	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	The Mixed Use Zone (MUZ) is not the most appropriate zone for Kerikeri town centre for the following reasons: - MUZ does not give effect to Objective 1 and Policy 1 of the NPS-UD - Section 32 Evaluation - Urban Environments is incomplete and flawed (refer to submission for specific reasoning) - PDP does not provide strategic direction or policy support for the suite of urban zones proposed - MUZ provisions do not sufficiently enable a range of commercial activities.	Amend PDP by reviewing the suite of commercial zones proposed and rezone Kerikeri town centre to Town Centre Zone (or similar commercial zone) that appropriately reflects commercial development and activities within Kerikeri township, alternatively if relief not accepted by FNDC, amend the Mixed Use Zone provisions to provide for an increased range of commercial and community activities.		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS172.1	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	The reasons stated in this primary submission and my primary submission.	Allow		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS350.009	Puketona Lodge Ltd		Support	The reasons given in the original submission and primary submission of the submitter.  The Mixed Use zone is not the most appropriate zone for Kerikeri town centre for the following reasons: a. The Mixed Use zone does not give effect to objective 1 and policy 1 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD); b. The Section 32 Evaluation - Urban Environments incomplete and flawed: i. The evaluation does not provide sufficient level of detail that	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>corresponds to the scale and significance of due to the importance of the zone being the only commercial zone proposed within the District;</p> <p>ii. The evaluation fails to consider the full range of commercial zoning options and identify reasonably practicable options to achieve objectives;</p> <p>iii. The evaluation fails to evaluate appropriate zone criteria and boundaries;</p> <p>c. The PDP does not provide strategic direction or policy support for the suite of urban zones proposed;</p> <p>d. The Mixed Use zone provisions do not sufficiently enable a range of commercial activities.</p>				
<b>FS441.009</b>	Adrian and Sue Knight		Support	<p>Amend PDP by reviewing the suite of commercial zones proposed and rezone Kerikeri town centre to Town Centre Zone (or similar commercial zone) that appropriately reflects commercial development and activities within Kerikeri township, alternatively if relief not accepted by FNDC, amend the Mixed Use Zone provisions to provide for an increased range of commercial and community activities.</p>	Allow	Amend	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>FS403.025</b>	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support in part	<p>Te Whatu Ora support the review of the suite of commercial zones proposed and zoning that reflects commercial development.</p>	Allow in part	Te Whatu Ora support the review of the suite of commercial zones proposed and zoning that reflects commercial development.	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>S325.002</b>	Adrian and Sue Knight	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	<p>The Mixed Use Zone is not the most appropriate zone for Kerikeri town centre.</p> <p>The Section 32 Evaluation - Urban</p>	<p>Review the suite of commercial zones proposed and rezone Kerikeri town centre to Town Centre Zone (or similar commercial zone) that appropriately reflects commercial development</p>		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				Environments incomplete and flawed. The PDP does not provide strategic direction or policy support for the suite of urban zones proposed. The Mixed Use Zone provisions do not sufficiently enable a range of commercial activities.	and activities within Kerikeri township; or If relief 1 is not accepted that FNDC amend the Mixed Use Zone provisions to provide for an increased range of commercial and community activities.			
FS172.5	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	The reasons given in this primary submission and in my primary submission.	Allow		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS350.049	Puketona Lodge Ltd		Support	The reasons given in the original submission and primary submission of the submitter.  The Mixed Use Zone is not the most appropriate zone for Kerikeri town centre. The Section 32 Evaluation - Urban Environments incomplete and flawed. The PDP does not provide strategic direction or policy support for the suite of urban zones proposed. The Mixed Use Zone provisions do not sufficiently enable a range of commercial activities.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS403.011	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support in part	Te Whatu Ora support the review of the suite of commercial zones proposed and zoning that reflects commercial development.	Allow in part	Te Whatu Ora support the review of the suite of commercial zones proposed and zoning that reflects commercial development.	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
S534.003	Roger Atkinson	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	The Mixed Use zone is not the most appropriate zone for Kerikeri town centre for the following reasons: a. The Mixed Use zone does not give effect to objective 1 and policy 1 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD); b. The Section 32 Evaluation - Urban Environments incomplete and flawed: i. The evaluation does not provide	Review the suite of commercial zones proposed and rezone Kerikeri town centre to Town Centre Zone (or similar commercial zone) that appropriately reflects commercial development and activities within Kerikeri township; OR  If above relief is not accepted, amend the Mixed Use zone provisions to provide for an increased range of commercial and community activities.		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>sufficient level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance of due to the importance of the zone being the only commercial zone proposed within the District;</p> <p>ii. The evaluation fails to consider the full range of commercial zoning options and identify reasonably practicable options to achieve objectives;</p> <p>iii. The evaluation fails to evaluate appropriate zone criteria and boundaries;</p> <p>c. The PDP does not provide strategic direction or policy support for the suite of urban zones proposed;</p> <p>d. The Mixed Use zone provisions do not sufficiently enable a range of commercial activities.</p>				
<b>FS172.9</b>	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	The reasons given in this primary submission and in my primary submission.	Allow		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>FS350.003</b>	Puketona Lodge Ltd		Support	<p>The reasons given in the original submission and primary submission of the submitter.</p> <p>The Mixed Use zone is not the most appropriate zone for Kerikeri town centre for the following reasons:</p> <p>a. The Mixed Use zone does not give effect to objective 1 and policy 1 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD);</p> <p>b. The Section 32 Evaluation - Urban Environments incomplete and flawed:</p> <p>i. The evaluation does not provide sufficient level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance of due to the importance of the zone being the only commercial zone proposed within the District;</p> <p>ii. The evaluation fails to consider the full range of commercial zoning options</p>	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				and identify reasonably practicable options to achieve objectives; iii. The evaluation fails to evaluate appropriate zone criteria and boundaries; c. The PDP does not provide strategic direction or policy support for the suite of urban zones proposed; d. The Mixed Use zone provisions do not sufficiently enable a range of commercial activities.				
<b>FS441.003</b>	Adrian and Sue Knight		Support	Review the suite of commercial zones proposed and rezone Kerikeri town centre to Town Centre Zone (or similar commercial zone) that appropriately reflects commercial development and activities within Kerikeri township; OR If above relief is not accepted, amend the Mixed Use zone provisions to provide for an increased range of commercial and community activities	Allow	Amend	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>FS403.030</b>	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support in part	Te Whatu Ora support the review of the suite of commercial zones proposed and zoning that reflects commercial development.	Allow in part	Te Whatu Ora support the review of the suite of commercial zones proposed and zoning that reflects commercial development.	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>S534.004</b>	Roger Atkinson	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	The Section 32 Evaluation - Urban Environment does not include any specified zone criteria; as such it is unclear as to why the Mixed Use zone boundaries have been established as notified for Kerikeri town centre. The proposed Kerikeri Mixed Use zone mapped area extends west along Kerikeri Road, stopping short of The Ridge and Ranui Avenue. The proposed Mixed Use zone boundary does not follow a logical defensible boundary, nor does it include existing	1. Review the notified Mixed Use zone boundary around the Kerikeri town centre and main commercial strip and change to reflect the existing commercial activities and establish logical zone boundaries to enable appropriate business land capacity and development opportunity;  AND  1. Rezone land to an appropriate Commercial or Mixed Use zone to		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				lawfully established commercial activities located along Kerikeri Road or at the Redwoods. Commercial activities, particularly tourist and horticulturally based commercial activities, are well established along Kerikeri Road and at the Redwoods. These activities contribute to the vibrancy, character and amenity of the introduction to Kerikeri town centre. The PDP should provide for and enable these activities along Kerikeri Road and at the Redwoods.	legitimise and enable tourist and horticulture based commercial activities to occur: a. along both sides of Kerikeri Road from the roundabout with State Highway 10 to Kerikeri town centre; and b. at the Redwoods in accordance with the map in Appendix 1. If above relief sought is not accepted, establish an overlay/precinct or similar, or amend the provisions of the applicable zone, to legitimise and enable tourist and horticulture based commercial activities to occur: a. along both sides of Kerikeri Road from the roundabout with State Highway 10 to Kerikeri town centre; and b. at the Redwoods in accordance with the map in Appendix 1.			
<b>FS172.10</b>	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	The reasons given in this primary submission and in my primary submission.	Allow		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>FS270.4</b>	C Otway Ltd		Support	For the reasons stated in this primary submission and in my primary submission.	Allow		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>FS350.004</b>	Puketona Lodge Ltd		Support	The reasons given in the original submission and primary submission of the submitter.  The Section 32 Evaluation - Urban Environment does not include any specified zone criteria; as such it is unclear as to why the Mixed Use zone boundaries have been established as notified for Kerikeri town centre. The proposed Kerikeri Mixed Use zone mapped area extends west along Kerikeri Road, stopping short of The Ridge and Ranui Avenue. The proposed Mixed Use zone boundary does not follow a logical defensible boundary, nor does it include existing	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>lawfully established commercial activities located along Kerikeri Road or at the Redwoods. Commercial activities, particularly tourist and horticulturally based commercial activities, are well established along Kerikeri Road and at the Redwoods. These activities contribute to the vibrancy, character and amenity of the introduction to Kerikeri town centre. The PDP should provide for and enable these activities along Kerikeri Road and at the Redwoods.</p>				
FS441.004	Adrian and Sue Knight		Support	<p>Review the notified Mixed Use zone boundary around the Kerikeri town centre and main commercial strip and change to reflect the existing commercial activities and establish logical zone boundaries to enable appropriate business land capacity and development opportunity; AND Rezone land to an appropriate Commercial or Mixed Use zone to legitimise and enable tourist and horticulture based commercial activities to occur: a. along both sides of Kerikeri Road from the roundabout with State Highway 10 to Kerikeri town centre; and b. at the Redwoods in accordance with the map in Appendix 1. If above relief sought is not accepted, establish an overlay/precinct or similar, or amend the provisions of the applicable zone, to legitimise and enable tourist and horticulture based commercial activities to occur: a. along both sides of Kerikeri Road from the</p>	Allow	Amend	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				roundabout with State Highway 10 to Kerikeri town centre; and b. at the Redwoods in accordance with the map in Appendix 1.				
<b>S535.004</b>	John and Rose Whitehead	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	The Mixed Use zone is not the most appropriate zone for Kerikeri town centre for the following reasons: a. The Mixed Use zone does not give effect to objective 1 and policy 1 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD); b. The Section 32 Evaluation - Urban Environments incomplete and flawed: i. The evaluation does not provide sufficient level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance of due to the importance of the zone being the only commercial zone proposed within the District; ii. The evaluation fails to consider the full range of commercial zoning options and identify reasonably practicable options to achieve objectives; iii. The evaluation fails to evaluate appropriate zone criteria and boundaries; c. The PDP does not provide strategic direction or policy support for the suite of urban zones proposed; d. The Mixed Use zone provisions do not sufficiently enable a range of commercial activities.	Review the suite of commercial zones proposed and rezone Kerikeri town centre to Town Centre Zone (or similar commercial zone) that appropriately reflects commercial development and activities within Kerikeri township; OR  If above relief is not accepted, amend the Mixed Use zone provisions to provide for an increased range of commercial and community activities.		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>FS172.19</b>	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	The reasons given in this primary submission and in my primary submission.	Allow		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>FS403.031</b>	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support in part	Te Whatu Ora support the review of the suite of commercial zones proposed and zoning that reflects commercial development.	Allow in part	Te Whatu Ora support the review of the suite of commercial zones proposed and zoning that reflects commercial development.	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report	
S535.005	John and Rose Whitehead	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	<p>The Section 32 Evaluation - Urban Environment does not include any specified zone criteria; as such it is unclear as to why the Mixed Use zone boundaries have been established as notified for Kerikeri town centre. The proposed Kerikeri Mixed Use zone mapped area extends west along Kerikeri Road, stopping short of The Ridge and Ranui Avenue. The proposed Mixed Use zone boundary does not follow a logical defensible boundary, nor does it include existing lawfully established commercial activities located along Kerikeri Road or at the Redwoods. Commercial activities, particularly tourist and horticulturally based commercial activities, are well established along Kerikeri Road and at the Redwoods. These activities contribute to the vibrancy, character and amenity of the introduction to Kerikeri town centre. The PDP should provide for and enable these activities along Kerikeri Road and at the Redwoods.</p>	<p>1. Review the notified Mixed Use zone boundary around the Kerikeri town centre and main commercial strip and change to reflect the existing commercial activities and establish logical zone boundaries to enable appropriate business land capacity and development opportunity;</p> <p>AND</p> <p>1. Rezone land to an appropriate Commercial or Mixed Use zone to legitimise and enable tourist and horticulture based commercial activities to occur:</p> <p>a. along both sides of Kerikeri Road from the roundabout with State Highway 10 to Kerikeri town centre; and</p> <p>b. at the Redwoods in accordance with the map in Appendix 1.</p> <p>If above relief sought is not accepted, establish an overlay/precinct or similar, or amend the provisions of the applicable zone, to legitimise and enable tourist and horticulture based commercial activities to occur:</p> <p>a. along both sides of Kerikeri Road from the roundabout with State Highway 10 to Kerikeri town centre; and</p> <p>b. at the Redwoods in accordance with the map in Appendix 1.</p>	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection	
FS172.20	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	The reasons given in this primary submission and in my primary submission.	Allow	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection	
FS270.6	C Otway Ltd		Support	For the reasons stated in this primary submission and in my primary submission.	Allow	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection	
FS36.007	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency		Oppose	Submitter is concerned that any proposed rezoning (particularly but not limited to alongside a State Highway) requires an ITA to ensure the effects of	Disallow in part	Disallow original submission in part until an Integrated Transport Assessment can be prepared to understand the	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				the effectiveness, efficiency and safety of the land transport system will be assessed and avoided remedied or mitigated.	wider effects of the proposed rezoning.		
<b>S252.003</b>	Hall Nominees Ltd	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	<p>The Mixed Use Zone is not the most appropriate zone for Kerikeri town centre for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The Mixed Use Zone does not give effect to objective 1 and policy 1 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD);</li> <li>b. The Section 32 Evaluation - Urban Environments incomplete and flawed:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The evaluation does not provide sufficient level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance of due to the importance of the zone being the only commercial zone proposed within the District;</li> <li>ii. The evaluation fails to consider the full range of commercial zoning options and identify reasonably practicable options to achieve objectives;</li> <li>iii. The evaluation fails to evaluate appropriate zone criteria and boundaries;</li> </ul> </li> <li>c. The PDP does not provide strategic direction or policy support for the suite of urban zones proposed;</li> <li>d. The Mixed Use Zone provisions do not sufficiently enable a range of commercial activities.</li> </ul> <p>The PDP does not provide alternative commercial zones, providing only a Mixed-Use Zone. The Section 32 Evaluation - Urban Environment does not provide any justification for this approach nor does it evaluate options utilising the full range of National Planning Standard commercial zones7. The PDP does not include any form of direction by way of mapping or provisions to set a clear hierarchy of</p>	Amend the suite of commercial zones proposed and rezone Kerikeri town centre to Town Centre Zone (or similar commercial zone) that appropriately reflects commercial development and activities within Kerikeri township; OR If above relief is not accepted, amend the Mixed Use zone provisions to provide for an increased range of commercial and community activities.	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				centres. This lack of strategic direction will hinder the ability to achieve a sustainable and compact urban form. The approach to commercial zoning within the PDP has resulted in the inability to utilise the Mixed Use Zone as intended by the National Planning Standards. This approach has led to ineffective and inefficient methods in the PDP, which does not provide for the sustainable development and use of business land.				
<b>FS172.40</b>	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	The reasons given in this primary submission and in my primary submission.	Allow		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>FS350.029</b>	Puketona Lodge Ltd		Support	<p>The reasons given in the original submission and primary submission of the submitter.</p> <p>The Mixed Use Zone is not the most appropriate zone for Kerikeri town centre for the following reasons:</p> <p>a. The Mixed Use Zone does not give effect to objective 1 and policy 1 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD);</p> <p>b. The Section 32 Evaluation - Urban Environments incomplete and flawed:</p> <p>i. The evaluation does not provide sufficient level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance of due to the importance of the zone being the only commercial zone proposed within the District;</p> <p>ii. The evaluation fails to consider the full range of commercial zoning options and identify reasonably practicable options to achieve objectives;</p> <p>iii. The evaluation fails to evaluate appropriate zone criteria and boundaries;</p> <p>c. The PDP does not provide strategic</p>	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				direction or policy support for the suite of urban zones proposed; d. The Mixed Use Zone provisions do not sufficiently enable a range of commercial activities.				
<b>FS441.024</b>	Adrian and Sue Knight		Support	Amend the suite of commercial zones proposed and rezone Kerikeri town centre to Town Centre Zone (or similar commercial zone) that appropriately reflects commercial development and activities within Kerikeri township; OR If above relief is not accepted, amend the Mixed Use zone provisions to provide for an increased range of commercial and community activities	Allow	Amend	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>FS570.720</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	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>FS566.734</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	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>FS569.756</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	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>FS403.183</b>	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support in part	Te Whatu Ora support the review of the suite of commercial zones proposed and zoning that reflects commercial development	Allow in part		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>S252.006</b>	Hall Nominees Ltd	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	The Mixed Use Zone is not the most appropriate zone for Kerikeri town centre for the following reasons: a. The Mixed Use Zone does not give effect to objective 1 and policy 1 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD); b. The Section 32 Evaluation - Urban	Amend the suite of commercial zones proposed and rezone Kerikeri town centre to Town Centre Zone (or similar commercial zone) that appropriately reflects commercial development and activities within Kerikeri township; OR If above relief is not accepted, amend the Mixed Use zone provisions to provide for an increased range of commercial and community activities.		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>Environments incomplete and flawed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The evaluation does not provide sufficient level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance of due to the importance of the zone being the only commercial zone proposed within the District;</li> <li>ii. The evaluation fails to consider the full range of commercial zoning options and identify reasonably practicable options to achieve objectives;</li> <li>iii. The evaluation fails to evaluate appropriate zone criteria and boundaries;</li> <li>c. The PDP does not provide strategic direction or policy support for the suite of urban zones proposed;</li> <li>d. The Mixed Use Zone provisions do not sufficiently enable a range of commercial activities.</li> </ul> <p>The PDP does not provide alternative commercial zones, providing only a Mixed-Use Zone. The Section 32 Evaluation - Urban Environment does not provide any justification for this approach nor does it evaluate options utilising the full range of National Planning Standard commercial zones<sup>7</sup>.</p> <p>The PDP does not include any form of direction by way of mapping or provisions to set a clear hierarchy of centres. This lack of strategic direction will hinder the ability to achieve a sustainable and compact urban form. The approach to commercial zoning within the PDP has resulted in the inability to utilise the Mixed Use Zone as intended by the National Planning Standards. This approach has led to ineffective and inefficient methods in the PDP, which does not provide for the sustainable development and use of business land.</p>			

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS172.43	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	The reasons given in this primary submission and in my primary submission.	Allow		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS25.018	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Support	Supports the intent of the submission to provide greater flexibility for development in the Kerikeri town centre. Submitter agrees that Kerikeri and Waipapa comprise an urban environment that must give effect to the NPS-UD.	Allow	Allow the original submission, subject to appropriate wording.	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS350.032	Puketona Lodge Ltd		Support	<p>The reasons given in the original submission and primary submission of the submitter.</p> <p>The Mixed Use Zone is not the most appropriate zone for Kerikeri town centre for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The Mixed Use Zone does not give effect to objective 1 and policy 1 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD);</li> <li>b. The Section 32 Evaluation - Urban Environments incomplete and flawed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The evaluation does not provide sufficient level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance of due to the importance of the zone being the only commercial zone proposed within the District;</li> <li>ii. The evaluation fails to consider the full range of commercial zoning options and identify reasonably practicable options to achieve objectives;</li> <li>iii. The evaluation fails to evaluate appropriate zone criteria and boundaries;</li> </ul> </li> <li>c. The PDP does not provide strategic direction or policy support for the suite of urban zones proposed;</li> <li>d. The Mixed Use Zone provisions do</li> </ul>	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				not sufficiently enable a range of commercial activities.				
<b>FS325.014</b>	Turnstone Trust Limited		Support	TT supports the intent of the submission to provide greater flexibility for development in the Kerikeri town centre. TT agrees with the submitter that Kerikeri and Waipapa comprise an urban environment that must give effect to the NPS-UD.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>FS441.027</b>	Adrian and Sue Knight		Support	Amend the suite of commercial zones proposed and rezone Kerikeri town centre to Town Centre Zone (or similar commercial zone) that appropriately reflects commercial development and activities within Kerikeri township; OR If above relief is not accepted, amend the Mixed Use zone provisions to provide for an increased range of commercial and community activities.	Allow	Amend	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>FS403.008</b>	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support in part	Te Whatu Ora support the review of the suite of commercial zones proposed and zoning that reflects commercial development.	Allow in part	Te Whatu Ora support the review of the suite of commercial zones proposed and zoning that reflects commercial development.	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>FS570.723</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	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>FS566.737</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	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>FS569.759</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	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>S271.033</b>	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	Only one commercial zone has been picked from the available options (Mixed Use Zone), this provides limited	Insert additional commercial and mixed use zones and urban design guidelines to better manage the larger urban centers.		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				ability to really target this in a meaningful way. Accordingly, in general more targeted zoning in the urban centers is sought. Further it is considered that the development of urban design guidelines and reference to the guidelines in any Commercial Zone would help to clearly direct good urban design outcomes.				
<b>FS172.160</b>	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission and in my primary submission to review commercial zones.	Allow		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>FS25.076</b>	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Support	Supports the proposal to establish different commercial zones to respond to particular issues in particular centres. Subject to appropriate drafting, a more nuanced zone for the Kerikeri town centre may be appropriate.	Allow	Allow the original submission, subject to appropriate wording.	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>FS407.012</b>	Far North Holdings Limited		Support	The submission notes the lack of commercial zoning provided through the plan, only being supplied through the Mixed Use Zone. The submission to increase the tools for commercial and mixed use zoning is supported.	Allow	allow the original submission	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>FS325.050</b>	Turnstone Trust Limited		Support	TT supports the proposal to establish different commercial zones to respond to particular issues in particular centres. Subject to appropriate drafting, a more nuanced zone for the Kerikeri town centre may be appropriate.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate wording.	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>FS403.009</b>	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support in part	Te Whatu Ora support the review of the suite of commercial zones proposed and zoning that reflects commercial development.	Allow in part	Te Whatu Ora support the review of the suite of commercial zones proposed and zoning that reflects commercial development.	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS570.756	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	allow the original submission	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS566.770	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS569.792	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
S385.018	McDonalds Restaurants (NZ) Limited	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	McDonald's Kerikeri, Kaikohe and Kaitaia have all been zoned Mixed Use. Mixed Use Zone is the only commercial zone within the Proposed Plan suite. As noted in section 2.0, McDonald's considers the limited commercial zoning to be a flaw of the Proposed Plan and seeks that Council review the suite of zoning, in the least, to differentiate between town centres and commercial areas on the peripheries where Light Industrial is not appropriate. This will enable a more targeted approach to ensure that the right activities are located in	Amend suite of commercial zoning.		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS172.161	Audrey Campbell-Freear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission and in my primary submission to review commercial zones.	Allow		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS350.022	Puketona Lodge Ltd		Support	The reasons given in the original submission and primary submission of the submitter to review commercial zones.  McDonald's Kerikeri, Kaikohe and Kaitaia have all been zoned Mixed Use. Mixed Use Zone is the only commercial zone within the Proposed Plan suite. As noted in section 2.0, McDonald's considers the limited	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				commercial zoning to be a flaw of the Proposed Plan and seeks that Council review the suite of zoning, in the least, to differentiate between town centres and commercial areas on the peripheries where Light Industrial is not appropriate. This will enable a more targeted approach to ensure that the right activities are located in.				
<b>FS407.013</b>	Far North Holdings Limited		Support	The submission is supported on the basis that the Council should be considering a wider use of zones / tools to differentiate between town centres and urban areas in the Far North. This approach is supported to enable differing outcomes in differing locations	Allow	allow the original submission	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>FS542.001</b>	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Support	Foodstuffs supports the use of a broader suite of zones for commercial land uses.	Allow	allow the original submission	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>S524.033</b>	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	Only one commercial zone has been picked from the available options (Mixed Use Zone), this provides limited ability to really target this in a meaningful way. Accordingly, in general more targeted zoning in the urban centers is sought. Further it is considered that the development of urban design guidelines and reference to the guidelines in any Commercial Zone would help to clearly direct good urban design outcomes.	Insert additional commercial and mixed use zones and urban design guidelines to better manage the larger urban centers.		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>FS172.162</b>	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission and in my primary submission to review commercial zones.	Allow		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS542.005	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Support	Foodstuffs supports the use of a broader suite of zones for commercial land uses.	Allow	allow the original submission	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS406.006	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Support	McDonald's supports the use of a broader suite of zones for commercial land uses.	Allow	allow the original submission	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS566.1851	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
S529.098	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	Only one commercial zone has been picked from the available options (Mixed Use Zone), this provides limited ability to really target this in a meaningful way. Accordingly, in general more targeted zoning in the urban centers is sought. Further it is considered that the development of urban design guidelines and reference to the guidelines in any Commercial Zone would help to clearly direct good urban design outcomes.	Amend to include additional commercial and mixed use zones and urban design guidelines to better manage the larger urban centers.		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS172.163	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission and in my primary submission to review commercial zones.	Allow		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS542.006	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Support	Foodstuffs supports the use of a broader suite of zones for commercial land uses.	Allow	allow the original submission	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS406.007	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Support	McDonald's supports the use of a broader suite of zones for commercial land uses	Allow	allow the original submission	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS403.029	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support in part	Te Whatu Ora support the review of the suite of commercial zones proposed and	Allow in part	Te Whatu Ora support the review of the suite of commercial zones proposed	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				zoning that reflects commercial development.		and zoning that reflects commercial development.		
<b>FS570.1986</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>FS566.2000</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>FS569.2022</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>S344.002</b>	Paihia Properties Holdings Corporate Trustee Limited and UP Management Ltd	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	The PDP does not provide alternative commercial zones. Council has not provided any section 32 evaluation to support the approach to MUZ, nor has it considered all viable zoning options.	Amend the approach to commercial zones and reconsider the most appropriate zoning of the subject site. Insert a clear strategic direction for a compact urban form and establish a centres hierarchy within the Plan. Amend the approach to commercial zones and reconsider the most appropriate zoning for existing centres and villages which accurately reflects existing and planned levels of development specific to those areas. Insert sufficient section 32 evaluation to support the approach to zoning.		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>FS172.164</b>	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission and in my primary submission to review commercial zones.	Allow		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>FS542.004</b>	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Support	Foodstuffs supports the use of a broader suite of zones for commercial land uses.	Allow	allow the original submission	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>FS406.005</b>	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Support	McDonald's supports the use of a broader suite of zones for commercial land uses.	Allow	allow the original submission	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>FS403.019</b>	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support	Te Whatu Ora supports the establishment of	Allow	Te Whatu Ora supports the establishment of a centres	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				a centres hierarchy with identification of growth aspirations to establish consolidated, vibrant urban environments.		hierarchy with identification of growth aspirations to establish consolidated, vibrant urban environments.		
<b>FS396.023</b>	Ed and Inge Amsler		Support	The submission seeks various changes in relation to the urban environment / coastal environment interface as well as specific provisions in the Mixed Use Zone. Additionally, the submission seeks better reflection of business land needs that should be reflected throughout the Plan.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>S344.027</b>	Paihia Properties Holdings Corporate Trustee Limited and UP Management Ltd	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	The PDP utilises MUZ for all existing urban centres, with no alternative commercial zones proposed. The MUZ does not provide for a sufficient range of commercial activities as a permitted activity.	Insert clear strategic direction for a compact urban form and establish a centres hierarchy within the Plan. Amend the approach to commercial zones and reconsider the most appropriate zoning for existing centres and villages which accurately reflects existing and planned levels of development specific to those areas. Insert sufficient section 32 evaluation to support the approach to zoning. Amend and reconsider MUZ and rezone the subject site to an appropriate and enabling commercial zone.		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>FS172.165</b>	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission and in my primary submission to review commercial zones.	Allow		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>FS403.020</b>	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support	Te Whatu Ora supports the establishment of a centres hierarchy with identification of growth aspirations to establish consolidated, vibrant urban environments.	Allow	Te Whatu Ora supports the establishment of a centres hierarchy with identification of growth aspirations to establish consolidated, vibrant urban environments.	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>FS396.048</b>	Ed and Inge Amsler		Support	The submission seeks various changes in relation to the urban environment / coastal environment interface as well as specific	Allow	Allow the original submission	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				provisions in the Mixed Use Zone. Additionally, the submission seeks better reflection of business land needs that should be reflected throughout the Plan.				
<b>S363.037</b>	Foodstuffs North Island Limited	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	A large number of Foodstuffs sites of interest have been zoned MUZ. Being the only commercial zone proposed the MUZ, logically it is intended to provide for a range of business activities and enable supermarket activities. As drafted the MUZ does not provide any form of policy direction with respect to appropriate business activities.	Amend to reconsider the approach to commercial zones and reconsider the most appropriate zoning for existing centres and villages which accurately reflects existing and planned levels of development specific to those areas. Provide sufficient section 32 evaluation to support the approach to zoning		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>FS172.166</b>	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission and in my primary submission to review commercial zones.	Allow		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>FS350.023</b>	Puketona Lodge Ltd		Support	The reasons given in the original submission and primary submission of the submitter to review commercial zones.  A large number of Foodstuffs sites of interest have been zoned MUZ. Being the only commercial zone proposed the MUZ, logically it is intended to provide for a range of business activities and enable supermarket activities. As drafted the MUZ does not provide any form of policy direction with respect to appropriate business activities.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>FS406.002</b>	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Support	McDonald's supports the use of a broader suite of zones for commercial land uses	Allow	allow the original submission	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>S137.004</b>	Lynley Newport	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	I support the introduction of the Mixed use zone and its application.	Retain the Mixed Use zone		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Overview

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS172.214	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission seeking to review commercial zones.	Disallow		Reject	Key Issue: MUZ Overview
FS175.2	Denis Thomson		Support	Support the Mixed use Zone	Allow		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Overview
FS403.004	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Oppose	Introduction of a Mixed Use Zone is supported, however the PDP proposes a generic use of MUZ. Te Whatu Ora supports the establishment of a centres hierarchy with identification of growth aspirations to establish consolidated, vibrant urban environments.	Disallow in part	Seek provision details as above.	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ Overview
S188.002	Puketotara Lodge Ltd	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	The Mixed Use Zone (MUZ) is not the most appropriate zone for Kerikeri town centre for the following reasons: - MUZ does not give effect to Objective 1 and Policy 1 of the NPS-UD - Section 32 Evaluation - Urban Environments is incomplete and flawed (refer to submission for specific reasoning) - PDP does not provide strategic direction or policy support for the suite of urban zones proposed - MUZ provisions do not sufficiently enable a range of commercial activities.	Amend PDP by reviewing the suite of commercial zones proposed and rezone Kerikeri town centre to Town Centre Zone (or similar commercial zone) that appropriately reflects commercial development and activities within Kerikeri township, alternatively if relief not accepted by FNDC, amend the Mixed Use Zone provisions to provide for an increased range of commercial and community activities.		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS172.414	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons stated in this primary submission and in my primary submission.	Allow		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS350.062	Puketona Lodge Ltd		Support	The reasons given in the original submission and primary submission of the submitter.  The Mixed Use Zone (MUZ) is not the most appropriate zone for Kerikeri	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				town centre for the following reasons: - MUZ does not give effect to Objective 1 and Policy 1 of the NPS-UD - Section 32 Evaluation - Urban Environments is incomplete and flawed (refer to submission for specific reasoning) - PDP does not provide strategic direction or policy support for the suite of urban zones proposed - MUZ provisions do not sufficiently enable a range of commercial activities.				
<b>FS441.053</b>	Adrian and Sue Knight		Support	For the reasons stated in this primary submission and in my primary submission.	Allow	Amend	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>FS403.006</b>	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support in part	Te Whatu Ora support the review of the suite of commercial zones proposed and zoning that reflects commercial development.	Allow in part	Seek provision details as above.	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>S522.017</b>	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	We need sensible design aesthetic in the new mixed use zone to preserve the character of the town. The PDP or other appropriate mechanism needs to set standards relating to older houses (sometimes in relatively poor condition) moved from elsewhere, low cost housing and rental housing, so that quality standards are maintained for affordable housing.	Amend PDP to control the types, qualities and quantity of buildings occurring in towns such as Kerikeri [inferred].		Accept in part	Key Issue: Urban design
<b>FS243.012</b>	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose	Kāinga Ora recommend the introduction of a Town Centre zone for Kerikeri township as the largest and fastest growing township in the Far North. Kerikeri town is of sufficient urban size and predicted growth to support a medium density residential zone	Disallow	Amend PDP to control the types, qualities and quantity of buildings occurring in towns such as Kerikeri	Reject	Key Issue: Urban design

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				around the immediate town centre. This approach would be consistent with the National Planning Standard for Urban Development.				
<b>FS566.1756</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: Urban design
<b>S363.001</b>	Foodstuffs North Island Limited	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	The submitter notes that the PDP does not include any form of direction by way of mapping or provisions to set a clear hierarchy of centres. There is no identification of small, medium or large centres. the submitter considers this lack of strategic direction and centres hierarchy to be a significant flaw in the plan that will hinder the ability to achieve a sustainable and compact urban form.	Amend the whole plan to establish a centre hierarchy to set a clear policy direction for the larger urban areas within the District, and amend provisions and zoning as necessary to implement the hierarchy that achieves a compact urban form.		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>FS370.012</b>	Bunnings Limited		Support	Bunnings supports amendments to the strategic direction chapter for the reasons outlined in its original submission. Bunnings have general concern that the Strategic Direction chapter contains objectives for each topic, and not policies. The objectives need policies to demonstrate how they are going to be achieved in the Plan. It is also important at this strategic level of the Proposed Plan, that the policies provide clear direction for the consideration of resource consents where there is conflict between different areas of strategic direction. No clear policy direction to give effect to the proposed objective could lead to an ineffective plan (inferred).	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>FS403.021</b>	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support	Te Whatu Ora supports the establishment of a centres hierarchy with identification of growth aspirations to establish	Allow	Te Whatu Ora supports the establishment of a centres hierarchy with identification of growth aspirations to establish	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				consolidated, vibrant urban environments.		consolidated, vibrant urban environments.		
<b>FS361.001</b>	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the requested amendment sought within this submission point.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>S446.034</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust	District Plan Framework	Not Stated	In general, it is sought that good urban design outcomes are encouraged in the urban centers throughout the District. However, given that only one commercial zone has been picked from the available options (Mixed Use Zone), this provides limited ability to really target this in a meaningful way. Accordingly, in general more targeted zoning in the urban centers is sought. Further it is considered that the development of urban design guidelines and reference to the guidelines in any Commercial Zone would help to clearly direct good urban design outcomes.	Amend to introduce additional commercial and mixed use zones to better manage the larger urban centers (such as Kerikeri) and develop a set of urban design guidelines to be referenced		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>FS172.158</b>	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission and in my primary submission to review commercial zones.	Allow		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>FS542.007</b>	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Support	Foodstuffs supports the use of a broader suite of zones for commercial land uses.	Allow	allow the original submission	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>FS406.008</b>	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Support	McDonald's supports the use of a broader suite of zones for commercial land uses.	Allow	allow the original submission	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>FS403.036</b>	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support in part	Te Whatu Ora supports the establishment of a centres hierarchy with identification of growth aspirations to establish consolidated, vibrant urban environments.	Allow in part	Te Whatu Ora supports the establishment of a centres hierarchy with identification of growth aspirations to establish consolidated, vibrant urban environments.	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS569.1793	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS570.1793	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
S446.040	Kapiro Conservation Trust	District Plan Framework	Not Stated	In general, it is sought that good urban design outcomes are encouraged in the urban centers throughout the District. However, given that only one commercial zone has been picked from the available options (Mixed Use Zone), this provides limited ability to really target this in a meaningful way. Accordingly, in general more targeted zoning in the urban centers is sought. Further it is considered that the development of urban design guidelines and reference to the guidelines in any Commercial Zone would help to clearly direct good urban design outcomes.	Amend to introduce additional commercial and mixed use zones to better manage the larger urban centers (such as Kerikeri) and develop a set of urban design guidelines to be referenced		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS172.159	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission and in my primary submission to review commercial zones.	Allow		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS111.004	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)		Support in part	PHTTCCT agree that the relationship between provisions and rules in zone/district wide chapters should be clarified to improve effectiveness of the plan for plan users.	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS369.025	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy agrees that the relationship between provisions and rules in zone/district wide chapters should be clarified to improve effectiveness of the plan for plan users.	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS403.037	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support in part	Te Whatu Ora supports the establishment of a centres hierarchy with identification of growth aspirations to establish consolidated, vibrant urban environments, and Te Whatu Ora agree that the relationship between provisions and rules in zone/district wide chapters should be clarified to improve effectiveness of the plan for plan users.	Allow in part	Seek provision details as above.	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS569.1799	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS570.1799	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
S209.002	Audrey Campbell-Frear	District Plan Framework	Oppose	The Mixed Use Zone (MUZ) is not the most appropriate zone for Kerikeri town centre for the following reasons: - MUZ does not give effect to Objective 1 and Policy 1 of the NPS-UD - Section 32 Evaluation - Urban Environments is incomplete and flawed (refer to submission for specific reasoning) - PDP does not provide strategic direction or policy support for the suite of urban zones proposed - MUZ provisions do not sufficiently enable a range of commercial activities.	Amend PDP by reviewing the suite of commercial zones proposed and rezone Kerikeri town centre to Town Centre Zone (or similar commercial zone) that appropriately reflects commercial development and activities within Kerikeri township, alternatively if relief not accepted by FNDC, amend the Mixed Use Zone provisions to provide for an increased range of commercial and community activities.		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS350.017	Puketona Lodge Ltd		Support	The reasons given in the original submission and primary submission of the submitter.  The Mixed Use Zone (MUZ) is not the most appropriate zone for Kerikeri town centre for the following reasons:	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- MUZ does not give effect to Objective 1 and Policy 1 of the NPS-UD</li> <li>- Section 32 Evaluation - Urban Environments is incomplete and flawed (refer to submission for specific reasoning)</li> <li>- PDP does not provide strategic direction or policy support for the suite of urban zones proposed</li> <li>- MUZ provisions do not sufficiently enable a range of commercial activities.</li> </ul>				
<b>FS441.017</b>	Adrian and Sue Knight		Support	Amend PDP by reviewing the suite of commercial zones proposed and rezone Kerikeri town centre to Town Centre Zone (or similar commercial zone) that appropriately reflects commercial development and activities within Kerikeri township, alternatively if relief not accepted by FNDC, amend the Mixed Use Zone provisions to provide for an increased range of commercial and community activities	Allow	Amend	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>FS403.032</b>	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support in part	Te Whatu Ora support the review of the suite of commercial zones proposed and zoning that reflects commercial development.	Allow in part	Te Whatu Ora support the review of the suite of commercial zones proposed and zoning that reflects commercial development.	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>FS566.499</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	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>S209.006</b>	Audrey Campbell-Frear	District Plan Framework	Oppose	<p>The Mixed Use Zone (MUZ) is not the most appropriate zone for Kerikeri town centre for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- MUZ does not give effect to Objective 1 and Policy 1 of the NPS-UD</li> <li>- Section 32 Evaluation - Urban Environments is incomplete and flawed (refer to submission for specific reasoning)</li> </ul>	Amend PDP by reviewing the suite of commercial zones proposed and rezone Kerikeri town centre to Town Centre Zone (or similar commercial zone) that appropriately reflects commercial development and activities within Kerikeri township, alternatively if relief not accepted by FNDC, amend the Mixed Use Zone provisions to provide for an increased range of commercial and community activities.	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection	

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				- PDP does not provide strategic direction or policy support for the suite of urban zones proposed - MUZ provisions do not sufficiently enable a range of commercial activities.				
<b>FS350.021</b>	Puketona Lodge Ltd		Support	The reasons given in the original submission and primary submission of the submitter.  The Mixed Use Zone (MUZ) is not the most appropriate zone for Kerikeri town centre for the following reasons: - MUZ does not give effect to Objective 1 and Policy 1 of the NPS-UD - Section 32 Evaluation - Urban Environments is incomplete and flawed (refer to submission for specific reasoning) - PDP does not provide strategic direction or policy support for the suite of urban zones proposed - MUZ provisions do not sufficiently enable a range of commercial activities.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>FS441.021</b>	Adrian and Sue Knight		Support	Amend PDP by reviewing the suite of commercial zones proposed and rezone Kerikeri town centre to Town Centre Zone (or similar commercial zone) that appropriately reflects commercial development and activities within Kerikeri township, alternatively if relief not accepted by FNDC, amend the Mixed Use Zone provisions to provide for an increased range of commercial and community activities.	Allow	Amend	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>FS566.503</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	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>S516.078</b>	Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland	Relationships between spatial layers	Not Stated	The PDP utilises a Mixed Use Zone (MUZ) for all existing urban centres, with no alternative commercial zones proposed. The National Planning Standards provide a range of commercial zones: Neighbourhood Centre Zone Local Centre Zone Commercial Zone Large Format Retail Zone Mixed Use Zone Town Centre Zone Metropolitan Centre Zone City Centre Zone. In the absence of a section 32 evaluation, Ngā Tai Ora are unable to understand why Council has chosen to only use one	Amend the Plan to provide clear strategic direction for a compact urban form and establish a centres hierarchy within the Plan. Reconsider the approach to commercial zones and reconsider the most appropriate zoning for existing centres and villages which accurately reflects existing and planned levels of development specific to those areas. Provide sufficient section 32 evaluation to support the approach to zoning.		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>S335.029</b>	BP Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited, Z Energy Limited	COMMERCIAL ACTIVITY	Support	The PDP does not contain a definition (or use anywhere in the PDP) of "drive-thru", which was part of the draft plan to which the Fuel Companies commented on. In light of this removal, and further to the paragraph above, the Fuel Companies consider that a truck stop is a Commercial activity under the PDP.	Retain definition of Commercial Activities as notified.		Accept	Key Issue: Definitions
<b>FS406.016</b>	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Oppose	McDonald's seeks changes to this definition in accordance with its original submission	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Definitions
<b>FS403.048</b>	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Oppose	Te Whatu Ora seek amendment to the commercial activities definitions to include nesting tables and a definition of Food and Beverage Activities.	Disallow in part	Te Whatu Ora seek amendment to the commercial activities definitions to include nesting tables and a definition of Food and Beverage Activities.	Reject	Key Issue: Definitions

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S336.001	Z Energy Limited	COMMERCIAL ACTIVITY	Support	Z Energy acknowledges that the definition of commercial activity is taken directly from the National Planning Standards (as is required) and supports this and supports the intent in the PDP (as apparent from Rule 2 in the Mixed Use zone) that service stations (which are not defined) are commercial activities	Retain the definition of commercial activity		Accept	Key Issue: Definitions
FS406.017	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Oppose	McDonald's seeks changes to this definition in accordance with its original submission.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Definitions
FS403.049	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Oppose	Te Whatu Ora seek amendment to the commercial activities definitions to include nesting tables and a definition of Food and Beverage Activities.	Disallow in part	Te Whatu Ora seek amendment to the commercial activities definitions to include nesting tables and a definition of Food and Beverage Activities.	Reject	Key Issue: Definitions
S437.003	FNR Properties Limited	COMMERCIAL ACTIVITY	Support in part	It is considered that the proposed definition of 'Commercial Activities' as notified is vague and could lead to interpretation issues.	Amend definition of 'Commercial Activities' to be more specific in terms of the activities provided for.		Reject	Key Issue: Definitions
FS406.018	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Support in part	McDonald's supports changes to this definition to be more specific, noting the changes outlined in its original submission	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Definitions
FS403.050	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support in part	Te Whatu Ora seek amendment to the commercial activities definitions to include nesting tables and a definition of Food and Beverage Activities.	Allow in part	Te Whatu Ora seek amendment to the commercial activities definitions to include nesting tables and a definition of Food and Beverage Activities.	Reject	Key Issue: Definitions
S79.001	Archibald Northland Limited	COMMERCIAL SERVICE	Support in part	Supports that commercial services definitions are included in the Proposed District Plan. However, there is a lack of certainty as there is no reference to car sales as a commercial service.	Amend definition of Commercial Service to add 'car sales' to the list of included activities.		Reject	Key Issue: Definitions

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>S385.003</b>	McDonalds Restaurants (NZ) Limited	LARGE FORMAT RETAIL	Support in part	McDonald's considers that the reliance on a performance standard (gross business area) for this definition is flawed. It is confusing in a predominantly activities based plan, results in difficult interaction with other activities based definitions, and results in unclear rules. McDonald's seek that the definition for Large Format Retail be reviewed to relate to the type of retail activity Council want to manage through this definition, and rely on performance standards to manage scale and associated effects.	Amend definition of Large Format Retail to removed reference to Gross Floor Area and refer to retail activities that Council wants to capture through this definition.		Reject	Key Issue: Definitions
<b>S371.007</b>	Bunnings Limited	LARGE FORMAT RETAIL	Support in part	Bunnings considers that the reliance on a performance standard (gross business area) for this definition is flawed. It is confusing in a predominantly activities based plan, results in difficult interaction with other activities based definitions, and results in unclear rules. Bunnings seeks: 1. the definition be reviewed to relate to the type of retail Council want to manage through this definition, and rely on performance standards to manage effects 2. Trade Supplier be expressly excluded (noting S371.004)	Amend the definition of Large Format Retail to remove reference to Gross Floor Area, and expressly exclude Trade Suppliers		Reject	Key Issue: Definitions
<b>FS406.019</b>	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Support in part	McDonald's seeks to amend the definition to remove the reference to Gross floor area and refer to retail activities that Council wants to capture through this definition.	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Definitions
<b>S385.004</b>	McDonalds Restaurants (NZ) Limited	New Definition	Not Stated	Drive-through activity is a term used in the Mixed Use Zone (see MUZ-R16) and fast food with 'drive-thru' under 'Food and Beverage Activity' in the Transport Chapter tables. McDonald's note that: - Neither drive through, drive-thru or	Insert definition for drive-through activity.		Accept	Key Issue: Definitions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>food and beverage are defined.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It is unclear whether a McDonald's restaurant would be captured by any of these activity,</li> <li>- In the absence of a nesting table, it is difficult to understand if these activities are considered commercial activities (which is defined) and whether they are sub classification.</li> </ul> <p>As noted in section 2 and sub#1 McDonalds seek that Council review definitions and include a nesting table to provide some clarity for plan users and ensure an efficient and effective plan that can be applied consistently. With specific regard to Drive-through activity McDonalds seeks that a definition be included.</p>			
<b>S516.015</b>	Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland	New Definition	Not Stated	<p>Ngā Tai Ora seek to ensure that "commercial activities related to food and beverage activities follow food hygiene regulations (preparation and storage). It is important that food and beverage activities are separately defined.</p>	<p>Insert a definition for 'Food and beverage activity' as follows:<b>Food and Beverage Activity means activities where the primary business is selling food or beverages.</b></p> <p><b>Includes:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>restaurants and cafes;</b></li> <li>2. <b>food halls; and</b></li> <li>3. <b>takeaway food bars and bakeries.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>Excludes:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>retail shops; and</b></li> <li>2. <b>grocery stores.</b></li> </ol>	Reject	Key Issue: Definitions
<b>S385.032</b>	McDonalds Restaurants (NZ) Limited	New Definition	Not Stated	<p>The overview of the Mixed Use Zone provides for activities that are not defined (retail activities, and food and beverage). As per sub#1 and sub#2</p>	<p>Insert a new definition for 'retail activities'</p>	Reject	Key Issue: Definitions

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				McDonald's seeks clear definitions and nesting tables to provide clarity to plan users.				
<b>S385.033</b>	McDonalds Restaurants (NZ) Limited	New Definition	Not Stated	The overview of the Mixed Use Zone provides for activities that are not defined (retail activities, and food and beverage). As per sub#1 and sub#2 McDonald's seeks clear definitions and nesting tables to provide clarity to plan users.	Insert new definition for 'food and beverage'		Reject	Key Issue: Definitions
<b>FS403.063</b>	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support	Te Whatu Ora support the inclusion of a definition for "food and beverage" activities.	Allow	Te Whatu Ora support the inclusion of a definition for "food and beverage" activities.	Reject	Key Issue: Definitions
<b>S529.218</b>	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	Rules	Support in part	We support the principle of PDP provisions controlling the area of impermeable surface per site, and consider it is probably also necessary to monitor and limit the total cumulative impermeable area in residential/urban zones.	Amend to provide for greater limits on impermeable areas (and/or requirements for minimum permeable areas) for subdivision, use and development. In urban/residential zones, it will also be necessary to adopt measures to limit the cumulative total impermeable surface and/or protect a specified cumulative total permeable area.		Reject	Key Issue: Impermeable surfaces
<b>FS570.2105</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Impermeable surfaces
<b>FS566.2119</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Impermeable surfaces
<b>FS569.2141</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Impermeable surfaces
<b>S521.014</b>	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	Rules	Support in part	We support the principle of PDP provisions controlling the area of impermeable surface per site, and consider it is probably also necessary to monitor and limit the total cumulative impermeable area in residential/urban zones.	Amend to provide for greater limits on impermeable areas (and/or requirements for minimum permeable areas) for subdivision, use and development. In urban/residential zones, it will also be necessary to adopt measures to limit the cumulative total impermeable surface and/or		Reject	Key Issue: Impermeable surfaces

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					protect a specified cumulative total permeable area.			
FS566.1724	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Impermeable surfaces
S27.001	Trent Simpkin	SUB-S1	Support	Support mixed use having no minimum lot size. This allows for townhouse developments and similar in townships like Kerikeri where they would be super beneficial for the working class.	Retain the proposed standard for Mixed Use zone, which has no minimum lot size for Mixed Use Zone.		Accept	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
S174.002	Tristan Simpkin	SUB-S1	Support	Support mixed use having no minimum lot size. This allows for townhouse developments and similar in townships like Kerikeri where they would be super beneficial for the working class.	Retain the proposed standard for Mixed Use zone, which has no minimum lot size for Mixed Use Zone.		Accept	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
FS29.19	Trent Simpkin		Support	Support this suggestion for no minimum lot size as in town centres alot of homes can be put onto a smaller area which is better use of land, with careful design.	Allow		Accept	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
S368.004	Far North District Council	SUB-S1	Support in part	Correction: The onsite wastewater option for both Mixed Use and Light Industrial zones needs to be removed as they are both 'urban' as defined in the PDP. This was incorrectly applied, the intention of the PDP in urban zoned land is the availability of adequate development infrastructure.	Amend SUB-S1 Mixed Use <del>2,000m2 onsite wastewater disposal</del> 250m2 reticulated wastewater disposal Light Industrial <del>2,000m2 onsite wastewater disposal</del> 500m2 reticulated wastewater disposal		Accept	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
FS25.114	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Support	Supports the correction as it reflects the underlying intent of the FNDP.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
FS395.009	Ti Toki Farms Limited		Support	Provided that the intention of the change is to allow the level of subdivision expressed within the submission without the need for	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept	Key Issue: Subdivision framework

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				Council owned three waters reticulation, then the submission is supported. However, if the intention of the submission is that despite certain areas such as Waipapa being proposed as Mixed Use / Light Industrial, that subdivision can only proceed with Council 3 waters reticulation than the submission is not supported.				
<b>FS391.009</b>	LD Family Investments Ltd		Support in part	Provided that the intention of the change is to allow the level of subdivision expressed within the submission without the need for Council owned three waters reticulation, then the submission is supported. However, if the intention of the submission is that despite certain areas such as Waipapa being proposed as Mixed Use / Light Industrial, that subdivision can only proceed with Council 3 waters reticulation than the submission is not supported.	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Accept	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
<b>FS243.067</b>	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Support	Kāinga Ora supports the amendments proposed, consistent with the change sought in its primary submission.	Allow	Amend SUB-S1 Mixed Use .....	Accept	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
<b>FS325.072</b>	Turnstone Trust Limited		Support	TT supports the correction as it reflects the underlying intent of the proposed district plan.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept	Key Issue: Subdivision framework
<b>S74.006</b>	Brownie Family Trust	Overview	Support in part	The phrases "The Mixed-Use zone provides a framework in which commercial and residential activities can coexist and it enables a range of compatible activities" and "...limited residential activities" are at odds with each other. If there is an appropriate framework for commercial and residential activities to co-exist	Amend the overview (inferred) to read as follows:..." <i>and beverage establishments as well as social and educational services, with limited residential activities.</i> "		Reject	Key Issue: MUZ Policies

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				established, why is it necessary to limit residential activities? The limitation should be removed.			
<b>S385.019</b>	McDonalds Restaurants (NZ) Limited	Overview	Support in part	<p>The overview of the Mixed Use Zone provides for activities that are not defined (retail activities, and food and beverage). As per sub#1 and sub#2 McDonald's seeks clear definitions and nesting tables to provide clarity to plan users.</p> <p>McDonald's notes that the overview of the Zone suggests that it seeks to 'revitalise urban centres', however, the zone has been applied beyond urban centres which could create issues in terms of the integrity of this Chapter.</p> <p>As noted in sub#2 and section 2.0 McDonald's seeks that Council review their suite of zones to provide additional commercial zones.</p>	Insert definitions for retail activities and food and beverage.	Reject	Key Issue: Definitions
<b>S320.011</b>	Far North Holdings Limited	Overview	Not Stated	<p>The submitter considers that amendments to the Overview of the Mixed Use zone are appropriate for all of the Far North Holdings Ltd (FNHL) landholdings, as it better reflects existing, consented and proposed land uses (s32 assessment provided with submission).</p>	<p>Amend the Overview section of the Mixed Use zone as follows:</p> <p>The District's urban business centres have traditionally been zoned commercial and contain retail activities, commercial services, food and beverage establishments as well as social and educational services, with limited residential activities.</p> <p>The Mixed Use zone provides a framework in which commercial and residential activities can co-exist and it enables a range of compatible activities. The focus of the zone is to revitalise urban centres <b>and other identified areas such as the Opuā Marina, Marine Business Park, Commercial Estate, Colenzo Triangle and the Opuā Marine Development Area 'OMDA'</b>, and support business owners, residents and visitors, while ensuring that associated</p>	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ overview

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					<p>effects are appropriately managed.</p> <p>The Mixed Use zone will contribute to the vibrancy, safety and prosperity of the District's urban centres, <b>and other identified areas such as the Opuā Marina, Colenzo Triangle, Marine Business Park, Commercial Estate and the Opuā Marine Development Area 'OMDA'</b> and will be serviced by appropriate infrastructure.</p> <p>The Council has a responsibility under the RMA, the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and the RPS to ensure that there is sufficient land for housing and business to meet the future demands of the District, that development occurs in the right location and that it is appropriately serviced.</p>		
<b>FS107.5</b>	Laurell Douglas		Support	As above	Allow	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ overview
<b>FS107.6</b>	Laurell Douglas		Support	Per above	Allow	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ overview
<b>S561.117</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Overview	Not Stated	Introduce a framework of Objectives; Policies; Standards and rules; Matters of discretion; and Assessment Criteria to support the proposed Town Centre zone. In particular, a Town Centre zone is sought for Kerikeri to enable up to 6 storey buildings. Increased development height is sought for Kerikeri to support business and residential investment in the centre.	Insert new provisions as set out in Appendix 5 to support the introduction of the proposed Town Centre zone.	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone selection

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				While it is understood that FNDC are currently reviewing infrastructure within the District, it is noted that the Kerikeri - Waipapa Structure Plan 2007 (KKWSP) promotes a Mixed use zoned land and provision for a higher density Residential zone within the networked area. The findings of the current infrastructure review should be integrated into the zoning provisions for Kerikeri.				
FS172.176	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support in part	For the reasons set out in this primary submission and in my primary submission to review commercial zones (support TCZ but not 6 storey height).	Allow in part		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone selection
FS42.002	Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections		Neutral	Submitter is neutral on the relief sought but seeks that Community corrections sites support offenders living in the community (the activity would default to a discretionary activity status under proposed rule TCZ-R10). The submitter looks to locate its sites in areas that are easily accessible to offenders, and near other supporting government agencies. As such, sites are commonly located within central business areas (i.e. town centre zones). The demand for both community corrections activities and the submitters residential activities will increase as a result of residential intensification and consequential population growth. The submitter needs to be able to meet that demand, therefore it is important that this is enabled by the relevant plan provisions.	Not stated	Retain proposed rule TCZ-R5, which provides for residential units as a permitted activity. Insert new permitted activity rule for community corrections activity in the TCZ where activity status where compliance not achieved is not applicable.	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone selection
FS32.171	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone selection

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes.</p> <p>The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts.</p> <p>The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.</p>				
<b>FS23.389</b>	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone selection
<b>FS47.131</b>	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone selection

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document				
<b>FS348.204</b>	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone selection
<b>FS584.003</b>	Peter Malcolm		Support	Support enabling building heights up to 6 storeys (22m) in the Kerikeri Town Centre. There is currently a shortage of affordable and public housing within this area. Central Kerikeri is an appropriate location to enable residential intensification as it has sufficient servicing, low natural hazard risk and is accessible to public transport, services and amenities. Enabling intensification within the Kerikeri Town Centre will help reduce sprawl, improve economic viability and promote vibrant communities.	Allow in part	Amend the Proposed District Plan to enable building heights up to 6 storeys (22m) in the Kerikeri Town Centre (inferred).	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone selection
<b>S82.004</b>	Good Journey Limited	Objectives	Oppose	The objectives are opposed in part. There are apparent errors in the plan drafting such that activities that were clearly intended to be permitted, will in fact trigger resource consent on the face of the wording.	Amend the Objectives in the Mixed Use zone		Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ Objectives
<b>S179.044</b>	Russell Protection Society (INC)	Objectives	Support		Retain objectives		Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ Objectives

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

<b>Submission Point</b>	<b>Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)</b>	<b>Provision</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Summary of Decision Requested</b>		<b>Officer recommendation</b>	<b>Relevant section of S42A Report</b>
<b>S218.007</b>	Summerset Group Holdings Limited	Objectives	Not Stated	expresses support for the submission of the Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand (submission 520) in its entirety.	Insert new objective supporting provision for a variety of densities, housing types and lot sizes that respond to housing needs and demand.		Reject	Key Issue: Retirement villages
<b>S520.007</b>	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Objectives	Not Stated	Provision for retirement villages in the Mixed Use zone commensurate with the provisions sought by RVA in the General Residential zone	Insert new objective supporting provision for a variety of densities, housing types and lot sizes that respond to housing needs and demand.		Reject	Key Issue: Retirement villages
<b>S561.118</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Objectives	Not Stated	Introduce a framework of Objectives; Policies; Standards and rules; Matters of discretion; and Assessment Criteria to support the proposed Town Centre zone. In particular, a Town Centre zone is sought for Kerikeri to enable up to 6 storey buildings. Increased development height is sought for Kerikeri to support business and residential investment in the centre. While it is understood that FNDC are currently reviewing infrastructure within the District, it is noted that the Kerikeri - Waipapa Structure Plan 2007 (KKWSP) promotes a Mixed use zoned land and provision for a higher density Residential zone within the networked area. The findings of the current infrastructure review should be integrated into the zoning provisions for Kerikeri.	Insert new provisions as set out in Appendix 5 to support the introduction of the proposed Town Centre zone.		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>FS172.177</b>	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support in part	For the reasons set out in this primary submission and in my primary submission to review commercial zones (support TCZ but not 6 storey height).	Allow in part		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>FS42.003</b>	Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections		Neutral	Submitter is neutral on the relief sought but seeks that Community corrections sites support offenders living in the community (the activity would default to a discretionary activity status under	Not stated	Retain proposed rule TCZ-R5, which provides for residential units as a permitted activity. Insert new permitted activity rule for community corrections	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>proposed rule TCZ-R10). The submitter looks to locate its sites in areas that are easily accessible to offenders, and near other supporting government agencies. As such, sites are commonly located within central business areas (i.e. town centre zones). The demand for both community corrections activities and the submitters residential activities will increase as a result of residential intensification and consequential population growth. The submitter needs to be able to meet that demand, therefore it is important that this is enabled by the relevant plan provisions.</p>		<p>activity in the TCZ where activity status where compliance not achieved is not applicable.</p>		
<p><b>FS32.172</b></p>	<p>Jeff Kemp</p>		<p>Oppose</p>	<p>The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes.</p> <p>The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts.</p> <p>The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change</p>	<p>Disallow</p>	<p>Disallow the original submission.</p>	<p>Deferred</p>	<p>Key Issue: Zone Selection</p>

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.				
<b>FS23.390</b>	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>FS47.132</b>	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>FS348.205</b>	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>FS584.004</b>	Peter Malcolm		Support	Support enabling building heights up to 6 storeys (22m) in the Kerikeri Town Centre. There is currently a shortage of affordable and public housing within this area. Central Kerikeri is an appropriate location to enable	Allow in part	Amend the Proposed District Plan to enable building heights up to 6 storeys (22m) in the Kerikeri Town Centre (inferred).	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				residential intensification as it has sufficient servicing, low natural hazard risk and is accessible to public transport, services and amenities. Enabling intensification within the Kerikeri Town Centre will help reduce sprawl, improve economic viability and promote vibrant communities.				
<b>S454.116</b>	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	Objectives	Not Stated	Objective MUZ-O1 sets out the activities that will occur in the Mixed Use zone. Transpower supports the intent of this objective to identify the activities that are likely to occur within the Mixed Use zone, 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. The new objective is required to make it explicit that infrastructure such as the National Grid is contemplated in Mixed Use zone.	Insert new objective MUZ-Ox as follows: <b>The Mixed Use zone is used by compatible activities and infrastructure, that have a functional or operational need to locate in the zone.</b>		Reject	Key Issue: Plan wide and urban wide issues
<b>FS243.159</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	Key Issue: Plan wide and urban wide issues
<b>FS369.508</b>	Top Energy		Support	Top Energy supports the objective to provide for infrastructure that has a functional or operational need to locate in the zone.	Allow		Reject	Key Issue: Plan wide and urban wide issues
<b>S74.007</b>	Brownie Family Trust	MUZ-O1	Support in part	The current drafting is a little unclear. Does "these activities" mean commercial, community etc. or residential?	Amend objective MUZ-O1 to read as follows: <i>The Mixed Use zone is the focal point for the District's commercial, community and civic activities, and provides for</i>		Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ objectives

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					<b>compatible residential development and compatible residential activities and is not incompatible with these activities.</b>		
<b>S336.009</b>	Z Energy Limited	MUZ-O1	Support in part	Objective MUZ-01 is supported.	Retain Objective MUZ-01	Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ objectives
<b>S561.079</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	MUZ-O1	Support in part	Kāinga Ora recommend the introduction of a Town Centre zone for Kerikeri township as the largest and fastest growing township in the Far North (and is consistent with National Planning Standards). The Mixed Use zone is generally supported as it provides for the existing commercial activities as well as residential activity. However, a Town Centre zone is considered more appropriate for Kerikeri as this will be in accordance with the government direction given through the NPS-UD enabling growth and investment in the key centre of the District. Kerikeri town is of sufficient urban size and predicted growth to be given a Town Centre zoning. While it is understood that the Council is currently reviewing infrastructure assets to better understand capacity, the requirement for adequate infrastructure to be in place to support development (as set out in policy MUZ-P01 below) ensures that any infrastructure constraints will be addressed when any new development is proposed.	Retain MUZ-01 as notified with the introduction of a Town Centre zone for Kerikeri.	Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ objectives
<b>FS172.175</b>	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission and in my primary submission to review commercial zones (support TCZ but not 6 storey height).	Allow	Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ objectives

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS25.130	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Oppose	<p>Supports a more appropriate zoning for Kerikeri town centre than the Mixed Use Zone subject to appropriate provisions that reflect the character and environmental characteristics of Kerikeri. KFO does not support a maximum building height of 22 metres for all of Kerikeri town centre and considers that more fine grained planning should be undertaken to identify locations suitable for higher buildings to ensure town centre amenity is maintained. This includes wind tunnel and other amenity effects.</p>	Disallow in part	<p>Disallow the building height aspect of the submission subject to more detailed / fine grained planning - potentially a Precinct to identify suitable locations for higher buildings. Support other changes subject to wording and changes sought (inferred).</p>	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ objectives
FS32.133	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	<p>The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes.</p> <p>The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts.</p> <p>The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change</p>	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ objectives

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.				
<b>FS325.068</b>	Turnstone Trust Limited		Oppose	TT supports a more appropriate zoning for Kerikeri town centre than the Mixed Use Zone subject to appropriate provisions that reflect the character and environmental characteristics of Kerikeri. TT does not support a maximum building height of 22 metres for all of Kerikeri town centre and considers that more fine-grained planning should be undertaken to identify locations suitable for higher buildings to ensure town centre amenity is maintained, such as a precinct. This includes wind tunnel and other amenity effects.	Disallow in part	Disallow the original submission subject to a more detailed planning process required such as a precinct to identify locations suitable for higher buildings; Allow other changes sought in the original submission subject to appropriate wording.	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ objectives
<b>FS23.351</b>	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ objectives
<b>FS47.093</b>	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ objectives

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document				
FS348.166	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ objectives
FS584.001	Peter Malcolm		Support	Support enabling building heights up to 6 storeys (22m) in the Kerikeri Town Centre. There is currently a shortage of affordable and public housing within this area. Central Kerikeri is an appropriate location to enable residential intensification as it has sufficient servicing, low natural hazard risk and is accessible to public transport, services and amenities. Enabling intensification within the Kerikeri Town Centre will help reduce sprawl, improve economic viability and promote vibrant communities.	Allow in part	Amend the Proposed District Plan to enable building heights up to 6 storeys (22m) in the Kerikeri Town Centre (inferred).	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ objectives
S554.026	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited	MUZ-O1	Support	KFO supports Objective MUZ-O1 as identifying that the Mixed Use Zone is the focal point for commercial, community and civic activities.	Retain the objective as notified.		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ objectives
FS175.3	Denis Thomson		Support	Support the purpose of the Mixed Use Zone	Allow		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ objectives
FS32.029	Jeff Kemp		Support in part	The submitter supports the overall intent and purpose of the original submission as it is the only viable and practical option to enable planned and coordinated development in and around Kerikeri and the Waipapa area.  The submitter notes that the documentation on proposed traffic movements is unclear. The original	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	Key Issue: MUZ objectives

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>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>				
FS389.032	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	Key Issue: MUZ objectives
S331.079	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	MUZ-O1	Support in part	The submitter supports objective MUZ-O1 as the focal point for the District's commercial, community and civic activities and provides for residential development. However, the submitter requests that complimentary and compatible non-residential activities which have an operational need to be in the Mixed Use zone, such as educational facilities, are enabled.	Amend objective MUZ-O1 as follows: The Mixed Use zone is the focal point for the District's commercial, community and civic activities, and provides for <b>complementary and compatible residential development and non-residential activities which support the operation of the Mixed Use zone.</b> <del>where it complements and is not incompatible with these activities.</del>		Reject	Key Issue: Plan wide and urban wide submissions
FS243.191	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Support	Kāinga Ora supports provisions that enable housing with good access to jobs, amenities and services and the	Allow	Amend objective MUZ-O1 as follows: .....	Reject	Key Issue: Plan wide and urban

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				co-location of activities to contribute to economic, social, environmental, and cultural wellbeing. As such, Kāinga Ora supports the enablement of activities within the General Residential zone that may not be residential activities but will contribute to the achievement of good housing outcomes.				wide submissions
<b>S74.008</b>	Brownie Family Trust	MUZ-O2	Support	Development should fit the intended amenity for the zone.	Retain objective MUZ-O2 as notified.		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ objectives
<b>S336.010</b>	Z Energy Limited	MUZ-O2	Support in part	Objective MUZ-02 is supported.	Retain Objective MUZ-02		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ objectives
<b>S554.027</b>	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited	MUZ-O2	Support	KFO supports Objective MUZ-O2 as appropriately providing for development that contributes positively to the vibrancy, safety and amenity of the zone.	Retain the objective as notified.		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ objectives
<b>FS32.030</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</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	Key Issue: MUZ objectives

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>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>				
<b>FS389.033</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	Key Issue: MUZ objectives
<b>S561.080</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	MUZ-O2	Support	This objective recognises the need for the commercial centres of the District to be developed while maintaining amenity.	Retain MUZ-O2 as notified		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ objectives
<b>FS32.134</b>	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	<p>The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes.</p> <p>The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based</p>	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ objectives

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts.</p> <p>The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.</p>				
<b>FS23.352</b>	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	<p>Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.</p>	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Support	Key Issue: MUZ objectives
<b>FS47.094</b>	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	<p>The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan.</p> <p>Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document</p>	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ objectives
<b>FS348.167</b>	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	<p>The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA</p>	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ objectives

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

<b>Submission Point</b>	<b>Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)</b>	<b>Provision</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Summary of Decision Requested</b>		<b>Officer recommendation</b>	<b>Relevant section of S42A Report</b>
<b>S271.034</b>	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	MUZ-O2	Support	Generally, support the objective as it requires consideration of urban design principals.	Retain as notified (inferred)		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ objectives
<b>FS570.757</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ objectives
<b>FS566.771</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ objectives
<b>FS569.793</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ objectives
<b>S529.099</b>	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	MUZ-O2	Support	Generally, support the objective as it requires consideration of urban design principals.	Retain as notified (inferred)		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ objectives
<b>FS570.1987</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ objectives
<b>FS566.2001</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ objectives
<b>FS569.2023</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ objectives
<b>S524.034</b>	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	MUZ-O2	Support	Generally, support the objective as it requires consideration of urban design principals.	Retain as notified (inferred)		Accept	Key Issues: MUZ objectives
<b>FS566.1852</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Key Issues: MUZ objectives

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S446.035	Kapiro Conservation Trust	MUZ-O2	Support	Generally, support the objective and policy as they require consideration of urban design principals.	Retain MUZ-O2 ( inferred )	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ objectives
FS569.1794	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ objectives
FS570.1794	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ objectives
S74.009	Brownie Family Trust	MUZ-O3	Support in part	The objective should relate to subdivision in the Mixed Use zone	Amend objective MUZ-O3 as follows: <i>Enable land use and subdivision in the Light Industrial Mixed Use</i> zonewhere there is adequacy and capacity of available or programmed developmentinfrastructure to support it.	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ objectives
S137.001	Lynley Newport	MUZ-O3	Support in part	Objective MUZ-O3 includes topographical error.	Amend Objective MUZ-O3 as follows: Enable land use and subdivision in the <del>Light Industrial</del> <b>Mixed Use</b> Zone where there is adequacy and capacity available or programmed development infrastructure to support it.	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ objectives
S368.092	Far North District Council	MUZ-O3	Support in part	Drafting error. Should be referencing the Mixed Use zone not the Light Industrial zone, needs to be changed	Amend MUZ-O3 Enable land use and subdivision in the <del>Light industrial</del> <b>Mixed use</b> zone where there is adequacy and capacity of available or programmed development infrastructure to support it.	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ objectives

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S336.011	Z Energy Limited	MUZ-O3	Support in part	Objective MUZ-O3 refers to the Light Industrial zone. Z Energy questions whether this is an error and is instead meant to refer to the Mixed Use zone	Amend or clarify reference to Light Industrial zone in Objective MUZ-O3.		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ objectives
S320.012	Far North Holdings Limited	MUZ-O3	Not Stated	The submitter considers objective MUZ-O3 to contain an error and an unnecessary word (inferred).	Amend objective MUZ-03 to read as follows: Enable land use and subdivision in the <del>Light Industrial</del> <b>Mixed Use</b> zone where there is adequacy and capacity of available or programmed development infrastructure to support it.		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ objectives
S554.028	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited	MUZ-O3	Oppose	KFO supports the intent of Objective MUZ-O3, but seeks to clarify whether it should refer to the Mixed Use Zone, rather than the Light Industrial Zone. The Objective should also recognise that developer-led infrastructure solutions may be appropriate.	Amend Objective MUZ-O3 as follows: Enable land use and subdivision in the <del>Light Industrial</del> <b>Mixed Use</b> zone where there is adequacy and capacity of available or programmed development infrastructure, <b>or a private infrastructure solution</b> , to support it.		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ objectives
FS32.031	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</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	Key Issue: MUZ objectives

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>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>				
<b>FS389.034</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	Key Issue: MUZ objectives
<b>S561.081</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	MUZ-O3	Support	not stated	Retain MUZ-O3 as notified		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ objectives
<b>FS32.135</b>	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	<p>The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes.</p> <p>The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based</p>	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ objectives

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts.</p> <p>The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.</p>				
<b>FS23.353</b>	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	<p>Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.</p>	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ objectives
<b>FS47.095</b>	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	<p>The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan.</p> <p>Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document</p>	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ objectives
<b>FS348.168</b>	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	<p>The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA</p>	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ objectives

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S431.113	John Andrew Riddell	MUZ-O3	Not Stated	Not stated	Amend the reference to a Light Industrial zone in objective MUZ-O3 to the Mixed Use zone.		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ objectives
FS332.113	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	Key Issue: MUZ objectives
S74.010	Brownie Family Trust	MUZ-O4	Support	Adverse effects created by the type of development should be managed.	Retain objective MUZ-O4 as notified.		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ objectives
S336.012	Z Energy Limited	MUZ-O4	Support in part	Objective MUZ-04 is supported.	Retain Objective MUZ-04		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ objectives
S554.029	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited	MUZ-O4	Support	KFO supports Objective MUZ-04 as recognising the need to manage adverse effects.	Retain the objective as notified.		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ objectives
FS32.032	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>	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	Key Issue: MUZ objectives

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				The 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>FS389.035</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	Key Issue: MUZ objectives
<b>S561.082</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	MUZ-O4	Support	not stated	Retain MUZ-O4 as notified		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ objectives
<b>FS32.136</b>	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	<p>The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes.</p> <p>The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts.</p>	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ objectives

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.				
<b>FS23.354</b>	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ objectives
<b>FS47.096</b>	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ objectives
<b>FS348.169</b>	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ objectives

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S74.011	Brownie Family Trust	MUZ-O5	Oppose	The location of residential activities in relation to commercial activities won't achieve active frontages and will only limit development that might otherwise be compatible. Quality urban design and appropriate development standards are appropriate methods.	Delete the requirement in objective MUZ-O5 to locate residential activities above commercial activities from the objective.		Reject	Key Issue: Residential units- ground floor
S336.013	Z Energy Limited	MUZ-O5	Support in part	Objective MUZ-05 is supported	Retain Objective MUZ-05		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Objectives
S561.083	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	MUZ-O5	Support in part	Residential use being prevented on the ground floor of buildings is opposed as this activity can be designed to complement the streetscape and it is a use that will be beneficial to centres. The zone has been applied to areas surrounding the main street of centres where residential activity would enhance the centre and buildings may be towards the rear of sites. The provision to restrict residential use should only be applied to the main street where a 'pedestrian frontage' overlay has been applied. The amendment sought will provide for and promote the redevelopment of these sites for residential use. If the policy and related rules are not amended then these Kāinga Ora sites' zoning is opposed and a residential zone is sought (as set out in submission section "Kāinga Ora Properties" below).	Retain MUZ-O5 with the following amendment: Residential activity in the Mixed Use zone <b>where it is identified as a pedestrian frontage</b> is located above commercial activities to ensure active street frontages, except where the interface is with the Open Space zone.		Reject	Key Issue: Residential Units – ground floor
FS175.4	Denis Thomson		Support in part	Residential activity in the MU Zone should not be made to be on the upper level. It should also be an activity that can occur on the ground /street level.	Allow in part		Reject	Key Issue: Residential Units – ground floor
FS32.137	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept	Key Issue: Residential Units – ground floor

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes.</p> <p>The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts.</p> <p>The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.</p>				
<b>FS23.355</b>	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Units – ground floor
<b>FS47.097</b>	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Accept	Key Issue: Residential Units – ground floor

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document				
<b>FS348.170</b>	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept	Key Issue: Residential Units – ground floor
<b>S554.030</b>	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited	MUZ-O5	Support	KFO supports Objective MUZ-O5 and its recognition that residential activities may be appropriate above ground floor.	Retain the objective as notified.		Accept	Key Issue: Residential Units – ground floor
<b>FS32.033</b>	Jeff Kemp		Support in part	The submitter supports the overall intent and purpose of the original submission as it is the only viable and practical option to enable planned and coordinated development in and around Kerikeri and the Waipapa area.  The submitter notes that the documentation on proposed traffic movements is unclear. The original submission has not provided details on potential traffic movements and intersections for Waitotara Dive and Waipapa Road and how these might link to State Highway 10. For example, it is unclear if the new link from State 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.	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	Key Issue: Residential Units – ground floor

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				The 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.				
FS389.036	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	Key Issue: Residential Units – ground floor
S356.116	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	MUZ-O5	Support	Supportive of mixed use zoning, but it would be good to understand the rationale for not using a town centre zone in Kerikeri, Kaitaia and Kaikohe - particularly as these settlements continue to grow and develop.	Retain MUZ-O5 as notified		Accept	Key Issue: Residential Units – ground floor
FS243.198	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose	Kāinga Ora supports provisions that sure housing choice by enabling a range of housing typologies at various densities. However, the change sought is not consistent with Kāinga Ora primary submission. Kāinga Ora supports housing with good access to jobs, amenities and services and the co-location of activities to contribute to economic, social, environmental, and cultural wellbeing. The restriction of residential activities on the ground floor should only be applied to the main street where a 'pedestrian frontage' overlay has been applied.	Disallow	Retain MUZ-O5 as notified.	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Units – ground floor
S138.017	Kairos Connection Trust and Habitat for Humanity	MUZ-O5	Support in part	Understand that the Mixed Use zone has replaced the existing Commercial zone. Residential activities are provided for in the proposed zone, but only if these are located above ground level. Proposed Objective MUZ-O5 and Policy MUZ-P5 indicate that this is	Amend Objective MUZ-O5 as follows: <del>Residential activity is located in the Mixed Use zone is located above commercial activities to ensure active street frontages, except where</del>		Reject	Key Issue: Residential Units – ground floor

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
	Northern Region Ltd			to ensure that active street frontages are maintained, and to avoid adverse effects on the function, role, sense of place and amenity of the Mixed Use zone, except where the boundary interface is with the Open Space zone. Support the continued ability to establish residential activities in the Mixed Use Zone. However, as not all building development on a Mixed Use site would necessarily affect street frontages and facades, particularly on a rear site, or if an apartment style building was located behind an existing building, seek that the ability to locate residential activities at ground level is enabled under specified circumstances.	<del>the interface is with the Open Space zone where</del> adverse effects on street frontages are avoided.			
<b>FS243.200</b>	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Support	Kāinga Ora supports provisions that ensure housing choice by enabling a range of housing typologies at various densities. Kāinga Ora supports housing with good access to jobs, amenities and services and the co-location of activities to contribute to economic, social, environmental, and cultural wellbeing. The provision restricting residential uses at ground level should only be applied to the main street where a 'pedestrian frontage' overlay has been applied.	Allow	Amend Objective MUZ-O5 as follows: .....	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Units – ground floor
<b>S82.005</b>	Good Journey Limited	Policies	Oppose	The policies of the Mixed Use Zone are opposed in part. There are apparent errors in the plan drafting such that activities that were clearly intended to be permitted, will in fact trigger resource consent on the face of the wording.	Amend the Policies in the Mixed Use zone		Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ Policies

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

<b>Submission Point</b>	<b>Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)</b>	<b>Provision</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Summary of Decision Requested</b>	<b>Officer recommendation</b>	<b>Relevant section of S42A Report</b>
<b>S179.045</b>	Russell Protection Society (INC)	Policies	Support		Retain policies	Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
<b>S218.008</b>	Summerset Group Holdings Limited	Policies	Not Stated	expresses support for the submission of the Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand (submission 520) in its entirety.	Insert new policies commensurate with that sought by RVA for retirement villages in the General Residential zone	Reject	Key Issue: Retirement villages
<b>S520.008</b>	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Policies	Not Stated	Provision for retirement villages in the Mixed Use zone commensurate with the provisions sought by RVA in the General Residential zone	Insert new policies commensurate with that sought by RVA for retirement villages in the General Residential zone	Reject	Key Issue: Retirement villages
<b>S320.013</b>	Far North Holdings Limited	Policies	Not Stated	The submitter considers that a new policy MUZ-P9 is appropriate for all of the Far North Holdings Ltd (FNHL) landholdings, as it better reflects existing, consented and proposed land uses. (s32 assessment provided with submission).	Insert a new policy MUZ-P9 as follows: <b>Promote the use of Development Areas to provide for areas where plans such s concept plans, structure plans, outline development plans, master plans or growth area plans, apply to determine future land use and development and when the associated development is complete the Development Area spatial layers are removed from through a trigger in the development area provisions.</b>	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
<b>S363.021</b>	Foodstuffs North Island Limited	Policies	Not Stated	The submitter considers that as a large number of Foodstuffs sites of interest have been zoned Mixed Use Zone, being the only commercial zone proposed. As drafted the Mixed Use Zone does not provide any form of policy direction with respect to appropriate business activities.	Amend to include policy in the Mixed Use Zone supporting and enabling supermarkets.	Reject	Key Issue: Supermarkets

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>S561.119</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Policies	Not Stated	Introduce a framework of Objectives; Policies; Standards and rules; Matters of discretion; and Assessment Criteria to support the proposed Town Centre zone. In particular, a Town Centre zone is sought for Kerikeri to enable up to 6 storey buildings. Increased development height is sought for Kerikeri to support business and residential investment in the centre. While it is understood that FNDC are currently reviewing infrastructure within the District, it is noted that the Kerikeri - Waipapa Structure Plan 2007 (KKWSP) promotes a Mixed use zoned land and provision for a higher density Residential zone within the networked area. The findings of the current infrastructure review should be integrated into the zoning provisions for Kerikeri.	Insert new provisions as set out in Appendix 5 to support the introduction of the proposed Town Centre zone.		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone selection
<b>FS172.178</b>	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support in part	For the reasons set out in this primary submission and in my primary submission to review commercial zones (support TCZ but not 6 storey height).	Allow in part		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone selection
<b>FS42.004</b>	Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections		Neutral	Submitter is neutral on the relief sought but seeks that Community corrections sites support offenders living in the community (the activity would default to a discretionary activity status under proposed rule TCZ-R10). The submitter looks to locate its sites in areas that are easily accessible to offenders, and near other supporting government agencies. As such, sites are commonly located within central business areas (i.e. town centre zones). The demand for both community corrections activities and the submitters residential activities will increase as a result of residential intensification and	Not stated	Retain proposed rule TCZ-R5, which provides for residential units as a permitted activity. Insert new permitted activity rule for community corrections activity in the TCZ where activity status where compliance not achieved is not applicable.	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone selection

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				consequential population growth. The submitter needs to be able to meet that demand, therefore it is important that this is enabled by the relevant plan provisions.				
FS32.173	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	<p>The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes.</p> <p>The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts.</p> <p>The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.</p>	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone selection
FS23.391	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone selection

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.				
<b>FS47.133</b>	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	<p>The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan.</p> <p>Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document</p>	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone selection
<b>FS348.206</b>	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone selection
<b>FS584.005</b>	Peter Malcolm		Support	<p>Support enabling building heights up to 6 storeys (22m) in the Kerikeri Town Centre. There is currently a shortage of affordable and public housing within this area. Central Kerikeri is an appropriate location to enable residential intensification as it has sufficient servicing, low natural hazard risk and is accessible to public transport, services and amenities. Enabling intensification within the Kerikeri Town Centre will help reduce sprawl, improve economic viability and promote vibrant communities.</p>	Allow in part	Amend the Proposed District Plan to enable building heights up to 6 storeys (22m) in the Kerikeri Town Centre (inferred).	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone selection

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S454.117	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	Policies	Not Stated	MUZ-P1 sets out the activities that are to be enabled in the Mixed Use 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 Mixed Use zone.	Insert new policy MUZ-Px as follows: <b>Enable compatible activities and infrastructure, that have a functional or operational need to locate in the Mixed Use zone.</b>		Reject	Key Issue: Plan wide and urban wide submissions
FS243.170	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	Key Issue: Plan wide and urban wide submissions
FS369.509	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	Key Issue: Plan wide and urban wide submissions
S74.012	Brownie Family Trust	MUZ-P1	Support in part	Is any change intended in the Mixed Use zone to achieve the outcomes sought by the Mixed Use zone provisions? If so, the intended amenity and development for the zone needs to be addressed.	Amend policy MUZ-P1 to include guidance to direct the nature of future development		Reject	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
S336.014	Z Energy Limited	MUZ-P1	Support in part	Z Energy supports Policy MUZ-P1 and the recognition of the range of activities that can occur appropriately in the Mixed Use zone, including consideration of the existing environment. However, Z considers the focus should more appropriately be on	Amend Policy MUZ-P1 as follows: Enable a range of commercial, community, civic, and residential activities in the Mixed Use zone where: a. <b>it</b> <b>they</b> supports the function, role, sense of place and amenity of the <b>zone</b> , <b>while recognising the existing</b>		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Policies

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				achieving the intent of the zone while recognising the existing environment.	environment; and b....			
S554.031	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited	MUZ-P1	Support in part	KFO supports Policy MUZ-P1 as appropriately enabling a range of activities, however, the Policy should recognise that developer-led infrastructure may be appropriate, particularly as an interim solution before Council infrastructure is delivered.	Amend Policy MUZ-P1 as follows: Enable a range of commercial, community, civic and residential activities in the Mixed Use zone where: a) it supports the function, role, sense of place and amenity of the existing environment; and b) there is: i. existing infrastructure to support development and intensification, or ii. additional infrastructure capacity can be provided to service the development and intensification; <b>oriii. a private infrastructure solution.</b>		Reject	Key Issue: Infrastructure
FS32.034	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</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	Key Issue: Infrastructure

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				supports the proposed zoning as depicted within the original submission is an efficient use of land.				
<b>FS389.037</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	Key Issue: Infrastructure
<b>S561.084</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	MUZ-P1	Support	MUZ-P1 provides for a range of activities within the centres while ensuring any new development is supported by the necessary infrastructure.	Retain MUZ-P1 as notified		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Objectives
<b>FS32.138</b>	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	<p>The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes.</p> <p>The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts.</p> <p>The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change</p>	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ Objectives

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.				
FS23.356	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Objectives
FS47.098	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ Objectives
FS348.171	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ Objectives
S331.080	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	MUZ-P1	Support in part	The submitter supports in part policy MUZ-P1 as it enables a range of commercial, community, civic and residential activities in the Mixed Use zone. However, the submitter requests that non-residential activities which	Amend policy MUZ-P1 as follows: Enable a range of commercial, community, civic, <del>and</del> residential activities and <b>non-residential activities</b> in the Mixed Use		Reject	Key Issue: Plan wide and urban wide submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				have a functional or operational need to be in the Mixed Use zone, such as educational facilities, are enabled.	zone where:  a. it supports the function, <b>operation</b> , role, sense of place and amenity of the existing environment; and b. there is: i. existing infrastructure to support development and intensification, or ii. infrastructure capacity can be provided to service future development and intensification.			
<b>FS243.192</b>	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Support	Kāinga Ora supports provisions that enable housing with good access to jobs, amenities and services and the co-location of activities to contribute to economic, social, environmental, and cultural wellbeing. As such, Kāinga Ora supports the enablement of activities within the General Residential zone that may not be residential activities but will contribute to the achievement of good housing outcomes.	Allow	Amend policy MUZ-P1 as follows: .....	Reject	Key Issue: Plan wide and urban wide submissions
<b>S356.117</b>	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	MUZ-P1	Support	Supportive of mixed use zoning, but it would be good to understand the rationale for not using a town centre zone in Kerikeri, Kaitaia and Kaikohe - particularly as these settlements continue to grow and develop.	Retain MUZ-P1 as notified		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
<b>FS243.199</b>	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Support	Kāinga Ora supports provisions that enable a range of activities within centres while ensuring any new development is supported by necessary infrastructure.	Allow	Wishes to understand rationale for not using a town centre zone in Kerikeri,	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Policies

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				Kāinga Ora submits that a Town Centre zoning is a more appropriate zone for the commercial centre of Kerikeri as it recognises the regional significance and anticipated growth of Kerikeri. A Town Centre zone is also more compatible with the National Planning Standards	Kaitaia and Kaikohe. Retain MUZ-P1 as notified		
S74.013	Brownie Family Trust	MUZ-P2	Support	No comment provided.	Retain policy MUZ-P2 as notified.	Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
S368.023	Far North District Council	MUZ-P2	Support in part	Minor grammatical error in reference to c	Amend MUZ-P2 Require all subdivision in the Mixed Use zone to provide the following reticulated services to the boundary of each lot:  a. telecommunications: i. fibre where it is available; ii. copper where fibre is not available; iii. copper where the area is identified for future fibre deployment. b. local electricity distribution network; and c. wastewater, potable water supply and stormwater where <b>they are</b> it is available.	Reject	Key Issue: Infrastructure
S336.015	Z Energy Limited	MUZ-P2	Support	Policy MUZ-P2 is supported as Z Energy considers that any subdivision and associated development within the zone should have services and infrastructure available.	Retain Policy MUZ-P2	Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
S554.032	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited	MUZ-P2	Support in part	KFO supports the intent of the policy, but considers that Policy MUZ-P2 should also recognise alternative means of addressing shortages in infrastructure capacity provided for by Council. There may be cases where private solutions can provide adequate capacity to support land use and subdivision in the Mixed Use Zone or Developer Agreements can be entered into to	Amend Policy MUZ-P2 as follows: Require all subdivision in the Mixed Use zone to provide the following <del>reticulated</del> services to the boundary of each lot: a. telecommunications: i. fibre where it is available; ii. copper where fibre is not available; iii. copper where the area is identified	Reject	Key Issue: Infrastructure

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				facilitate extensions or upgrades to infrastructure. Connections to the reticulated network may be made to the boundary but are unable to be connected until such time as there is an upgrade of the Council wastewater or potable water system. During this time, an interim onsite solution may be able to adequately address the infrastructure shortfall.	for future fibre deployment. b. local electricity distribution network; and c. wastewater, potable water supply and stormwater where it is available.			
<b>FS32.035</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.	Reject	Key Issue: Infrastructure
<b>FS389.038</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	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept	Key Issue: Infrastructure

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				future access point through the Further Submitters land				
<b>S561.085</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	MUZ-P2	Support	These are standard requirements for subdivision and are considered appropriate matters.	Retain MUZ-P2 as notified		Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
<b>FS32.139</b>	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	<p>The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes.</p> <p>The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts.</p> <p>The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.</p>	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
<b>FS23.357</b>	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ Policies

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.				
<b>FS47.099</b>	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
<b>FS348.172</b>	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
<b>S74.014</b>	Brownie Family Trust	MUZ-P3	Support	No comment provided.	Retain policy MUZ-P3 as notified		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
<b>S257.001</b>	Te Hiku Community Board	MUZ-P3	Support	We support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkept to maintain Amenity values in town centres.	Retain policy MUZ-P3 a) and b), requiring development in the Mixed Use zone to contribute positively to high quality streetscapes and pedestrian amenity.		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
<b>S336.016</b>	Z Energy Limited	MUZ-P3	Support	Z Energy supports Policy MUZ-P3 and its focus on development contributing positively to amenity and safety without prescribing precisely how this is to be achieved. This is important as it recognises the functional requirements	Retain Policy MUZ-P3		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Policies

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				of a range of activities, including existing service stations.				
<b>S358.001</b>	Leah Frieling	MUZ-P3	Support	We support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkept to maintain amenity values in town centres	Retain policy MUZ-P3 a) and b), requiring development in the Mixed Use zone to contribute positively to high quality streetscapes and pedestrian amenity		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
<b>S357.001</b>	Sean Frieling	MUZ-P3	Support	Support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkept to maintain Amenity values in town centres.	Retain policy MUZ-P3 a) and b), requiring development in the Mixed Use zone to contribute positively to high quality streetscapes and pedestrian amenity.		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
<b>S472.001</b>	Michael Foy	MUZ-P3	Support	We support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkept to maintain Amenity values in town centres.	Retain policy MUZ-P3 a) and b), requiring development in the Mixed Use zone to contribute positively to high quality streetscapes and pedestrian amenity.		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
<b>S137.002</b>	Lynley Newport	MUZ-P3	Support in part	Support introduction of the Mixed Use zone and its application, however, believe too much attention is paid to how something looks (visual amenity). People will choose to reside in this zone because of convenience not because of visual outlook.	Delete part (a) of Policy MUZ-P3.		Reject	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
<b>FS196.89</b>	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko	Allow		Reject	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
<b>S554.033</b>	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited	MUZ-P3	Support	KFO supports Policy MUZ-P3 and the contribution it will make to creating well function urban environments.	Retain the policy as notified.		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
<b>FS32.036</b>	Jeff Kemp		Support in part	The submitter supports the overall intent and purpose of the original submission as it is the only viable and practical option to enable planned and coordinated development	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to consideration of traffic movements, flood mitigation measures and amending the zoning as	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Policies

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>in and around Kerikeri and the Waipapa area.</p> <p>The submitter notes that the documentation on proposed traffic movements is unclear. The original submission has not provided details on potential traffic movements and intersections for Waitotara Dive and Waipapa Road and how these might link to State Highway 10. For example, it is unclear if the new link from State Highway 10 through to the Kerikeri Town Centre is going to be a primary route and the link through to Waipapa Road a secondary route.</p> <p>The submitter notes it is unclear if the proposed flood mitigation measures will increase or reduce flooding along Waitotara Drive. The submitter also supports the proposed zoning as depicted within the original submission is an efficient use of land.</p>		depicted in the original submission.		
<b>FS389.039</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	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
<b>S561.086</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	MUZ-P3	Support	These matters provide for quality development with integration with the surrounding transport network.	Retain MUZ-P3 as notified		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
<b>FS32.140</b>	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ Policies

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes.</p> <p>The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts.</p> <p>The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.</p>				
<b>FS23.358</b>	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
<b>FS47.100</b>	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ Policies

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document				
<b>FS348.173</b>	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
<b>S271.035</b>	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	MUZ-P3	Support	Generally, support the policy as it requires consideration of urban design principals.	Retain as notified (inferred)		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
<b>FS570.758</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
<b>FS566.772</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
<b>FS569.794</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
<b>S529.100</b>	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	MUZ-P3	Support	Generally, support the policy as it requires consideration of urban design principals.	Retain as notified (inferred)		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
<b>FS570.1988</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
<b>FS566.2002</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
<b>FS569.2024</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Policies

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>S524.035</b>	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	MUZ-P3	Support	Generally, support the policy as it requires consideration of urban design principals.	Retain as notified (inferred)		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
<b>FS566.1853</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
<b>S446.036</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust	MUZ-P3	Support	Generally, support the objective and policy as they require consideration of urban design principals.	Retain MUZ-P3 (inferred)		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
<b>FS569.1795</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
<b>FS570.1795</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
<b>S74.015</b>	Brownie Family Trust	MUZ-P4	Support	No comment provided	Retain policy MUZ-P4 as notified.		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
<b>S554.034</b>	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited	MUZ-P4	Support	KFO supports Policy MUZ-P4 as appropriately managing the interface between Mixed Use zoning and adjacent residential or open space zones.	Retain the policy as notified.		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
<b>FS32.037</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</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	Key Issue: MUZ Policies

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>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>				
<b>FS389.040</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	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
<b>S561.087</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	MUZ-P4	Support	These matters enable adjoining residential and open space zones to be considered as part of any mixed use development.	Retain MUZ-P4 as notified		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
<b>FS32.141</b>	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	<p>The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes.</p> <p>The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting</p>	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ Policies

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts.</p> <p>The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.</p>				
<b>FS23.359</b>	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
<b>FS47.101</b>	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	<p>The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan.</p> <p>Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document</p>	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
<b>FS348.174</b>	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ Policies

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA			
<b>S74.016</b>	Brownie Family Trust	MUZ-P5	Support in part	Compatible residential activities and visitor accommodation are an integral part of the Mixed Use zone. The activities should be managed with appropriate standards not restricted. As currently worded P5 contradicts P1 which enables residential activity.	Delete clause 'a ' from policy MUZ-P5, as follows - <i>Restrict activities that are likely to have an adverse effect on the function, role, sense of place and amenity of the Mixed Use zone, including:</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>residential activity, retirement facilities and visitor accommodation on the ground floor of buildings, except where a site adjoins an Open Space zone;</i></li> <li>2. <i>light or heavy industrial activity;</i></li> <li>3. <i>storage and warehousing;</i></li> <li>4. <i>large format retail activity over 400 m<sup>2</sup>; and</i></li> <li>5. <i>waste management activity.</i></li> </ol>	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Units – Ground floor
<b>S256.001</b>	Josh Henwood	MUZ-P5	Oppose	If the dwelling is only residential, there is no reason to have residential activity on the ground floor. Also where the building is limited to only 5 metres high, so only one storey, the residential activity would have to be on the ground floor. Or is it the FNDC intention to have ALL of the Environmental area as commercial activity only (if residential activity only allowed on first floor).	Amend policy to allow for residential activity on ground floor of new buildings, where there is only residential activity on the site.	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Units – Ground floor

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S285.002	Leisa Henwood	MUZ-P5	Oppose	The policy does not make sense in areas restricted to 5m height (single storey) where residential then must be on the ground floor.	Amend MUZ-P5 to enable residential activities on the ground floor of new buildings.	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Units – Ground floor
S289.002	Terry Henwood	MUZ-P5	Oppose	The policy does not make sense in areas restricted to 5m height (single storey) where residential then must be on the ground floor.	Amend MUZ-P5 to enable residential activities on the ground floor of new buildings.	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Units – Ground floor
S293.001	Bruce and Kim Rogers	MUZ-P5	Oppose	The policy does not make provision for existing residential only sites. Residential activity on the ground floor of new buildings should continue to be permitted where residential activity only is present on site.	Amend policy MUZ-P5 to enable residential activity on the ground where of new buildings where there is only residential activity on site.	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Units – Ground floor
S294.001	Bruce and Kim Rogers	MUZ-P5	Oppose	The policy does not make provision for existing residential only sites. Residential activity on the ground floor of new buildings should continue to be permitted where residential activity only is present on site.	Amend policy MUZ-P5 to enable residential activity on the ground where of new buildings where there is only residential activity on site.	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Units – Ground floor
S524.036	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	MUZ-P5	Support in part	Need to ensure good urban design outcomes are a requirement to consider.	Amend MUZ-P5 (MUZ-P8 inferred) Manage land use and subdivision to address the effects of the activity requiring resource consent, including (but not limited to) consideration of the following matters where relevant to the application: a. consistency with the scale, density, design, amenity and character of the <b>surrounding mixed use environment, and with the urban design guidelines;</b> b. the location, scale and design of buildings or structures, outdoor storage areas, parking and internal roading; c. at zone interfaces: i. any setbacks, fencing, screening or	Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ Policies

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					landscaping required to address potential conflicts; ii. any adverse effects on the character and amenity of adjacent zones; d. the adequacy and capacity of available or programmed development infrastructure to accommodate the proposed activity; including: i. opportunities for low impact design principles; ii. management of three waters infrastructure and trade waste; e. managing natural hazards; f. the adequacy of roading infrastructure to service the proposed activity; <b>g. alignment with any strategic or spatial document;</b> <b>h. provisions made to ensure connectivity;</b> i. any adverse effects on historic heritage and cultural values, natural features and landscapes or indigenous biodiversity, and j. any historical, spiritual, or cultural association held by tangata whenua, with regard to the matters set out in Policy TW-P6.		
<b>FS88.69</b>	Stephanie Lane		Support in part	Submit: Allow for dogs and their people to enjoy good urban design.	Allow in part	Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ Policies

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS566.1854	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
S529.101	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	MUZ-P5	Support in part	Need to ensure good urban design outcomes are a requirement to consider	<p>Amend MUZ-P5 (MUZ-P8 inferred)            Manage land use and subdivision to address the effects of the activity requiring resource consent, including (but not limited to) consideration of the following matters where relevant to the application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. consistency with the scale, density, design, amenity and character of the <b>surrounding mixed use environment, and with the urban design guidelines;</b></li> <li>b. the location, scale and design of buildings or structures, outdoor storage areas, parking and internal roading;</li> <li>c. at zone interfaces:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. any setbacks, fencing, screening or landscaping required to address potential conflicts;</li> <li>ii. any adverse effects on the character and amenity of adjacent zones;</li> </ul> </li> <li>d. the adequacy and capacity of available or programmed development infrastructure to accommodate the proposed activity; including:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. opportunities for low impact design principles;</li> <li>ii. management of three waters infrastructure and trade waste;</li> </ul> </li> <li>e. managing natural hazards;</li> </ul>		Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ Policies

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report	
					f. the adequacy of roading infrastructure to service the proposed activity;g. <b>alignment with any strategic or spatial document</b> ;h. <b>provisions made to ensure connectivity</b> ; i. any adverse effects on historic heritage and cultural values, natural features and landscapes or indigenous biodiversity, and j. any historical, spiritual, or cultural association held by tangata whenua, with regard to the matters set out in Policy TW-P6.			
<b>FS88.78</b>	Stephanie Lane		Support in part	Do this without dog bans	Allow in part	Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ Policies	
<b>FS570.1989</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
<b>FS566.2003</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
<b>FS569.2025</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
<b>S271.036</b>	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	MUZ-P5	Support in part	Need to ensure good urban design outcomes are a requirement to consider.	Amend MUZ-P5 (MUZ-P8 inferred) Manage land use and subdivision to address the effects of the activity requiring resource consent, including (but not limited to) consideration of the following matters where relevant to the application: a. consistency with the scale, density, design, amenity and character of the <b>surrounding mixed use environment, and with the</b>	Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ Policies	

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					<p><b>urban design guidelines;</b>                      b. the location, scale and design of buildings or structures, outdoor storage areas, parking and internal roading;                      c. at zone interfaces:                      i. any setbacks, fencing, screening or landscaping required to address potential conflicts;                      ii. any adverse effects on the character and amenity of adjacent zones;                      d. the adequacy and capacity of available or programmed development infrastructure to accommodate the proposed activity; including:                      i. opportunities for low impact design principles;                      ii. management of three waters infrastructure and trade waste;                      e. managing natural hazards;                      f. the adequacy of roading infrastructure to service the proposed activity;  <b>g. alignment with any strategic or spatial document;</b>  <b>h. provisions made to ensure connectivity;</b>                      i. any adverse effects on historic heritage and cultural values, natural features and landscapes or indigenous biodiversity, and                      j. any historical, spiritual, or cultural</p>		

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					association held by tangata whenua, with regard to the matters set out in Policy TW-P6.			
FS25.077	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Support	Supports the concept of achieving good urban design outcomes. However, any urban design guidelines would need to be carefully considered and appropriately drafted.	Allow	Allow the original submission, subject to appropriate wording.	Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
FS325.051	Turnstone Trust Limited		Support	TT supports the concept of achieving good urban design outcomes. However, any urban design guidelines would need to be carefully considered and appropriately drafted.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate wording.	Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
FS570.759	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
FS566.773	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
FS569.795	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
S554.035	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited	MUZ-P5	Oppose	The PDP provides for residential development within the Mixed Use Zone. The policy should clarify that such activities are not restricted within the Mixed Use zone provided they are above ground floor level. Some light industrial activities are complementary to the Mixed Use zone such as a warehouse facility. These types of activities where the effects can be mitigated should not be restricted by the Mixed Use Zone. If Policy MUZ-P5 restricts large format retail over 400m2 in size, this places undue restrictions on uses such as supermarkets which are suited to be located within the Mixed Use	Amend Policy MUZ-P5 as follows: Restrict activities that are likely to have an adverse effect on the function, role, sense of place and amenity of the Mixed Use zone, including: a. residential activity, retirement facilities and visitor accommodation <b>activities located on the ground floor of buildings, except where a site adjoins an Open Space zone;</b> b. light or heavy industrial activity <b>(excluding warehousing);</b> c. <del>storage and warehousing;</del>		Reject	Key Issue: MUZ Policies

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				Zone. KFO seeks that the 400m2 restriction be reconsidered.	d. <del>large format retail activity over 400 m<sup>2</sup></del> ; and e. waste management activity.			
FS32.038	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	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
FS389.041	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	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
S561.088	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	MUZ-P5	Support in part	As noted above for Objective MUZ-O5, the restriction of residential activity on the ground floor of all areas in the	Retain MUZ-P5 with the following amendment: Restrict activities that are likely to have an adverse effect on the function, role, sense of		Reject	Key Issue: Residential Units – Ground floor

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				Mixed Use zone is opposed. This policy restriction for residential use should be limited to the main street frontage as residential use elsewhere within the centre is a compatible activity and one that can be designed so as not to detract from the surrounding centre streetscape. The provision to restrict residential use should only be applied to the main street where a 'pedestrian frontage' overlay has been applied. The restriction on other activities listed is supported as these are less compatible with a centre zone.	place and amenity of the Mixed Use zone, including: a. residential activity, retirement facilities and visitor accommodation on the ground floor of buildings <b>within the pedestrian frontage overlay</b> , except where a site adjoins an Open Space zone; b. light or heavy industrial activity; c. storage and warehousing; d. large format retail activity over 400 m <sup>2</sup> ; and e. waste management activity.			
FS32.142	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	<p>The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes.</p> <p>The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts.</p> <p>The original submission heralds the</p>	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept	Key Issue: Residential Units – Ground floor

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.				
FS23.360	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Units – Ground floor
FS47.102	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Accept	Key Issue: Residential Units – Ground floor
FS348.175	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept	Key Issue: Residential Units – Ground floor
S138.018	Kairos Connection Trust and Habitat for	MUZ-P5	Support in part	Understand that the Mixed Use zone has replaced the existing Commercial zone. Residential activities are provided for in the proposed zone, but	Amend Policy MUZ-P5 as follows: <i>Restrict activities that are likely to have an adverse effect on the function, role,</i>		Reject	Key Issue: Residential Units – Ground floor

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
	Humanity Northern Region Ltd			only if these are located above ground level. Proposed Objective MUZ-O5 and Policy MUZ-P5 indicate that this is to ensure that active street frontages are maintained, and to avoid adverse effects on the function, role, sense of place and amenity of the Mixed Use zone, except where the boundary interface is with the Open Space zone. Support the continued ability to establish residential activities in the Mixed Use Zone. However, as not all building development on a Mixed Use site would necessarily affect street frontages and facades, particularly on a rear site, or if an apartment style building was located behind an existing building, seek that the ability to locate residential activities at ground level is enabled under specified circumstances.	<i>sense of place and amenity of the Mixed Use zone, including:</i>  1. <i>residential activity, retirement facilities and visitor accommodation on the ground floor of buildings, except where a site adjoins an Open Space zone adjacent to street frontages;</i> 2. <i>light or heavy industrial activity;</i> 3. <i>storage and warehousing;</i> 4. <i>large format retail activity over 400 m<sup>2</sup>; and</i> 5. <i>waste management activity.</i>			
<b>FS243.201</b>	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose	Kāinga Ora supports provisions that sure housing choice by enabling a range of housing typologies at various densities. Kāinga Ora supports housing with good access to jobs, amenities and services and the co-location of activities to contribute to economic, social, environmental, and cultural wellbeing. The restriction of residential uses at ground level should only be applied to the main street where a 'pedestrian frontage' overlay has been applied.	Disallow	Amend Policy MUZ-P5 as follows:	Accept	Key Issue: Residential Units – Ground floor
<b>S446.037</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust	MUZ-P5	Support in part	Seek the following additions to ensure good urban design outcomes that a requirement to consider alignment with urban design guidelines (see earlier point seeking that Council develops	Amend MUZ-P5 (MUZ-P8 inferred) Manage land use and subdivision to address the effects of the activity requiring resource consent, including (but not limited to) consideration of the following matters where relevant to the application:		Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ Policies

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				some) be included as a matter in this policy.	a. consistency with the scale, density, design, amenity and character of <b>the surrounding mixed use environment, and with the urban design guidelines;</b> b. the location, scale and design of buildings or structures, outdoor storage areas, parking and internal roading; c. at zone interfaces: i. any setbacks, fencing, screening or landscaping required to address potential conflicts; ii. any adverse effects on the character and amenity of adjacent zones; d. the adequacy and capacity of available or programmed development infrastructure to accommodate the proposed activity; including: i. opportunities for low impact design principles; ii. management of three waters infrastructure and trade waste; e. managing natural hazards; f. the adequacy of roading infrastructure to service the proposed activity; <b>g. alignment with any strategic or spatial document;</b> <b>h. provisions made to ensure connectivity;</b> i. any adverse effects on historic heritage and cultural values, natural		

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					features and landscapes or indigenous biodiversity, and j. any historical, spiritual, or cultural association held by tangata whenua, with regard to the matters set out in Policy TW-P6.			
<b>FS569.1796</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
<b>FS570.1796</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
<b>S74.017</b>	Brownie Family Trust	MUZ-P6	Support	No comment provided.	Retain policy MUZ-P6 as notified.		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
<b>S554.036</b>	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited	MUZ-P6	Support	KFO supports Policy MUZ-P6 as appropriately encouraging efficient design.	Retain the policy as notified.		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
<b>FS32.039</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>	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	Key Issue: MUZ Policies

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				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.				
FS389.042	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	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
S74.018	Brownie Family Trust	MUZ-P7	Support	No comment provided.	Retain policy MUZ-P7 as notified.		Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
S336.017	Z Energy Limited	MUZ-P7	Support in part	Z Energy considers that the amenity of more sensitive activities, such as residential activities, will be better protected where they have been appropriately designed to manage reverse sensitivity effects where there is an interface with lawfully established non-residential activities. The relief sought is consistent with design principle 1: The Site of the National medium density design guide (Ministry for the Environment, May 2022) which seeks that current or proposed nearby non-residential activities are identified and that residential development responds to them.	Amend Policy MUZ-P7 as follows: Consider the following effects when assessing applications to establish residential, early childhood, retirement and education facilities: a.the level of ambient noise; b.reduced privacy; c.shadowing and visual domination; <del>and</del> d.light spill; <del>and</del> .reverse sensitivity.		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
S331.081	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	MUZ-P7	Support in part	The submitter supports in part policy MUZ-P7, in particular the consideration of the listed effects when assessing applications for educational facilities. However, the inclusion early childhood is unnecessary as the definition of 'educational facilities' includes early childhood centres.	Amend policy MUZ-P7, as follows: Consider the following effects when assessing applications to establish residential, <del>early childhood</del> , retirement and education facilities:		Accept	Key Issue: Plan wide and Urban wide submissions

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					a. the level of ambient noise; b. reduced privacy; c. shadowing and visual domination; and d. light spill.			
<b>S554.037</b>	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited	MUZ-P7	Support	KFO supports Policy MUZ-P7 as recognising the need to manage the interface with sensitive activities establishing in the Mixed Use zone.	Retain the policy as notified.		Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
<b>FS32.040</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 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.	Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ Policies

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS389.043	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	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
S561.089	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	MUZ-P7	Support	Policy MUZ-P7 is supported. These provisions will ensure the amenity of these more sensitive activities are considered when located within centres.	Retain MUZ-P7 as notified		Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
FS32.143	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	<p>The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes.</p> <p>The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts.</p> <p>The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.</p>	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ Policies

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS23.361	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
FS47.103	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
FS348.176	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
S74.019	Brownie Family Trust	MUZ-P8	Support	No comment provided.	Retain policy MUZ-P8 as notified.		Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
S336.018	Z Energy Limited	MUZ-P8	Support in part	Z Energy supports Policy MUZ-P8 in that it considers the interface between commercial and residential activities when assessing proposals for land use and subdivision in the Mixed Use zone.	Amend policy MUZ-P8 as follows Manage land use and subdivision to address the effects of the activity requiring resource consent, including (but not limited to) consideration of the following matters where relevant to the		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Policies

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				However, as currently drafted, this only relates to activities at zone interfaces, whereas such issues relate to conflicts between activities rather than zones per se, and therefore relief is recommended to ensure that the interface of activities is considered in such assessments. This would manage potential reverse sensitivity effects on existing service stations where they are adjacent to residential and commercial activities, notwithstanding the zone.	application: ... c. at zone interfaces <b>and the interface between commercial and noise-sensitive activities:</b> i. any setbacks, fencing, screening or landscaping required to address potential conflicts; ii. any adverse effects on the character and amenity of adjacent zones <b>or the adjacent activity;</b> ...			
S356.118	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	MUZ-P8	Support	Supportive of mixed use zoning, but it would be good to understand the rationale for not using a town centre zone in Kerikeri, Kaitiaki and Kaikohe - particularly as these settlements continue to grow and develop.	Retain MUZ-P8 as notified		Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
S554.038	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited	MUZ-P8	Support	KFO supports Policy MUZ-P8 as it appropriately recognises the need to manage development, including managing various competing activities to ensure a well-functioning urban environment.	Retain the policy as notified.		Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
FS32.041	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</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	Key Issue: MUZ Policies

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>link to State Highway 10. For example, it is unclear if the new link from State Highway 10 through to the Kerikeri Town Centre is going to be a primary route and the link through to Waipapa Road a secondary route.</p> <p>The submitter notes it is unclear if the proposed flood mitigation measures will increase or reduce flooding along Waitotara Drive. The submitter also supports the proposed zoning as depicted within the original submission is an efficient use of land.</p>				
FS389.044	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	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
S561.090	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	MUZ-P8	Support in part	As much of this zoned land is currently not developed to the scale, density, amenity and character anticipated in the Mixed Use zone, the policy wording needs to be amended to ensure that new developments are considered in the context of this anticipated Mixed Use environment rather than the existing environment. Kāinga Ora seek an amendment to the policy wording to reflect this.	Amend MUZ-P8 as follows:  Manage land use and subdivision to address the effects of the activity requiring resource consent, including (but not limited to) consideration of the following matters where relevant to the application: a. consistency with the scale, density, design, amenity and character of the <b>planned mixed use environment</b> ;		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
FS32.144	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ Policies

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes.</p> <p>The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts.</p> <p>The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.</p>				
<b>FS23.362</b>	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	<p>Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.</p>	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
<b>FS47.104</b>	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	<p>The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan.</p> <p>Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of</p>	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ Policies

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document				
<b>FS348.177</b>	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ Policies
<b>S416.050</b>	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	MUZ-P8	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	Key Issue: Plan wide or urban wide issues
<b>FS243.136</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	Reject	Key Issue: Plan wide or urban wide issues
<b>S82.006</b>	Good Journey Limited	Rules	Oppose	The rules of the Mixed Use Zone are opposed in part. There are apparent errors in the plan drafting such that activities that were clearly intended to be permitted, will in fact trigger resource consent on the face of the wording, and there is an undue emphasis on restricting retail that exceeds 400m2 in GFA by requiring	Amend the rules in the Mixed Use zone		Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ Rules

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

<b>Submission Point</b>	<b>Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)</b>	<b>Provision</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Summary of Decision Requested</b>	<b>Officer recommendation</b>	<b>Relevant section of S42A Report</b>
				<p>fully discretionary resource consent. MUZ-R2 states that commercial activities are permitted where; The activity is a service station Any office does not exceed GFA of 200m<sup>2</sup> And that the activity status where compliance is not achieved is Discretionary.</p> <p>The mixture of double negatives in the wording of the rules is unfortunate and seems to have the effect of making retail a fully discretionary activity and service stations a permitted activity in the MUZ, which is the opposite of what is intended.</p> <p>This could be addressed by amending the wording of PER-1 to "the activity is not a service station"</p> <p>Retail exceeding 400m<sup>2</sup> in GFA should not be discouraged via a fully discretionary activity status in a district where retail is in general decline. The provisions should be reworded to incentivise retail of this nature but provide standards so that good urban design outcomes are the result.</p>			
<b>S218.009</b>	Summerset Group Holdings Limited	Rules	Not Stated	expresses support for the submission of the Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand (submission 520) in its entirety.	Insert new rules commensurate with that sought by RVA for retirement villages in the General Residential zone	Accept in part	Key Issue: Retirement Villages
<b>S218.010</b>	Summerset Group Holdings Limited	Rules	Not Stated	expresses support for the submission of the Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand (submission 520) in its entirety.	Insert a notification presumption commensurate with that sought by RVA for retirement villages in the General Residential zone	Reject	Key Issue: Retirement Villages
<b>S520.009</b>	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Rules	Not Stated	Provision for retirement villages in the Mixed Use zone commensurate with the provisions sought by RVA in the general Residential zone	Insert new rules commensurate with that sought by RVA for retirement villages in the General Residential zone	Accept in part	Key Issue: Retirement Villages

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S520.010	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Rules	Not Stated	<p>A key consenting issue for retirement village operators across the country relates to the delays, costs and uncertainties associated with notification processes. Applications for retirement villages in the Mixed Use should not be publicly notified. Limited notification should only be used where a retirement village application proposes a breach of standards and the relevant effects threshold in the RMA is met</p>	<p>Insert a notification presumption commensurate with that sought by RVA for retirement villages in the General Residential zone</p>	Reject	Key Issue: Retirement Villages
S158.015	Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	Rules	Oppose	<p>The zone framework does not enable community corrections activities and provides discretionary activity status for these activities in accordance with the default "activities not otherwise listed in this chapter" rule MUZ-R17). Community corrections activities are essential social infrastructure and play a valuable role in reducing reoffending. They enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural well-being and for their health and safety. It is important that provision is made to enable non-custodial community corrections sites to establish, operate and redevelop, within appropriate areas. Industrial and commercial areas provide suitable sites for community corrections activities; in particular community work components often require large sites for yard-based activities and large equipment and/or vehicle storage. Community corrections activities are a compatible and appropriate activity in a Mixed Use zone. They are consistent with the character and amenity of such zones. Furthermore, as community corrections facilities are not sensitive to</p>	<p>Insert a permitted activity rule in the Mixed Use zone for a "community corrections activity" as follows:<b>MUZ-RX Community corrections activity</b> <b>Activity status: Permitted</b> <b>Activity status where compliance not achieved: Not applicable</b></p>	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Rules

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				the effects of commercial environments (e.g. noise, high traffic movements, etc), they are not prone to reverse sensitivity. Requests that the respective rule framework for the Mixed Use zone be amended to provide for "community corrections activities" as a permitted activity.			
<b>S438.012</b>	New Zealand Motor Caravan Association	Rules	Support in part	The NZMCA operates a number of campgrounds and park over properties that are present in a variety of zones. Allowing for more permissive rules around the establishment of campgrounds will make it easier to establish sites for self-contained vehicle-based camping in the Far North District. This will also create positive social and economic benefits for the community. The effects of camping grounds in the Mixed Use Zone are similar to other activities anticipated in the zone.	Amend the Mixed Use Zone rules to include a conditional activity status for Camping grounds (inferred).	Reject	Key Issue: Plan wide or urban wide submissions
<b>S438.013</b>	New Zealand Motor Caravan Association	Rules	Support in part	The NZMCA operates a number of campgrounds and park over properties that are present in a variety of zones. Allowing for more permissive rules around the establishment of campgrounds will make it easier to establish sites for self-contained vehicle-based camping in the Far North District. This will also create positive social and economic benefits for the community. The proposed insertion is consistent with the treatment of other small scale visitor accommodation in the Mixed Use zone.	Amend Mixed Use Zone rules to provide for camping sites of 20 guests or under subject to noise standards as a permitted activity.	Reject	Key Issue: Plan wide or urban wide submissions
<b>S458.002</b>	Woolworths New Zealand Limited	Rules	Support in part	This rule and policy framework suggest that large format retail, which a supermarket is currently classed as, needs to be restricted in this zone as it	Amend the rule and policy framework of the Mixed Urban Zone (MUZ) to specifically provide for supermarket activities as a Permitted Activity.	Reject	Key Issue: Supermarkets

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				is likely to have adverse effects on the zone. Unlike the other activities listed above, there is no other zone which provides for large format retail activities. It is considered that a more enabling policy framework is required, which supports those limited activities and services, such as a supermarket, which are necessary to support businesses, residents and visitors, while ensuring that associated effects are appropriately managed.			
<b>S512.054</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	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	Key Issue: Plan wide or urban wide submissions

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				and Emergency request that emergency service facilities are exempt from these standards				
<b>S427.036</b>	Kapiro Residents Association	Rules	Support in part	The PDP should control the types, qualities and quantity of buildings occurring in towns such as Kerikeri. The PDP or other appropriate mechanism needs to set standards relating to older houses (sometimes in relatively poor condition) moved from elsewhere, low cost housing and rental housing, so that quality standards are maintained for affordable housing	Amend Mixed Use zone to preserve local character through the control of building types, qualities, quantity and design		Accept in part	Key Issue: Urban design
<b>S559.031</b>	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rēhia	Rules	Support in part	We support the purpose of the mixed-use zone in the urban centre, providing residential opportunities and the ability for people to live and work within the heart of urban centres.	Insert new permitted activity rule in the Mixed Use zone which provides for ground level residential dwellings in locations that do not impact on street frontage (inferred).		Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Unit – Ground floor
<b>FS151.339</b>	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Unit – Ground floor
<b>FS243.196</b>	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Support	Kāinga Ora supports provisions that sure housing choice by enabling a range of housing typologies at various densities. Kāinga Ora supports housing with good access to jobs, amenities and services and the co-location of activities to contribute to economic, social, environmental, and cultural wellbeing. The provision restricting residential uses at ground level should only be applied to the main street where a 'pedestrian frontage' overlay has been applied.	Allow	Insert new permitted activity rule in the Mixed Use zone which provides for ground level residential dwellings in locations that do not impact on street frontage.	Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Unit – Ground floor
<b>FS570.2221</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	Key Issue: Residential Unit – Ground floor

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS348.058	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Unit – Ground floor
FS566.2235	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	Key Issue: Residential Unit – Ground floor
FS569.2257	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	Key Issue: Residential Unit – Ground floor
S471.002	Karen and Graeme Laurie	Rules	Oppose	The Mixed Use Zone (MUZ) is not the most appropriate zone for Kerikeri town centre for the following reasons: - MUZ does not give effect to Objective 1 and Policy 1 of the NPS-UD - Section 32 Evaluation - Urban Environments is incomplete and flawed (refer to submission for specific reasoning) - PDP does not provide strategic direction or policy support for the suite of urban zones proposed - MUZ provisions do not sufficiently enable a range of commercial activities.	Amend PDP by reviewing the suite of commercial zones proposed and rezone Kerikeri town centre to Town Centre Zone (or similar commercial zone) that appropriately reflects commercial development and activities within Kerikeri township, alternatively if relief not accepted by FNDC, amend the Mixed Use Zone provisions to provide for an increased range of commercial and community activities.		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone selection
FS172.30	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	The reasons given in this primary submission and in my primary submission.	Allow		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone selection
FS350.053	Puketona Lodge Ltd		Support	The reasons given in the original submission and primary submission of the submitter.  The Mixed Use Zone (MUZ) is not the most appropriate zone for Kerikeri town centre for the following reasons: - MUZ does not give effect to Objective 1 and Policy 1 of the NPS-UD - Section 32 Evaluation - Urban Environments is incomplete and flawed (refer to submission for specific	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone selection

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				reasoning) - PDP does not provide strategic direction or policy support for the suite of urban zones proposed - MUZ provisions do not sufficiently enable a range of commercial activities.				
<b>FS441.044</b>	Adrian and Sue Knight		Support	The reasons given in this primary submission and in my primary submission.	Allow	Amend	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone selection
<b>S561.120</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Rules	Not Stated	Introduce a framework of Objectives; Policies; Standards and rules; Matters of discretion; and Assessment Criteria to support the proposed Town Centre zone. In particular, a Town Centre zone is sought for Kerikeri to enable up to 6 storey buildings. Increased development height is sought for Kerikeri to support business and residential investment in the centre. While it is understood that FNDC are currently reviewing infrastructure within the District, it is noted that the Kerikeri - Waipapa Structure Plan 2007 (KKWSP) promotes a Mixed use zoned land and provision for a higher density Residential zone within the networked area. The findings of the current infrastructure review should be integrated into the zoning provisions for Kerikeri.	Insert new provisions as set out in Appendix 5 to support the introduction of the proposed Town Centre zone.		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone selection
<b>FS172.416</b>	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support in part	For the reasons set out in this primary submission and in my primary submission to review commercial zones (support TCZ but not 6 storey height).	Allow in part		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone selection
<b>FS42.005</b>	Ara Poutama Aotearoa the		Neutral	Submitter is neutral on the relief sought but seeks that Community corrections sites support offenders	Not stated	Retain proposed rule TCZ-R5, which provides for residential units as a permitted activity.	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone selection

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
	Department of Corrections			<p>living in the community (the activity would default to a discretionary activity status under proposed rule TCZ-R10). The submitter looks to locate its sites in areas that are easily accessible to offenders, and near other supporting government agencies. As such, sites are commonly located within central business areas (i.e. town centre zones). The demand for both community corrections activities and the submitters residential activities will increase as a result of residential intensification and consequential population growth. The submitter needs to be able to meet that demand, therefore it is important that this is enabled by the relevant plan provisions.</p>		<p>Insert new permitted activity rule for community corrections activity in the TCZ where activity status where compliance not achieved is not applicable.</p>		
FS32.174	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	<p>The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes.</p> <p>The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts.</p>	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone selection

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.				
<b>FS23.392</b>	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone selection
<b>FS47.134</b>	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone selection
<b>FS348.207</b>	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone selection
<b>FS584.006</b>	Peter Malcolm		Support	Support enabling building heights up to 6 storeys (22m) in the Kerikeri Town Centre. There is currently a shortage of	Allow in part	Amend the Proposed District Plan to enable building heights up to 6 storeys (22m)	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone selection

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				affordable and public housing within this area. Central Kerikeri is an appropriate location to enable residential intensification as it has sufficient servicing, low natural hazard risk and is accessible to public transport, services and amenities. Enabling intensification within the Kerikeri Town Centre will help reduce sprawl, improve economic viability and promote vibrant communities.			
<b>S138.020</b>	Kairos Connection Trust and Habitat for Humanity Northern Region Ltd	Rules	Support in part	Regarding the amenity of residential living in the Mixed Use zones, seek that the Council consider a minimum size for residential units because as presently proposed, there is no ability to ensure that units are suitably sized for habitation. The retention of noise insulation controls on residential units is supported.	Insert a new rule as follows (adopted from Auckland Unitary Plan City centre zone): <b>The minimum net internal floor area of a residential unit shall be:- 35m<sup>2</sup> for studio unitsThe minimum net internal floor area for studio units may be reduced by 5m<sup>2</sup> where a balcony, ground floor terrace or roof terrace of 5m<sup>2</sup> or greater is provided.- 45m<sup>2</sup> for one or more bedroom unitThe minimum net internal floor area for one or more bedroom units may be reduced by 8m<sup>2</sup> where a balcony, ground floor terrace or roof terrace of 8m<sup>2</sup> or greater is provided.</b>	Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ Rules
<b>FS196.91</b>	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko	Allow	Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ Rules
<b>S561.125</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Rules	Oppose	This rule wording needs to be amended for more clarity. Commercial activity is defined in the plan and commercial service activity is listed separately as a Permitted activity. It is unclear whether this rule is solely applying to service station activity, in	Delete MUZ-R2 in its entirety and include new provisions in the activity table to list Service Stations and offices > 200m <sup>2</sup> as a Discretionary activity.	Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ Rules

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				which case it could be listed as a Discretionary activity. Stating that Discretionary status applies to any activity where 'compliance not achieved with PER-1' could be interpreted as all commercial activity that is not a service station is Discretionary?				
<b>FS32.179</b>	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	<p>The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes.</p> <p>The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts.</p> <p>The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.</p>	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ Rules
<b>FS23.397</b>	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.				
<b>FS47.139</b>	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ Rules
<b>FS348.212</b>	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ Rules
<b>S179.046</b>	Russell Protection Society (INC)	Rules	Support		Retain the rules		Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ Rules
<b>FS542.089</b>	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs seeks and amendments of some provisions to provide for supermarkets.	Disallow	amend to provide for supermarkets.	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ Rules
<b>FS406.062</b>	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Oppose	McDonald's seeks amendments of some provisions to better provide for its existing and potential future activities within the Mixed Use Zone for the reasons outlined in its original submission.	Disallow	amend mixed use rules	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ Rules

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>S338.020</b>	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	Rules	Not Stated	The PDP should control the types, qualities and quantity of buildings occurring in towns such as Kerikeri. We need sensible design aesthetic in the new Mixed Use zone to preserve the character of the town. The PDP or other appropriate mechanism needs to set standards relating to older houses (sometimes in relatively poor condition) moved from elsewhere, low-cost housing and rental housing, so that quality standards are maintained for affordable housing.	Amend rules to preserve local character through the control of building types, qualities, quantity and design,		Accept in part	Key Issue: Urban design
<b>FS570.961</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: Urban design
<b>FS566.975</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: Urban design
<b>FS569.997</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: Urban design
<b>S529.026</b>	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	Rules	Oppose	The PDP should control the types, qualities and quantity of buildings occurring in towns such as Kerikeri. We need sensible design aesthetic in the new Mixed Use zone to preserve the character of the town. The PDP or other appropriate mechanism needs to set standards relating to older houses (sometimes in relatively poor condition) moved from elsewhere, low-cost housing and rental housing, so that quality standards are maintained for affordable housing	Amend rules to preserve local character through the control of building types, qualities, quantity and design,		Accept in part	Key Issue: Urban design
<b>FS570.1916</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: Urban design

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS566.1930	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: Urban design
FS569.1952	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: Urban design
S344.031	Paihia Properties Holdings Corporate Trustee Limited and UP Management Ltd	Rules	Not Stated	The MUZ appears to have an unusual mix of activities permitted, with an onerous default to discretionary activity status. Due to the complicated nature of the commercial activities rules and the lack of definitions we are unable to confirm what activities would be permitted onsite. Both the MUZ and CE state that any activity not specifically provided for requires consent for a discretionary activity.	Amend the MUZ and overlay provisions to clarify the relationship between the zone and overlay rules; and reconsider the most appropriate zone of the site, including reviewing the limited commercial zone options. Insert additional (permitted activity) rules should the site remain MUZ.  Amend the MUZ rules to provide clear permitted activities and consenting pathways with particular reference to definitions.		Reject	Key Issue: MUZ rules
FS396.052	Ed and Inge Amsler		Support	The submission seeks various changes in relation to the urban environment / coastal environment interface as well as specific provisions in the Mixed Use Zone. Additionally, the submission seeks better reflection of business land needs that should be reflected throughout the Plan.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ rules
S522.040	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	Rules	Oppose	We need sensible design aesthetic in the new mixed use zone to preserve the character of the town. The PDP or other appropriate mechanism needs to set standards relating to older houses (sometimes in relatively poor condition) moved from elsewhere, low cost housing and rental housing, so that quality standards are maintained for affordable housing.	Amend PDP to control the types, qualities and quantity of buildings occurring in towns such as Kerikeri [inferred].		Accept in part	Key Issue: Urban design
FS566.1779	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: Urban design

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>S449.027</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust	Rules	Oppose	The PDP should control the types, qualities and quantity of buildings occurring in towns such as Kerikeri. We need sensible design aesthetic in the new Mixed Use zone to preserve the character of the town. The PDP or other appropriate mechanism needs to set standards relating to older houses (sometimes in relatively poor condition) moved from elsewhere, low-cost housing and rental housing, so that quality standards are maintained for affordable housing.	Amend rules to preserve local character through the control of building types, qualities, quantity and design,		Accept in part	Key Issue: Urban design
<b>FS569.1826</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Accept in part	Key Issue: Urban design
<b>FS570.1843</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Accept in part	Key Issue: Urban design
<b>S344.029</b>	Paihia Properties Holdings Corporate Trustee Limited and UP Management Ltd	Notes	Oppose	It is considered that a GFA of less than 400m <sup>2</sup> with a default to discretionary activity where compliance cannot be achieved is particularly onerous within the MUZ given this is the only commercial zone providing for supermarket activities. It is considered that building bulk and scale should be managed separately to the scale of activities, MUZ-R1 note is confusing these effects, resulting unnecessary restrictions upon activities within the MUZ.	Delete the MUZ-R1 note.		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ rules
<b>FS396.050</b>	Ed and Inge Amsler		Support	The submission seeks various changes in relation to the urban environment / coastal environment interface as well as specific provisions in the Mixed Use Zone. Additionally, the submission seeks better reflection of business land needs that should be reflected throughout the Plan.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>S50.001</b>	Vaughan Norton-Taylor	MUZ-R1	Oppose	Submitter opposes the permitted activity standard in the mixed use zone which requires that the GFA any new building or structure and extension to an existing building or structure does not exceed 400m2 GFA. The submitter contends that this restricts options for development without any justification for this change being provided.	Delete MUZ-R1 (inferred)	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ rules
<b>S368.070</b>	Far North District Council	MUZ-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 MUZ-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	Key Issue: MUZ rules
<b>S536.001</b>	Vaughan Norton-Taylor	MUZ-R1	Oppose	Limiting the gross floor area to 400 m <sup>2</sup> in Rule MUZ-R1 restricts the options for development. No logic or reason are given for this change.	Delete Rule MUZ-R1 and retain status quo (inferred)	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ rules
<b>S512.101</b>	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	MUZ-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	Key Issue: Plan wide or urban wide submissions
<b>S363.022</b>	Foodstuffs North Island Limited	MUZ-R1	Not Stated	The submitter considers that rule MUZ-R1 New buildings or structures, and extensions or alterations to existing	Amend rule MUZ-R1 New buildings or structures, and extensions or alterations to existing buildings or structures, to provide for an increase to GFA,	Accept in part	Key Issue: Supermarkets

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				buildings or structures, is onerous given the Mixed Use Zone is the only commercial zone providing for supermarket activities and that building bulk and scale should be managed separately to the scale of activities. In addition, the MUZ-R1 note is confusing these effects, resulting unnecessary restrictions upon activities within the MUZ.	to ensure that supermarkets (buildings) can be established as a permitted activity and a restricted discretionary activity status where compliance cannot be achieved with the GFA cannot be achieved. Amend MUZ-R1 to provide for additions and alterations to existing buildings with a GFA of more than 400m2 where they do not change the existing footprint. Delete the MUZ-R1 note.			
<b>S482.006</b>	House Movers Section of New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc	MUZ-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 MUZ-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) restricteddiscretionary activity status for relocated buildings that do not meet thepermitted activity status standards		Accept in part	Key Issue: Plan wider or urban wide submissions
<b>FS23.153</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	Accept in part	Key Issue: Plan wider or urban wide submissions
<b>S561.091</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	MUZ-R1	Support in part	The rule is supported as it provides for the management of building works carried out within the mixed use zone.	Retain MUZ-R1 as notified		Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ rules
<b>FS32.145</b>	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ rules

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes.</p> <p>The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts.</p> <p>The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.</p>				
<b>FS542.094</b>	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs seeks amendments of some provisions to better provide for supermarkets.	Disallow	amend MUZ-R1	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ rules
<b>FS406.066</b>	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Oppose	McDonald's seeks amendments to this rule for the reasons set out in its original submission.	Disallow	amend MUZ-R1	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ rules
<b>FS23.363</b>	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS47.105	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ rules
FS348.178	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ rules
S338.024	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	MUZ-R1	Not Stated	The current height restriction of 12m in the Mixed Use zone should be strictly adhered to. Exceptions to this height limit should not be allowed for multi-unit developments or other purpose.	Amend Rule MUZ-R1 to remove the option of exceeding the height limit through the resource consent process		Reject	Key Issue: MUZ rules
FS407.011	Far North Holdings Limited		Oppose	The submission is not supported as it essentially seeks to create any activity greater than 12m in height a prohibited activity.	Disallow	disallow original submission	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ rules
FS277.57	Jenny Collison		Support	12 metres should be the maximum height	Allow		Reject	Key Issue: MUZ rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS570.965	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ rules
FS566.979	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ rules
FS569.1001	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ rules
S251.010	New Zealand Maritime Parks Ltd	MUZ-R1	Support in part	NZMPL seek amendments to the building and structures provisions to ensure that a range of suitable buildings and structures can be established as a permitted activity. NZMPL considers that the 400m <sup>2</sup> Gross Floor Area restriction for permitted activity with a default to discretionary activity where compliance is not achieved is particularly onerous approach. In the absence of any s32 justification for this threshold, NZMPL seeks that this be increased. Flexibility is also required for extensions and alterations for existing legally established structures. As currently drafted, any alteration to an existing building or structure that is already more than 400m <sup>2</sup> GFA would require discretionary resource consent, regardless as to whether this is internal/external or the degree of change to the approved footprint.	Amend Rule MUZ -R1 as follows: - Increase threshold for coverage for new buildings or structures. - Insert a new clause which permits alterations where they do not result in an increased building footprint. - Default to a restricted discretionary activity for non- compliance with PER 2.		Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ rules
FS400.015	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Support	Submission 251 rightly notes that the underlying analyses related to the Coastal Environment provisions has not sufficiently considered the appropriate implementation of these provision in the urban environment.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ rules

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				Specific provisions such a height limits and gross floor area restrictions (for example) require flexibility when considered against the urban environment values and existing environment.				
<b>FS396.015</b>	Ed and Inge Amsler		Support	Submission 251 rightly notes that the underlying analyses related to the Coastal Environment provisions has not sufficiently considered the appropriate implementation of these provision in the urban environment. Specific provisions such a height limits and gross floor area restrictions (for example) require flexibility when considered against the urban environment values and existing environment.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ rules
<b>FS542.091</b>	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Support	Foodstuffs supports amendments to the provision	Allow	amend MUZ-R1	Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ rules
<b>FS406.064</b>	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Support	McDonald's supports amendments to the provision for the reasons outlined in its original submission	Allow	amend MUZ-R1	Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ rules
<b>S74.020</b>	Brownie Family Trust	MUZ-R1	Support	The provision is appropriate.	Retain rule MUZ-R1 as notified.		Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ rules
<b>FS542.090</b>	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs seeks exemptions for supermarkets for pedestrian frontage requirements.	Disallow	amend to exempt for supermarkets for pedestrian frontage requirements.	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ rules
<b>FS406.063</b>	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Oppose	McDonald's seeks amendments of some provisions to better provide for its existing and potential future activities within the Mixed Use Zone for the reasons outlined in its original submission.	Disallow	amend MUZ-R1	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ rules

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>S344.028</b>	Paihia Properties Holdings Corporate Trustee Limited and UP Management Ltd	MUZ-R1	Not Stated	It is considered that a GFA of less than 400m <sup>2</sup> with a default to discretionary activity where compliance cannot be achieved is particularly onerous within the MUZ given this is the only commercial zone providing for supermarket activities. It is considered that building bulk and scale should be managed separately to the scale of activities, MUZ-R1 note is confusing these effects, resulting unnecessary restrictions upon activities within the MUZ.	Amend MUZ-R1 to provide for an increase to GFA, to ensure that supermarkets (buildings) can be established as a permitted activity and a restricted discretionary activity status where compliance cannot be achieved with the GFA cannot be achieved.		Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ rules
<b>FS542.092</b>	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Support	Foodstuffs supports amendments to the provision	Allow	amend MUZ-R1	Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ rules
<b>FS396.049</b>	Ed and Inge Amsler		Support	The submission seeks various changes in relation to the urban environment / coastal environment interface as well as specific provisions in the Mixed Use Zone. Additionally, the submission seeks better reflection of business land needs that should be reflected throughout the Plan.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ rules
<b>S385.020</b>	McDonalds Restaurants (NZ) Limited	MUZ-R1	Support in part	McDonald's seek amendments to the building and structures provisions to ensure that McDonald's restaurants (buildings and structures) can be established as a permitted activity. As noted in sub#1 and sub#2 given the lack of definitions nesting table, it is difficult to understand how a McDonald's restaurant would be treated. Regardless, it is considered that PER-1 is unnecessary as resource consent will be required for the activity separately if it is not permitted which will provide Council the opportunity to consider the appropriateness of the activity.	Amend MUZ -R1 as follows: - Delete PER -1 - Increase threshold for coverage for new buildings or structures - Permit alterations where they do not result in an increased building footprint - Permit extensions of an appropriate scale where they comply with MUZ-S1, MUZ-S2, MUZ-S3, MUZ-S4, MUZ-S10 to avoid unnecessary consenting requirements. - Default to a restricted discretionary activity for non-compliance with PER 2.		Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>McDonalds considers that the 400m2 Gross Floor Area restriction for permitted activity with a default to discretionary activity where compliance is not achieved is particularly onerous approach. In the absence of any s32 justification for this threshold, McDonald's seeks that this be increased.</p> <p>Flexibility is also required for extensions and alterations for existing legally established structures. As currently drafted, any alteration to an existing building or structure that is already more than 400m2 GFA would require discretionary resource consent, regardless as to whether this is internal/external or the degree of change to the approved footprint</p>				
<b>FS542.093</b>	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Support	Foodstuffs supports amendments to the provision	Allow	amend MUZ-R1	Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ rules
<b>S431.127</b>	John Andrew Riddell	MUZ-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		Accept in part	Key Issue: Plan wide or urban wide submissions
<b>FS332.127</b>	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part	Key Issue: Plan wide or urban wide submissions
<b>S522.043</b>	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	MUZ-R1	Support in part	The current height restriction of 12m in the Mixed Use zone should be strictly adhered to. Exceptions to this height limit should not be allowed for multi-unit developments or other purpose	Amend Rule MUZ-R1 to remove the option of exceeding the height limit through the resource consent process		Reject	Key Issue: MUZ rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS277.58	Jenny Collison		Support	12 meters should be the maximum height	Allow		Reject	Key Issue: MUZ rules
FS566.1782	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ rules
S529.031	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	MUZ-R1	Support in part	The current height restriction of 12m in the Mixed Use zone should be strictly adhered to. Exceptions to this height limit should not be allowed for multi-unit developments or other purpose	Amend Rule MUZ-R1 to remove the option of exceeding the height limit through the resource consent process		Reject	Key Issue: MUZ rules
FS570.1921	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ rules
FS566.1935	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ rules
FS569.1957	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ rules
S449.032	Kapiro Conservation Trust	MUZ-R1	Support in part	The current height restriction of 12m in the Mixed Use zone should be strictly adhered to. Exceptions to this height limit should not be allowed for multi-unit developments or other purpose	Amend Rule MUZ-R1 to remove the option of exceeding the height limit through the resource consent process		Reject	Key Issue: MUZ rules
FS569.1831	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Reject	Key Issue: MUZ rules
FS570.1848	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Reject	Key Issue: MUZ rules
S50.002	Vaughan Norton-Taylor	MUZ-R2	Oppose	Submitter opposes the permitted activity standard in this rule which restricts a commercial activity which is	Delete MUZ-R2 (inferred)		Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				carried out within and office to 200m2 of gross floor are.			
<b>S74.021</b>	Brownie Family Trust	MUZ-R2	Support in part	It appears that under this rule any service station is permitted and all commercial activities are permitted provided that GFA is limited. Is this what is intended? Service stations can generate adverse effects and these should be managed.	Amend to separate the rules for commercial activities and service stations. Change the activity status for a new service station to a discretionary activity.	Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ rules
<b>S137.003</b>	Lynley Newport	MUZ-R2	Support in part	The Mixed Use zone is intended to enable commercial activity. Believe Rule MUZ-R2 includes a typographical error as it makes any commercial activity other than a service station a discretionary activity within the Mixed Use zone.	Amend Rule MUZ-R2 PER-1 as follows: The activity is <b>not</b> a service station.	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ rules
<b>S341.002</b>	Ed and Inge Amsler	MUZ-R2	Oppose	The rationale for limiting office space in a commercial / mixed use zone is not clearly known. The type of activity should be supported, especially where other provisions seek to require bottom floor commercial uses, prior to residential activities being permitted. By using a GFA approach, the proposal also limits the intention of 'building up' as indicated by the MUZ height rules. The rule is not consistent with MUZ-R1-PER-2 which allows for 400m2 GFA coverage and seems to work against an office space activity specifically.	Delete the requirements which limit office coverage to 200m2 GFA in MUZ-R2 Commercial Activity - PER-2.	Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ rules
<b>S536.002</b>	Vaughan Norton-Taylor	MUZ-R2	Oppose	Limiting the gross floor area to 200 m <sup>2</sup> in Rule MUZ-R2 encroaches on development options. No logic or reason are given for this change.	Delete Rule MUZ-R2 and retain status quo (inferred)	Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ rules
<b>S363.025</b>	Foodstuffs North Island Limited	MUZ-R2	Not Stated	The submitter considers that rule MUZ-R2 Commercial activity, as currently drafted, only provides for service	Amend rule MUZ-R2 Commercial activity, to provide for supermarkets, without a GFA limit.	Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				stations and any office which does not exceed GFA of 200m2 as permitted activities and any activity that fails to comply is a discretionary activity. The submitter considers that this is completely inappropriate, inefficient and ineffective as the MUZ is the only commercial zone intended to enable supermarkets.				
<b>S561.092</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	MUZ-R2	Oppose	This rule wording needs to be amended for more clarity. Commercial activity is defined in the plan and commercial service activity is listed separately as a Permitted activity. It is unclear whether this rule is solely applying to service station activity, in which case it could be listed as a Discretionary activity. Stating that Discretionary status applies to any activity where 'compliance not achieved with PER-1' could be interpreted as all commercial activity that is not a service station is Discretionary?	<p>Delete MUZ-R2 in its entirety and include new provisions in the activity table to list Service Stations and offices > 200m2 as a Discretionary activity.</span></span>		Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ rules
<b>FS55.001</b>	Z Energy Limited		Oppose	<p>The submitter considers that it is appropriate for service stations to be a permitted activity in the MUZ as they provide an essential service to communities which are designed to support the function and amenity of a mixed use environment. Service stations are also not listed as an activity MUZ-P5 seeks to restrict and can achieve the objectives and policies of the zone.</p> <p>The submitter notes it is important service stations are enabled in central areas. They are listed as permitted in the HIZ zone but land in this zone is limited and is some distance away from MUZ zoning across the district. For</p>	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ rules

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				example, the closest HIZ zone to Kaikohe and Paihia is 25km away.				
<b>FS32.146</b>	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	<p>The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes.</p> <p>The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts.</p> <p>The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.</p>	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ rules
<b>FS23.364</b>	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	<p>Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.</p>	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS47.106	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ rules
FS348.179	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ rules
S251.011	New Zealand Maritime Parks Ltd	MUZ-R2	Support in part	It is unclear whether the intentions of Rule MUZ-R2 is to enable service station activities and no other commercial activity, in any case it is NZMPL's view that this rule, given the purpose of the zone, should be amended to remove any restrictions to make it clear that the intended environment for all commercial activities is in the MUZ.	Amend Rule MUZ-R2 to delete PER-1 and PER-2.		Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ rules
FS400.016	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Support	Submission 251 rightly notes that the underlying analyses related to the Coastal Environment provisions has not sufficiently considered the appropriate implementation of these provision in the urban environment.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ rules

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				Specific provisions such a height limits and gross floor area restrictions (for example) require flexibility when considered against the urban environment values and existing environment.				
<b>FS396.016</b>	Ed and Inge Amsler		Support	Submission 251 rightly notes that the underlying analyses related to the Coastal Environment provisions has not sufficiently considered the appropriate implementation of these provision in the urban environment. Specific provisions such a height limits and gross floor area restrictions (for example) require flexibility when considered against the urban environment values and existing environment.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ rules
<b>S336.019</b>	Z Energy Limited	MUZ-R2	Support	Service Stations can appropriately operate in a range of zones and amongst a range of activities. Z Energy supports MUZ-R2 which permits Service Stations in the MUZ.	Retain Rule MUZ-R2		Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ rules
<b>FS542.096</b>	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs seeks supermarkets are provided for by this rule	Disallow	amend MUZ-R2	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ rules
<b>S320.014</b>	Far North Holdings Limited	MUZ-R2	Not Stated	The submitter considers that the deletion of MUZ-R2 Commercial Activity PER-2 is an appropriate and necessary relief to achieve the aims of this submission (s32 assessment provided with submission).	Amend MUZ-R2 to dleete Commercial Activity PER-2 as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The activity is a service station. <del>PER-2 Any office does not exceed GFA of 200m2.</del>		Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ rules
<b>FS542.097</b>	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Support in part	Foodstuffs seeks supermarkets are provided for by this rule	Allow in part	amend MUZ-R2	Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ rules

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

<b>Submission Point</b>	<b>Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)</b>	<b>Provision</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Summary of Decision Requested</b>	<b>Officer recommendation</b>	<b>Relevant section of S42A Report</b>
<b>S50.003</b>	Vaughan Norton-Taylor	MUZ-R3	Oppose	Submitter is opposed to the activity of visitor accommodation within a residential unit is required to be that is located above the ground floor level of a building unless the residential unit existed at 27 July 2022. The submitter contends that no consideration for access for the disabled has been given, nor consideration as to the high cost of such a development and finally that no justification has been provided.	Amend MUZ-R3 to remove requirement for visitor accommodation to be above ground floor prior to 27 July 2022 (inferred) and delete the requirement for disabled access (inferred)	Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Unit – Ground Floor
<b>S74.022</b>	Brownie Family Trust	MUZ-R3	Oppose	The rule as drafted is unduly harsh on new compatible visitor accommodation. Hotels and motels and new residential units should be allowed at ground floor if appropriate urban design standards are met.	Delete PER-1 of rule MUZ-R3	Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Unit – Ground Floor
<b>S341.003</b>	Ed and Inge Amsler	MUZ-R3	Oppose	The proposed rule seeks residential living above a ground floor or resource consent is required. Such above ground living reduces the potential of the zone to appropriately provide for residential land uses by reason that the cost of development associated with having to meet the rule may actively work against the zones intentions. Residential uses on the ground floor should be actively promoted.	Delete the requirements which promote visitor accommodation to only be located above the ground floor in MUZ-R3, Visitor Accommodation - PER-1.	Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Unit – Ground Floor
<b>S536.003</b>	Vaughan Norton-Taylor	MUZ-R3	Oppose	Limiting visitor accommodation to first floor in Rule MUZ-R3 provides no consideration for access for the disabled, huge costs inflicted on development. No logic or reason are given for this change.	Delete Rule MUZ-R3 and retain status quo (inferred)	Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Unit – Ground Floor
<b>S320.015</b>	Far North Holdings Limited	MUZ-R3	Not Stated	The submitter considers that the deletion of MUZ-R3 Visitor Accommodation, PER-1 is an appropriate and necessary relief to	Delete MUZ-R3 Visitor Accommodation PER-1 as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: <del>PER-1</del> The visitor accommodation	Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Unit – Ground Floor

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				achieve the aims of this submission (s32 assessment provided with submission).	<del>is within a residential unit that is located above the ground floor level of a building unless the residential unit existed at 27 July 2022.</del> PER-2 The residential unit complies with standard: NOISE-S5 Noise insulation.		
<b>S214.006</b>	Airbnb	MUZ-R3	Support in part	<p>The proposed district plan allows for visitor accommodation as a permitted activity for less than or equal to 6-10 guests on site. If these conditions are not met, the activity is discretionary except in the settlement zone where it is restricted discretionary. Airbnb supports the overall approach to allow visitor accommodation to occur in all zones and commends the Council's leadership in this space. We would, however, recommend that restrictions around the number of guests be standardised to 10 across the district to account for the range of families that tend to stay in this type of accommodation and would also recommend that properties that do not meet permitted status default to restricted discretionary as opposed to discretionary. This would increase certainty for our Hosts and unlock the full potential of residential visitor accommodation in the district.</p> <p>Airbnb strongly believes that consistency for guests and hosts is important and that a national approach is the most effective way to address these concerns. Kiwis agree with 64%</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	Key Issue: Plan wide and urban wide submissions

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				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).				
<b>FS23.068</b>	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Support standardizing the number applying to permitted visitor accommodation activities across all zones. Taking a consistent approach will make it easier for the plan provisions to be applied and understood. The effects are not likely to differ significantly in residential zones	Allow	allow relief sought	Reject	Key Issue: Plan wide and urban wide submissions
<b>S561.093</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	MUZ-R3	Support in part	Restrictions on residential and visitor accommodation activities at ground floor should only be limited to the 'pedestrian frontage' area identified on the planning maps (consistent with the amendments sought to the objectives and policies above).	Amend MUZ-R3 to include the following: Activity status: Permitted Where: <b>PER-1</b> <b>Where the site is identified as a pedestrian frontage,</b> the visitor accommodation is within a residential unit that is located above the ground floor level of a building. <b>This rule does not apply to</b> <del>unless the</del> residential units <b>that</b> existed at 27 July 2022. <b>PER-2</b> The residential unit complies with standard: NOISE-S5 Noise insulation.		Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Unit – Ground Floor

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS32.147	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	<p>The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes.</p> <p>The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts.</p> <p>The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.</p>	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Unit – Ground Floor
FS23.365	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Unit – Ground Floor
FS47.107	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Unit – Ground Floor

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document				
FS348.180	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Unit – Ground Floor
S74.023	Brownie Family Trust	MUZ-R4	Oppose	People should be able to live in and use a residential unit for residential activity that has been appropriately designed and consented.	Delete rule MUZ-R4		Reject	Key Issue: Residential Unit – Ground Floor
S158.012	Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	MUZ-R4	Support	The permitted activity status is appropriate in the context of the establishment and operation of supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided for by Ara Poutama; i.e. people living in a residential situation, who are subject to support and/or supervision by Ara Poutama.	Retain the land use activity rule applying to "residential activities" in the Mixed Use zone, Rule MUZ-R4.		Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Unit – Ground Floor
S158.014	Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	MUZ-R4	Neutral	The definition of "residential activity" entirely captures supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided for by Ara Poutama; i.e. people living in a residential situation, who are subject to support and/or supervision by Ara	Retain as notified the provisions applicable to "residential activities" in the Mixed Use zone. BUT - If Council are to retain the "supported residential care activity" definition, then amend the rule framework for the Mixed Use zone to include a permitted rule applying to "supported residential care activity" as follows: <b>Activity</b>		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ rules

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>Poutama, and therefore a separate definition of "supported residential care activities" is unnecessary. However, should Council see it as being absolutely necessary to implement the separate definition of "supported residential care activity", then Ara Poutama requests that the rules applying to supported and transitional accommodation activities in the Mixed Use zone are amended. The zone framework would not otherwise enable supported residential care activities, and provides discretionary activity status for these activities in the zone, in accordance with the default "activities not otherwise listed in this chapter" rule MUZ-R17.</p> <p>Supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided for by Ara Poutama, are an important component of the rehabilitation and reintegration process for people under Ara Poutama's supervision. They enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural well-being and for their health and safety.</p> <p>The Mixed Use zone includes suitable locations for supported and transitional accommodation activities; as they are close to civic amenities and services. This is apparent in that the zones provide for residential activities as permitted, including aligned activities such as visitor accommodation.</p> <p>Supported and transitional accommodation activities are a compatible and appropriate activity in the Mixed Use zone. They are consistent with the character and amenity of the zone, and the effects of such can be managed through the</p>	<p><b>status: Permitted</b>  <b>Where: PER-1</b>  <b>The supported residential care activity is within a residential unit that is located above the ground floor level of a building unless the residential unit existed at 27 July 2022.</b>  <b>PER-2</b>  <b>The number of occupants does not exceed six.</b>  <b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-1 or PER-2: Discretionary</b></p>		

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				imposition of a restriction on the maximum number of residents (six), as is the case in the General Residential zone. The enabled activities rule framework should be amended to provide for supported and transitional accommodation activities as a permitted activity (should the definition of "support residential care activity" be retained).			
<b>S256.004</b>	Josh Henwood	MUZ-R4	Oppose	If the site is also in the coastal environment zone, then you can only build to 5 metres high (one level). This rule then doesn't make any sense as there is no second level to have the residential activity on.	Amend the standard to allow for 1) residential activity on ground floor and 2) as per S257.003 increase permitted height to 8.5 metres in the Mixed Use Zone.	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Unit – Ground Floor
<b>S285.004</b>	Leisa Henwood	MUZ-R4	Oppose	With only being able to build 5m (single storey) this rule does not make sense. Even if allowed to build higher we see no reason to have a residential on the first floor if building back from the foreshore by 27m.	Amend rule MUZ-R4 to permit residential activity on ground floor and upper floors of new buildings.	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Unit – Ground Floor
<b>S289.004</b>	Terry Henwood	MUZ-R4	Oppose	With only being able to build 5m (single storey) this rule does not make sense. Even if allowed to build higher we see no reason to have a residential on the first floor if building back from the foreshore by 27m.	Amend rule MUZ-R4 to permit residential activity on ground floor and upper floors of new buildings.	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Unit – Ground Floor
<b>S293.002</b>	Bruce and Kim Rogers	MUZ-R4	Support in part	The rule does not make provision for existing residential only sites. Residential activity on the ground floor of new buildings should continue to be permitted where residential activity only is present on site.	Amend rule MUZ-R4 to permit residential activity on ground floor and upper floors of new buildings where there is a residential activity only on site.	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Unit – Ground Floor
<b>S294.003</b>	Bruce and Kim Rogers	MUZ-R4	Support in part	The rule does not make provision for existing residential only sites. Residential activity on the ground floor of new buildings should continue to be	Amend rule MUZ-R4 to permit residential activity on ground floor and upper floors of new buildings.	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Unit – Ground Floor

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				permitted where residential activity only is present on site.				
<b>S341.004</b>	Ed and Inge Amsler	MUZ-R4	Oppose	The proposed rule seeks residential living above a ground floor or resource consent is required. Such above ground living reduces the potential of the zone to appropriately provide for residential land uses by reason that the cost of development associated with having to meet the rule may actively work against the zones intentions. Residential uses on the ground floor should be actively promoted.	Delete requirements which promote residential activities to only be located above the ground floor in MUZ-R4 Residential Activity - PER 1.		Reject	Key Issue: Residential Unit – Ground Floor
<b>S283.005</b>	Trent Simpkin	MUZ-R4	Oppose	Residential activities should be permitted on the ground floor also. There are many places in the mixed use zone that aren't likely going to be for retail activities (King St in Kerikeri for example), and moreso for townhouse developments. And when designing townhouses, putting the living spaces above the ground floor is a lot more expensive - plumbing, drainage, outdoor spaces i.e. decks etc.	Amend to permit residential activities on the ground floor of buildings also.		Reject	Key Issue: Residential Unit – Ground Floor
<b>FS45.20</b>	Tristan Simpkin		Support	Support as per Reasons given in submission	Allow		Reject	Key Issue: Residential Unit – Ground Floor
<b>FS175.5</b>	Denis Thomson		Support	Residential activity should also be allowed on the ground floor	Allow		Reject	Key Issue: Residential Unit – Ground Floor
<b>FS570.819</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	Key Issue: Residential Unit – Ground Floor
<b>FS566.833</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	Key Issue: Residential Unit – Ground Floor

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS569.855	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	Key Issue: Residential Unit – Ground Floor
S368.006	Far North District Council	MUZ-R4	Support in part	Drafting error. There is a need to consider a minimum net internal floor area for residential units in the Mixed Use zone, similar or the same as that proposed in the General Residential zone for Residential activity (multi-unit development). Doing so will retain control of amenity and quality of residential units in this zone.	Amend MUZ-R4 to apply a minimum net internal floor area for residential units in the Mixed Use zone, following investigation and consideration of appropriate minimum net internal floor area.		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Rules
FS25.091	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Support	Supports the management of internal floor area to ensure that dwellings in the MUZ are of an appropriate size to provide a quality living environment.	Allow	Allow the original submission, subject to appropriate wording	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Rules
FS325.063	Turnstone Trust Limited		Support	TT supports the management of internal floor area to ensure that dwellings in the MUZ are of an appropriate size to provide a quality living environment.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate wording.	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Rules
FS243.190	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose	Kāinga Ora supports District Plan provisions that provide for a range of residential activities and housing choices. However, a minimum net internal floor area for residential units is unnecessary and not required.	Disallow	Amend MUZ-R4 to apply a minimum net internal floor area for residential units in the Mixed Use zone, following investigation and consideration of appropriate minimum net internal floor area.	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ Rules
S561.094	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	MUZ-R4	Support in part	Restrictions on residential and visitor accommodation activities at ground floor should only be limited to the 'pedestrian frontage' area identified on the planning maps (consistent with the amendments sought to the objectives and policies above).	Amend MUZ-R4 to include the following: Activity status: Permitted Where: <b>PER-1 Where the site is identified as a pedestrian frontage control on the planning maps, the residential activity is within a residential unit that is located above the ground floor level of</b>		Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Unit – Ground Floor

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					a building. <b>This rule does not apply to</b> <del>unless the residential units that existed</del> at 27 July 2022.			
FS32.148	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	<p>The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes.</p> <p>The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts.</p> <p>The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.</p>	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Unit – Ground Floor
FS23.366	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	<p>Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes</p>	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Unit – Ground Floor

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.				
<b>FS47.108</b>	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Unit – Ground Floor
<b>FS348.181</b>	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Unit – Ground Floor
<b>S251.012</b>	New Zealand Maritime Parks Ltd	MUZ-R4	Support	NZMPL support the provision of mixed residential and commercial activities. This is considered to promote vibrancy and vitality within urban centres. Further, requiring residential activities to be established above street frontages ensures the active streetscapes.	Retain Rule MUZ-R4		Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Unit – Ground Floor
<b>FS400.017</b>	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Support	Submission 251 rightly notes that the underlying analyses related to the Coastal Environment provisions has not sufficiently considered the appropriate implementation of these provision in the urban environment.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Unit – Ground Floor

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				Specific provisions such a height limits and gross floor area restrictions (for example) require flexibility when considered against the urban environment values and existing environment.				
FS396.017	Ed and Inge Amsler		Support	Submission 251 rightly notes that the underlying analyses related to the Coastal Environment provisions has not sufficiently considered the appropriate implementation of these provision in the urban environment. Specific provisions such a height limits and gross floor area restrictions (for example) require flexibility when considered against the urban environment values and existing environment	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Unit – Ground Floor
S501.003	Kaitaia Business Association	MUZ-R4	Support in part	The Kaitaia Business Association generally supports Rule MUZ-R4 and for residential activities to be located above the ground floor level. The Mixed Use Zone includes the main central business district where it is imperative to have active shop frontages to engage consumers by providing a shopper experience. The Kaitaia Business Association received numerous complaints and concerns for a potential social housing project to be established in the CBD area. The KBA would not support social housing within the Mixed Use Zone. An exclusion clause is required in regard to residential activities for the purpose of temporary overnight or emergency/assisted or social housing within the CBD area. Kaitaia currently has some residential units located above commercial premises that are used by the	Amend Rule MUZ-R4 as follows: The residential activity <b>excluding a residential activity for temporary overnight accommodation or emergency/assisted or social housing</b> is within a residential unit that is located above the ground floor level of a building unless the residential unit existed at 27 July 2022.		Reject	Key Issue: MUZ rules

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				property/business owners. Accommodation for temporary overnight, emergency, assisted or social housing is a different housing type that requires tenant management with specific needs not suitable for the CBD area. The General Residential Zone provides for this activity where social mix opportunities are available to increase social cohesion and neighborhood participation				
FS243.193	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose	Kāinga Ora supports District Plan provisions that provide for a range of residential activities and housing choices. Public housing or any other form of residential activity should be singled out due to the tenancy make-up; all forms of housing are residential activity and remain as residential activity.	Disallow	Seeks to prevent social housing within the Mixed Use zone. Amend Rule MUZ-R4 as follows: .....	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ rules
S502.031	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	MUZ-R4	Support in part	Kaitaia currently has some residential units located above commercial premises that are used by the property/business owners. Accommodation for temporary overnight, emergency, assisted or social housing is a different housing type that requires tenant management with specific needs not suitable for the CBD area. The General Residential Zone provides for this activity where social mix opportunities are available to increase social cohesion and neighbourhood participation. The General Residential Zone provides for a variety of housing typologies and sizes where temporary overnight accommodation or emergency/assisted or social housing integrates similar effects to other residential activities.	Amend MUZ-R4 PER-1 The residential activity <b>excluding a residential activity for temporary overnight accommodation or emergency/assisted or social housing</b> is within a residential unit that is located above the ground floor level of a building unless the residential unit existed at 27 July 2022.		Reject	Key Issue: MUZ rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS243.195	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose	Kāinga Ora supports District Plan provisions that provide for a range of residential activities and housing choices. Public housing or any other form of residential activity should be singled out due to the tenancy make-up; all forms of housing are residential activity and remain as residential activity.	Disallow	Amend MUZ-R4 PER-1 The residential activity excluding a residential activity for temporary overnight accommodation or emergency/assisted or social housing is within a residential unit that is located above the ground floor level of a building unless the residential unit existed at 27 July 2022.	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ rules
S287.005	Tristan Simpkin	MUZ-R4	Oppose	Residential activities should be permitted on the ground floor also. There are many places in the mixed use zone that aren't likely going to be for retail activities (King St in Kerikeri for example), and more-so for townhouse developments. And when designing townhouses, putting the living spaces above the ground floor is a lot more expensive - plumbing, drainage, outdoor spaces i.e. decks etc.	Amend rule to permit residential living activities on ground floors of buildings.		Reject	Key Issue: Residential Unit – Ground Floor
FS570.876	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	Key Issue: Residential Unit – Ground Floor
FS566.890	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	Key Issue: Residential Unit – Ground Floor
FS569.912	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	Key Issue: Residential Unit – Ground Floor
S50.004	Vaughan Norton-Taylor	MUZ-R5	Oppose	Submitter opposes the permitted standard residential unit activity requirement that the residential unit is located above the ground floor level of	Amend MUZ-R5 to remove requirement for residential units to be above ground floor prior to 27 July 2022 (inferred) and		Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Unit – Ground Floor

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				a building unless it existed at 27 July 2022. The submitter considers that no consideration has been given to access for the disabled and no justification has been given for the rule.	delete the requirement for disabled access (inferred)		
S74.024	Brownie Family Trust	MUZ-R5	Oppose	New residential units should be allowed at ground floor if appropriate urban design standards are met and the development is compatible.	Delete PER-1 of rule MUZ-R5	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Unit – Ground Floor
S138.019	Kairos Connection Trust and Habitat for Humanity Northern Region Ltd	MUZ-R5	Support in part	Understand that the Mixed Use zone has replaced the existing Commercial zone. Residential activities are provided for in the proposed zone, but only if these are located above ground level. Proposed Objective MUZ-O5 and Policy MUZ-P5 indicate that this is to ensure that active street frontages are maintained, and to avoid adverse effects on the function, role, sense of place and amenity of the Mixed Use zone, except where the boundary interface is with the Open Space zone. Support the continued ability to establish residential activities in the Mixed Use Zone. However, as not all building development on a Mixed Use site would necessarily affect street frontages and facades, particularly on a rear site, or if an apartment style building was located behind an existing building, seek that the ability to locate residential activities at ground level is enabled under specified circumstances.	Amend PER-1 of Rule MUZ-R5 as follows: <i>PER-1 The residential unit is located above the ground floor level of a building where it adjoins a road boundary unless it existed at 27 July 2022.</i>	Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Unit – Ground Floor
S293.004	Bruce and Kim Rogers	MUZ-R5	Support in part	The rule does not make provision for existing residential only sites. Residential activity on the ground floor of new buildings should continue to be permitted where residential activity only is present on site.	Amend rule MUZ-R5 to permit residential activity on the ground floor of new buildings where residential activity only is present on site.	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Unit – Ground Floor

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>S294.004</b>	Bruce and Kim Rogers	MUZ-R5	Support in part	The rule does not make provision for existing residential only sites. Residential activity on the ground floor of new buildings should continue to be permitted where residential activity only is present on site.	Amend rule MUZ-R5 to permit residential activity on the ground floor of new buildings where residential activity only is present on site.	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Unit – Ground Floor
<b>S368.093</b>	Far North District Council	MUZ-R5	Support in part	Inconsistent wording, should read the same as MUZ-R3	Amend MUZ-R5 ..... <del>PER-2 The residential units established after 27 July 2022 comply</del> <b>complies</b> with standard: NOISE-S5 Noise insulation.	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Unit – Ground Floor
<b>S341.005</b>	Ed and Inge Amsler	MUZ-R5	Oppose	The proposed rule seeks residential living above a ground floor or resource consent is required. Such above ground living reduces the potential of the zone to appropriately provide for residential land uses by reason that the cost of development associated with having to meet the rule may actively work against the zones intentions. Residential uses on the ground floor should be actively promoted.	Delete the requirements which promote residential units to only be located above the ground floor in MUZ-R5 Residential Unit - PER 1.	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Unit – Ground Floor
<b>S385.021</b>	McDonalds Restaurants (NZ) Limited	MUZ-R5	Support	McDonalds supports providing for commercial activities as a permitted activity, however as noted in earlier submissions, and section 2.0 it is critical to the effectiveness and efficiency of the plan that it is clear to plan users what is incorporated as a commercial activity that it includes 'restaurants and cafes' which is a term that needs to be defined.	Retain as notified subject to the changes sought in sub#5 which seeks that Council clarify what a restaurant and café activity is, and that they are a subset of commercial activity.	Accept in part	Key Issue: Definitions
<b>S536.004</b>	Vaughan Norton-Taylor	MUZ-R5	Oppose	Limiting residential units to first floor in Rule MUZ-R5 provides no consideration for access for the	Delete Rule MUZ-R5 and retain status quo (inferred)	Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Unit – Ground Floor

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				disabled, huge costs inflicted on development. No logic or reason are given for this change.			
S476.005	David Truscott	MUZ-R5	Oppose	The mixed use zone rules will discourage development in Rawene town centre, demand for new commercial premises is low and the town will benefit from residential development on vacant land in the zone. Rules restricting residential activity to the above the ground floor are unnecessary.	Amend MUZ-R5 (inferred) PER1 to allow residential activity on the ground floor in the Rawene Mixed Use Zone.	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Unit – Ground Floor
S561.095	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	MUZ-R5	Support in part	Restrictions on residential and visitor accommodation activities at ground floor should only be limited to the 'pedestrian frontage' area identified on the planning maps (consistent with the amendments sought to the objectives and policies above.	Amend MUZ-R5 to include the following: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 <b>Where the site is identified as a pedestrian frontage, the residential unit is located above the ground floor level of a building. This rule does not apply to unless the residential units that existed at 27 July 2022.</b> PER-2 Residential units established after 27 July 2022 comply with standard: NOISE-S5 Noise insulation. <b>PER-3a. Each Residential Unit shall be a minimum of 35m2 Gross Floor Area for a studio and 45m2 Gross Floor Area for units containing one or more bedrooms. The GFA excludes areas used as garaging or balconies.</b> <b>b. Each residential unit with habitable internal space at ground floor shall be</b>	Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Unit – Ground Floor

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					<p>provided with an outdoor living space in a continuous area, with a minimum area of 20m<sup>2</sup> and a minimum dimension of 4m. Where the unit is located at first floor or above, it shall be provided with an outdoor living space in the form of a balcony that is a minimum area of 8m<sup>2</sup> and a minimum dimension of 1.5m.c. Balconies or living area windows at first floor level or above shall be setback a minimum of 4m from internal boundaries, with bedroom windows setback a minimum of 1m. No setbacks are required for:i. Windows associated with a hall, stairwell, or bathroom;ii. Windows that are frosted;iii. Windows that are more than 90 degrees to the boundary;iv. Windows where the sill height is more than 1.6m above internal floor level.</p> <p>...Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-3: Restricted discretionaryMatters of discretion are restricted to:a. Occupant amenity.b. The degree to which the outdoor living space will receive sunlight.c. The accessibility and convenience of the</p>		

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					<b>outdoor living space for occupiers.d. Proximity to communal or public open space.</b>			
FS32.149	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	<p>The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes.</p> <p>The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts.</p> <p>The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.</p>	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Unit – Ground Floor
FS348.014	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	<p>The proposed PER-3 reduction in residential unit areas is both undesirable and unnecessary. The proposed areas are apartment size in central Auckland, not required in FNDC.</p>	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Unit – Ground Floor

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS23.367	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Unit – Ground Floor
FS47.109	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Unit – Ground Floor
FS348.182	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Reject	Key Issue: Residential Unit – Ground Floor
S74.050	Brownie Family Trust	MUZ-R6	Support	These activities are appropriate within a Mixed Use zone provided that they are appropriately designed and are compatible with existing built development.	Retain rule MUZ-R6 as notified.		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Rules

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

<b>Submission Point</b>	<b>Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)</b>	<b>Provision</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Summary of Decision Requested</b>	<b>Officer recommendation</b>	<b>Relevant section of S42A Report</b>
<b>S341.006</b>	Ed and Inge Amsler	MUZ-R6	Support	The zone provisions should enable such uses without secondary limitations and this is supported.	Retain permitted activity status for activities in Rules MUZ-R6-11.	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Rules
<b>S74.051</b>	Brownie Family Trust	MUZ-R7	Support	These activities are appropriate within a Mixed Use zone provided that they are appropriately designed and are compatible with existing built development.	Retain rule MUZ-R7 as notified.	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Rules
<b>S341.015</b>	Ed and Inge Amsler	MUZ-R7	Support	The MUZ appears to have an unusual mix of activities permitted, with an onerous default to discretionary activity status. Due to the complicated nature of the commercial activities rules and the lack of definitions we are unable to confirm what activities would be permitted onsite.	Retain permitted activity status for activities in Rules MUZ-R6-11.	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Rules
<b>S74.052</b>	Brownie Family Trust	MUZ-R8	Support	These activities are appropriate within a Mixed Use zone provided that they are appropriately designed and are compatible with existing built development.	Retain rule MUZ-R8 as notified.	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Rules
<b>S341.016</b>	Ed and Inge Amsler	MUZ-R8	Support	The MUZ appears to have an unusual mix of activities permitted, with an onerous default to discretionary activity status. Due to the complicated nature of the commercial activities rules and the lack of definitions we are unable to confirm what activities would be permitted onsite.	Retain permitted activity status for activities in Rules MUZ-R6-11.	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Rules
<b>S74.053</b>	Brownie Family Trust	MUZ-R9	Support	These activities are appropriate within a Mixed Use zone provided that they are appropriately designed and are compatible with existing built development.	Retain rule MUZ-R9 as notified.	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Rules
<b>S341.017</b>	Ed and Inge Amsler	MUZ-R9	Support	The MUZ appears to have an unusual mix of activities permitted, with an onerous default to discretionary activity status. Due to the complicated nature of the commercial activities rules and	Retain permitted activity status for activities in Rules MUZ-R6-11.	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Rules

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				the lack of definitions we are unable to confirm what activities would be permitted onsite.				
<b>S74.054</b>	Brownie Family Trust	MUZ-R10	Support	These activities are appropriate within a Mixed Use zone provided that they are appropriately designed and are compatible with existing built development.	Retain rule MUZ-R10 as notified.		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Rules
<b>S341.018</b>	Ed and Inge Amsler	MUZ-R10	Support	The MUZ appears to have an unusual mix of activities permitted, with an onerous default to discretionary activity status. Due to the complicated nature of the commercial activities rules and the lack of definitions we are unable to confirm what activities would be permitted onsite.	Retain permitted activity status for activities in Rules MUZ-R6-11.		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Rules
<b>S74.025</b>	Brownie Family Trust	MUZ-R11	Support	These activities are appropriate within a Mixed Use zone provided that they are appropriately designed and are compatible with existing built development.	Retain rule MUZ-R11 as notified.		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Rules
<b>S341.019</b>	Ed and Inge Amsler	MUZ-R11	Support	The MUZ appears to have an unusual mix of activities permitted, with an onerous default to discretionary activity status. Due to the complicated nature of the commercial activities rules and the lack of definitions we are unable to confirm what activities would be permitted onsite.	Retain permitted activity status for activities in Rules MUZ-R6-11.		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Rules
<b>S561.096</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	MUZ-R11	Oppose	This rule appears to duplicate rule MUZ-R6.	Delete Rule MUZ-R11 in its entirety.		Reject	Key Issue: MUZ Rules
<b>FS32.150</b>	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Rules

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes.</p> <p>The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts.</p> <p>The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.</p>				
<b>FS23.368</b>	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ Rules
<b>FS47.110</b>	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Rules

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document				
FS348.183	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Rules
S74.026	Brownie Family Trust	MUZ-R12	Support	The listed activities are appropriate for the Mixed Use zone provided generated effects are managed by way of resource consent.	Retain rule MUZ-R12 as notified.		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Rules
S331.082	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	MUZ-R12	Oppose	The submitter opposes rule MUZ-R12 Educational Facility (see submission #S331.017) and wishes the plan to provide for educational facilities as a permitted activity in the Mixed Use zone in the Infrastructure Chapter. In conjunction with this relief, the submitter seeks the removal of this rule from the Mixed Use zone to limit rule duplication. However, if this relief is not granted, the submitter also opposes the Discretionary activity status for educational facilities in the Mixed Use zone. The Ministry requests that educational facilities are enabled in the Mixed Use zone to serve the education needs of the community and suggest a Permitted activity status subject to compliance with the noise insulation standard. If compliance with this standard cannot be achieved, a Restricted Discretionary activity status	Delete rule MUZ-R12 Educational Facility or Amend rule MUZ-R12 Educational Facility as follows: Educational facility Activity status: <del>Restricted Discretionary</del> <b>Permitted Where: PER-1 Educational facilities established after 27 July 2022 comply with standard: NOISE-S5 Noise insulation. Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-1: Restricted discretionary Matters of discretion are restricted to: a) the matters of discretion of the infringed standard.b) traffic generation, safety and access;c) provision of parking; andd) consideration of reverse sensitivity effects.Activity status where compliance not</b>		Reject	Key Issue: Plan wide or Urban wide rules

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				is suggested with the following matters of discretion.	<b>achieved: Not applicable</b>			
<b>S74.027</b>	Brownie Family Trust	MUZ-R13	Support	The listed activities are appropriate for the Mixed Use zone provided generated effects are managed by way of resource consent.	Retain rule MUZ-R13 as notified.		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Rules
<b>S74.028</b>	Brownie Family Trust	MUZ-R14	Support	The listed activities are appropriate for the Mixed Use zone provided generated effects are managed by way of resource consent.	Retain rule MUZ-R14 as notified.		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Rules
<b>S74.029</b>	Brownie Family Trust	MUZ-R15	Support	The listed activities are appropriate for the Mixed Use zone provided generated effects are managed by way of resource consent.	Retain rule MUZ-R15 as notified.		Reject	Key Issue: MUZ Rules
<b>S385.022</b>	McDonalds Restaurants (NZ) Limited	MUZ-R16	Oppose	As noted earlier, Drive-through is not a defined activity, as such it is difficult to understand if a McDonald's drive through would be captured by this definition. On the assumption that it would be captured, McDonald's oppose Drive-through activities as a discretionary activity in the Mixed Use Zone, and notes that this activity is not currently provided for as a permitted activity in any zone. McDonalds seek that this activity be permitted in the Mixed Use Zone.	Insert provision to provide for drive-through as a permitted activity in the Mixed Use zone.		Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ Rules
<b>S74.030</b>	Brownie Family Trust	MUZ-R16	Support	The listed activities are appropriate for the Mixed Use zone provided generated effects are managed by way of resource consent.	Retain rule MUZ-R16 as notified.		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Rules
<b>FS406.067</b>	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Oppose	McDonald's seek amendments to this rule to permit drive- through	Disallow	amend MUZ-R16	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S74.031	Brownie Family Trust	MUZ-R17	Support	The listed activities are appropriate for the Mixed Use zone provided generated effects are managed by way of resource consent.	Retain rule MUZ-R17 as notified.	Accept in part	Key Issue: Residential Unit – Ground Floor
S74.032	Brownie Family Trust	MUZ-R18	Support in part	New residential units should be allowed at ground floor if appropriate urban design standards are met and the development is compatible. The other activities are best suited to other zones and should not be enabled in the Mixed Use zone.	Delete rule MUZ-R18	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ rules
S74.033	Brownie Family Trust	MUZ-R19	Support in part	New residential units should be allowed at ground floor if appropriate urban design standards are met and the development is compatible. The other activities are best suited to other zones and should not be enabled in the Mixed Use zone.	Retain rule MUZ-R19 as notified.	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ rules
S74.034	Brownie Family Trust	MUZ-R20	Support in part	New residential units should be allowed at ground floor if appropriate urban design standards are met and the development is compatible. The other activities are best suited to other zones and should not be enabled in the Mixed Use zone.	Retain rule MUZ-R20 as notified.	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ rules
S74.035	Brownie Family Trust	MUZ-R21	Support in part	New residential units should be allowed at ground floor if appropriate urban design standards are met and the development is compatible. The other activities are best suited to other zones and should not be enabled in the Mixed Use zone.	Retain rule MUZ-R21 as notified.	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ rules
S74.036	Brownie Family Trust	MUZ-R22	Support in part	New residential units should be allowed at ground floor if appropriate urban design	Retain rule MUZ-R22 as notified.	N/A	Key Issue: MUZ rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				standards are met and the development is compatible. The other activities are best suited to other zones and should not be enabled in the Mixed Use zone				
<b>S82.007</b>	Good Journey Limited	Standards	Oppose	The standards in the Mixed Use zone are opposed in part. There are apparent errors in the plan drafting such that activities that were clearly intended to be permitted, will in fact trigger resource consent on the face of the wording.	Amend the standards in the Mixed Use zone		Reject	Key Issue: MUZ standards
<b>S561.121</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Standards	Not Stated	Introduce a framework of Objectives; Policies; Standards and rules; Matters of discretion; and Assessment Criteria to support the proposed Town Centre zone. In particular, a Town Centre zone is sought for Kerikeri to enable up to 6 storey buildings. Increased development height is sought for Kerikeri to support business and residential investment in the centre. While it is understood that FNDC are currently reviewing infrastructure within the District, it is noted that the Kerikeri - Waipapa Structure Plan 2007 (KKWSP) promotes a Mixed use zoned land and provision for a higher density Residential zone within the networked area. The findings of the current infrastructure review should be integrated into the zoning provisions for Kerikeri.	Insert new provisions as set out in Appendix 5 to support the introduction of the proposed Town Centre zone.		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>FS172.179</b>	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support in part	For the reasons set out in this primary submission and in my primary submission to review commercial zones (support TCZ but not 6 storey height).	Allow in part		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>FS42.006</b>	Ara Poutama Aotearoa the		Neutral	Submitter is neutral on the relief sought but seeks that Community corrections sites support offenders living in the	Not stated	Retain proposed rule TCZ-R5, which provides for residential units as a permitted activity.	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
	Department of Corrections			community (the activity would default to a discretionary activity status under proposed rule TCZ-R10). The submitter looks to locate its sites in areas that are easily accessible to offenders, and near other supporting government agencies. As such, sites are commonly located within central business areas (i.e. town centre zones). The demand for both community corrections activities and the submitters residential activities will increase as a result of residential intensification and consequential population growth. The submitter needs to be able to meet that demand, therefore it is important that this is enabled by the relevant plan provisions.		Insert new permitted activity rule for community corrections activity in the TCZ where activity status where compliance not achieved is not applicable.		
FS32.175	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	<p>The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes.</p> <p>The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts.</p>	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.				
<b>FS23.393</b>	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>FS47.135</b>	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>FS348.208</b>	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>FS584.007</b>	Peter Malcolm		Support	Support enabling building heights up to 6 storeys (22m) in the Kerikeri Town Centre. There is currently a shortage of affordable and public housing within	Allow in part	Amend the Proposed District Plan to enable building heights up to 6 storeys (22m)	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				this area. Central Kerikeri is an appropriate location to enable residential intensification as it has sufficient servicing, low natural hazard risk and is accessible to public transport, services and amenities. Enabling intensification within the Kerikeri Town Centre will help reduce sprawl, improve economic viability and promote vibrant communities.			
<b>S74.004</b>	Brownie Family Trust	MUZ-S1	Support	Planning Maps - Building Height Limit (Area A). The height limit is appropriate to ensure that residential development is not dominated by an inappropriate scale of development. The height limit is compatible with existing development.	Retain the Building Height Limit (Area A) overlay as notified.	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ standards
<b>S179.047</b>	Russell Protection Society (INC)	MUZ-S1	Oppose	the Russell commercial area is characterized by single and two story buildings which blend in well with the village atmosphere of the township. The operative district plan recognizes this by specifying the following: (b) The maximum height of any building in the following Commercial zones shall be 8.5m: (i) Russell (Map 89)	Amend to reflect operative plan height limit for Russell commercial area of 8.m , consistent with the proposals for Paihia	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ standards
<b>S427.020</b>	Kapiro Residents Association	MUZ-S1	Support in part	Allowing exceptions to the height limit of 12m, would undermine the Council's objective.	Retain proposed maximum height restriction of 12m in the Mixed Use Zone and exceptions to these height limits should not be allowed for multi-unit developments or other purpose.	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ standards
<b>S320.016</b>	Far North Holdings Limited	MUZ-S1	Not Stated	The submitter considers that standard MUZ-S1 should include additional clauses which are appropriate for all of the Far North Holdings Ltd (FNHL) landholdings, as it better reflects existing, consented and proposed land uses. (s32 assessment provided with submission).	Insert into standard MUZ-S1 Maximum Height, two additional clauses as follows: The maximum height of a building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure, is 12m above ground level, except: i. the maximum height differs within the following areas that are mapped within Paihia:	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ standards

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Area A: 8.5m</li> <li>• Area B: 10m; and</li> </ul> ii. that any fence or standalone wall along a side or rear boundary which adjoins a site zoned General Residential, Rural Residential, Rural Lifestyle, Māori Purpose - Urban, Open Space, Natural Open Space, or Sport and Recreation does not exceed 2m in height. <b>iii. The height limit within the OMDA is 16m above ground level.</b> <b>iv. The height limit at Marine Business Park, Commercial Estate, and Colenzo Triangle where the maximum height limit is 12m.</b>			
<b>S251.013</b>	New Zealand Maritime Parks Ltd	MUZ-S1	Support	NZMPL supports the 12m building height for buildings and structures.	Retain Standard MUZ-S1		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ standards
<b>FS400.018</b>	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Support	Submission 251 rightly notes that the underlying analyses related to the Coastal Environment provisions has not sufficiently considered the appropriate implementation of these provision in the urban environment. Specific provisions such a height limits and gross floor area restrictions (for example) require flexibility when considered against the urban environment values and existing environment.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ standards
<b>FS396.018</b>	Ed and Inge Amsler		Support	Submission 251 rightly notes that the underlying analyses related to the Coastal Environment provisions has not sufficiently considered the appropriate implementation of these provision in the urban environment. Specific provisions such a height limits	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ standards

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				and gross floor area restrictions (for example) require flexibility when considered against the urban environment values and existing environment				
<b>FS452.0100</b>	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs seeks amendments to this standard to reflect amendments sought in MUZ-R1	Disallow	amend MUZ-S1	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ standards
<b>FS406.070</b>	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Support	McDonald's support the retention of this standard	Allow	retain MUZ-S1	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ standards
<b>S344.030</b>	Paihia Properties Holdings Corporate Trustee Limited and UP Management Ltd	MUZ-S1	Not Stated	It is considered that a GFA of less than 400m2 with a default to discretionary activity where compliance cannot be achieved is particularly onerous within the MUZ given this is the only commercial zone providing for supermarket activities. It is considered that building bulk and scale should be managed separately to the scale of activities, MUZ-R1 note is confusing these effects, resulting unnecessary restrictions upon activities within the MUZ.	Amend Standards MUZ S1-S9 to give effect to the relief sought for MUZ-R1 (inferred)		Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ rules
<b>FS452.095</b>	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Support	Foodstuffs supports amendments to the provisions.	Allow	amend MUZ-R1	Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ rules
<b>FS452.106</b>	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Support	Foodstuffs seeks amendments to this standard to reflect amendments sought in MUZ-R1	Allow	amend MUZ-S1	Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ rules
<b>FS396.051</b>	Ed and Inge Amsler		Support	The submission seeks various changes in relation to the urban environment / coastal environment interface as well as specific provisions in the Mixed Use Zone. Additionally, the submission seeks better reflection of business land needs that should be reflected throughout the Plan.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>S74.037</b>	Brownie Family Trust	MUZ-S1	Support	The height restriction in Area A is appropriate given the existing development and surrounding mapped overlays.	Retain standard MUZ-S1 as notified.		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ standards
<b>FS542.098</b>	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs seeks amendments to this standard to reflect amendments sought in MUZ-R1.	Disallow	amend MUZ-S1	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ standards
<b>FS406.068</b>	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Support	McDonald's support the retention of this standard	Allow	retain MUZ-S1	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ standards
<b>S522.019</b>	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	MUZ-S1	Support	The current height restriction of 12m in the Mixed Use zone should be strictly adhered to. Exceptions to this height limit should not be allowed for multi-unit developments or other purpose.	Retain Standard MUZ-S1		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ standards
<b>FS542.099</b>	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs seeks amendments to this standard to reflect amendments sought in MUZ-R1.	Disallow	amend MUZ-S1	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ standards
<b>FS406.069</b>	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Support	McDonald's support the retention of this standard	Allow	retain MUZ-S1	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ standards
<b>FS277.59</b>	Jenny Collison		Support	12 meters should be the maximum height	Allow		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ standards
<b>FS566.1758</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ standards
<b>S338.023</b>	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	MUZ-S1	Not Stated	The current height restriction of 12m in the Mixed Use zone should be strictly adhered to. Exceptions to this height limit should not be allowed for multi-unit developments or other purpose.	Retain Standard MUZ-S1		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ standards

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS542.101	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs seeks amendments to this standard to reflect amendments sought in MUZ-R1	Disallow	amend MUZ-S1	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ standards
FS406.071	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Support	McDonald's support the retention of this standard	Allow	retain MUZ-S1	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ standards
FS277.60	Jenny Collison		Support	12 meters should be the maximum height	Allow		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ standards
FS570.964	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ standards
FS566.978	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ standards
FS569.1000	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ standards
S341.007	Ed and Inge Amsler	MUZ-S1	Oppose	The standard allows 12m building height which is supported to encourage development.	Retain maximum height limit in MUZ-S1.		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ standards
FS542.102	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs seeks amendments to this standard to reflect amendments sought in MUZ-R1	Disallow	amend MUZ-S1	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ standards
FS406.072	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Support	McDonald's support the retention of this standard	Allow	retain MUZ-S1	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ standards
S529.028	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	MUZ-S1	Support	The current height restriction of 12m in the Mixed Use zone should be strictly adhered to. Exceptions to this height limit should not be allowed for multi-unit developments or other purpose.	Retain Standard MUZ-S1		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ standards

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS542.103	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs seeks amendments to this standard to reflect amendments sought in MUZ-R1	Disallow	amend MUZ-S1	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ standards
FS406.073	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Support	McDonald's support the retention of this standard	Allow	retain MUZ-S1	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ standards
FS570.1918	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ standards
FS566.1932	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ standards
FS569.1954	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ standards
S385.023	McDonalds Restaurants (NZ) Limited	MUZ-S1	Support	McDonald's supports the 12m building height for buildings and structures.	Retain as notified		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ standards
FS542.104	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs seeks amendments to this standard to reflect amendments sought in MUZ-R1	Disallow	amend MUZ-S1	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ standards
S449.029	Kapiro Conservation Trust	MUZ-S1	Support	The current height restriction of 12m in the Mixed Use zone should be strictly adhered to. Exceptions to this height limit should not be allowed for multi-unit developments or other purpose.	Retain Standard MUZ-S1		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ standards
FS542.105	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs seeks amendments to this standard to reflect amendments sought in MUZ-R1	Disallow	amend MUZ-S1	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ standards
FS406.074	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Support	McDonald's support the retention of this standard	Allow	retain MUZ-S1	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ standards

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS569.1828	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ standards
FS570.1845	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ standards
S431.109	John Andrew Riddell	MUZ-S1	Not Stated	The Mixed Use Zone applies to parts of Kororāreka/Russell. Some of the provisions in the Mixed Use Zone should be amended to ensure consistency with the Kororāreka Russell Township Zone and with the Kororāreka Russell Heritage Area Overlay	Amend standard MUZ-S1 so that a maximum height of 8.5 m applies to the Mixed Use zone at Kororāreka/Russell		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ standards
FS332.109	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	Key Issue: MUZ standards
S431.110	John Andrew Riddell	MUZ-S1	Not Stated	The Mixed Use Zone applies to parts of Kororāreka/Russell. Some of the provisions in the Mixed Use Zone should be amended to ensure consistency with the Kororāreka Russell Township Zone and with the Kororāreka Russell Heritage Area Overlay	Amend the Mixed Use Zone standard to ensure consistency the Kororāreka Russell provisions.		Reject	Key Issue: MUZ standards
FS332.110	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	Key Issue: MUZ standards
S74.038	Brownie Family Trust	MUZ-S2	Support in part	The intention of the standard is supported in principle. To create compatible developments some effects may also	Insert provisions in standard MUZ-S2 to control the impact of development within the Mixed Use zone		Reject	Key Issue: MUZ standards

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				be needed within the zone and not just between zone boundaries.				
<b>S341.008</b>	Ed and Inge Amsler	MUZ-S2	Oppose	It is unclear what the true shadowing effects may be from a potential development on the Marsden Road site to the adjoining Natural Open Space Zone which is currently vegetated. Exemptions should be provided where these situations occur.	Amend to provide exemptions should be made for areas which adjoin Open Space or Natural Open Space zones currently covered in protected vegetation in MUZ-S2.		Reject	Key Issue: MUZ standards
<b>S431.186</b>	John Andrew Riddell	MUZ-S2	Not Stated	Not stated	Retain the approach varying the required height to boundary depending on the orientation of the relevant boundary.		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ standards
<b>S251.014</b>	New Zealand Maritime Parks Ltd	MUZ-S2	Support	NZMPL supports no height in relation to boundary standard for where the site adjoins industrial or mixed use zoned sites.	Retain Standard MUZ-S2		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ standards
<b>FS400.019</b>	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Support	Submission 251 rightly notes that the underlying analyses related to the Coastal Environment provisions has not sufficiently considered the appropriate implementation of these provision in the urban environment. Specific provisions such a height limits and gross floor area restrictions (for example) require flexibility when considered against the urban environment values and existing environment.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ standards
<b>FS396.019</b>	Ed and Inge Amsler		Support	Submission 251 rightly notes that the underlying analyses related to the Coastal Environment provisions has not sufficiently considered the appropriate implementation of these provision in the urban environment. Specific provisions such a height limits and gross floor area restrictions (for example) require flexibility when considered against	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ standards

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				the urban environment values and existing environment				
<b>FS542.109</b>	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs seeks amendments to this standard to reflect amendments sought in MUZ-R1	Disallow	amend MUZ-S2	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ standards
<b>FS406.076</b>	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Support	McDonald's support the retention of this standard	Allow	retain MUZ-S2	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ standards
<b>S385.024</b>	McDonalds Restaurants (NZ) Limited	MUZ-S2	Support	McDonald's supports no height in relation to boundary standard for where the site adjoins industrial or mixed use zoned sites.	Retain as notified		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ standards
<b>FS542.108</b>	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs seeks amendments to this standard to reflect amendments sought in MUZ-R1	Disallow	amend MUZ-S@	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ standards
<b>S344.033</b>	Paihia Properties Holdings Corporate Trustee Limited and UP Management Ltd	MUZ-S2	Not Stated	It is considered that a GFA of less than 400m2 with a default to discretionary activity where compliance cannot be achieved is particularly onerous within the MUZ given this is the only commercial zone providing for supermarket activities. It is considered that building bulk and scale should be managed separately to the scale of activities, MUZ-R1 note is confusing these effects, resulting unnecessary restrictions upon activities within the MUZ.	Amend Standards MUZ S1-S9 to give effect to the releif sought for MUZ-R1 (inferred)		Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ Rules
<b>FS542.110</b>	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Support	Foodstuffs seeks amendments to this standard to reflect amendments sought in MUZ-R1	Allow	amend MUZ-S2	Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ Rules
<b>FS396.054</b>	Ed and Inge Amsler		Support	The submission seeks various changes in relation to the urban environment / coastal environment interface as well as specific provisions in the Mixed Use Zone. Additionally, the submission seeks	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				better reflection of business land needs that should be reflected throughout the Plan.				
<b>S431.111</b>	John Andrew Riddell	MUZ-S2	Not Stated	The Mixed Use Zone applies to parts of Kororāreka/Russell. Some of the provisions in the Mixed Use Zone should be amended to ensure consistency with the Kororāreka Russell Township Zone and with the Kororāreka Russell Heritage Area Overlay	Amend the Mixed Use Zone standard to be consistent with the Kororāreka Russell provisions.		Reject	Key Issue: MUZ Standards
<b>FS332.111</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.	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ Standards
<b>S179.048</b>	Russell Protection Society (INC)	MUZ-S2	Support		Retain MUZ-S2		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Standards
<b>FS406.075</b>	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Support	McDonald's support the retention of this standard	Allow	retain MUZ-S2	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Standards
<b>S74.039</b>	Brownie Family Trust	MUZ-S3	Support in part	Setbacks between developments are necessary to ensure that adverse effects are appropriately. Zero setbacks can compromise urban amenity. Quality Urban design can manage effects such as shading.	Insert controls in standard MUZ-S3 to manage effects generated between developments within the Mixed Use zone.		Reject	Key Issue: MUZ Standards
<b>S256.002</b>	Josh Henwood	MUZ-S3	Oppose	We do not support this standard because we do not believe such large setbacks are necessary, as may loose significant areas of buildable land.	Amend standard to a minimum setback of 1.2 metres		Reject	Key Issue: MUZ Standards
<b>S285.003</b>	Leisa Henwood	MUZ-S3	Oppose	We do not believe set backs are necessary. Our flat site is very small and set backs we will loose a significant portion of our land	Delete standard MUZ-S3 so there are no setbacks required in MUZ.		Reject	Key Issue: MUZ Standards

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S289.003	Terry Henwood	MUZ-S3	Oppose	We do not believe set backs are necessary. Our flat site is very small and set backs we will loose a significant portion of our land	Delete standard MUZ-S3 so there are no setbacks required in MUZ.	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ Standards
S294.002	Bruce and Kim Rogers	MUZ-S3	Support	Support this standard as setbacks in the Mixed Use zone are not necessary and if setbacks were required they would lose the use of a significant portion of their land.	Retain the standard with no setbacks for sites in the Mixed Use Zone (inferred because standard only applies setbacks where sites adjoin other more sensitive zones).	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Standards
S341.009	Ed and Inge Amsler	MUZ-S3	Support in part	With such a narrow site, the Marsden Road property needs minimal setbacks to enjoy potential development opportunities.  The 0m road setback is supported as a means to located buildings close to the road frontage.	Delete rear setback of 3m from a Natural Open Space zone, and retain the 0m setback from the road is supported in MUZ-S3.	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ Standards
S512.077	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	MUZ-S3	Support in part	Setbacks play a role in reducing spread of fire as well as ensuring Fire and Emergency personnel can get to a fire source or other emergency. An advice note is recommended to raise to plan users (e.g. developers) early on in the resource consent process that there is further control of building setbacks and firefighting access through the New Zealand Building Code (NZBC).	Insert advice note to setback standard <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	Key Issues: Plan wide or urban wide issues
S251.015	New Zealand Maritime Parks Ltd	MUZ-S3	Support	NZMPL support no setback requirements where the site adjoins industrial or mixed use zoned	Retain Standard MUZ-S3	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Standards

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS400.020	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Support	Submission 251 rightly notes that the underlying analyses related to the Coastal Environment provisions has not sufficiently considered the appropriate implementation of these provision in the urban environment. Specific provisions such a height limits and gross floor area restrictions (for example) require flexibility when considered against the urban environment values and existing environment.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Standards
FS396.020	Ed and Inge Amsler		Support	Submission 251 rightly notes that the underlying analyses related to the Coastal Environment provisions has not sufficiently considered the appropriate implementation of these provision in the urban environment. Specific provisions such a height limits and gross floor area restrictions (for example) require flexibility when considered against the urban environment values and existing environment	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Standards
FS542.112	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs seeks amendments to this standard to reflect amendments sought in MUZ-R1	Disallow	amend MUZ-S3	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ Standards
FS406.078	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Support	McDonald's support the retention of this standard	Allow	retain MUZ-S3	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Standards
S179.049	Russell Protection Society (INC)	MUZ-S3	Support		Retain MUZ-S3		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Standards
FS542.111	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs seeks amendments to this standard to reflect amendments sought in MUZ-R1	Disallow	amend MUZ-S3	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ Standards

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS406.077	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Support	McDonald's support the retention of this standard	Allow	retain MUZ-S3	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Standards
S385.025	McDonalds Restaurants (NZ) Limited	MUZ-S3	Support	McDonald's support no setback requirements where the site adjoins industrial or mixed use zoned	Retain as notified		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ Standards
FS542.113	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs seeks amendments to this standard to reflect amendments sought in MUZ-R1	Disallow	amend MUZ-S3	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ Standards
S344.034	Paihia Properties Holdings Corporate Trustee Limited and UP Management Ltd	MUZ-S3	Not Stated	It is considered that a GFA of less than 400m2 with a default to discretionary activity where compliance cannot be achieved is particularly onerous within the MUZ given this is the only commercial zone providing for supermarket activities. It is considered that building bulk and scale should be managed separately to the scale of activities, MUZ-R1 note is confusing these effects, resulting unnecessary restrictions upon activities within the MUZ.	Amend Standards MUZ S1-S9 to give effect to the relief sought for MUZ-R1 (inferred)		Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ Rules
FS542.114	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Support	Foodstuffs seeks amendments to this standard to reflect amendments sought in MUZ-R1	Allow	amend MUZ-S3	Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ Rules
FS396.055	Ed and Inge Amsler		Support	The submission seeks various changes in relation to the urban environment / coastal environment interface as well as specific provisions in the Mixed Use Zone. Additionally, the submission seeks better reflection of business land needs that should be reflected throughout the Plan.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ Rules
S431.112	John Andrew Riddell	MUZ-S3	Not Stated	The Mixed Use Zone applies to parts of Kororāreka/Russell. Some of the provisions in the Mixed Use Zone should be amended to ensure	Amend the Mixed Use Zone standard to be consistent with the Kororāreka Russell provisions.		Reject	Key Issue: MUZ Standards

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				consistency with the Kororāreka Russell Township Zone and with the Kororāreka Russell Heritage Area Overlay				
FS332.112	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ Standards
S416.062	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	MUZ-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.</p> <p>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. 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</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>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</li> <li>the safe and efficient operation of the rail network</li> </ul>	Accept in part	Key Issue: Plan wide or urban wide issues	

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>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. 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</p>			

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				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.				
FS243.148	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the requested 5m setback; a considerably reduced setback 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:	Reject	Key Issue: Plan wide or urban wide issues
S368.094	Far North District Council	MUZ-S5	Support in part	Drafting change to improve readability and understanding	Amend MUZ-S5 ..... 1 . At least 65% of the building frontage at ground floor must be clear glazing; and  2. The principal public entrance to the building must be located on the <b>road-front</b> boundary.		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs
S336.020	Z Energy Limited	MUZ-S5	Support in part	The pedestrian frontage overlays are identified on both road boundaries at Z Kaikohe and the Commerce Street Road boundary at the Z service station in Kaitaia. Standard MUZ-S5 would apply if Z Energy, on their established sites, was seeking consent for a building or structure, and states: "The principal public entrance to the building must be located on the front boundary". This built-form outcome is not necessarily practical in the context of a service station and is incongruous with the permitted activity status of service stations under Rule MUZ-R2. Service stations are vehicle-oriented activities and the "entrance" or	Amend Standard MUZ-S5 (inferred) to acknowledge that in some circumstances it may not be appropriate for a building to be located on the front boundary of the site, as follows: For sites with pedestrian frontage identified on the planning maps:  1. At least 65% of the building frontage at ground floor <del>must be</del> is clear glazing; and  2. The principal public entrance to the building must be located on the front boundary, <b>Except where the activity is a service station.</b>		Reject	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				entrances to a service station site are typically via vehicle accesses from a main road or roads to a forecourt, with the retail building setback within the site for functional reasons. Requiring a resource consent application for infringing this standard due to a functional requirement, particularly where associated with a lawfully established activity, is not considered the most appropriate way of achieving the intended outcome of the zone and standard.				
<b>S363.023</b>	Foodstuffs North Island Limited	MUZ-S5	Not Stated	The submitter considers that standard MUZ-S5 Pedestrian Frontage, is particularly onerous given that the within the MUZ is the only commercial zone providing for supermarket activities.	Amend standard MUZ-S5 Pedestrian Frontage, to provide an exemption for supermarkets from pedestrian frontage requirements.		Reject	Key Issue: Supermarkets
<b>S74.041</b>	Brownie Family Trust	MUZ-S5	Support	The provision enables active frontages.	Retain standard MUZ-S5 as notified		Reject	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs
<b>FS542.118</b>	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs seeks amendments to this standard to provide and exemption for supermarkets.	Disallow	amend MUZ-S5	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs
<b>S179.051</b>	Russell Protection Society (INC)	MUZ-S5	Support		Retain MUZ-S5		Reject	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs
<b>FS542.119</b>	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs seeks amendments to this standard to provide and exemption for supermarkets.	Disallow	amend MUZ-S5	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs
<b>S257.002</b>	Te Hiku Community Board	MUZ-S5	Support	We support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have	Retain MUZ-S5 standards for pedestrian frontages identified on the planning maps.		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				presented and upkept to maintain Amenity values in town centres.				
FS542.120	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs seeks amendments to this standard to provide and exemption for supermarkets.	Disallow	amend MUZ-S5	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs
S358.002	Leah Frieling	MUZ-S5	Support	We support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkept to maintain amenity values in town centres.	Retain Standard MUZ-S5 for pedestrian frontages identified on the planning maps.		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs
FS542.121	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs seeks amendments to this standard to provide and exemption for supermarkets.	Disallow	amend MUZ-S5	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs
S357.002	Sean Frieling	MUZ-S5	Support	Support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkept to maintain Amenity values in town centres.	Retain MUZ-S5 standards for pedestrian frontages identified on the planning maps.		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs
FS542.122	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs seeks amendments to this standard to provide and exemption for supermarkets.	Disallow	amend MUZ-S5	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs
S472.002	Michael Foy	MUZ-S5	Support	We support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkept to maintain Amenity values in town centres.	Retain MUZ-S5 standards for pedestrian frontages identified on the planning maps		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs
FS542.123	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs seeks amendments to this standard to provide and exemption for supermarkets.	Disallow	amend MUZ-S5	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>S344.036</b>	Paihia Properties Holdings Corporate Trustee Limited and UP Management Ltd	MUZ-S5	Not Stated	It is considered that a GFA of less than 400m <sup>2</sup> with a default to discretionary activity where compliance cannot be achieved is particularly onerous within the MUZ given this is the only commercial zone providing for supermarket activities. It is considered that building bulk and scale should be managed separately to the scale of activities, MUZ-R1 note is confusing these effects, resulting unnecessary restrictions upon activities within the MUZ.	Amend Standards MUZ S1-S9 to give effect to the relief sought for MUZ-R1 (inferred)		Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ Rules
<b>FS542.124</b>	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Support	Foodstuffs supports amendments to reflect sought in MUZ-R1.	Allow	amend MUZ-S5	Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ Rules
<b>FS396.057</b>	Ed and Inge Amsler		Support	The submission seeks various changes in relation to the urban environment / coastal environment interface as well as specific provisions in the Mixed Use Zone. Additionally, the submission seeks better reflection of business land needs that should be reflected throughout the Plan.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ Rules
<b>S336.021</b>	Z Energy Limited	MUZ-S6	Support in part	Standard MUZ-S6 requires, for sites with a pedestrian frontage identified on the planning maps: (1) all buildings (including alterations and extensions to existing) to be built up to the road boundary; and (2) that a verandah on the relevant road boundary is provided. The performance standard would appear to relate to buildings only which is supported however it is a performance standard associated with permitted activity Rule MUZ-R1 which permits new buildings and structures... the principle of the standard is supported insofar as it related to new or altered buildings, but not a structure.	Amend Standard MUZ-S6 (inferred) to clarify that it does not apply to buildings that have a functional need to be set back from the road boundary, as follows: For sites with pedestrian frontage identified on the planning maps: 1. Any new building, or extension or alteration to a building (including alterations to the façade) must be built up to the road boundary; and 2. A verandah must be provided for the full frontage of the road boundary of the site. The verandah shall: a. directly adjoin any adjacent veranda so there is no horizontal gap to provide continuous pedestrian coverage; and b. have a minimum height of 3m and a maximum height of 6m above the footpath immediately		Reject	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>The standard appears to apply if Z Energy was seeking consent for a building on an existing site with a pedestrian frontage, and requires a building at the relevant road boundary and a verandah to extend the full width of the building elevation. This is not practical in the context of a service station, where the buildings on the site are usually a canopy over the refuelling area and the ancillary retail building to one side or to the rear.</p> <p>Z Energy considers that greater recognition of these existing activities and their operational and functional requirements that prevent compliance is needed, noting the investment associated with the existing commercial activities, the benefits they provide to the community and the need for them to be maintained and upgraded from time to time.</p> <p>Furthermore, requiring a resource consent application for infringing this standard due to a functional requirement in particular, that associated with a lawfully established activity, is not considered the most appropriate way of achieving the intended outcome of the zone and standard.</p>	<p>below; and c.be setback a minimum of 300mm and a maximum of 600mm from a vertical line measured up from the face of the kerb.<b>Except where the activity is a service station.</b></p>		
S385.026	McDonalds Restaurants (NZ) Limited	MUZ-S6	Support in part	<p>McDonald's Kerikeri is subject to a pedestrian frontage overlay. McDonalds seek that MUZ-S6 be amended so that it does not apply to extensions and alterations.</p> <p>Further, McDonald's considers that 65% clear glazing on building frontages will generate issues in terms of passive solar gain and seek that this be reduced. It is difficult to understand the justification behind this figure, accordingly, McDonald's seeks that this</p>	<p>Amend MUZ-S6 as follows (or to same effect). For sites with pedestrian frontage identified on the planning maps:<b>1.Any new building must have:1.a.</b> At least <b>25%65%</b> of the building frontage at ground floor must be clear glazing; and<b>2.b.</b>The principal public entrance to the building must be located on the front boundary</p>	Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				be reduced to 25% which will still provide for active street frontages.				
<b>S363.024</b>	Foodstuffs North Island Limited	MUZ-S6	Not Stated	The submitter considers that standard MUZ-S6 Verandah, is particularly onerous given that the within the MUZ is the only commercial zone providing for supermarket activities.	Amend standard MUZ-S6 Verandah, to provide an exemption for supermarkets from verandah requirements.		Reject	Key Issue: Supermarkets
<b>S74.042</b>	Brownie Family Trust	MUZ-S6	Support	Verandahs provide a pleasant environment in a commercial setting.	Retain standard MUZ-S6 as notified		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs
<b>FS542.125</b>	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs seeks amendments to this standard to provide and exemption for supermarkets.	Disallow	amend MUZ-S6	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs
<b>FS406.079</b>	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Oppose	McDonald's seeks changes to the Pedestrian frontage overlay so it doesn't apply to extensions and alterations.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs
<b>S179.052</b>	Russell Protection Society (INC)	MUZ-S6	Support		Retain MUZ-S6		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs
<b>FS542.126</b>	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs seeks amendments to this standard to provide and exemption for supermarkets.	Disallow	amend MUZ-S6	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs
<b>FS406.080</b>	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Oppose	McDonald's seeks changes to the Pedestrian frontage overlay so it doesn't apply to extensions and alterations.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs
<b>S257.003</b>	Te Hiku Community Board	MUZ-S6	Support	We support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkept to maintain Amenity values in town centres.	Retain MUZ-S6 standards for verandahs on sites with pedestrian frontage identified on the planning maps.		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS542.127	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs seeks amendments to this standard to provide and exemption for supermarkets.	Disallow	amend MUZ-S6	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs
FS406.081	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Oppose	McDonald's seeks changes to the Pedestrian frontage overlay so it doesn't apply to extensions and alterations.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs
S541.013	Elbury Holdings	MUZ-S6	Support	We support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkept to maintain Amenity values in town centres.	Retain MUZ-S6 standards for verandahs on sites with pedestrian frontage identified on the planning maps.		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs
FS542.128	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs seeks amendments to this standard to provide and exemption for supermarkets.	Disallow	amend MUZ-S6	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs
FS406.082	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Oppose	McDonald's seeks changes to the Pedestrian frontage overlay so it doesn't apply to extensions and alterations.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs
S485.015	Elbury Holdings	MUZ-S6	Support	support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkept to maintain Amenity values in town centres.	Retain MUZ-S6 as notified.		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs
FS542.129	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs seeks amendments to this standard to provide and exemption for supermarkets.	Disallow	amend MUZ-S6	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs
FS406.083	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Oppose	McDonald's seeks changes to the Pedestrian frontage overlay so it doesn't apply to extensions and alterations.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S519.015	Elbury Holdings	MUZ-S6	Support	We support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkept to maintain Amenity values in town centres.	Retain MUZ-S6 as notified.		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs
FS542.130	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs seeks amendments to this standard to provide and exemption for supermarkets.	Disallow	amend MUZ-S6	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs
FS406.084	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Oppose	McDonald's seeks changes to the Pedestrian frontage overlay so it doesn't apply to extensions and alterations.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs
S358.003	Leah Frieling	MUZ-S6	Support	We support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkept to maintain amenity values in town centres.	Retain Standard MUZ-S6		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs
FS542.131	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs seeks amendments to this standard to provide and exemption for supermarkets.	Disallow	amend MUZ-S6	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs
FS406.085	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Oppose	McDonald's seeks changes to the Pedestrian frontage overlay so it doesn't apply to extensions and alterations.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs
S357.003	Sean Frieling	MUZ-S6	Support	Support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkept to maintain Amenity values in town centres.	Retain MUZ-S6 standards for verandahs on sites with pedestrian frontage identified on the planning maps.		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs
FS542.132	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs seeks amendments to this standard to provide and exemption for supermarkets.	Allow in part	amend MUZ-S6	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS406.086	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Oppose	McDonald's seeks changes to the Pedestrian frontage overlay so it doesn't apply to extensions and alterations.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs
S472.003	Michael Foy	MUZ-S6	Support	We support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkept to maintain Amenity values in town centres.	Retain MUZ-S6 standards for verandahs on sites with pedestrian frontage identified on the planning maps.		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs
FS542.133	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs seeks amendments to this standard to provide and exemption for supermarkets.	Disallow	amend MUZ-S6	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs
FS406.087	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Oppose	McDonald's seeks changes to the Pedestrian frontage overlay so it doesn't apply to extensions and alterations.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs
S543.014	LJ King Limited	MUZ-S6	Support	We support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkept to maintain Amenity values in town centres.	Retain MUZ-S6 as notified.		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs
FS542.134	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs seeks amendments to this standard to provide and exemption for supermarkets.	Disallow	amend MUZ-S6	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs
FS406.088	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Oppose	McDonald's seeks changes to the Pedestrian frontage overlay so it doesn't apply to extensions and alterations.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs
FS566.2175	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>S547.014</b>	LJ King Limited	MUZ-S6	Support	We support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkept to maintain Amenity values in town centres.	Retain MUZ-S6 as notified		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs
<b>FS542.135</b>	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs seeks amendments to this standard to provide and exemption for supermarkets.	Disallow	amend MUZ-S6	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs
<b>FS406.089</b>	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Oppose	McDonald's seeks changes to the Pedestrian frontage overlay so it doesn't apply to extensions and alterations.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs
<b>S464.014</b>	LJ King Ltd	MUZ-S6	Support	Support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mixed use zones to have presented and upkept to maintain amenity values in town centres.	Retain MUZ-S6 as notified.		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs
<b>FS542.136</b>	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs seeks amendments to this standard to provide and exemption for supermarkets.	Disallow	amend MUZ-S6	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs
<b>FS406.090</b>	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Oppose	McDonald's seeks changes to the Pedestrian frontage overlay so it doesn't apply to extensions and alterations.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs
<b>FS566.1559</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs
<b>S344.037</b>	Paihia Properties Holdings Corporate Trustee Limited and UP	MUZ-S6	Not Stated	It is considered that a GFA of less than 400m2 with a default to discretionary activity where compliance cannot be achieved is particularly onerous within the MUZ given this is the only commercial zone providing for	Amend Standards MUZ S1-S9 to give effect to the relief sought for MUZ-R1 (inferred)		Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
	Management Ltd			supermarket activities. It is considered that building bulk and scale should be managed separately to the scale of activities, MUZ-R1 note is confusing these effects, resulting unnecessary restrictions upon activities within the MUZ.				
FS542.137	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Support	Foodstuffs supports relief sought to reflect amendment sought in MUZR1.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ rules
FS396.058	Ed and Inge Amsler		Support	The submission seeks various changes in relation to the urban environment / coastal environment interface as well as specific provisions in the Mixed Use Zone. Additionally, the submission seeks better reflection of business land needs that should be reflected throughout the Plan.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ rules
S501.001	Kaitaia Business Association	MUZ-S6	Support in part	Request an amendment to Standard MUZ-S6 and introduction of bylaw that will require property owners to maintain the exterior of their buildings so the town has a presentable amenity in line with the intent of the Pedestrian Frontage Rule imposed by the District Plan. The proposed by-law (as attached to submission) will allow Council to employ contractors to complete works on those buildings detracting from the amenity of the town centre and will do the work required and bill the owner accordingly.	Amend Standard MUZ-S6 to include new point 3. as follows: <b>3.Verandah facades must comply with the Amenity Protection By-Law and be regularly maintained and cleaned accordingly.</b> <i>(Refer to submission for a copy of proposed bylaw)</i>		Reject	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs
FS243.194	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the introduction of an Amenity Protection Bylaw. It is a separate process for creating a bylaw and this PDP is not the process or document.	Disallow	Seeks to introduce Amenity Protection Bylaw and requirements around the maintenance of facades. Amend Standard MUZ-S6 to	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					include new point 3. as follows: .....		
S502.032	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	MUZ-S6	Support in part	The Kaitia Business Association recently commissioned a Retail Strategy Report completed by First Retail which discusses the unmaintained buildings and dated public realm that creates an impression of decline. The sites with Pedestrian Frontage have existing verandas some of which are well maintained and contribute to the overall vibrancy of the town centre. Other sites have been left to become dilapidated and unattractive with old signage from 20+ years ago with peeling paint and mould which detracts from the overall amenity of the town centre.	Amend MUZ-S6 For sites with pedestrian frontage identified on the planning maps: 1. Any new building, or extension or alteration to a building (including alterations to the façade) must be built up to the road boundary; and 2. A verandah must be provided for the full frontage of the road boundary of the site. The verandah shall: a. directly adjoin any adjacent veranda so there is no horizontal gap to provide continuous pedestrian coverage; and b. have a minimum height of 3m and a maximum height of 6m above the footpath immediately below; and c. be setback a minimum of 300mm and a maximum of 600mm from a vertical line measured up from the face of the kerb. <b>3. Verandah facades must comply with the Amenity Protection By-Law and be regularly maintained and cleaned accordingly.</b>	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs
FS243.197	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the introduction of an Amenity Protection Bylaw. It is a separate process for creating a bylaw and this PDP is not the process or document.	Disallow Seeks to implement Amenity Protection Bylaw and requirements around the maintenance of facades. Amend MUZ-S6 For sites with pedestrian frontage identified on the planning maps:.....	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs
S385.027	McDonalds Restaurants (NZ) Limited	MUZ-S7	Support in part	McDonald's Kerikeri is subject to a pedestrian frontage overlay. McDonalds seek that MUZ-S6 be amended so that it does not apply to extensions and alterations. McDonald's is concerned that this provision may prevent property owners	Amend MUZ-S7 as follows: For sites with pedestrian frontage identified on the planning maps: 1. Any new building, <del>or extension or alteration to a building (including alterations to the façade)</del> must be built	Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				upgrading the exterior of existing buildings which could result in perverse urban design outcomes and impacts on streetscape.	up to the road boundary; and 2. A verandah must be provided for the full frontage of the road boundary of the site. The verandah shall: a. directly adjoin any adjacent veranda so there is no horizontal gap to provide continuous pedestrian coverage; and b. have a minimum height of 3m and a maximum height of 6m above the footpath immediately below; and c. be setback a minimum of 300mm and a maximum of 600mm from a vertical line measured up from the face of the kerb.			
<b>S385.028</b>	McDonalds Restaurants (NZ) Limited	MUZ-S7	Support in part	McDonald's seeks flexibility within the drafting of provisions so that MUZ-S7 is not triggered where an alteration of extension to a legally established building or structure that contains a permitted activity (see sub# 18).	Amend MUZ-S7 to provide flexibility for alterations and extensions.		Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ standards
<b>S74.043</b>	Brownie Family Trust	MUZ-S7	Support	This provides for appropriate visual amenity.	Retain standard MUZ-S7 as notified		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ standards
<b>FS542.138</b>	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs supports relief sought to reflect amendment sought in MUZR1.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ standards
<b>FS406.091</b>	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Oppose	McDonald's seeks amendments to this standard to allow flexibility for additions and alterations.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ standards
<b>S179.053</b>	Russell Protection Society (INC)	MUZ-S7	Support		Retain MUZ-S7		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ standards

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS542.139	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs supports relief sought to reflect amendment sought in MUZR1.	Disallow	amend MUZ-S7	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ standards
FS406.092	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Oppose	McDonald's seeks amendments to this standard to allow flexibility for additions and alterations	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ standards
S257.004	Te Hiku Community Board	MUZ-S7	Support	We support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkept to maintain Amenity values in town centres.	Retain MUZ-S7 standards for screening of outdoor storage areas from adjoining sites and roads.		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ standards
FS542.140	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs supports relief sought to reflect amendment sought in MUZR1.	Disallow	amend MUZ-S7	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ standards
FS406.093	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Oppose	McDonald's seeks amendments to this standard to allow flexibility for additions and alterations.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ standards
S541.014	Elbury Holdings	MUZ-S7	Support	We support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkept to maintain Amenity values in town centres.	Retain MUZ-S7 standards for screening of outdoor storage areas from adjoining sites and roads.		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ standards
FS542.141	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs supports relief sought to reflect amendment sought in MUZR1.	Disallow	amend MUZ-S7	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ standards
FS406.094	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Oppose	McDonald's seeks amendments to this standard to allow flexibility for additions and alterations	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ standards
S485.016	Elbury Holdings	MUZ-S7	Support	support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have	Retain MUZ-S7 as notified.		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ standards

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				presented and upkept to maintain Amenity values in town centres.				
FS542.142	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs supports relief sought to reflect amendment sought in MUZR1.	Disallow	amend MUZ-S7	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ standards
FS406.095	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Oppose	McDonald's seeks amendments to this standard to allow flexibility for additions and alterations	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ standards
S519.016	Elbury Holdings	MUZ-S7	Support	We support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkept to maintain Amenity values in town centres.	Retain MUZ-S7 as notified.		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ standards
FS542.143	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs supports relief sought to reflect amendment sought in MUZR1.	Disallow	amend MUS-S7	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ standards
FS406.096	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Oppose	McDonald's seeks amendments to this standard to allow flexibility for additions and alterations	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ standards
S358.004	Leah Frieling	MUZ-S7	Support	We support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkept to maintain amenity values in town centres.	Retain Standard MUZ-S7		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ standards
FS542.144	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs supports relief sought to reflect amendment sought in MUZR1.	Disallow	amend MUS-S7	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ standards
FS406.097	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Oppose	McDonald's seeks amendments to this standard to allow flexibility for additions and alterations	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ standards

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S357.004	Sean Frieling	MUZ-S7	Support	Support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkept to maintain Amenity values in town centres.	Retain MUZ-S7 standards for screening of outdoor storage areas from adjoining sites and roads.		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ standards
FS542.145	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs supports relief sought to reflect amendment sought in MUZR1.	Disallow	amend MUZ-S7	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ standards
FS406.098	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Oppose	McDonald's seeks amendments to this standard to allow flexibility for additions and alterations	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ standards
S472.004	Michael Foy	MUZ-S7	Support	We support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkept to maintain Amenity values in town centres.	Retain MUZ-S7 standards for screening of outdoor storage areas from adjoining sites and roads.		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ standards
FS542.146	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs supports relief sought to reflect amendment sought in MUZR1.	Disallow	amend MUZ-S7	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ standards
FS406.099	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Oppose	McDonald's seeks amendments to this standard to allow flexibility for additions and alterations.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ standards
S543.015	LJ King Limited	MUZ-S7	Support	We support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkept to maintain Amenity values in town centres.	Retain MUZ-S7 as notified.		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ standards
FS542.147	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs supports relief sought to reflect amendment sought in MUZR1.	Disallow	amend MUZ-S7	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ standards

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS406.0100	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Oppose	McDonald's seeks amendments to this standard to allow flexibility for additions and alterations	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ standards
FS566.2176	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ standards
S547.015	LJ King Limited	MUZ-S7	Support	We support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkept to maintain Amenity values in town centres.	Retain MUZ-S7 as notified		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ standards
FS542.148	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs supports relief sought to reflect amendment sought in MUZR1.	Disallow	amend MUZ-S7	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ standards
FS406.101	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Oppose	McDonald's seeks amendments to this standard to allow flexibility for additions and alterations	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ standards
S464.015	LJ King Ltd	MUZ-S7	Support	Support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mixed use zones to have presented and upkept to maintain amenity values in town centres.	Retain MUZ-S7 as notified.		Accept	Key Issue: MUZ standards
FS542.149	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs supports relief sought to reflect amendment sought in MUZR1.	Disallow	amend MUZ-S7	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ standards
FS406.102	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Oppose	McDonald's seeks amendments to this standard to allow flexibility for additions and alterations	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ standards
FS566.1560	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ standards

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>S344.038</b>	Paihia Properties Holdings Corporate Trustee Limited and UP Management Ltd	MUZ-S7	Not Stated	It is considered that a GFA of less than 400m <sup>2</sup> with a default to discretionary activity where compliance cannot be achieved is particularly onerous within the MUZ given this is the only commercial zone providing for supermarket activities. It is considered that building bulk and scale should be managed separately to the scale of activities, MUZ-R1 note is confusing these effects, resulting unnecessary restrictions upon activities within the MUZ.	Amend Standards MUZ S1-S9 to give effect to the relief sought for MUZ-R1 (inferred)		Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ rules
<b>FS342.150</b>	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Support	Foodstuffs supports relief sought to reflect amendment sought in MUZR1.	Allow	amend MUZ-S7	Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ rules
<b>FS396.059</b>	Ed and Inge Amsler		Support	The submission seeks various changes in relation to the urban environment / coastal environment interface as well as specific provisions in the Mixed Use Zone. Additionally, the submission seeks better reflection of business land needs that should be reflected throughout the Plan.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ rules
<b>S74.044</b>	Brownie Family Trust	MUZ-S8	Support in part	The standard is supported in principle. Landscaping can soften an otherwise hard looking development.	Amend standard MUZ-S8 to include a provision to manage visibility and ensure pedestrian safety near vehicle crossings (in particular). Visual sight lines need to be maintained for the safety of traffic and pedestrians.		Reject	Key Issue: Landscaping standards
<b>S336.022</b>	Z Energy Limited	MUZ-S8	Support in part	Standard MUZ-S8 (Landscaping and screening on a road boundary) requires, inter alia, that landscaping along a road boundary shall be a minimum height of 1m at installation and shall achieve a continuous screen of 1.8m in height and 1.5m in width within five years. Any changes to existing service stations, for example, will have to consider this standard	Amend Standard MUZ-S8 to exclude existing service station sites from the landscaping requirements. This could be achieved by including the following additional exemption to the standard: 1. Where a site adjoins a road boundary, at least 50% of that road boundary not occupied by buildings or driveways shall be landscaped with plants or trees. 2. The landscaping shall be a minimum height of		Reject	Key Issue: Landscaping standards

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>which is not currently achieved at any of the three sites identified in the submission. Moreover, it is unlikely to be achievable for a number of functional requirement reasons, including traffic safety.</p> <p>Z Energy opposes the imposition of this standard to existing service stations sites. Z Energy accepts that landscaping along the road boundary can enhance the attractiveness of a site and mitigate the effects of the development of the site. For service station sites, however, incorporating trees into front boundary landscaping is problematic. It is clear from the standard that the Council anticipates the planting of trees or plants that will be substantial enough to form a visual screen over time. At service station sites, which have a significant number of traffic movements into and out of the site per day and where visibility to the forecourt and to signage is critical to a successful and safe operation, substantial trees or hedging can create a nuisance commercially and in terms of root extent and traffic safety.</p> <p>Requiring trees, and in particular in this instance, screening, can block the view of signage and the forecourt, block visibility of vehicles entering and exiting, develop root systems that interfere with existing infrastructure and services and be difficult to achieve at service stations due to vehicle crossing requirements, tanker tracking and signage visibility</p>	<p>1m at installation and shall achieve a continuous screen of 1.8m in height and 1.5m in width within five years. <b>Except where: a. the site is utilised by an existing service station activity.</b></p>		
S385.029	McDonalds Restaurants (NZ) Limited	MUZ-S8	Support in part	McDonald's seeks flexibility within the drafting of provisions so that MUZ-S7 is not triggered where an alteration of extension to a legally established	Amend MUZ-S8 to provide flexibility for alterations and extensions	Accept in part	Key Issue: Landscaping standards

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				building or structure that contains a permitted activity (see sub# 18).				
<b>S179.054</b>	Russell Protection Society (INC)	MUZ-S8	Support		Retain MUZ-S8		Accept	Key Issue: Landscaping standards
<b>FS542.151</b>	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs supports relief sought to reflect amendment sought in MUZR1.	Disallow	amend MUZ-S8	Reject	Key Issue: Landscaping standards
<b>FS406.103</b>	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Oppose	McDonald's seeks amendments to this standard to allow flexibility for additions and alterations	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Landscaping standards
<b>S257.005</b>	Te Hiku Community Board	MUZ-S8	Support	We support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkept to maintain Amenity values in town centres.	Retain MUZ-S8 standards for 50% landscaping and screening along road boundaries.		Accept	Key Issue: Landscaping standards
<b>FS542.152</b>	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs supports relief sought to reflect amendment sought in MUZR1.	Disallow	amend MUZ-S8	Reject	Key Issue: Landscaping standards
<b>FS406.104</b>	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Oppose	McDonald's seeks amendments to this standard to allow flexibility for additions and alterations	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Landscaping standards
<b>S541.015</b>	Elbury Holdings	MUZ-S8	Support	We support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkept to maintain Amenity values in town centres.	Retain MUZ-S8 standards for 50% landscaping and screening along road boundaries.		Accept	Key Issue: Landscaping standards
<b>FS542.153</b>	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs supports relief sought to reflect amendment sought in MUZR1.	Disallow	amend MUZ-S8	Reject	Key Issue: Landscaping standards
<b>FS406.105</b>	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Oppose	McDonald's seeks amendments to this standard to allow flexibility for additions and alterations	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Landscaping standards

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S485.017	Elbury Holdings	MUZ-S8	Support	support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkept to maintain Amenity values in town centres.	Retain MUZ-S8 as notified.		Accept	Key Issue: Landscaping standards
FS42.154	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs supports relief sought to reflect amendment sought in MUZR1.	Disallow	amend MUZ-S8	Reject	Key Issue: Landscaping standards
FS406.106	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Oppose	McDonald's seeks amendments to this standard to allow flexibility for additions and alterations	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Landscaping standards
S519.017	Elbury Holdings	MUZ-S8	Support	We support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkept to maintain Amenity values in town centres.	Retain MUZ-S8 as notified.		Accept	Key Issue: Landscaping standards
FS42.155	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs supports relief sought to reflect amendment sought in MUZR1.	Disallow	amend MUZ-S8	Reject	Key Issue: Landscaping standards
FS406.107	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Oppose	McDonald's seeks amendments to this standard to allow flexibility for additions and alterations	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Landscaping standards
S358.005	Leah Frieling	MUZ-S8	Support	We support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkept to maintain amenity values in town centres.	Retain Standard MUZ-S8		Accept	Key Issue: Landscaping standards
FS42.156	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs supports relief sought to reflect amendment sought in MUZR1.	Disallow	amend MUZ-S8	Reject	Key Issue: Landscaping standards
FS406.108	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Oppose	McDonald's seeks amendments to this standard to allow flexibility for additions and alterations	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Landscaping standards

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S357.005	Sean Frieling	MUZ-S8	Support	Support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkept to maintain Amenity values in town centres.	Retain MUZ-S8 standards for 50% landscaping and screening along road boundaries.		Accept	Key Issue: Landscaping standards
FS42.157	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs supports relief sought to reflect amendment sought in MUZR1.	Disallow	amend MUZ-S8	Reject	Key Issue: Landscaping standards
FS406.109	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Oppose	McDonald's seeks amendments to this standard to allow flexibility for additions and alterations	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Landscaping standards
S472.005	Michael Foy	MUZ-S8	Support	We support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkept to maintain Amenity values in town centres	Retain MUZ-S8 standards for 50% landscaping and screening along road boundaries		Accept	Key Issue: Landscaping standards
FS42.158	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs supports relief sought to reflect amendment sought in MUZR1.	Disallow	amend MUZ-S8	Reject	Key Issue: Landscaping standards
FS406.110	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Oppose	McDonald's seeks amendments to this standard to allow flexibility for additions and alterations	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Landscaping standards
S543.016	LJ King Limited	MUZ-S8	Support	We support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkept to maintain Amenity values in town centres.	Retain MUZ-S8 as notified		Accept	Key Issue: Landscaping standards
FS42.159	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs supports relief sought to reflect amendment sought in MUZR1.	Disallow	amend MUZ-S8	Reject	Key Issue: Landscaping standards
FS406.111	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Oppose	McDonald's seeks amendments to this standard to allow flexibility for additions and alterations	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Landscaping standards

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS566.2177	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Landscaping standards
S344.039	Paihia Properties Holdings Corporate Trustee Limited and UP Management Ltd	MUZ-S8	Not Stated	It is considered that a GFA of less than 400m2 with a default to discretionary activity where compliance cannot be achieved is particularly onerous within the MUZ given this is the only commercial zone providing for supermarket activities. It is considered that building bulk and scale should be managed separately to the scale of activities, MUZ-R1 note is confusing these effects, resulting unnecessary restrictions upon activities within the MUZ.	Amend Standards MUZ S1-S9 to give effect to the relief sought for MUZ-R1 (inferred)		Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ Rules
FS542.160	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Support	Foodstuffs supports relief sought to reflect amendment sought in MUZR1.	Allow	amend MUZ-S8	Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ Rules
FS396.060	Ed and Inge Amsler		Support	The submission seeks various changes in relation to the urban environment / coastal environment interface as well as specific provisions in the Mixed Use Zone. Additionally, the submission seeks better reflection of business land needs that should be reflected throughout the Plan.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ Rules
S547.016	LJ King Limited	MUZ-S8	Support	We support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkept to maintain Amenity values in town centres.	Retain MUZ-S8 as notified		Accept	Key Issue: Landscaping standards
FS406.112	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Oppose	McDonald's seeks amendments to this standard to allow flexibility for additions and alterations	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Landscaping standards

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>S464.016</b>	LJ King Ltd	MUZ-S8	Support	Support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mixed use zones to have presented and upkept to maintain amenity values in town centres.	Retain MUZ-S8 as notified.		Accept	Key Issue: Landscaping standards
<b>FS406.113</b>	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Oppose	McDonald's seeks amendments to this standard to allow flexibility for additions and alterations	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Landscaping standards
<b>FS566.1561</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Landscaping standards
<b>S74.045</b>	Brownie Family Trust	MUZ-S9	Support in part	The standard is supported in principle. Landscaping can soften an otherwise hard looking development. Visual sight lines need to be maintained for the safety of traffic and pedestrians. This could be a problem near shared access points.	Amend standard MUZ-S9 to include a provision to manage visibility and ensure pedestrian safety near vehicle crossings (in particular)		Accept	Key Issue: Landscaping standards
<b>S368.095</b>	Far North District Council	MUZ-S9	Support in part	Typo, should be site not side	Amend MUZ-S9 <b>Side Site boundaries that adjoin any zone other than Mixed Use, Light Industrial or Heavy Industrial must:</b>		Accept	Key Issue: Landscaping standards
<b>S179.055</b>	Russell Protection Society (INC)	MUZ-S9	Support		Retain MUZ-S9		Accept	Key Issue: Landscaping standards
<b>FS542.161</b>	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs supports relief sought to reflect amendment sought in MUZR1.	Disallow	amend MUZ-S9	Reject	Key Issue: Landscaping standards
<b>S344.040</b>	Paihia Properties Holdings Corporate	MUZ-S9	Not Stated	It is considered that a GFA of less than 400m2 with a default to discretionary activity where compliance cannot be achieved is particularly onerous within	Amend Standards MUZ S1-S9 to give effect to the relief sought for MUZ-R1 (inferred)		Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ rules

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
	Trustee Limited and UP Management Ltd			the MUZ given this is the only commercial zone providing for supermarket activities. It is considered that building bulk and scale should be managed separately to the scale of activities, MUZ-R1 note is confusing these effects, resulting unnecessary restrictions upon activities within the MUZ.				
<b>FS542.162</b>	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Support	Foodstuffs supports relief sought to reflect amendment sought in MUZR1.	Allow	amend MUZ-S9	Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ rules
<b>FS396.061</b>	Ed and Inge Amsler		Support	The submission seeks various changes in relation to the urban environment / coastal environment interface as well as specific provisions in the Mixed Use Zone. Additionally, the submission seeks better reflection of business land needs that should be reflected throughout the Plan.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ rules
<b>S50.005</b>	Vaughan Norton-Taylor	MUZ-S10	Oppose	The submitter opposes the requirement in this standard for coverage in the mixed use zone that at least 10% of the site shall be planted in grass, vegetation or landscaped with permeable material. The submitter considers that no consideration has been given to the value of the land that this requirement will consume.	Amend to remove the requirement for coverage in the mixed use zone being 10% (inferred)		Reject	Key Issue: MUZ Standards
<b>S385.030</b>	McDonalds Restaurants (NZ) Limited	MUZ-S10	Support in part	McDonald's seeks flexibility within the drafting of provisions so that MUZ-S10 is not triggered where an alteration of extension to a legally established building or structure that contains a permitted activity (see sub# 18).	Amend MUZ-S10 to provide flexibility for alterations and extensions.		Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ Rules
<b>S536.005</b>	Vaughan Norton-Taylor	MUZ-S10	Oppose	Retaining at least 10% of the site in grass provides no consideration for the value of the land that it will consume.	Delete Standard MUZ-S10 and retain status quo (inferred)		Reject	Key Issue: MUZ Standards

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				No logic or reason are given for this change.				
<b>S74.046</b>	Brownie Family Trust	MUZ-S10	Support	Softening a site with landscaping and ensuring stormwater is appropriately managed is supported.	Retain standard MUZ-S10 as notified.		Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ Standards
<b>FS406.114</b>	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Oppose	McDonald's seeks changes to this standard to introduce flexibility of addition and alterations.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Awaiting recommendation	
<b>S179.056</b>	Russell Protection Society (INC)	MUZ-S10	Support		Retain MUZ-S10		Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ Standards
<b>FS406.115</b>	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Oppose	McDonald's seeks changes to this standard to introduce flexibility of addition and alterations.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Awaiting recommendation	
<b>S267.003</b>	Brad Hedger	MUZ-S10	Support	This is a good rule it encourages permeable areas and potentially amenity in these spaces.	Retain MUZ-S10.		Accept in part	Key Issue: MUZ Standards
<b>FS406.116</b>	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Oppose	McDonald's seeks changes to this standard to introduce flexibility of addition and alterations.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Awaiting recommendation	
<b>S501.002</b>	Kaitaia Business Association	Pedestrian Frontage	Support in part	The Kaitaia Business Association generally supports Standard MUZ-S6 (inferred) however would like the standard to be expanded to cover the amenity and character of the existing business district. In particular the main street of Kaitaia which is identified in submission as being the Pedestrian Frontage area.	Amend the extent of the 'pedestrian frontage' area in Kaitaia, extending it to include the existing business district		Reject	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs
<b>S561.122</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Pedestrian Frontage	Oppose	The pedestrian frontage overlay at 1 Cottage Court, Kaikohe is opposed. It is not considered appropriate given the existing uses at the site and surrounding sites and does not align with the frontage control for the opposite side of Raihara Street.	Delete the Pedestrian Frontage control identified on Planning Maps from 1 Cottage Court, Kaikohe, as per Appendix 2 of the submission. This is south of the dashed blue line shown from 6 Raihara Street, Kaikohe. Amend the Pedestrian Frontage to the location shown on the map in Appendix 2 of the		Reject	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					submission to ensure the frontage is in an appropriate location and is complemented on both sides of Raihara Street.			
FS32.176	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	<p>The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes.</p> <p>The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts.</p> <p>The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.</p>	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs
FS23.394	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	<p>Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.</p>	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS47.136	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs
FS348.209	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs
S561.123	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Pedestrian Frontage	Oppose	The pedestrian frontage overlay at 2 Cottage Court, Kaikohe is opposed. It is not considered appropriate given the existing uses at the site and surrounding sites and does not align with the frontage control for the opposite side of Raihara Street.	Delete the Pedestrian Frontage control identified on Planning Maps from 2 Cottage Court, Kaikohe, as per Appendix 2 of the submission. This is south of the dashed blue line shown from 6 Raihara Street, Kaikohe. Amend the Pedestrian Frontage to the location shown on the map in Appendix 2 of the submission to ensure the frontage is in an appropriate location and is complemented on both sides of Raihara Street.		Reject	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs
FS32.177	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes.</p> <p>The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts.</p> <p>The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.</p>				
<b>FS23.395</b>	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	<p>Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.</p>	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Reject	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs
<b>FS47.137</b>	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	<p>The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan.</p> <p>Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently</p>	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document				
<b>FS348.210</b>	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs
<b>S358.006</b>	Leah Frieling	General Residential Zone	Support	We support the new mixed used zone and submit that we support a greater area of Mixed Use zone in Coopers Beach, and Cable Bay/Doubtless Bay, to encourage more activation of this area and to allow a wider range of housing options.	Amend the planning maps to increase the area of the Mixed Use zone at Coopers Beach, Cable Bay and Doubtless Bay.		Reject	Key Issue: Zone Boundaries
<b>S472.006</b>	Michael Foy	General Residential Zone	Support	We support the new mixed used Zones, and submit that we support a greater area of mixed use zone in Coopers Beach, and Cable Bay/Doubtless Bay, to encourage more activation of this area and to allow a wider range of housing options.	Amend the Planning Maps to increase the area of the Mixed Use zones at Coopers Beach, Cable Bay and Doubtless Bay.		Reject	Key Issue: Zone Boundaries
<b>S82.003</b>	Good Journey Limited	Mixed Use Zone	Support	The application of the Mixed Use zone to those sites within the geographic area spanned by Ngati Kahu Road on the western edge of Taipa to the Oruaiti River to the east, encompassing the settlements of Taipa, Cable Bay, Coopers Beach, and Mangonui is supported. The reasons for this is that the extent and location of the Mixed Use zone is logical, is supported by appropriate analysis, meets the provisions of s.32 of the Act, and accords with Part II of the RMA 1991.	Retain the extent of the Mixed Use zone within the geographic area spanned by Ngati Kahu Road on the western edge of Taipa to the Oruaiti River to the east, encompassing the settlements of Taipa, Cable Bay, Coopers Beach, and Mangonui.		Accept	Key Issue: Zone Boundaries

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

<b>Submission Point</b>	<b>Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)</b>	<b>Provision</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Summary of Decision Requested</b>	<b>Officer recommendation</b>	<b>Relevant section of S42A Report</b>
<b>S72.001</b>	Mhairi Wylde and Ted Davis	Mixed Use Zone	Oppose	The submitter opposes the layer of Pedestrian Frontage notation as it is shown on 6 Routley Avenue (Lot 1 DP 5004674) which is zoned General Residential and it adjoins the Mixed Use Zone. There are also other properties to which this situation applies.	Delete the Pedestrian Frontage notation as it applies to 6 Routley Avenue (Lot 1 DP 5004674) and any other property which is zoned General Residential and adjoins the Mixed Use Zone, where the Pedestrian Frontage notation has extended into an adjoining property.	Accept	Key Issue: MUZ - Pedestrian Frontage / Verandahs
<b>S257.006</b>	Te Hiku Community Board	Mixed Use Zone	Support	We support the new mixed used Zones and submit that we support a greater area of mixed use zone in Coopers Beach, and Cable Bay/Doubtless Bay, to encourage more activation of this area and to allow a wider range of housing options.	Amend the Planning Maps to increase the area of the Mixed Use zones at Coopers Beach, Cable Bay and Doubtless Bay.	Reject	Key Issue: Zone Boundaries
<b>S541.016</b>	Elbury Holdings	Mixed Use Zone	Support in part	We support the new mixed used Zones, and submit that we support a greater area of mixed use zone in Coopers Beach, and Cable Bay/Doubtless Bay, to encourage more activation of this area and to allow a wider range of housing options. Would like to have an added zone for Ahipara and Pukenui and other serviced settlements	Amend the Planning Maps to increase the area of the Mixed Use zones at Coopers Beach, Cable Bay and Doubtless Bay, Ahipara, Pukenui and other serviced settlements.	Reject	Key Issue: Zone Boundaries
<b>S519.018</b>	Elbury Holdings	Mixed Use Zone	Support in part	The proposed amendment will encourage more activation of the listed areas and allow for a wider range of housing options.	Amend the Planning Maps to increase the area of the Mixed Use zones at Coopers Beach, Cable Bay and Doubtless Bay, Ahipara, Pukenui and other serviced settlements.	Reject	Key Issue: Zone Boundaries
<b>S485.018</b>	Elbury Holdings	Mixed Use Zone	Support in part	support the new mixed used Zones, and submit that we support a greater area of mixed use zone in Coopers Beach, and Cable Bay/Doubtless Bay, to encourage more activation of this area and to allow a wider range of housing options. Would like to have an added zone for Ahipara and Pukenui and other serviced settlements	Amend the Planning Maps to increase the area of the Mixed Use zones at Coopers Beach, Cable Bay and Doubtless Bay, Ahipara, Pukenui and other serviced settlements.	Reject	Key Issue: Zone Boundaries

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S547.017	LJ King Limited	Mixed Use Zone	Support	We support the new mixed used Zones, and submit that we support a greater area of mixed use zone in Coopers Beach, and Cable Bay/Doubtless Bay, to encourage more activation of this area and to allow a wider range of housing options.	Amend the Mixed Use Zone to apply to a greater area of land in Coopers Beach, Cable Bay/Doubtless Bay, Ahipara, Pukenui and other serviced settlements		Reject	Key Issue: Zone Boundaries
S475.003	Robert Keith Beale	Mixed Use Zone	Oppose	The Section 32 Evaluation - Urban Environment does not include any specified zone criteria; as such it is unclear as to why the Mixed Use Zone (MUZ) boundaries have been established as notified for Kerikeri town centre. The proposed Kerikeri MUZ mapped area extends west along Kerikeri Road, stopping short of The Ridge and Ranui Avenue. The proposed MUZ boundary does not follow a logical defensible boundary, nor does it include existing lawfully established commercial activities located along Kerikeri Road or at the Redwoods.	Amend by reviewing the notified Mixed Use Zone (MUZ) boundary around the Kerikeri town centre and main commercial strip and change to reflect the existing commercial activities and establish logical zone boundaries to enable appropriate business land capacity and development opportunity.		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS172.3	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	The reasons given in this primary submission and in my primary submission.	Allow		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS270.12	C Otway Ltd		Support	For the reasons stated in this primary submission and in my primary submission.	Allow		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS350.0010	Puketona Lodge Ltd		Support	The reasons given in the original submission and primary submission of the submitter.  The Section 32 Evaluation - Urban Environment does not include any specified zone criteria; as such it is unclear as to why the Mixed Use Zone (MUZ) boundaries have been established as notified for Kerikeri town centre. The proposed Kerikeri MUZ	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				mapped area extends west along Kerikeri Road, stopping short of The Ridge and Ranui Avenue. The proposed MUZ boundary does not follow a logical defensible boundary, nor does it include existing lawfully established commercial activities located along Kerikeri Road or at the Redwoods.				
<b>FS441.0010</b>	Adrian and Sue Knight		Support	Amend by reviewing the notified Mixed Use Zone (MUZ) boundary around the Kerikeri town centre and main commercial strip and change to reflect the existing commercial activities and establish logical zone boundaries to enable appropriate business land capacity and development opportunity	Allow	Amend	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>S325.003</b>	Adrian and Sue Knight	Mixed Use Zone	Oppose	The Section 32 Evaluation - Urban Environment does not include any specified zone criteria, as such it is unclear as to why the Mixed Use Zone boundaries have been established as notified for Kerikeri town centre. The proposed Mixed Use Zone boundary does not follow a logical defensible boundary, nor does it include existing lawfully established commercial activities located along Kerikeri Road or at the Redwoods. Commercial activities, particularly tourist and horticulturally based commercial activities, are well established along Kerikeri Road and at the Redwoods. These activities contribute to the vibrancy, character and amenity of the introduction to Kerikeri town centre. The PDP should	Review the notified Mixed Use Zone boundary around the Kerikeri town centre and main commercial strip and change to reflect the existing commercial activities and establish logical zone boundaries to enable appropriate business land capacity and development opportunity; and Rezone land to an appropriate commercial or mixed use zone to legitimise and enable tourist and horticulture based commercial activities to occur: a. along both sides of Kerikeri Road from the roundabout with State Highway 10 to Kerikeri town centre; and b. at the Redwoods in accordance with the map in Appendix 1 to the submission. If relief sought 3(b) is not accepted, that FNDC establish an overlay/precinct or similar, or amend the provisions of the applicable zone, to legitimise and enable tourist and horticulture based commercial activities to occur:		Accept in part	Key Issue: Zone Boundaries

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				provide for and enable these activities along Kerikeri Road and at the Redwoods.	a. along both sides of Kerikeri Road from the roundabout with State Highway 10 to Kerikeri town centre; and b. at the Redwoods in accordance with the map in Appendix 1 to the submission.			
<b>FS172.7</b>	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	The reasons given in this primary submission and in my primary submission.	Allow		Accept in part	Key Issue: Zone Boundaries
<b>FS270.3</b>	C Otway Ltd		Support	For the reasons stated in this primary submission and in my primary submission.	Allow		Accept in part	Key Issue: Zone Boundaries
<b>FS350.050</b>	Puketona Lodge Ltd		Support	<p>The reasons given in the original submission and primary submission of the submitter.</p> <p>The Section 32 Evaluation - Urban Environment does not include any specified zone criteria, as such it is unclear as to why the Mixed Use Zone boundaries have been established as notified for Kerikeri town centre. The proposed Mixed Use Zone boundary does not follow a logical defensible boundary, nor does it include existing lawfully established commercial activities located along Kerikeri Road or at the Redwoods. Commercial activities, particularly tourist and horticulturally based commercial activities, are well established along Kerikeri Road and at the Redwoods. These activities contribute to the vibrancy, character and amenity of the introduction to Kerikeri town centre. The PDP should provide for and enable these activities along Kerikeri Road and at the Redwoods.</p>	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part	Key Issue: Zone Boundaries

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS243.231	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose	Kāinga Ora is interested in the proposed change from rural production to an urban zone. Kāinga Ora wishes to see further details to the proposed change and how the proposed change will fit with the district's planned and future growth. Kāinga Ora is interested in understanding the balance of enabling urban development while maintaining productive rural environments.	Disallow in part	Amend the Mixed Use zone boundary around the Kerikeri town centre and .....	Reject	Key Issue: Zone Boundaries
S534.002	Roger Atkinson	Mixed Use Zone	Oppose	<p>The Mixed Use zone is not the most appropriate zone for Kerikeri town centre for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The Mixed Use zone does not give effect to objective 1 and policy 1 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD);</li> <li>b. The Section 32 Evaluation - Urban Environments incomplete and flawed:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The evaluation does not provide sufficient level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance of due to the importance of the zone being the only commercial zone proposed within the District;</li> <li>ii. The evaluation fails to consider the full range of commercial zoning options and identify reasonably practicable options to achieve objectives;</li> <li>iii. The evaluation fails to evaluate appropriate zone criteria and boundaries;</li> </ul> </li> <li>c. The PDP does not provide strategic direction or policy support for the suite of urban zones proposed;</li> <li>d. The Mixed Use zone provisions do not sufficiently enable a range of commercial activities.</li> </ul>	<p>Review the suite of commercial zones proposed and rezone Kerikeri town centre to Town Centre Zone (or similar commercial zone) that appropriately reflects commercial development and activities within Kerikeri township;</p> <p>OR</p> <p>If above relief is not accepted, amend the Mixed Use zone provisions to provide for an increased range of commercial and community activities.</p>		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS172.13	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	The reasons given in this primary submission and in my primary submission.	Allow		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS350.002	Puketona Lodge Ltd		Support	<p>The reasons given in the original submission and primary submission of the submitter.</p> <p>The Mixed Use zone is not the most appropriate zone for Kerikeri town centre for the following reasons:</p> <p>a. The Mixed Use zone does not give effect to objective 1 and policy 1 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD);</p> <p>b. The Section 32 Evaluation - Urban Environments incomplete and flawed:</p> <p>i. The evaluation does not provide sufficient level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance of due to the importance of the zone being the only commercial zone proposed within the District;</p> <p>ii. The evaluation fails to consider the full range of commercial zoning options and identify reasonably practicable options to achieve objectives;</p> <p>iii. The evaluation fails to evaluate appropriate zone criteria and boundaries;</p> <p>c. The PDP does not provide strategic direction or policy support for the suite of urban zones proposed;</p> <p>d. The Mixed Use zone provisions do not sufficiently enable a range of commercial activities.</p>	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS441.002	Adrian and Sue Knight		Support	Review the suite of commercial zones proposed and rezone Kerikeri town centre to Town Centre Zone (or similar commercial zone) that appropriately reflects commercial development and activities within Kerikeri township; OR If	Allow	Amend	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				above relief is not accepted, amend the Mixed Use zone provisions to provide for an increased range of commercial and community activities			
<b>S535.003</b>	John and Rose Whitehead	Mixed Use Zone	Oppose	<p>The Mixed Use zone is not the most appropriate zone for Kerikeri town centre for the following reasons:</p> <p>a. The Mixed Use zone does not give effect to objective 1 and policy 1 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD);</p> <p>b. The Section 32 Evaluation - Urban Environments incomplete and flawed:</p> <p>i. The evaluation does not provide sufficient level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance of due to the importance of the zone being the only commercial zone proposed within the District;</p> <p>ii. The evaluation fails to consider the full range of commercial zoning options and identify reasonably practicable options to achieve objectives;</p> <p>iii. The evaluation fails to evaluate appropriate zone criteria and boundaries;</p> <p>c. The PDP does not provide strategic direction or policy support for the suite of urban zones proposed;</p> <p>d. The Mixed Use zone provisions do not sufficiently enable a range of commercial activities.</p>	<p>Review the suite of commercial zones proposed and rezone Kerikeri town centre to Town Centre Zone (or similar commercial zone) that appropriately reflects commercial development and activities within Kerikeri township;</p> <p>OR</p> <p>If above relief is not accepted, amend the Mixed Use zone provisions to provide for an increased range of commercial and community activities.</p>	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>FS172.18</b>	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	The reasons given in this primary submission and in my primary submission.	Allow	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>S393.002</b>	C Otway Ltd	Mixed Use Zone	Oppose	The Mixed Use Zone does not give effect to objective 1 and policy 1 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD);	Amend the suite of commercial zones proposed and amend the Kerikeri town centre to a town centre zone (or similar commercial zone) that appropriately reflects commercial development	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>b. The section 32 Evaluation - Urban Environments incomplete and flawed:</p> <p>i. The evaluation does not provide sufficient level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance of due to the importance of the zone being the only commercial zone proposed within the District;</p> <p>ii. The evaluation fails to consider the full range of commercial zoning options and identify reasonably practicable options to achieve objectives;</p> <p>iii. The evaluation fails to evaluate appropriate zone criteria and boundaries;</p> <p>c. The PDP does not provide strategic direction or policy support for the suite of urban zones proposed;</p> <p>d. The Mixed Use Zone provisions do not sufficiently enable a range of commercial activities.</p> <p>The PDP does not provide alternative commercial zones, providing only a Mixed-Use Zone. The Section 32 Evaluation - Urban Environment does not provide any justification for this approach nor does it evaluate options utilising the full range of National Planning Standard commercial zones. The PDP does not include any form of direction by way of mapping or provisions to set a clear hierarchy of centres. This lack of strategic direction will hinder the ability to achieve a sustainable and compact urban form. The approach to commercial zoning within the PDP has resulted in the inability to utilise the Mixed Use Zone as intended by the National Planning Standards. This approach has led to ineffective and inefficient methods in</p>	<p>and activities within Kerikeri township if that is not accepted amend the Mixed Use Zone provisions to provide for an increased range of commercial and community activities.</p>		

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				the PDP, which does not provide for the sustainable development and use of business land.				
FS172.24	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	The reasons given in this primary submission and in my primary submission.	Allow		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS350.013	Puketona Lodge Ltd		Support	<p>The reasons given in the original submission and primary submission of the submitter.</p> <p>The Mixed Use zone is not the most appropriate zone for Kerikeri town centre for the following reasons:</p> <p>a. The Mixed Use zone does not give effect to objective 1 and policy 1 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD);</p> <p>b. The Section 32 Evaluation - Urban Environments incomplete and flawed:</p> <p>i. The evaluation does not provide sufficient level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance of due to the importance of the zone being the only commercial zone proposed within the District;</p> <p>ii. The evaluation fails to consider the full range of commercial zoning options and identify reasonably practicable options to achieve objectives;</p> <p>iii. The evaluation fails to evaluate appropriate zone criteria and boundaries;</p> <p>c. The PDP does not provide strategic direction or policy support for the suite of urban zones proposed;</p> <p>d. The Mixed Use zone provisions do not sufficiently enable a range of commercial activities.</p>	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS441.013	Adrian and Sue Knight		Support	Amend the suite of commercial zones proposed and amend the Kerikeri town centre to a town centre	Allow	Amend	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				zone (or similar commercial zone) that appropriately reflects commercial development and activities within Kerikeri township if that is not accepted amend the Mixed Use Zone provisions to provide for an increased range of commercial and community activities				
<b>S393.003</b>	C Otway Ltd	Mixed Use Zone	Support in part	The Section 32 Evaluation - Urban Environment does not include any specified zone criteria; as such it is unclear as to why the Mixed Use Zone boundaries have been established as notified for Kerikeri town centre. The proposed Kerikeri Mixed Use Zone mapped area extends west along Kerikeri Road, stopping short of The Ridge and Ranui Avenue. The proposed Mixed Use Zone boundary does not follow a logical defensible boundary, nor does it include existing lawfully established commercial activities located along Kerikeri Road or at the Redwoods. Commercial activities, particularly tourist and horticulturally based commercial activities, are well established along Kerikeri Road and at the Redwoods. These activities contribute to the vibrancy, character and amenity of the introduction to Kerikeri town centre. The PDP should provide for and enable these activities along Kerikeri Road and at the Redwoods.	Amend the Mixed Use Zone boundary around the Kerikeri town centre and main commercial strip and change to reflect the existing commercial actives and establish logical zone boundaries to enable appropriate business land capacity and development.		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>FS172.25</b>	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	The reasons given in this primary submission and in my primary submission.	Allow		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>FS350.014</b>	Puketona Lodge Ltd		Support	The reasons given in the original submission and primary submission of the submitter.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				The Section 32 Evaluation - Urban Environment does not include any specified zone criteria; as such it is unclear as to why the Mixed Use Zone boundaries have been established as notified for Kerikeri town centre. The proposed Kerikeri Mixed Use Zone mapped area extends west along Kerikeri Road, stopping short of The Ridge and Ranui Avenue. The proposed Mixed Use Zone boundary does not follow a logical defensible boundary, nor does it include existing lawfully established commercial activities located along Kerikeri Road or at the Redwoods. Commercial activities, particularly tourist and horticulturally based commercial activities, are well established along Kerikeri Road and at the Redwoods. These activities contribute to the vibrancy, character and amenity of the introduction to Kerikeri town centre. The PDP should provide for and enable these activities along Kerikeri Road and at the Redwoods.				
<b>FS441.014</b>	Adrian and Sue Knight		Support	Amend the Mixed Use Zone boundary around the Kerikeri town centre and main commercial strip and change to reflect the existing commercial actives and establish logical zone boundaries to enable appropriate business land capacity and development.	Allow	Amend	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>S393.004</b>	C Otway Ltd	Mixed Use Zone	Support in part	The Section 32 Evaluation - Urban Environment does not include any specified zone criteria; as such it is unclear as to why the Mixed Use Zone boundaries have been established as notified for Kerikeri town centre. The	Amend the zoning of land to an appropriate commercial or mixed use zone to legitimise and enable tourist and horticulture based commercial activities to occur: a. along both sides of Kerikeri Road from the roundabout with State Highway 1A to		Accept in part	Key Issue: Zone boundaries

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>proposed Kerikeri Mixed Use Zone mapped area extends west along Kerikeri Road, stopping short of The Ridge and Ranui Avenue. The proposed Mixed Use Zone boundary does not follow a logical defensible boundary, nor does it include existing lawfully established commercial activities located along Kerikeri Road or at the Redwoods. Commercial activities, particularly tourist and horticulturally based commercial activities, are well established along Kerikeri Road and at the Redwoods. These activities contribute to the vibrancy, character and amenity of the introduction to Kerikeri town centre. The PDP should provide for and enable these activities along Kerikeri Road and at the Redwoods.</p>	<p>Kerikeri town centre; and                      b. at the Redwoods in accordance with the map in Appendix 1. If this is not accepted FNDC establish an overlay / precinct or similiar, or amend the provisions of the applicable zone to legitimse and eanble tourst and horticulture based commerial activiteis to occur:                      a. along both sides of Kerikeri Road from the roundabout with State Highway 10 to Kerikeri town centre; and                      b. at the Redwoods in accordance with the map in Appendix 1.</p>			
<b>FS172.28</b>	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	The reasons given in this primary submission and in my primary submission.	Allow		Accept in part	Key Issue: Zone boundaries
<b>FS350.015</b>	Puketona Lodge Ltd		Support	<p>The reasons given in the original submission and primary submission of the submitter.</p> <p>The Section 32 Evaluation - Urban Environment does not include any specified zone criteria; as such it is unclear as to why the Mixed Use Zone boundaries have been established as notified for Kerikeri town centre. The proposed Kerikeri Mixed Use Zone mapped area extends west along Kerikeri Road, stopping short of The Ridge and Ranui Avenue. The proposed Mixed Use Zone boundary does not follow a logical defensible boundary, nor does it include existing lawfully established commercial activities located along Kerikeri Road</p>	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part	Key Issue: Zone boundaries

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				or at the Redwoods. Commercial activities, particularly tourist and horticulturally based commercial activities, are well established along Kerikeri Road and at the Redwoods. These activities contribute to the vibrancy, character and amenity of the introduction to Kerikeri town centre. The PDP should provide for and enable these activities along Kerikeri Road and at the Redwoods.				
<b>FS441.015</b>	Adrian and Sue Knight		Support	Amend the zoning of land to an appropriate commercial or mixed use zone to legitimise and enable tourist and horticulture based commercial activities to occur: a. along both sides of Kerikeri Road from the roundabout with State Highway 1A to Kerikeri town centre; and b. at the Redwoods in accordance with the map in Appendix 1. If this is not accepted FNDC establish an overlay / precinct or similar, or amend the provisions of the applicable zone to legitimise and enable tourist and horticulture based commercial activities to occur: a. along both sides of Kerikeri Road from the roundabout with State Highway 10 to Kerikeri town centre; and b. at the Redwoods in accordance with the map in Appendix 1.	Allow	Amend	Accept in part	Key Issue: Zone boundaries
<b>S471.003</b>	Karen and Graeme Laurie	Mixed Use Zone	Oppose	The Section 32 Evaluation - Urban Environment does not include any specified zone criteria; as such it is unclear as to why the Mixed Use Zone (MUZ) boundaries have been established as notified for Kerikeri town centre. The proposed Kerikeri MUZ mapped area extends west along	Amend by reviewing the notified Mixed Use Zone (MUZ) boundary around the Kerikeri town centre and main commercial strip and change to reflect the existing commercial activities and establish logical zone boundaries to enable appropriate business land capacity and development opportunity.		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone selection

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				Kerikeri Road, stopping short of The Ridge and Ranui Avenue. The proposed MUZ boundary does not follow a logical defensible boundary, nor does it include existing lawfully established commercial activities located along Kerikeri Road or at the Redwoods.				
<b>FS172.31</b>	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	The reasons given in this primary submission and in my primary submission.	Allow		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone selection
<b>FS270.14</b>	C Otway Ltd		Support	For the reasons stated in this primary submission and in my primary submission.	Allow		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone selection
<b>FS350.054</b>	Puketona Lodge Ltd		Support	The reasons given in the original submission and primary submission of the submitter.  The Section 32 Evaluation - Urban Environment does not include any specified zone criteria; as such it is unclear as to why the Mixed Use Zone (MUZ) boundaries have been established as notified for Kerikeri town centre. The proposed Kerikeri MUZ mapped area extends west along Kerikeri Road, stopping short of The Ridge and Ranui Avenue. The proposed MUZ boundary does not follow a logical defensible boundary, nor does it include existing lawfully established commercial activities located along Kerikeri Road or at the Redwoods.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone selection
<b>FS441.045</b>	Adrian and Sue Knight		Support	The reasons given in this primary submission and in my primary submission.	Allow	Amend	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone selection

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>S549.002</b>	Levin Stones Holding Limited, Keri Keri Park Lodge Limited	Mixed Use Zone	Oppose	The Mixed Use Zone (MUZ) is not the most appropriate zone for Kerikeri town centre for the following reasons: - MUZ does not give effect to Objective 1 and Policy 1 of the NPS-UD - Section 32 Evaluation - Urban Environments is incomplete and flawed (refer to submission for specific reasoning) - PDP does not provide strategic direction or policy support for the suite of urban zones proposed - MUZ provisions do not sufficiently enable a range of commercial activities.	Amend PDP by reviewing the suite of commercial zones proposed and rezone Kerikeri town centre to Town Centre Zone (or similar commercial zone) that appropriately reflects commercial development and activities within Kerikeri township, alternatively if relief not accepted by FNDC, amend the Mixed Use Zone provisions to provide for an increased range of commercial and community activities.		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone selection
<b>FS172.34</b>	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	The reasons given in this primary submission and in my primary submission.	Allow		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone selection
<b>FS565.002</b>	Levin Stone Holdings Limited		Support	The reasons given in this primary submission and in my primary submission.	Allow	allow the original submission	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone selection
<b>FS350.057</b>	Puketona Lodge Ltd		Support	The reasons given in the original submission and primary submission of the submitter.  The Mixed Use Zone (MUZ) is not the most appropriate zone for Kerikeri town centre for the following reasons: - MUZ does not give effect to Objective 1 and Policy 1 of the NPS-UD - Section 32 Evaluation - Urban Environments is incomplete and flawed (refer to submission for specific reasoning) - PDP does not provide strategic direction or policy support for the suite of urban zones proposed - MUZ provisions do not sufficiently enable a range of commercial activities.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone selection

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS441.048	Adrian and Sue Knight		Support	The reasons given in this primary submission and in my primary submission.	Allow	Amend	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone selection
FS570.2187	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	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone selection
FS566.2201	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	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone selection
FS569.2223	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	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone selection
S549.003	Levin Stones Holding Limited, Keri Keri Park Lodge Limited	Mixed Use Zone	Oppose	The Section 32 Evaluation - Urban Environment does not include any specified zone criteria; as such it is unclear as to why the Mixed Use Zone (MUZ) boundaries have been established as notified for Kerikeri town centre. The proposed Kerikeri MUZ mapped area extends west along Kerikeri Road, stopping short of The Ridge and Ranui Avenue. The proposed MUZ boundary does not follow a logical defensible boundary, nor does it include existing lawfully established commercial activities located along Kerikeri Road or at the Redwoods.	Amend by reviewing the notified Mixed Use Zone (MUZ) boundary around the Kerikeri town centre and main commercial strip and change to reflect the existing commercial activities and establish logical zone boundaries to enable appropriate business land capacity and development opportunity.		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone selection
FS172.35	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	The reasons given in this primary submission and in my primary submission.	Allow		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone selection
FS270.15	C Otway Ltd		Support	For the reasons stated in this primary submission and in my primary submission.	Allow		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone selection

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS565.003	Levin Stone Holdings Limited		Support	The reasons given in this primary submission and in my primary submission.	Allow	allow the original submission	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone selection
FS350.058	Puketona Lodge Ltd		Support	<p>The reasons given in the original submission and primary submission of the submitter.</p> <p>The Section 32 Evaluation - Urban Environment does not include any specified zone criteria; as such it is unclear as to why the Mixed Use Zone (MUZ) boundaries have been established as notified for Kerikeri town centre. The proposed Kerikeri MUZ mapped area extends west along Kerikeri Road, stopping short of The Ridge and Ranui Avenue. The proposed MUZ boundary does not follow a logical defensible boundary, nor does it include existing lawfully established commercial activities located along Kerikeri Road or at the Redwoods.</p>	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone selection
FS441.049	Adrian and Sue Knight		Support	The reasons given in this primary submission and in my primary submission.	Allow	Amend	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone selection
FS570.2188	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	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone selection
FS566.2202	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	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone selection
FS569.2224	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	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone selection

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>S252.004</b>	Hall Nominees Ltd	Mixed Use Zone	Oppose	<p>The Section 32 Evaluation - Urban Environment does not include any specified zone criteria; as such it is unclear as to why the Mixed Use zone boundaries have been established as notified for Kerikeri town centre. The proposed Kerikeri Mixed Use zone mapped area extends west along Kerikeri Road, stopping short of The Ridge and Ranui Avenue. The proposed Mixed Use zone boundary does not follow a logical defensible boundary, nor does it include existing lawfully established commercial activities located along Kerikeri Road or at the Redwoods.</p> <p>Commercial activities, particularly tourist and horticulturally based commercial activities, are well established along Kerikeri Road and at the Redwoods. These activities contribute to the vibrancy, character and amenity of the introduction to Kerikeri town centre. The PDP should provide for and enable these activities along Kerikeri Road and at the Redwoods.</p>	<p>Amend the Mixed Use zone boundary around the Kerikeri town centre and main commercial strip and change to reflect the existing commercial activities and establish logical zone boundaries to enable appropriate business land capacity and development opportunity; and Rezone land to an appropriate Commercial or Mixed Use zone to legitimise and enable tourist and horticulture based commercial activities to occur:</p> <p>a. along both sides of Kerikeri Road from the roundabout with State Highway 10 to Kerikeri town centre; and</p> <p>b. at the Redwoods in accordance with the map in Appendix 1 to submission.</p> <p>If above relief sought (b) is not accepted, establish an overlay/precinct or similar, or amend the provisions of the applicable zone, to legitimise and enable tourist and horticulture based commercial activities to occur:</p> <p>a. along both sides of Kerikeri Road from the roundabout with State Highway 10 to Kerikeri town centre; and</p> <p>b. at the Redwoods in accordance with the map in Appendix 1 to submission.</p>		Accept in part	Key Issue: Zone boundaries
<b>FS172.41</b>	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	The reasons given in this primary submission and in my primary submission.	Allow		Accept in part	Key Issue: Zone boundaries
<b>FS270.10</b>	C Otway Ltd		Support	For the reasons stated in this primary submission and in my primary submission.	Allow		Accept in part	Key Issue: Zone boundaries
<b>FS350.030</b>	Puketona Lodge Ltd		Support	<p>The reasons given in the original submission and primary submission of the submitter.</p> <p>The Section 32 Evaluation - Urban Environment does not include any specified zone criteria; as such it is</p>	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part	Key Issue: Zone boundaries

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				unclear as to why the Mixed Use zone boundaries have been established as notified for Kerikeri town centre. The proposed Kerikeri Mixed Use zone mapped area extends west along Kerikeri Road, stopping short of The Ridge and Ranui Avenue. The proposed Mixed Use zone boundary does not follow a logical defensible boundary, nor does it include existing lawfully established commercial activities located along Kerikeri Road or at the Redwoods. Commercial activities, particularly tourist and horticulturally based commercial activities, are well established along Kerikeri Road and at the Redwoods. These activities contribute to the vibrancy, character and amenity of the introduction to Kerikeri town centre. The PDP should provide for and enable these activities along Kerikeri Road and at the Redwoods.				
<b>FS243.230</b>	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose	Kāinga Ora is interested in the proposed change from rural production to an urban zone. Kāinga Ora wishes to see further details to the proposed change and how the proposed change will fit with the district's planned and future growth. Kāinga Ora is interested in understanding the balance of enabling urban development while maintaining productive rural environments.	Disallow in part	Amend the Mixed Use zone boundary around the Kerikeri town centre and .....	Reject	Key Issue: Zone boundaries
<b>FS441.025</b>	Adrian and Sue Knight		Support	Amend the Mixed Use zone boundary around the Kerikeri town centre and main commercial strip and change to reflect the existing commercial activities and establish logical zone boundaries to enable appropriate business land capacity and	Allow	Amend	Accept in part	Key Issue: Zone boundaries

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				development opportunity; and Rezone land to an appropriate Commercial or Mixed Use zone to legitimise and enable tourist and horticulture based commercial activities to occur: a. along both sides of Kerikeri Road from the roundabout with State Highway 10 to Kerikeri town centre; and b. at the Redwoods in accordance with the map in Appendix 1 to submission. If above relief sought (b) is not accepted, establish an overlay/precinct or similar, or amend the provisions of the applicable zone, to legitimise and enable tourist and horticulture based commercial activities to occur: a. along both sides of Kerikeri Road from the roundabout with State Highway 10 to Kerikeri town centre; and b. at the Redwoods in accordance with the map in Appendix 1 to submission				
<b>FS570.721</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Zone boundaries
<b>FS566.735</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Zone boundaries
<b>FS569.757</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	Reject	Key Issue: Zone boundaries
<b>S188.004</b>	Puketotara Lodge Ltd	Mixed Use Zone	Oppose	Commercial activities, particularly tourist and horticulturally based commercial activities, are well established along Kerikeri Road and at the Redwoods. These activities contribute to the vibrancy, character and amenity of the introduction to Kerikeri town centre. The PDP should	Amend to rezone land to an appropriate commercial or mixed use zone to legitimise and enable tourist and horticulture based commercial activities to occur: a. along both sides of Kerikeri Road from the roundabout with State Highway 10 to Kerikeri town centre; and b. at the Redwoods in accordance with the map in		Accept in part	Key Issue: Zone boundaries

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				provide for and enable these activities along Kerikeri Road and at the Redwoods.	Appendix 1 (refer to full submission). If relief not sought is not accepted, that FNCD establish an overlay/precinct or similar, or amend the provisions of the applicable zone, to legitimise and enable tourist and horticulture based commercial activities to occur: a. along both sides of Kerikeri Road from the roundabout with State Highway 10 to Kerikeri town centre; and b. at the Redwoods in accordance with the map in Appendix 1 (refer to full submission).			
<b>FS172.134</b>	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission and my primary submission.	Allow		Accept in part	Key Issue: Zone boundaries
<b>FS270.11</b>	C Otway Ltd		Support	For the reasons stated in this primary submission and in my primary submission.	Allow		Accept in part	Key Issue: Zone boundaries
<b>FS36.102</b>	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency		Oppose	Opposes the proposed rezoning/intensification of the submitters land until there is a clearer understanding on how the proposal affects the safety, efficiency, and effectiveness of the land transport system. Prior to rezoning and development, there needs to be clear documentation of what transport infrastructure/ upgrades/mitigation measures are needed to avoid, remedy or mitigate effects on the transport system, triggers for necessary infrastructure development and how the infrastructure will be funded. The proposed rezoning needs to ensure that it includes details as to how the proposed transport network will provide active modes and support the longer term development of public transport.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission until appropriate analysis and information has been provided for the proposed rezoning.	Reject	Key Issue: Zone boundaries
<b>FS350.064</b>	Puketona Lodge Ltd		Support	The reasons given in the original submission and primary submission of the submitter.  Commercial activities, particularly	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part	Key Issue: Zone boundaries

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				tourist and horticulturally based commercial activities, are well established along Kerikeri Road and at the Redwoods. These activities contribute to the vibrancy, character and amenity of the introduction to Kerikeri town centre. The PDP should provide for and enable these activities along Kerikeri Road and at the Redwoods.				
<b>FS243.219</b>	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose	Kāinga Ora is interested in the proposed change from rural production to an urban zone. Kāinga Ora wishes to see further details to the proposed change and how the proposed change will fit with the district's planned and future growth. Kāinga Ora is interested in understanding the balance of enabling urban development while maintaining productive rural environments.	Disallow in part	Amend to rezone land to an appropriate commercial or mixed use zone to legitimise and enable tourist and horticulture based commercial activities to occur: a. along both sides of Kerikeri Road from the roundabout with State Highway 10 to Kerikeri town centre; and b. at the Redwoods in accordance with the map in Appendix 1	Reject	Key Issue: Zone boundaries
<b>FS441.055</b>	Adrian and Sue Knight		Support	For the reasons stated in this primary submission and in my primary submission.	Allow	Amend	Accept in part	Key Issue: Zone boundaries
<b>S363.018</b>	Foodstuffs North Island Limited	Mixed Use Zone	Not Stated	The submitter considers that the National Planning Standards provide a range of commercial zones such as Neighbourhood Centre Zone, Local Centre Zone, Commercial Zone, Large Format Retail Zone, Mixed Use Zone, Town Centre Zone, Metropolitan Centre Zone and City Centre Zone and are unable to understand why Council has chosen to only use one commercial zone being the Mixed Use Zone.	Amend the proposed district plan to provide clear strategic direction for a compact urban form and establish a centres hierarchy within the Plan. Reconsider the approach to commercial zones and reconsider the most appropriate zoning for existing centres and villages which accurately reflects existing and planned levels of development specific to those areas. Provide sufficient section 32 evaluation to support the approach to zoning.		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone selection

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS172.169	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission and in my primary submission to review commercial zones.	Allow		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone selection
FS350.024	Puketona Lodge Ltd		Support	<p>The reasons given in the original submission and primary submission of the submitter to review commercial zones.</p> <p>The submitter considers that the National Planning Standards provide a range of commercial zones such as Neighbourhood Centre Zone, Local Centre Zone, Commercial Zone, Large Format Retail Zone, Mixed Use Zone, Town Centre Zone, Metropolitan Centre Zone and City Centre Zone and are unable to understand why Council has chosen to only use one commercial zone being the Mixed Use Zone.</p>	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone selection
FS243.202	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Support	<p>note numerous submitters not identified in Kainga ora list that request town centre zone) -</p> <p>Kāinga Ora supports housing with good access to jobs, amenities and services and the co-location of activities to contribute to economic, social, environmental, and cultural wellbeing. Kāinga Ora seeks a new Town Centre zone for Kerikeri in recognition of its importance as a growing centre in the Far North.</p>	Allow	Amend the proposed district plan to provide clear strategic direction .....	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone selection
S560.005	Jane E Johnston	Mixed Use Zone	Oppose	The area provided for in every township where the Mixed Use Zone is proposed to be introduced is too extensive, and it will hamper the development of much needed affordable accommodation by requiring a glut of unneeded 'commercial' space at ground floor level.	Amend the extent of the Mixed Use Zone to reduce the area of land covered by the zone by between 1/2 and 3/4 to allow for high density residential living, without the encumbrance of having to also provide for commercial use.		Reject	Key Issue: Zone Boundaries

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS172.171	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in in my primary submission to rezone Kerikeri fringe to commercial.	Disallow		Accept	Key Issue: Zone Boundaries
FS175.6	Denis Thomson		Oppose	Mixed use zoning is sound concept. The amount of area zoned as such around Kerikeri should not be reduced.	Disallow		Accept	Key Issue: Zone Boundaries
FS325.065	Turnstone Trust Limited		Support in part	TT agrees that there needs to be careful mapping as to the extent and location of Mixed Use zoning and if the town centre zoning is to change any Mixed Use zoning needs to carefully respond to the town centre zoning to ensure a well-functioning urban environment is achieved.	Allow	Allow the submission subject to wording of any provisions and mapping (inferred).	Reject	Key Issue: Zone Boundaries
FS348.084	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept	Key Issue: Zone Boundaries
S560.006	Jane E Johnston	Mixed Use Zone	Oppose	Insufficient industrial space has been envisaged as catering to 'warehousing' which requires a lot of vehicle movements, as delivery services are made both to and from the warehouse and storage nodes.	Amend the application of the Mixed Use Zone so areas are not contiguous and are established as nodes to allow for precincts of like activities to emerge and to allow for separation of travel and flow between nodes.		Reject	Key Issue: Zone Boundaries
FS172.172	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to rezone Kerikeri fringe to commercial.	Disallow		Accept	Key Issue: Zone Boundaries
FS325.066	Turnstone Trust Limited		Support in part	TT agrees that there needs to be careful mapping as to the extent and location of Mixed Use zoning and if the town centre zoning is to change any Mixed Use zoning needs to carefully respond to the town centre zoning to ensure a well-functioning urban environment is achieved.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate wording (inferred).	Reject	Key Issue: Zone Boundaries
FS348.085	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept	Key Issue: Zone Boundaries

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA			
<b>S561.111</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Mixed Use Zone	Not Stated	<p>The proposed Mixed Use Zone is applied at the core of the town centre of Kerikeri where a mixture of residential, commercial, recreational and/or community activities are compatible. Kāinga Ora submits that area Town Centre zoning is a more appropriate zone recognising the regional significance and anticipated growth of Kerikeri. A Town Centre zone is also more compatible with the National Planning Standards. Kāinga Ora therefore submits that the proposed Mixed Use zone be replaced with a new Town Centre Zone in Kerikeri, as shown in Appendix 3 and Appendix 5 of this Submission. According to the National Planning Standards, Town Centre zones are predominantly to be used: - in smaller urban areas, a range of commercial, community, recreational and residential activities. - in larger urban areas, a range of commercial, community, recreational and residential activities that service the needs of the immediate and neighbouring suburbs. The introduction of this new zone for Kerikeri will achieve the following: (i) recognise Kerikeri as an established town centre, different in size and functions (head offices, district community facilities and in proximity to airport) from other townships in Far North; and (ii) Avoid light industrial activities to be located within the town centre of Kerikeri. Furthermore, Kerikeri is the town centre least affected by flooding and therefore is more suitable for intensification as</p>	Amend the Mixed Use Zone in Kerikeri by replacing it with a Town Centre zone as shown in Appendix 3 and Appendix 5 of this submission.	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				other centres are affected more significantly.				
<b>FS172.173</b>	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support in part	For the reasons set out in this primary submission and in my primary submission to review commercial zones (support TCZ but not 6 storey height)	Allow in part		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>FS36.098</b>	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency		Support	Supports the introduction of a new Medium Density Residential Zone (over the proposed General Residential Zone) and Town Centre Zone (over the proposed Mixed Use Zone) in Kerikeri subject to the appropriate provision of infrastructure to provide a well-functioning urban environment. This aligns with the guidance in the National Policy Statement Urban Development.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to the appropriate provision of infrastructure.	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>FS32.165</b>	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	<p>The original submission seeks to amend the FNDP in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes.</p> <p>The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts.</p>	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.</p>				
<p><b>FS350.025</b></p>	<p>Puketona Lodge Ltd</p>		<p>Support in part</p>	<p>The reasons given in the original submission and primary submission of the submitter to review commercial zones. Supports TCZ but not 6 storey height.</p> <p>The proposed Mixed Use Zone is applied at the core of the town centre of Kerikeri where a mixture of residential, commercial, recreational and/or community activities are compatible. Kāinga Ora submits that area Town Centre zoning is a more appropriate zone recognising the regional significance and anticipated growth of Kerikeri. A Town Centre zone is also more compatible with the National Planning Standards. Kāinga Ora therefore submits that the proposed Mixed Use zone be replaced with a new Town Centre Zone in Kerikeri, as shown in Appendix 3 and Appendix 5 of this Submission. According to the National Planning Standards, Town Centre zones are predominantly to be used: - in smaller urban areas, a range of commercial, community, recreational and residential activities. - in larger urban areas, a range of commercial, community, recreational and residential activities that service the needs of the immediate and neighbouring suburbs. The introduction of this new zone for Kerikeri will achieve the following: (i) recognise Kerikeri as an established town centre, different in size and functions (head offices, district</p>	<p>Allow in part</p>	<p>Allow the original submission in part.</p>	<p>Deferred</p>	<p>Key Issue: Zone Selection</p>

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				community facilities and in proximity to airport) from other townships in Far North; and (ii) Avoid light industrial activities to be located within the town centre of Kerikeri. Furthermore, Kerikeri is the town centre least affected by flooding and therefore is more suitable for intensification as other centres are affected more significantly.				
FS23.383	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS47.125	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS348.198	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA				
<b>FS584.002</b>	Peter Malcolm		Support	Support enabling building heights up to 6 storeys (22m) in the Kerikeri Town Centre. There is currently a shortage of affordable and public housing within this area. Central Kerikeri is an appropriate location to enable residential intensification as it has sufficient servicing, low natural hazard risk and is accessible to public transport, services and amenities. Enabling intensification within the Kerikeri Town Centre will help reduce sprawl, improve economic viability and promote vibrant communities.	Allow in part	Amend the Proposed District Plan to enable building heights up to 6 storeys (22m) in the Kerikeri Town Centre (inferred).	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>S188.003</b>	Puketotara Lodge Ltd	Mixed Use Zone	Oppose	The Section 32 Evaluation - Urban Environment does not include any specified zone criteria; as such it is unclear as to why the Mixed Use Zone (MUZ) boundaries have been established as notified for Kerikeri town centre. The proposed Kerikeri MUZ mapped area extends west along Kerikeri Road, stopping short of The Ridge and Ranui Avenue. The proposed MUZ boundary does not follow a logical defensible boundary, nor does it include existing lawfully established commercial activities located along Kerikeri Road or at the Redwoods.	Amend by reviewing the notified Mixed Use Zone (MUZ) boundary around the Kerikeri town centre and main commercial strip and change to reflect the existing commercial activities and establish logical zone boundaries to enable appropriate business land capacity and development opportunity.		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>FS189.3</b>	Michael Schofield		Support	Support as the submission highlights that the current zoning does not reflect the existing commercial activities being undertaken on Kerikeri Road all the way up to Hall Rd. It is reflected in zoning Mixed Use up to Hall Road on one side but for some reason not on the other side despite established	Allow		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				commercial activities already being undertaken.				
FS172.415	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons stated in this primary submission and in my primary submission.	Allow		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS270.16	C Otway Ltd		Support	For the reasons stated in this primary submission and in my primary submission.	Allow		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS350.063	Puketona Lodge Ltd		Support	<p>The reasons given in the original submission and primary submission of the submitter.</p> <p>The Section 32 Evaluation - Urban Environment does not include any specified zone criteria; as such it is unclear as to why the Mixed Use Zone (MUZ) boundaries have been established as notified for Kerikeri town centre. The proposed Kerikeri MUZ mapped area extends west along Kerikeri Road, stopping short of The Ridge and Ranui Avenue. The proposed MUZ boundary does not follow a logical defensible boundary, nor does it include existing lawfully established commercial activities located along Kerikeri Road or at the Redwoods.</p>	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS243.218	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose	Kāinga Ora is interested in the proposed change from rural production to an urban zone. Kāinga Ora wishes to see further details to the proposed change and how the proposed change will fit with the district's planned and future growth. Kāinga Ora is interested in understanding the balance of enabling urban development while maintaining productive rural environments.	Disallow in part	Amend by reviewing the notified Mixed Use Zone (MUZ) boundary around the Kerikeri town centre and main commercial strip and change to reflect the existing commercial activities and establish logical zone boundaries to enable appropriate business land capacity and development opportunity	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS441.054	Adrian and Sue Knight		Support	For the reasons stated in this primary submission and in my primary submission.	Allow	Amend	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
S209.004	Audrey Campbell-Frear	Mixed Use Zone	Oppose	Commercial activities, particularly tourist and horticulturally based commercial activities, are well established along Kerikeri Road and at the Redwoods. These activities contribute to the vibrancy, character and amenity of the introduction to Kerikeri town centre. The PDP should provide for and enable these activities along Kerikeri Road and at the Redwoods.	<p>Amend to rezone land to an appropriate commercial or mixed use zone to legitimise and enable tourist and horticulture based commercial activities to occur:</p> <p>a. along both sides of Kerikeri Road from the roundabout with State Highway 10 to Kerikeri town centre; and</p> <p>b. at the Redwoods in accordance with the map in Appendix 1 (refer to full submission - note this is the first of the two appendices titled Appendix 1).</p> <p>If relief not sought is not accepted, that FNCD establish an overlay/precinct or similar, or amend the provisions of the applicable zone, to legitimise and enable tourist and horticulture based commercial activities to occur:</p> <p>a. along both sides of Kerikeri Road from the roundabout with State Highway 10 to Kerikeri town centre; and</p> <p>b. at the Redwoods in accordance with the map in Appendix 1 (refer to full submission - note this is the first of the two appendices titled Appendix 1).</p>		Accept in part	Key Issue: Zone Boundaries
FS270.2	C Otway Ltd		Support	For the reasons stated in this primary submission and in my primary submission.	Allow		Accept in part	Key Issue: Zone Boundaries
FS350.019	Puketona Lodge Ltd		Support	<p>The reasons given in the original submission and primary submission of the submitter.</p> <p>Commercial activities, particularly tourist and horticulturally based commercial activities, are well established along Kerikeri Road and at the Redwoods. These activities contribute to the vibrancy, character</p>	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part	Key Issue: Zone Boundaries

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				and amenity of the introduction to Kerikeri town centre. The PDP should provide for and enable these activities along Kerikeri Road and at the Redwoods.				
FS441.019	Adrian and Sue Knight		Support	Amend to rezone land to an appropriate commercial or mixed use zone to legitimise and enable tourist and horticulture based commercial activities to occur: a. along both sides of Kerikeri Road from the roundabout with State Highway 10 to Kerikeri town centre; and b. at the Redwoods in accordance with the map in Appendix 1 (refer to full submission - note this is the first of the two appendices titled Appendix 1). If relief not sought is not accepted, that FNCD establish an overlay/precinct or similar, or amend the provisions of the applicable zone, to legitimise and enable tourist and horticulture based commercial activities to occur: a. along both sides of Kerikeri Road from the roundabout with State Highway 10 to Kerikeri town centre; and b. at the Redwoods in accordance with the map in Appendix 1 (refer to full submission - note this is the first of the two appendices titled Appendix 1).	Allow	Amend	Accept in part	Key Issue: Zone Boundaries

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS566.501	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Key Issue: Zone Boundaries
S209.003	Audrey Campbell-Frear	Mixed Use Zone	Oppose	The Section 32 Evaluation - Urban Environment does not include any specified zone criteria; as such it is unclear as to why the Mixed Use Zone (MUZ) boundaries have been established as notified for Kerikeri town centre. The proposed Kerikeri MUZ mapped area extends west along Kerikeri Road, stopping short of The Ridge and Ranui Avenue. The proposed MUZ boundary does not follow a logical defensible boundary, nor does it include existing lawfully established commercial activities located along Kerikeri Road or at the Redwoods.	Amend by reviewing the notified Mixed Use Zone (MUZ) boundary around the Kerikeri town centre and main commercial strip and change to reflect the existing commercial activities and establish logical zone boundaries to enable appropriate business land capacity and development opportunity.		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS270.13	C Otway Ltd		Support	For the reasons stated in this primary submission and in my primary submission.	Allow		Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
FS350.018	Puketona Lodge Ltd		Support	The reasons given in the original submission and primary submission of the submitter.  The Section 32 Evaluation - Urban Environment does not include any specified zone criteria; as such it is unclear as to why the Mixed Use Zone (MUZ) boundaries have been established as notified for Kerikeri town centre. The proposed Kerikeri MUZ mapped area extends west along Kerikeri Road, stopping short of The Ridge and Ranui Avenue. The proposed MUZ boundary does not follow a logical defensible boundary, nor does it include existing lawfully established commercial activities	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				located along Kerikeri Road or at the Redwoods.				
<b>FS243.220</b>	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose	Kāinga Ora is interested in the proposed change from rural production to an urban zone. Kāinga Ora wishes to see further details to the proposed change and how the proposed change will fit with the district's planned and future growth. Kāinga Ora is interested in understanding the balance of enabling urban development while maintaining productive rural environments.	Disallow in part	The Section 32 Evaluation - .....	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>FS441.018</b>	Adrian and Sue Knight		Support	Amend by reviewing the notified Mixed Use Zone (MUZ) boundary around the Kerikeri town centre and main commercial strip and change to reflect the existing commercial activities and establish logical zone boundaries to enable appropriate business land capacity and development opportunity.	Allow	Amend	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>FS566.500</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	Deferred	Key Issue: Zone Selection
<b>S330.006</b>	The Paihia Property Owners Group	Mixed Use Zone	Support	The submitter generally supports the enabling intent of the Mixed Use zone however, when considered alongside the other overlays which constrain development these must be appropriately considered and selected based on a higher degree of evidence and assessment, as they relate specifically to Paihia.	Retain the Mixed Use zone as they apply to Paihia township with minimal overlays and restrictions.		Accept	Key Issue: Zone Boundaries
<b>FS547.118</b>	Heron Point Limited		Support	This decision sought is supported to the extent that the Proposed District	Allow	Retain the General Residential zone as they	Accept	Key Issue: Zone Boundaries

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				Plan facilitates residential development within the Paihia settlement to facilitate the delivery of housing supply within Paihia. The overlays should be removed from all residential zoned land within the wider Paihia area including the land owned by Heron Point Limited.		apply to Paihia township with minimal overlays and restrictions		
<b>S464.017</b>	LJ King Ltd	Mixed Use Zone	Support	We support the new mixed used Zones, and submit that we support a greater area of mixed use zone in Coopers Beach, and Cable Bay/Doubtless Bay, to encourage more activation of this area and to allow a wider range of housing options.	Amend the Mixed Use Zone to apply to a greater area of land in Coopers Beach, Cable Bay/Doubtless Bay, Ahipara, Pukenui and other serviced settlements.		Reject	Key Issue: Zone Boundaries
<b>FS566.1562</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	Key Issue: Zone Boundaries
<b>S543.017</b>	LJ King Limited	Mixed Use Zone	Support in part	We support the new mixed used Zones, and submit that we support a greater area of mixed use zone in Coopers Beach, and Cable Bay/Doubtless Bay, to encourage more activation of this area and to allow a wider range of housing options.	Amend the Planning Maps to increase the area of the Mixed Use zones at Coopers Beach, Cable Bay and Doubtless Bay, Ahipara, Pukenui and other serviced settlements.		Reject	Key Issue: Zone Boundaries
<b>FS566.2178</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	Key Issue: Zone Boundaries
<b>S357.006</b>	Sean Frieling	Mixed Use Zone	Support	We support the new mixed used Zones, and submit that we support a greater area of mixed use zone in Coopers Beach, and Cable Bay/Doubtless Bay, to encourage more activation of this area and to allow a wider range of housing options.	Amend the Planning Maps to increase the area of the Mixed Use zones at Coopers Beach, Cable Bay and Doubtless Bay.		Reject	Key Issue: Zone Boundaries