

## Appendix 1 Evaluation of Rezoning Submissions

Audrey Campbell – Frear							
Submission No/Point No.	Site Address	Decision Requested	Submitter Reasons	Nature of pre-hearing correspondence or submitter pre-circulated evidence (if any)	Rezoning Criteria	Officer's Comment	Costs and Benefits of accepting rezoning request
S209.003 Audrey Campbell-Frear	No site specific	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.	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.	<b>Pre-hearing meetings</b> N/A  <b>Pre-circulated evidence</b> <a href="#">Audrey-Campbell-Frear,-S209-D-Foy,-Economics-evidence.pdf</a>  <a href="#">Audrey-Campbell-Frear,-S209-M-McGrath,-Planning-evidence.pdf</a>	<b>Strategic direction</b>	Rezoning is not consistent with the urban form and development strategic objectives to achieve a compact urban form – this is a less efficient use of land than an urban zone and undermines the equivalent outcome sought by the Spatial Plan.	<b>Costs –</b>  Increased risk of reverse sensitivity resulting from intensification of landuse both on the opposite side of Kerikeri Road and further towards SH10, placing additional development pressure on other land in the Horticulture Precinct.  Pattern of development will be inefficient use of land, cementing peri-urban sprawl as opposed to compact urban development.  <b>Benefits –</b>  Economic benefits to landowners.
					<b>Alignment with zone outcomes</b>	Refer to paragraphs 8.5-8.16 of Ms McGrath's evidence and Section 2.2 of the section 32AA evaluation, plus commentary in Section 5.2.5 of the Section 42A report.	
					<b>Higher order direction</b>	Refer to paragraphs 8.5-8.16 of Ms McGrath's evidence and Section 2.2 of the Section 32AA evaluation, plus commentary in Section 5.2.5 of the Section 42A report.	
					<b>Reasons for the request</b>	Refer to paragraphs 8.5-8.16 of Ms McGrath's evidence and Section 2.2 of the Section 32AA evaluation, plus commentary in Section 5.2.5 of the Section 42A report.	
					<b>Assessment of site suitability and potential effects of rezoning</b>	Refer to paragraphs 8.5-8.16 of Ms McGrath's evidence and Section 2.2 of the Section 32AA evaluation, plus commentary in Section 5.2.5 of the Section 42A report.	
					<b>Infrastructure (three waters) servicing</b>	N/A servicing would be onsite.	
S209.004 Audrey Campbell-Frear		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	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>Transport infrastructure</b>	Brief assessment provided.	<b>Risks of acting or not acting</b>  Risks of acting include undermining the ability to achieve a compact urban form around Kerikeri as the location is not a preferred option.  Risks of not acting are low as the status quo will be maintained by the RPROZ zoning combined with the Horticulture Precinct.
					<b>Consultation and further submissions</b>	S209.003 5 Further Submissions S209.004 4 Further Submissions	
					<b>Other relevant matters</b>	S209.003 Zoned Mixed Use S209.004 Zoned Various	
					<b>Section 32AA evaluation</b>	N/A	

## Appendix 1 Evaluation of Rezoning Submissions

		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).					
<b>Recommendation</b>  Retain notified zoning. Reject original submission and further submissions in support and accept further submissions in opposition.							

## Appendix 1 Evaluation of Rezoning Submissions

Davies Kerikeri Family Trust, MR Davies and BR & R Davies							
Submission No/Point No.	Site Address	Decision Requested	Submitter Reasons	Nature of pre-hearing correspondence or submitter pre-circulated evidence (if any)	Rezoning Criteria	Officer’s Comment	Costs and Benefits of accepting rezoning request
S329.001 Davies Kerikeri Family Trust, MR Davies and BR & R Davies	20 Kerikeri Inlet Road, Kerikeri 0230 <i>Lot 2 DP 352147</i>	Delete the Rural Residential zoning of the front portion of the site (being the combined area of Lot 2 DP 352147, Lot 2 DP 159442, Lot 1 DP 201704 and Lot 3 DP 159442, Lot 4 DP 1598442, and Lot 2 DP 61878 fronting Kerikeri Inlet Road, Kerikeri) zone the front portion (as shown on figure 5 to the submission), General Residential.	Rezone part of the site fronting Kerikeri Inlet Road to General Residential as opposed to Rural Residential for a number of reasons, including: difficulties to comply with air emission requirements for the orchard operations on this area; natural stream boundary provides a logical and defensible boundary to the existing urban area, and will provide a buffer to horticultural operations on the remaining land to the south; the site has direct access to reticulated Council infrastructure; land can be rezoned General Residential zone under Regulation 3.6, and is consistent with Regulation 3.8(1)(a) of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land; economic benefits - relative increase in residential density; social benefits - buffer between proposed General Residential zone and horticultural activities - assist in minimising potential reverse sensitivity effects; environmental benefits include a potential esplanade reserve, and improvement to the site frontage with Kerikeri Inlet Road; the General Residential zone is a more efficient and effective use of the land and existing infrastructure; and the proposal better achieves the purpose of the Act in the context of Section 32.	<b>Pre-hearing meetings</b> In person prehearing meeting  <b>Pre-circulated evidence</b> <a href="#">Davies-Kerikeri-Family-Trust,-MR-Davies,-and-BR-and-R-Davies,-S329-J-Henehan,-Planning-evidence.pdf</a>	<b>Strategic direction</b>	Strategically the site sits outside the Spatial Plan area. Mr Henehan has provided an assessment in paragraph 7.1 onwards and addressed in section 5.2.8 of the report.	<b>Costs –</b>  Undermine growth in line with the Spatial Plan.  <b>Benefits –</b>  Economic benefits to landowners able to further subdivide land in close proximity to Kerikeri and Waipapa.  <b>Risks of acting or not acting</b>  Risks of acting include undermining the ability to achieve a compact urban form around Kerikeri and Waipapa, risk of oversupply of land.
	<b>Alignment with zone outcomes</b>				Assessment provided in Paragraph 7.7 onwards of Mr Henehan's evidence.		
	<b>Higher order direction</b>				Assessment provided in Paragraph 7.44 of Mr Henehan's evidence.		
	<b>Reasons for the request</b>				Outlined I Mr Henehan's evidence paragraph 6.1 onwards and in section 5.2.8 of the report.		
	<b>Assessment of site suitability and potential effects of rezoning</b>				Seems to be suitable for development.		
	<b>Infrastructure (three waters) servicing</b>				Infrastructure assessment provided Paragraph 7.39 onwards of Mr Henehan's evidence.		
	<b>Transport infrastructure</b>				Limited transport assessment provided in Paragraph 7.44 of Mr Henehan's evidence.		
	<b>Consultation and further submissions</b>				2 Further Submissions		
	<b>Other relevant matters</b>				Zoned Rural Residential River Flood Hazard Zone 10 year ARI Event River Flood Hazard Zone 10 year ARI Event		
	<b>Section 32AA evaluation</b>				N/A		
<b>Recommendation</b>							
Retain notified zoning. Reject original submission and further submissions in support and accept further submissions in opposition.							

## Appendix 1 Evaluation of Rezoning Submissions

Linda Gigger							
Submission No/Point No.	Site Address	Decision Requested	Submitter Reasons	Nature of pre-hearing correspondence or submitter pre-circulated evidence (if any)	Rezoning Criteria	Officer's Comment	Costs and Benefits of accepting rezoning request
S370.001 Linda Gigger	166 Waipapa Road <i>Lot 18 DP 357357</i>	Delete the Rural Residential zoning of 166 Waipapa Road, Kerikeri, being Lot 18 DP 357357, zone Light Industrial.	166 Waipapa Road, Kerikeri, being Lot 18 DP 357357, includes an existing and operating concrete product manufacturing plant producing wastewater treatment system components and pastoral water containment components, which has operated under planning approval. The provisions within the PDP has the opportunity to embody a management framework which can facilitate and sustain activities such as those undertaken by the submitter. The PDP contains such provisions which should be applied to the site. The proposed Rural Residential zone replicates the Operative District Plan which is incongruous to established site activity. A Light Industrial zoning which captures and reflects the nature and scale of the activities on the site is sought.	<b>Pre-hearing meetings</b> N/A  <b>Pre-circulated evidence</b> <a href="#">Linda-Gigger,-S370-A-McPhee,-Planning-evidence.pdf</a>	<b>Strategic direction</b>	Mr McPhee provides an assessment in his evidence. Strategically the rezoning of the site is inconsistent with the spatial plan.	<b>Costs –</b>  The proposed rezoning is inconsistent with the Spatial Plan which seeks to manage growth in a coordinated and integrated manner.  <b>Benefits –</b>  Potential economic benefits to landowners.  <b>Risks of acting or not acting</b>  Risks of acting include undermining the ability to achieve a compact urban form around Kerikeri and Waipapa,
					<b>Alignment with zone outcomes</b>	As set out in Mr McPhee's evidence from paragraph 23 onwards.	
					<b>Higher order direction</b>	As set out in Mr McPhee's evidence from paragraph 21 onwards.	
					<b>Reasons for the request</b>	Detailed in Mr McPhees evidence and section 5.2.9 of the report	
					<b>Assessment of site suitability and potential effects of rezoning</b>	As set out in Mr McPhee's evidence from paragraph 58 onwards.	
					<b>Infrastructure (three waters) servicing</b>	Site is serviced by reticulated water, and some stormwater servicing, onsite wastewater servicing.	
					<b>Transport infrastructure</b>	Limited transport assessment provided in Mr McPhee's evidence in paragraph 65.	
					<b>Consultation and further submissions</b>	0 Further Submissions	
					<b>Other relevant matters</b>	Zoned Rural Residential	
					<b>Section 32AA evaluation</b>	N/A	
<b>Recommendation</b>  Retain notified zoning. Reject original submission and further submissions in support and accept further submissions in opposition.							

## Appendix 1 Evaluation of Rezoning Submissions

Smartlife Trust							
Submission No/Point No.	Site Address	Decision Requested	Submitter Reasons	Nature of pre-hearing correspondence or submitter pre-circulated evidence (if any)	Rezoning Criteria	Officer's Comment	Costs and Benefits of accepting rezoning request
S15.001 Smartlife Trust	23 Aranga Road <i>Lot 2 and 3 DP 613888</i>	Delete Rural Residential zoning of the Kerikeri Holiday Park and Motel property (23 Aranga Road, Kerikeri, being Lot 2 DP 395942 and Lot 3 DP 335706), zone General Residential	The Kerikeri Holiday Park and Motel property (23 Aranga Road, Kerikeri, being Lot 2 DP 395942 and Lot 3 DP 335706) adjoins the General Residential zone and has direct access onto Aranga Road. Residential subdivision approvals have been granted to enable the creation of six residential sites as a non-complying activity. A residential zoning would promote the opportunity for collaboration for potential esplanade reserve, completing the current gap in access along the river. Property is connected to the Kerikeri Wastewater Reticulation system. Land is not identified as containing any high-class soils or being defined as highly productive. Inclusion within the General Residential zone is a coherent extension of urban Kerikeri area. The use of the property for residential development would compensate for the loss of those properties along Kerikeri Road currently zoned Residential and now proposed as Mixed Use.	<b>Pre-hearing meetings</b> Email correspondence regarding plan enabled capacity  <b>Pre-circulated evidence</b>  <a href="#">Smartlife-Trust,-S15-S-Sanson,-Planning-evidence.pdf</a>	<b>Strategic direction</b>	The proposed rezoning is consistent with the strategic direction. An assessment has been provided by Mr Sanson.	<b>Costs</b>  Infrastructure Demands: Any future development will require assessment of traffic impacts and servicing capacity (e.g., water, wastewater, stormwater), which may incur costs for upgrades or extensions.  Amenity Management: Ensuring that residential amenity values are maintained.  <b>Benefits</b> The planning evidence emphasizes several strategic and practical benefits:  Efficient Land Use: Rezoning supports compact urban form and better utilization of land within the Kerikeri-Waipapa Structure Plan Area.  Housing Supply: Enables increased residential capacity.  Alignment with NPS-UD: Supports national planning objectives for urban intensification and reduced reliance on private vehicles.  Compatibility with Surroundings: The site is adjacent to existing General Residential zones, making the transition logical and low impact.  <b>Risks of acting or not acting</b> Sufficient information to act
					<b>Alignment with zone outcomes</b>	The proposal aligns with the General Residential zone objectives and policies. An assessment has been provided by Mr Sanson.	
					<b>Higher order direction</b>	The proposal is considered to align with the relevant higher order documents. An assessment has been provided by Mr Sanson.	
					<b>Reasons for the request</b>	The reasons are detailed in the original submission.	
					<b>Assessment of site suitability and potential effects of rezoning</b>	The site is suitable for rezoning.	
					<b>Infrastructure (three waters) servicing</b>	Servicing position is discussed in section 5.2.10 of the report.	
					<b>Transport infrastructure</b>	The evidence discusses the site's proximity to existing road networks and its integration with the surrounding transport infrastructure. It emphasizes that the rezoning would support more efficient land use and better connectivity within the Kerikeri-Waipapa area.	
					<b>Consultation and further submissions</b>	2 Further Submissions	
					<b>Other relevant matters</b>	Zoned Rural Residential River Flood Hazard Zone 10 year ARI Event River Flood Hazard Zone 100 year ARI Event	
					<b>Section 32AA evaluation</b>	S32AA assessment provided in Section 5.2.10 of the report	
<b>Recommendation</b>  Rezone land to General Residential zone. Accept original submission and further submissions in support and reject further submissions in opposition.							

## Appendix 1 Evaluation of Rezoning Submissions

Turnstone Trust							
Submission No/Point No.	Site Address	Decision Requested	Submitter Reasons	Nature of pre-hearing correspondence or submitter pre-circulated evidence (if any)	Rezoning Criteria	Officer's Comment	Costs and Benefits of accepting rezoning request
S499.001 Turnstone Trust	126A Kerikeri Road  <i>Lot 1 DP 603456</i> <i>Lot 2 DP 60345</i> <i>Lot 3 DP 603456</i> <i>Lot 5 DP 603456</i>	Amend zoning of part of the land at 126A - 126B Kerikeri Road, Kerikeri from General Residential Zone to Mixed Use Zone (refer to submission for map of proposed zoning). Includes an additional area along Fairway Drive	It is considered that the FNDC is a tier 3 territorial authority and is therefore subject to the NPS-UD, as based on the Infometrics Report, the population of Kerikeri-Waipapa is projected to increase to over 10,000 people which meets the definition of an 'urban environment'. The NPS-UD requires business capacity is provided to meet demand, where the BERL Report also records that additional commercial land is required in the FND by 2045. The location of the PDP Mixed Use zoning for the Kerikeri Town Centre will not enable expansion of business or support a growing population, noting that a great extent of the area is already developed. Instead, it is considered that the submission site is located in a position that will provide greater cohesion to the town centre, will improve circulation in and around the town centre, will better align with interfaces between existing residential areas and has a high level of amenity. The proposed rezoning in this submission also better achieves the objectives and policies of the Mixed Use zone and better fulfils the requirements of the NPS-UD with respect to providing business capacity for the forecasted population growth.	<b>Pre-hearing meetings</b> Online meeting held with Ms O'Connor 21 <sup>st</sup> May 2025  <b>Pre-circulated evidence</b>  <a href="#">Turnstone-Trust,-S499-B-OConnor,-Planning-evidence.pdf</a>  <a href="#">Turnstone-Trust,-S499-F-Colegrave,-Economics-evidence.pdf</a>  <a href="#">Turnstone-Trust,-S499-G-Neill,-Urban-design-evidence.pdf</a>	<b>Strategic direction</b>	The proposed rezoning is consistent with the strategic direction. An assessment has been provided by MS O'Connor.	<b>Benefits</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Strategic alignment</b> with the Te Pātukurea – Kerikeri-Waipapa Spatial Plan and the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD).</li> <li><b>Supports mixed-use development</b> that enhances housing choice, walkability, and urban form.</li> <li>development.</li> <li><b>Economic uplift</b> through increased development capacity and potential for commercial activity.</li> </ul> <b>Costs</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Environmental sensitivity</b> due to proximity to the Kerikeri River and potential vegetation removal.</li> <li><b>Infrastructure pressure</b> if development proceeds without phased upgrades.</li> <li><b>Community concerns</b> around character, amenity, and traffic impacts.</li> </ul> <b>Risks of acting or not acting</b> Sufficient information to act on the submission.
					<b>Alignment with zone outcomes</b>	The proposed rezoning is consistent with the zone outcomes. An assessment has been provided by MS O'Connor.	
					<b>Higher order direction</b>	The proposed rezoning is consistent with the higher order direction. An assessment has been provided by MS O'Connor.	
					<b>Reasons for the request</b>	Ms O'Connor has provided reasons for the request these are outlined in section 5.2.3 of the report.	
					<b>Assessment of site suitability and potential effects of rezoning</b>	The site is suitable.	
					<b>Infrastructure (three waters) servicing</b>	The site is changing from one urban zone to another .	
					<b>Transport infrastructure</b>	The servicing report evaluates the site's access to Kerikeri Road and internal roading layout. It confirms that the proposed development can be supported by existing and planned road infrastructure, with appropriate connections to the wider transport network.	
					<b>Consultation and further submissions</b>	S499.001 4 Further Submissions S449.004 3 Further Submissions	
					<b>Other relevant matters</b>		
					<b>Section 32AA evaluation</b>	S32AA evaluation has been provided by Ms O'Connor and referred to in section 5.2.3 of the report.	
<b>Recommendation</b>  Rezone land 7.7ha of the Turnstone Trust site to Mixed Use zone zone. Accept in part the original submission and further submissions in support and reject further submissions in opposition.							

## Appendix 1 Evaluation of Rezoning Submissions

C Otway Ltd							
Submission No/Point No.	Site Address	Decision Requested	Submitter Reasons	Nature of pre-hearing correspondence or submitter pre-circulated evidence (if any)	Rezoning Criteria	Officer's Comment	Costs and Benefits of accepting rezoning request
S393.002 C Otway Ltd	No specific site	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 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.	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. 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 the PDP, which does not provide for the sustainable development and use of business land.	Pre-hearing meetings N/A   			