



## **Proposed Far North District Plan**

### **Volume 9 - Summary of Decisions Requested**

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (S409)</b>	S409.014	SCHED2 - Schedule of historic sites, buildings and objects	SCHED2 - Schedule of historic sites, buildings and objects	Support	The Proposed Plan is required to recognise and provide for the matters of national importance, in particular 6(f) "the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use and development" and s6(e) "the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga." HNZPT considers that the hybrid-plan format of the Proposed Plan, that includes: the identification of historic heritage; heritage area overlays; Kororareka Russell Township Zone and Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori issues (Overview), objectives, policies and rules each within a Section of the plan, is of assistance to the reader in understanding the background and reasons for the rules.	Retain Schedule 2 - Schedule of historic sites, buildings and objects
<b>Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited (S502)</b>	S502.113	SCHED2 - Schedule of historic sites, buildings and objects	SCHED2 - Schedule of historic sites, buildings and objects	Not Stated	Historic Site 100 (Te Karuwha Parade, Waitangi - Treaty House Hobson Memorial Whare Runanga, Flagpole) is located on Lot 1 DP 326610. While located within the general vicinity of each other, the combination of all items into one record can be confusing and there is potential that a historic building or structure may be missed in assessment. As such we seek that Site 100 is split into 4 separate notations on the map such that it is clear what buildings are considered historic within the planning document. This is consistent with other historic items in the District where there are multiple listings on a site.	Amend Historic Site 100 (Te Karuwha Parade, Waitangi - Treaty House Hobson Memorial Whare Runanga, Flagpole) located on Lot 1 DP 326610. Create four separate 'site records' such that it is clear what buildings are considered historic within the planning document. This is consistent with other historic items in the District where there are multiple listings on a site.
<b>Waitangi Limited (S503)</b>	S503.012	SCHED2 - Schedule of historic sites, buildings and objects	SCHED2 - Schedule of historic sites, buildings and objects	Not Stated	Historic Site 100 (Te Karuwha Parade, Waitangi - Treaty House Hobson Memorial Whare Runanga, Flagpole) is located on Lot 1 DP 326610. While located within the general vicinity of each other, the combination of all items into one record can be confusing and there is potential that a historic building or structure may be missed in assessment. As such we seek that Site 100 is split into 4 separate notations on the map such that it is clear what buildings are considered historic within the planning document. This is consistent with	Amend Historic Site 100 (Te Karuwha Parade, Waitangi - Treaty House Hobson Memorial Whare Runanga, Flagpole) located on Lot 1 DP 326610. Create four separate 'site records' such that it is clear what buildings are considered historic within the planning document. This is consistent with other historic items in the District where there are multiple listings on

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					other historic items in the District where there are multiple listings on a site.	a site.
<b>John-Peter Nilsson Trust and Anne-Marie Linder Nilsson (S1)</b>	S1.001	SCHED3 - Sites and areas of significance to Maori	SCHED3 - Sites and areas of significance to Maori	Oppose	Opposes to the part of his paddock being designated as an area significance to Maori (MS01-33). Submitters note that the area has been moved to a different part of their paddock which they consider is of no significance to Maori, there is nothing in this area except some rush bushes and grass, it has been this way for generations and prior to the area being developed it was simple scrubland. Submitter considers that identifying this area as of significance to Maori is clearly a mistake and probably was supposed to refer to a significant lake which is on the adjacent property (Shenstone forestry).	Delete MS01-33 from Schedule 3 of the Proposed District Plan (and planning maps) so that it is removed from the submitters property (at 8779 State Highway 1, Northern Aupouri) entirely.
<b>Michelle Patricia Nilsson-Webby Family Trust (S5)</b>	S5.001	SCHED3 - Sites and areas of significance to Maori	SCHED3 - Sites and areas of significance to Maori	Oppose	Part Paua Block and Part Paua No 2 Block, being 625B Paua Road, Te Kao, and DP 14043 Paua No2 BLK111, being 605A Paua Road, Te Kao, have no indication of Maori inhabitation. Dispute that the properties are of cultural significance to Maori and request removal of MA01-31 from the Historic sites map and other district plan maps (inferred).	Delete MA01-31 Paua papakainga development from Schedule 3 and planning maps: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Part Paua Block and Part Paua No 2 Block, being 625B Paua Road, Te Kao (inferred), and</li> <li>DP 14043 Paua No2 BLK111, being 605A Paua Road, Te Kao (inferred)</li> </ul>
<b>Nicole Butler (S305)</b>	S305.003	SCHED3 - Sites and areas of significance to Maori	SCHED3 - Sites and areas of significance to Maori	Support in part	We wish to include Ngawha geothermal field as a site of significance for Māori (Ref Waitangi Tribunal Report Ngawha Geothermal Resource 1993).	Insert Ngawha geothermal field as a site of significance for Māori.
<b>Te Aupōuri Commercial Development Ltd (S339)</b>	S339.057	SCHED3 - Sites and areas of significance to Maori	SCHED3 - Sites and areas of significance to Maori	Support	TACDL are supportive of the protection of sites and areas of significance to Māori throughout the Far North. However, it is of concern that the SCHED3 has not been updated with new sites as part of this process. There are many sites and areas of significance to Te Aupōuri, however, they are concerned with the sensitive nature of these sacred places and whether it is appropriate to have these incorporated into the PDP. Te Aupōuri	Amend to provide the flexibility to incorporate new sites into SCHED3

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					Iwi, hapū and whanau are the kaitiaki of these places and are unsure whether there is appropriate provision for their role as kaitiaki, and sufficient incorporation mātauranga and tikanga Māori.	
<b>Te Runanga o Ngai Takoto Trust (S390)</b>	S390.083	SCHED3 - Sites and areas of significance to Maori	SCHED3 - Sites and areas of significance to Maori	Support	The submitter considers the sites in Schedule 3 are appropriate sites for protection and have the support of iwi following past engagement.	Retain all Sites and areas of significance to Māori in Schedule 3.
<b>Haititaimaran gai Marae Kaitiaki Trust (S394)</b>	S394.060	SCHED3 - Sites and areas of significance to Maori	SCHED3 - Sites and areas of significance to Maori	Support in part	It should be clear to plan users that this Schedule is not exhaustive and that planning provisions pertaining to sites or areas of cultural significance apply to those sites and areas that are not identified. As above, it is not culturally appropriate to identify culturally significant sites or areas and to make that information available in all instances. Per s 6 RMA, must recognise and provision for tangata whenua culture, traditions and ancestral relationships - including traditions that relate to oral retention of mātauranga.	Amend the first paragraph of 'Schedule 3 - Sites and areas of significance to Māori' to include the following sentence: Refer to chapter on Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori for the rules that apply to the taonga in this schedule. <b>These rules apply to all sites and areas of significance to Māori, irrespective of whether those sites are identified in this Schedule.</b>
<b>Haititaimaran gai Marae Kaitiaki Trust (S394)</b>	S394.061	SCHED3 - Sites and areas of significance to Maori	SCHED3 - Sites and areas of significance to Maori	Support in part	Publicly known areas or sites of cultural significance to Haititaimarangai Marae include: - Waimango, its catchment and Karikari Moana; - Puheke maunga; - Puheke beach; - Parakerake beach; - Haititaimarangai Marae reserve.	Amend 'Schedule 3 - Sites and areas of significance to Māori' to include <b>Waimango catchment, Karikari Moana, Puheke maunga, Puheke beach, Parakerake beach and Haititaimarangai Marae reserve</b>
<b>Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (S409)</b>	S409.015	SCHED3 - Sites and areas of significance to Maori	SCHED3 - Sites and areas of significance to Maori	Support	The Proposed Plan is required to recognise and provide for the matters of national importance, in particular 6(f) "the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use and development" and s6(e) "the relationship of Maori	Retain Schedule 3 - Sites and areas of significance to Maori

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga." HNZPT considers that the hybrid-plan format of the Proposed Plan, that includes: the identification of historic heritage; heritage area overlays; Kororareka Russell Township Zone and Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori issues (Overview), objectives, policies and rules each within a Section of the plan, is of assistance to the reader in understanding the background and reasons for the rules.	
<b>Waiaua Bay Farm Limited (S463)</b>	S463.121	SCHED3 - Sites and areas of significance to Maori	SCHED3 - Sites and areas of significance to Maori	Oppose	Having discuss the matter with Ngāti Rehia mana whenua, WBF seeks the inclusion of the Piakoa wāhi tapu site on Schedule 3 to ensure the site is afforded ongoing statutory protection. Refer to Annexure D of submission which provides the New Zealand Heritage List entry for this site. Figure 2 of Annexure B of submission which shows WBF's proposed mapping of the site, based on the coordinates given in the New Zealand Heritage List entry.	Amend Schedule 3 (Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori) to include Piakoa
<b>Te Rūnanga o Whaingaroa (S486)</b>	S486.096	SCHED3 - Sites and areas of significance to Maori	SCHED3 - Sites and areas of significance to Maori	Support	These sites are appropriate sites for protection and have the support of iwi following past engagement.	Retain all Sites and areas of significance to Māori.
<b>Te Rūnanga Ā Iwi O Ngāpuhi (S498)</b>	S498.084	SCHED3 - Sites and areas of significance to Maori	SCHED3 - Sites and areas of significance to Maori	Support	The submitter considers the sites in Schedule 3 are appropriate sites for protection and have the support of iwi following past engagement.	Retain all Sites and areas of significance to Māori in Schedule 3.
<b>Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rēhia (S559)</b>	S559.043	SCHED3 - Sites and areas of significance to Maori	SCHED3 - Sites and areas of significance to Maori	Support in part	The area is is sacred to the people of Tākou Marae and Ngāti Rēhia of Ngāpuhi as an area which contains traditional burial caves (refer to submission for extract report from Heritage New Zealand).	Insert Piakoa, Tākou Bay (List no. 9832) to the schedule of sites of significance to Māori.
<b>Ahipara Takiwā (S576)</b>	S576.002	SCHED3 - Sites and areas of significance to Maori	SCHED3 - Sites and areas of significance to Maori	Support	The submitter states that the whole area of Moringai at 233 Foreshore Road, Ahipara, is of cultural significance. Morangai is a pa site and terraces have been identified. The significance of this area has been ignored and directives from a Judge. FNDC has not monitored the consent and	Amend Schedule 3 - Sites and areas to signiicance to Māori, to include Moringai at 233 Foreshore, Ahipara (inferred).

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					some sort of reflection of bad decisions by FNDC. The land that is being occupied and in private ownership should be purchased by the Council and made into a Māori Reserve. The Reserve land that exists should be turned into Māori land.	
<b>Ahipara Takiwā (S576)</b>	S576.003	SCHED3 - Sites and areas of significance to Maori	SCHED3 - Sites and areas of significance to Maori	Support	The submitter infers that the scheduling of Moringai, 233 Wharo Way, Ahipara should include the waterfall at the top of the subdivision and the stream which is called Moringai, also be identified as a significant waterway on to Te Oneroa a Tōhē.	Amend Schedule 3 - Sites and areas of significance to Māori to include the waterfall at the top of the subdivision, the stream is called Moringai and is to be identified as a significant waterway on to Te Oneroa a Tōhē (inferred).
<b>Moringai Whānau (S577)</b>	S577.001	SCHED3 - Sites and areas of significance to Maori	SCHED3 - Sites and areas of significance to Maori	Support	The submitter provides the following submission: Tena koutou e te whanau . Ko James Taniere toku ingoa September 2021 I arrived back to my grandmother's land of Ahipara. I am a direct descendant of the Heiwari line , one of the very first whānau in Ahipara . My connection to this whenua is not simply being a kaitiaki of the whenua and the rākau pohutukawa , but also being a protector of all manuhiri (visitors) to tell the right story of Moringai - a story handed down by our tupuna . Toakai lay at this site during his tangihanga. Since 2nd October, 2021 Moringai has welcomed many manuhiri from throughout the motu and the world. Some coming from as far as Zimbabwe. Moringai has given manaaki to anyone who came to hear our story . Moringai has hosted many Kura, Kohanga, Kaumātua, kuia, locals, who have a special connection to the whenua whether it is through whakapapa, waiata, karakia or being present on the land. Our tamariki is the reason why our whenua and our rākau tupuna should be returned . Ahiparapara is the heart of our people, we don't do computers to tell a story, we wānanga instead.	Amend Schedule 3 - Sites and areas of significance to Māori, to include the Whenua - Moringai/Moringaehē (Lot 1 Deposited Plan 381292), to ensure the preservation and the return of the whenua Moringai to the hapu of Ahipara as a site of historic and cultural significance (inferred).
<b>Roma Marae (S578)</b>	S578.001	SCHED3 - Sites and	SCHED3 - Sites and	Support	The submitter provides the following reasons: I am writing to you today firstly on behalf of the	Amend Schedule 3 - Sites and areas of significance to Māori to

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
		areas of significance to Maori	areas of significance to Maori		<p>Trustees of Roma Marae, Ahipara and the following hapu Ngāti Houpure, Ngāti Moetonga, Te Rokeka, Te Parewhero, Ngāti Pakahi, Patukirikiri, Ngāti Rua, Ngāti Moroki Ngati Waiora, Nga Uri o Hina, Ngā Uri o Hau, Rotohuri and Whanau Moana, that affiliate to Roma Marae. Secondly in support of the Tamaki Legal letter send to Council on the 2 December 2022.</p> <p>It is with great urgency and deep respect that I advocate for the preservation of this culturally important tree that holds immense significance for our hapu and takiwa. This cherished tree stands as a living testament to our heritage, identity, and the invaluable cultural legacy passed down through generations.</p> <p>The tree in question, is unique because it is sited on land that holds extraordinary historical and spiritual significance for our people. It is not merely a tree, but a living connection to our ancestors, a guardian of stories and traditions, and a symbol of our shared cultural heritage. Its roots run deep, mirroring the resilience and longevity of our people, while its branches reach for the sky, embodying the aspirations and dreams of future generations.</p> <p>Throughout history, our ancestors have woven tales and legends around this magnificent tree, making it a beacon of cultural pride and an intrinsic part of our collective consciousness. The land and tree have been a site for ceremonies, gatherings, and rituals, where knowledge, customs, and traditions have been imparted and celebrated. Its presence serves as a reminder of our deep connection to the land, the natural world, and our ancestors who walked this sacred land before us.</p> <p>The potential loss of this culturally significant tree</p>	include the whenua located at 1 Wharo Way, Ahipara, legal description: Lot 1, Deposited Plan 381292, to ensure the protection of the site above including the tree to be a site of cultural significance to the uri who affiliate to Roma Marae the principal marae of Ahipara.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>would have far-reaching implications for our Māori community, (ahi kā roa) causing irreparable damage to our cultural fabric and sense of belonging. Its destruction would be akin to severing a vital link to our ancestral past, eroding our cultural heritage, and depriving future generations of a tangible connection to their roots. I implore the Council to recognize the importance of preserving this sacred tree, not only for the Māori community but also for the entire community at large. By protecting this irreplaceable symbol of our culture, we can foster a greater understanding and appreciation of Māori values, traditions, and contributions.</p> <p>Moreover, preserving this tree aligns with the principles of environmental sustainability and respect for indigenous knowledge and practices.</p> <p>I respectfully urge the Council to take immediate action to halt any plans for the removal or destruction of this culturally significant tree. I propose that comprehensive consultation be undertaken with the Māori community, engaging cultural experts, elders, and representatives who have already developed an Ahipara Takiwa Management Plan, that respects and safeguards our heritage.</p> <p>By working together in a spirit of partnership and mutual respect, we can find a solution that ensures the survival of this invaluable cultural asset, while also fostering cultural diversity, intergenerational connections, and community harmony. Let us seize this opportunity to demonstrate our commitment to cultural preservation and to build a more inclusive and vibrant community for all.</p> <p>Finally I would appreciate an opportunity to present in person to the Council as there</p>	

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					are aspects of our history that I consider are private and are not for public dissemination. Thank you for your attention to this urgent matter. I trust that you will consider the profound significance of this tree and land and assist us to take the necessary steps to preserve it for the benefit of present and future generations. "Whatungarongaro te tangata, toitu te whenua. Man passes from this world, but land remains".	
<b>Ahipara Takiwā (S579)</b>	S579.002	SCHED3 - Sites and areas of significance to Maori	SCHED3 - Sites and areas of significance to Maori	Support	The submitter states that the whole area of Moringai at 233 Foreshore Road, Ahipara, is of cultural significance. Morangai is a pa site and terraces have been identified. The significance of this area has been ignored and directives from a Judge. FNDC has not monitored the consent and some sort of reflection of bad decisions by FNDC. The land that is being occupied and in private ownership should be purchased by the Council and made into a Māori Reserve. The Reserve land that exists should be turned into Māori land.	Amend Schedule 3 - Sites and areas of significance to Māori, to include Moringai at 233 Foreshore, Ahipara (inferred).
<b>Ahipara Takiwā (S579)</b>	S579.003	SCHED3 - Sites and areas of significance to Maori	SCHED3 - Sites and areas of significance to Maori	Support	The submitter infers that the scheduling of Moringai, 233 Wharo Way, Ahipara should include the waterfall at the top of the subdivision and the stream which is called Moringai, and is also be identified as a significant waterway onto Te Oneroa a Tōhē.	Amend Schedule 3 - Sites and areas of significance to Māori to include the waterfall at the top of the subdivision, the stream is called Moringai and is to be identified as a significant waterway on to Te Oneroa a Tōhē (inferred).
<b>Ahipara Takiwā (S579)</b>	S579.004	SCHED3 - Sites and areas of significance to Maori	SCHED3 - Sites and areas of significance to Maori	Support	The submitter provides the following reasons: I am writing to you today firstly on behalf of the Trustees of Roma Marae, Ahipara and the following hapu Ngāti Houpure, Ngāti Moetonga, Te Rokeka, Te Parewhero, Ngāti Pakahi, Patukirikiri, Ngāti Rua, Ngāti Moroki Ngāti Waioira, Nga Uri o Hina, Ngā Uri o Hau, Rotohuri and Whanau Moana, that affiliate to Roma Marae. Secondly in support of the Tamaki Legal letter send to Council on the 2 December 2022. It is with great urgency and deep respect that I advocate for the preservation of this	Amend Schedule 3 - Sites and areas of significance to Māori to include the whenua located at 1 Wharo Way, Ahipara, legal description: Lot 1, Deposited Plan 381292, to ensure the protection of the site above including the tree to be a site of cultural significance to the uri who affiliate to Roma Marae the principal marae of Ahipara.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>culturally important tree that holds immense significance for our hapu and takiwa. This cherished tree stands as a living testament to our heritage, identity, and the invaluable cultural legacy passed down through generations.</p> <p>The tree in question, is unique because it is sited on land that holds extraordinary historical and spiritual significance for our people. It is not merely a tree, but a living connection to our ancestors, a guardian of stories and traditions, and a symbol of our shared cultural heritage. Its roots run deep, mirroring the resilience and longevity of our people, while its branches reach for the sky, embodying the aspirations and dreams of future generations.</p> <p>Throughout history, our ancestors have woven tales and legends around this magnificent tree, making it a beacon of cultural pride and an intrinsic part of our collective consciousness. The land and tree have been a site for ceremonies, gatherings, and rituals, where knowledge, customs, and traditions have been imparted and celebrated. Its presence serves as a reminder of our deep connection to the land, the natural world, and our ancestors who walked this sacred land before us.</p> <p>The potential loss of this culturally significant tree would have far-reaching implications for our Māori community, (ahi kā roa) causing irreparable damage to our cultural fabric and sense of belonging. Its destruction would be akin to severing a vital link to our ancestral past, eroding our cultural heritage, and depriving future generations of a tangible connection to their roots. I implore the Council to recognize the importance of preserving this sacred tree, not only for the Māori community but also for the</p>	

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>entire community at large. By protecting this irreplaceable symbol of our culture, we can foster a greater understanding and appreciation of Māori values, traditions, and contributions. Moreover, preserving this tree aligns with the principles of environmental sustainability and respect for indigenous knowledge and practices.</p> <p>I respectfully urge the Council to take immediate action to halt any plans for the removal or destruction of this culturally significant tree. I propose that comprehensive consultation be undertaken with the Māori community, engaging cultural experts, elders, and representatives who have already developed an Ahipara Takiwa Management Plan, that respects and safeguards our heritage.</p> <p>By working together in a spirit of partnership and mutual respect, we can find a solution that ensures the survival of this invaluable cultural asset, while also fostering cultural diversity, intergenerational connections, and community harmony. Let us seize this opportunity to demonstrate our commitment to cultural preservation and to build a more inclusive and vibrant community for all.</p> <p>Finally I would appreciate an opportunity to present in person to the Council as there are aspects of our history that I consider are private and are not for public dissemination. Thank you for your attention to this urgent matter. I trust that you will consider the profound significance of this tree and land and assist us to take the necessary steps to preserve it for the benefit of present and future generations.</p> <p>"Whatungarongaro te tangata, toitu te whenua. Man passes from this world, but land remains".</p>	

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>Kellie Edwards (S63)</b>	S63.001	SCHED4 - Schedule of significant natural areas	SCHED4 - Schedule of significant natural areas	Oppose	Opposes changing Rural production land or rural lifestyle block sized properties being changed to SNA. it does not make practical sense for small titles of proposed SNA areas on Wainui Road near Ota Point Road to become SNA. The immediate local area is rural production, lifestyle blocks and sections in an area requiring more housing due to a substantial lack. This has obviously been recognised due to the close proximity of the new subdivision on Ota Point Road. Singling out a couple of small properties to be SNA beside a neighbour who is currently constructing a subdivision seem unreasonable. As stated in your plan the SNA proposal has been desk based and the 192 Wainui Road properties included as proposed SNA's seem lumped in due to this rather than a sensible and realistic assessment that feet on the ground at the titles at 192 Wainui Road, Kaeo would provide.	Amend the Proposed District Plan so that the land at 192 Wainui Road, Kaeo are not 'Significant Natural Areas'.
<b>Horticulture New Zealand (S159)</b>	S159.050	SCHED4 - Schedule of significant natural areas	SCHED4 - Schedule of significant natural areas	Oppose	There is a requirement in the draft National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity that territorial authorities undertake a district wide assessment: Subpart 2 - Significant natural areas 3.8 Assessing areas that qualify as significant natural areas (1) Every territorial authority must undertake a district-wide assessment of the land in its district to identify areas of significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitat of indigenous fauna that qualify as SNAs.	Amend to reword in line with National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity provisions
<b>Kerikeri Peninsula Conservation Charitable Trust (S180)</b>	S180.001	SCHED4 - Schedule of significant natural areas	SCHED4 - Schedule of significant natural areas	Not Stated	the schedule is blank, even though the Council's Consent process has already protected a number of sites that are SNA or equivalent. this is a grave omission	insert SNAs and similar sites that have already been protected through the Council's resource consent process, as well as future sites, should be added automatically by the Council into Schedule 4
<b>Nicole Wooster (S259)</b>	S259.005	SCHED4 - Schedule of significant natural areas	SCHED4 - Schedule of significant natural areas	Support in part	If mapping is proposed through submission or the government releasing the NPSIB then the draft mapping for the submitter's property should be reviewed and changed as required if in error, it	Amend, if proposed, any SNA mapping if brought into the plan, so that the mapping for the submitter's property is fully reviewed by the

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					has incorrectly identified SNA areas on the submitter's property. Mapping must be refined to ensure that it is correct due to the level of controls that will apply to land identified in an SNA. There is also concern that the mapping was based on flora only and no consideration for the lack of fauna. Council should continue to fund the mapping exercise for land owners that are not developing their land.	submitter and corrected to not protect land that is an SNA.
<b>Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust (S338)</b>	S338.044	SCHED4 - Schedule of significant natural areas	SCHED4 - Schedule of significant natural areas	Not Stated	Some areas of significant ecological value on private land have already been recognised and protected (by consent conditions, covenant, etc.) during a resource consenting process in recent years however they are not included in Schedule 4 of the PDP.	Amend Schedule 4 to include ecological areas already protected by resource consent conditions, consent notices, covenants etc
<b>Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation ) (S364)</b>	S364.002	SCHED4 - Schedule of significant natural areas	SCHED4 - Schedule of significant natural areas	Oppose	There are no scheduled SNAs within Schedule 4 of the Proposed District Plan. The Director-General is strongly opposed to this decision, which is considered contrary to section 6(c) of the RMA, the objectives and policies of the Regional Policy Statement for Northland, and the NPSIB exposure draft. The Director-General is concerned that the current wording of the subdivision chapter will allow potential SNA sites to be subdivided with minimal ability to consider the adverse effects of the subdivision on indigenous biodiversity.	Insert SNAs in the plan using the report prepared for Council titled "Significant Indigenous Vegetation and Habitats of the Far North District - Volume 1" prepared by Wildlands Consultants (Contract Report No. 4899d, December 2019) to include SNAs in the Proposed District Plan.
<b>Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand (S421)</b>	S421.139	SCHED4 - Schedule of significant natural areas	SCHED4 - Schedule of significant natural areas	Support	Federated Farmers supports the inclusion of proposed Schedule 4 in the proposed district plan. The schedule is an appropriate way to recognise the relationship between private landowners and Council and the need to work in partnership to manage Significant Natural Areas.	Retain Schedule 4 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas and develop as proposed
<b>Kapiro Residents Association (S430)</b>	S430.001	SCHED4 - Schedule of significant natural areas	SCHED4 - Schedule of significant natural areas	Not Stated	SNAs and similar sites that have already been protected through the council's resource consent process, as well as future sites, should be added automatically by the council into Schedule 4 of the PDP. The existing protected sites need to be added promptly into Schedule 4 - there is no justification for omitting the existing protected sites.	Amend Schedule 4 Schedule of significant natural areas to include all areas already protected through the resource consent process, updating the Schedule to automatically to include all new protected sites

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>Kapiro Conservation Trust (S442)</b>	S442.144	SCHED4 - Schedule of significant natural areas	SCHED4 - Schedule of significant natural areas	Support in part	Support having the schedule but the schedule does not have any SNAs listed. This schedule should be filled with SNAs.	Amend to fill this Schedule with SNAs.
<b>Kapiro Conservation Trust (S442)</b>	S442.167	SCHED4 - Schedule of significant natural areas	SCHED4 - Schedule of significant natural areas	Support in part	This schedule is empty, and there are few incentives for it to be used by landowners.	Amend to provide additional incentives for this schedule, as raised in submission (refer to S451.017).
<b>Kapiro Conservation Trust (S448)</b>	S448.001	SCHED4 - Schedule of significant natural areas	SCHED4 - Schedule of significant natural areas	Oppose	Schedule 4 is blank, even though the Council's consent process has already protected a number of sites that are SNAs or equivalent. This is a grave omission as the schedule should contain a list of all SNA's and similar sites which have already been protected through the consent process.	Insert SNA's and similar sites that have already been protected through the Council's resource consent process, as well as future sites, into Schedule 4 of the PDP.
<b>Kapiro Conservation Trust (S449)</b>	S449.044	SCHED4 - Schedule of significant natural areas	SCHED4 - Schedule of significant natural areas	Oppose	Some areas of significant ecological value on private land have already been recognised and protected (by consent conditions, covenant, etc.) during a resource consenting process in recent years however they are not included in Schedule 4 of the PDP.	Amend Schedule 4 to include ecological areas already protected by resource consent conditions, consent notices, covenants etc
<b>Pacific Eco-Logic (S451)</b>	S451.023	SCHED4 - Schedule of significant natural areas	SCHED4 - Schedule of significant natural areas	Support in part	This schedule is empty, and there are few incentives for it to be used by landowners	Amend to provide additional incentives for this schedule, as raised in submission (refer to S451.017)
<b>Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand (S511)</b>	S511.125	SCHED4 - Schedule of significant natural areas	SCHED4 - Schedule of significant natural areas	Support in part	Support having the schedule but the schedule does not have any SNAs listed. This schedule should be filled with SNAs	Amend to fill Schedule with SNAs
<b>Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK) (S522)</b>	S522.045	SCHED4 - Schedule of significant natural areas	SCHED4 - Schedule of significant natural areas	Oppose	Some areas of significant ecological value on private land have already been recognised and protected (by consent conditions, covenant, etc.) during a resource consenting process in recent years however they are not included in Schedule 4 of the PDP.	Amend Schedule 4 to include ecological areas already protected by resource consent conditions, consent notices, covenants etc
<b>Carbon Neutral NZ Trust (S529)</b>	S529.043	SCHED4 - Schedule of	SCHED4 - Schedule of	Oppose	Some areas of significant ecological value on private land have already been recognised and protected (by consent conditions, covenant, etc.)	Amend Schedule 4 to include ecological areas already protected

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
		significant natural areas	significant natural areas		during a resource consenting process in recent years however they are not included in Schedule 4 of the PDP	by resource consent conditions, consent notices, covenants etc
Ian Diarmid Palmer (S546)	S546.003	SCHED4 - Schedule of significant natural areas	SCHED4 - Schedule of significant natural areas	Oppose	<p>* In consistent with NPS-IB: The Far North SNA Regime is unnecessarily inconsistent with the 'Draft National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity' (NPS-IB; in particular by not distinguishing between Medium and High criteria SNA area, and this causes it to be unreasonably onerous to a large number of landowners in the Far North District.</p> <p>*Contrary to the Need for Active Management: The bigger threat to indigenous biodiversity and healthy ecosystems in the FND is not the lack of area that has native vegetation on it or the deliberate clearing of native vegetation, but rather the impact of pest animals and invasive non-indigenous plants on areas of nature vegetation.</p> <p>* Inaccurate Spatial Definition: The SNA boundaries are defined by aerial imagery acquired between 2014 and 2016 which in many cases will not correctly reflect the state of the land when the PDP is notified (when the relevant rule will take effect), and in any event can't accurately define what land areas do and don't meet the criteria for SNAs. It is apparent that there has been no effective evaluation of the land within the Landowners' Allotments (which are not even located on Butler's Point - the Allotments are on the Rangitoto Peninsula) to validly assess what if any land meets the RPS SNA criteria or the draft NPS-IB criteria (refer to Attachment 1 of the Submission).</p> <p>*Undermines Covenanting Regime: No guarantee has been given that the FNDC will retain its current policy and practices of providing rates relief in return for landowners voluntarily protecting areas by way of conservation covenants once the land that might otherwise be covenanted has</p>	Amend PDP to reference the 685 SNAs defined in the preparation of the FN SNA Regime in the same way that the ODP references the Protected Natural Areas (PNA) Programme currently. (Noting that when the Landowners applied for a RC for a boundary adjustment to their Allotments the FNDC had much regard for the particular PNA that related to the Allotments (PNA 004/207) and this was the starting point for reaching agreement on areas to covenant recognising that the PNA wasn't of sufficient resolution or sufficiently up to date to apply without further consideration of the current specifics of the land).

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>becomes 'protected' under the FN SNA Regime.</p> <p>*Undermines Conditions of Consent Regime: Currently activities that are not Permitted or Controlled are often given RMA Resource Consent (RC) in return for environmental offsets involving the landowner proposing / accepting conditions requiring protection of areas of indigenous bush by subjecting those areas to conservation covenants.</p> <p>*Discourages enhancement of non-SNA land: The FN SNA Regime penalises landowners who in the past have facilitated land reverting to regenerating indigenous bush by subjecting them to restrictive land use rules, whereas landowners who have cleared land and kept it largely clear of native bush are exempt from such penalty.</p> <p>*Rules for SNAs unreasonably restrictive: The rules for land subject to an SNA under the DDP are dramatically more restrictive than the rules in the Operative District Plan (ODP) even for land currently zoned Outstanding Landscape.</p> <p>*Overlay Overload: The proposed SNA overlay in the DDP adds to a plethora of new overlays not seen as necessary in the ODP, each with its own set of rules restricting land use.</p>	
<p><b>Ian Diarmid Palmer (S546)</b></p>	<p>S546.004</p>	<p>SCHED4 - Schedule of significant natural areas</p>	<p>SCHED4 - Schedule of significant natural areas</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>* In consistent with NPS-IB: The Far North SNA Regime is unnecessarily inconsistent with the 'Draft National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity' (NPS-IB; in particular by not distinguishing between Medium and High criteria SNA area, and this causes it to be unreasonably onerous to a large number of landowners in the Far North District.</p>	<p>Amend PDP, so when, and if, a landowner submits a RC application that relates to land subject to an SNA where the outcome of the application may be affected if the land in question met the High SNA criteria, then the landowner should have the right to have a detailed</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>*Contrary to the Need for Active Management: The bigger threat to indigenous biodiversity and healthy ecosystems in the FND is not the lack of area that has native vegetation on it or the deliberate clearing of native vegetation, but rather the impact of pest animals and invasive non-indigenous plants on areas of nature vegetation.</p> <p>* Inaccurate Spatial Definition: The SNA boundaries are defined by aerial imagery acquired between 2014 and 2016 which in many cases will not correctly reflect the state of the land when the PDP is notified (when the relevant rule swill take effect), and in any event can't accurately define what land areas do and don't meet the criteria for SNAs. It is apparent that there has been no effective evaluation of the land within the Landowners' Allotments (which are not even located on Butler's Point - the Allotments are on the Rangitoto Peninsula) to validly assess what if any land meets the RPS SNA criteria or the draft NPS-IB criteria (refer to Attachment 1 of the Submission).</p> <p>*Undermines Covenanting Regime: No guarantee has been given that the FNDC will retain its current policy and practices of providing rates relief in return for landowners voluntarily protecting areas by way of conservation covenants once the land that might otherwise be covenanted has becomes 'protected' under the FN SNA Regime.</p> <p>*Undermines Conditions of Consent Regime: Currently activities that are not Permitted or Controlled are often given RMA Resource Consent (RC) in return for environmental offsets involving the landowner proposing / accepting conditions requiring protection of areas of indigenous bush by subjecting those areas to</p>	<p>assessment of the area concerned undertaken (by consultants of his/her choice but at Council expense) applying the SNA assessment approach and criteria as set out in the NPS-IB, such that the SNA land in question can accurately and reliably be categorised as High, Medium or Low (where Low means doesn't meet the Medium threshold and hence is excluded from the SNA). By this approach, the FNDC as the Consenting Authority can still have proper regard to information related to the SNA (as revised if appropriate per the prior paragraph) that relates to the land in question when deciding on RC conditions (and such conditions may require some or all of the SNA identified land in question to be subject to a conservation covenant). This is no different in concept to what the FNDC does now under the ODP when it has regard to Protected Natural Areas (PNAs) even though there are no specific PNA overlay or PNA specific set of rules in the ODP.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>conservation covenants.</p> <p>*Discourages enhancement of non-SNA land: The FN SNA Regime penalises landowners who in the past have facilitated land reverting to regenerating indigenous bush by subjecting them to restrictive land use rules, whereas landowners who have cleared land and kept it largely clear of native bush are exempt from such penalty.</p> <p>*Rules for SNAs unreasonably restrictive: The rules for land subject to an SNA under the DDP are dramatically more restrictive than the rules in the Operative District Plan (ODP) even for land currently zoned Outstanding Landscape.</p> <p>*Overlay Overload: The proposed SNA overlay in the DDP adds to a plethora of new overlays not seen as necessary in the ODP, each with its own set of rules restricting land use.</p>	
<b>Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation) (S364)</b>	S364.078	SCHED5 - Schedule of Outstanding natural landscapes	SCHED5 - Schedule of Outstanding natural landscapes	Support	The Director-General supports the Council to identify, map and protect outstanding natural landscapes, especially those within the coastal environment in line the NZCPS.	Retain Schedule 5 - Schedule of Outstanding natural landscapes
<b>Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation) (S364)</b>	S364.079	SCHED6 - Schedule of Outstanding natural features	SCHED6 - Schedule of Outstanding natural features	Support	The Director-General supports the Council to identify, map and protect outstanding natural features, especially those within the coastal environment in line the NZCPS.	Retain Schedule 6 - Schedule of Outstanding natural features
<b>The Shooting Box Limited (S187)</b>	S187.097	SCHED7 - Schedule of High natural character	SCHED7 - Schedule of High natural character	Oppose	Refer to full submission for reasoning in relation to High Natural Character Overlay on Part Lot 1 Deposited Plan 53930 (4.2152 hectares); and Lot 1 Deposited Plan 97835 and Lot 1 Deposited Plan	Amend the High Natural Character overlay on the subject property legally described as Part Lot 1 Deposited Plan 53930 (4.2152 hectares); and Lot 1 Deposited Plan

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					71896 (9715 m2) to exclude areas of planted gardens and low value manuka/kanuka.	97835and Lot 1 Deposited Plan 71896 (9715 m2) to exclude areas of planted gardens and low value manuka/kanuka.
<b>Living Waters - Bay of Islands (S303)</b>	S303.002	SCHED7 - Schedule of High natural character	SCHED7 - Schedule of High natural character	Support in part	The inclusion of the Schedule is supported as it provides the reader with introductory information about the (largely) terrestrial parts of the natural character units measured and mapped in the RPS. However, many of the Unique Identifier numbers have been mistranscribed from the RPS data, making it difficult and confusing to dig deeper into the underlying maps, worksheets and tables in the RPS. For example, HNC187 has been given the identifier of 1-Oct instead of 01/10 and at the end of the mistranscriptions, HNC541 has been given the identifier Sep-36 instead of 09/36. This is probably because the underlying formatting in an intermediate Excel spreadsheet has used date formatting on the third column, rather than the general default format.	Amend to correct the misformatted Unique identifiers in the 3rd column to the correct format of "unit number/map number", rather than the inappropriate date format.
<b>Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation) (S364)</b>	S364.080	SCHED7 - Schedule of High natural character	SCHED7 - Schedule of High natural character	Support	The Director-General supports the Council to identify, map and protect the natural character of the coastal environment in line with Policies 13 and 14 of the NZCPS.	Retain Schedule 7 - Schedule of High natural character
<b>Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand (S421)</b>	S421.141	SCHED7 - Schedule of High natural character	SCHED7 - Schedule of High natural character	Support in part	Federated Farmers does not support the separation of natural character into high natural character (Schedule 7) and outstanding natural character (Schedule 8). Section 6(a) of the Resource Management Act 1991 does not separate natural character out into separate categories. The section simply requires the preservation of natural character of the coastal environment, wetlands, lakes, and rivers etc and their protection from inappropriate subdivision, use and development. Council is required to be consistent with the provisions of the Act. This includes Part 2 of the Act as well as its functions under the Act. The	Delete Schedule 7 Schedule of High Natural Character and Schedule 8 Schedule of High Natural Character, and create a single schedule for natural character (combining both of these Schedules).

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					separation of natural character into two separate categories does not achieve this. The additional layers are unnecessary and add additional layers of complexity and unwarranted barriers. Where an area of natural character is located within a rural zone, the zone provisions along with the provisions for natural character will assist in its preservation and protection from inappropriate subdivision, use and development. Rural zone provisions will manage the scale and density of buildings, earthworks, forestry, and subdivision, which are part of existing farming land uses that must be provided for as a right in the district plan.	
<b>Kapiro Conservation Trust (S442)</b>	S442.168	SCHED7 - Schedule of High natural character	SCHED7 - Schedule of High natural character	Support	Land use changes, vegetation succession and more detailed information/imagery obtained since 2012, indicate that the natural character mapping for a few locations should be updated. Some locations, primarily in the Bay of Islands and the Far North, should be more highly ranked.	Amend the natural character mapping to include additional locations for high natural character and remove a few areas of high natural character that have been cleared since 2012. The latter is primarily in the Bay of Islands.
<b>Pacific Eco-Logic (S451)</b>	S451.024	SCHED7 - Schedule of High natural character	SCHED7 - Schedule of High natural character	Support	Land use changes, vegetation succession and more detailed information/imagery obtained since 2012, indicate that the natural character mapping for a few locations should be updated. Some locations, primarily in the Bay of Islands and the Far North, should be more highly ranked	Amend the natural character mapping to include additional locations for high natural character and remove a few areas of high natural character that have been cleared since 2012. The latter is primarily in the Bay of Islands.
<b>Ecochic Properties Ltd (S574)</b>	S574.001	SCHED7 - Schedule of High natural character	SCHED7 - Schedule of High natural character	Oppose	The 'High Natural Character' overlay recorded against 48 Taupo Bay Road (Lot 113 DP 56268) has been placed in error. There is no justification for the overlay. There is no native vegetation on the property (the reason why the overlay was placed).	Delete the 'High Natural Character' overlay recorded against 48 Taupo Bay Road (Lot 113 DP 56268)
<b>Living Waters - Bay of Islands (S303)</b>	S303.003	SCHED8 - Schedule of Outstanding natural character	SCHED8 - Schedule of Outstanding natural character	Support in part	The inclusion of the Schedule of the Outstanding Natural Character units is fully supported, and because many of these are completely or partly terrestrial they should be included in a separate mapping overlay. The inclusion of the Schedule is supported as it provides the reader with introductory information about the (largely)	Amend to correct the formatting of the Unique Identifier column to "unit number/map number", rather than the date formatting selected from an Excel spreadsheet

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>terrestrial parts of the natural character units measured and mapped in the RPS. However, many of the Unique Identifier numbers have been mistranscribed from the RPS data, making it difficult and confusing to dig deeper into the underlying maps, worksheets and tables in the RPS. For example, ONC73 has been given the identifier of Feb-18 instead of 02/18. This is probably because the underlying formatting in an intermediate Excel spreadsheet has used date formatting on the third column, rather than the general default format.</p>	
<p><b>Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation) (S364)</b></p>	<p>S364.081</p>	<p>SCHED8 - Schedule of Outstanding natural character</p>	<p>SCHED8 - Schedule of Outstanding natural character</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>The Director-General supports the Council to identify, map and protect the natural character of the coastal environment in line with Policies 13 and 14 of the NZCPS.</p>	<p>Retain Schedule 8 - Schedule of Outstanding natural character</p>
<p><b>Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand (S421)</b></p>	<p>S421.142</p>	<p>SCHED8 - Schedule of Outstanding natural character</p>	<p>SCHED8 - Schedule of Outstanding natural character</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>Federated Farmers does not support the separation of natural character into high natural character (Schedule 7) and outstanding natural character (Schedule 8). Section 6(a) of the Resource Management Act 1991 does not separate natural character out into separate categories. The section simply requires the preservation of natural character of the coastal environment, wetlands, lakes, and rivers etc and their protection from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.</p> <p>Council is required to be consistent with the provisions of the Act. This includes Part 2 of the Act as well as its functions under the Act. The separation of natural character into two separate categories does not achieve this. The additional layers are unnecessary and add additional layers of complexity and unwarranted barriers.</p> <p>Where an area of natural character is located within a rural zone, the zone provisions along with the provisions for natural character will assist in its preservation and protection from inappropriate subdivision, use and development. Rural zone</p>	<p>Delete Schedule 7 Schedule of High Natural Character and Schedule 8 Schedule of High Natural Character, and create a single schedule for natural character (combining both of these Schedules).</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					provisions will manage the scale and density of buildings, earthworks, forestry, and subdivision, which are part of existing farming land uses that must be provided for as a right in the district plan.	
<b>Kapiro Conservation Trust (S442)</b>	S442.169	SCHED8 - Schedule of Outstanding natural character	SCHED8 - Schedule of Outstanding natural character	Support in part	Land use changes, vegetation succession and more detailed information/imagery obtained since 2012, indicate that the natural character mapping for a few locations should be updated. Some locations, primarily in the Bay of Islands and the Far North, should be more highly ranked.	Amend the natural character mapping to include additional locations for outstanding natural character.
<b>Pacific Eco-Logic (S451)</b>	S451.025	SCHED8 - Schedule of Outstanding natural character	SCHED8 - Schedule of Outstanding natural character	Support	Land use changes, vegetation succession and more detailed information/imagery obtained since 2012, indicate that the natural character mapping for a few locations should be updated. Some locations, primarily in the Bay of Islands and the Far North, should be more highly ranked	Amend the natural character mapping to include additional locations for outstanding natural character.
<b>Waiaua Bay Farm Limited (S463)</b>	S463.057	SCHED8 - Schedule of Outstanding natural character	SCHED8 - Schedule of Outstanding natural character	Oppose	Part of WBFs site is proposed to be included in the ONC80 area (151 Tepene Tablelands Road, Matauri Bay, being Lot 1 DP 199909 and Lot 8 DP 50236). WBF opposes the application of that layer to its property. For completeness, it also opposes this policy insofar as it would prohibit WBF's landscape maintenance activities and the upgrade and development of structures in the Totara Forest.	Delete ONC80 from SCHED8 - Schedule of Outstanding natural character and the mapping notation shown on 151 Tepene Tablelands Road, Matauri Bay, being Lot 1 DP 199909 and Lot 8 DP 50236 OR delete Policy CE-P9.
<b>Waiaua Bay Farm Limited (S463)</b>	S463.058	SCHED8 - Schedule of Outstanding natural character	SCHED8 - Schedule of Outstanding natural character	Oppose	Part of WBFs site is proposed to be included in the ONC80 area (151 Tepene Tablelands Road, Matauri Bay, being Lot 1 DP 199909 and Lot 8 DP 50236). WBF opposes the application of that layer to its property. For completeness, it also opposes this policy insofar as it would prohibit WBF's landscape maintenance activities and the upgrade and development of structures in the Totara Forest.	Delete ONC80 from SCHED8 - Schedule of Outstanding natural character and the mapping notation shown on 151 Tepene Tablelands Road, Matauri Bay, being Lot 1 DP 199909 and Lot 8 DP 50236 OR delete Policy CE-P9.
<b>Waiaua Bay Farm Limited (S463)</b>	S463.122	SCHED8 - Schedule of Outstanding natural character	SCHED8 - Schedule of Outstanding natural character	Oppose	The proposed ONC80 area does not have "near to pristine indigenous land cover". Numerous "human features" within and directly abutting the area present clearly apparent visual and acoustic modifications that cannot be described as "negligible". While the Totara Forest is undoubtedly a pleasant area that provides amenity	Delete ONC80 from Schedule 8 - Schedule of Outstanding natural character

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					for guests and visitors to Kauri Cliffs, it does not provide a "very strong experience of naturalness". On this basis WBF considers that it is inappropriate to apply ONC80 to the Totara Forest. The features and characteristics of this area are not consistent with the assessment criteria for areas of 'Outstanding Natural Character' stated in Appendix 1 of the Proposed Plan.	
<b>Vaughan Norton-Taylor (S50)</b>	S50.006	Planning maps	Coastal Environment	Oppose	Everything is discretionary not permitted. Disregard for options development and land values.	Not stated
<b>Brownie Family Trust (S74)</b>	S74.003	Planning maps	Coastal Environment	Support	The coastal environment is appropriate and does need appropriate planning provisions.	Retain the Coastal Environment overlay as notified
<b>Good Journey Limited (S82)</b>	S82.008	Planning maps	Coastal Environment	Oppose	The Application of the Coastal Environment Overlay as shown on the planning maps to 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 not supported by appropriate analysis, does not meet the provisions of s.32 of the Act, and does not accord with Part II of the RMA 1991.	Delete the Coastal Environment overlay from 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
<b>Yvonne Sharp (S90)</b>	S90.001	Planning maps	Coastal Environment	Oppose	Opito Bay is a built up residential area and is zoned coastal settlement. The Coastal environment overlay puts unreasonable conditions on an area that contains single and multi story dwellings and very small cottages, some of them the very original dwellings constructed in the bay. The Coastal Environment overlay is applied in a blanket manner that disregards long established settlements and applies rules for new builds or alterations that are inconsistent to the existing buildings and with the intent of the settlement zone.	Delete Coastal Environment Overlay from Opito Bay.
<b>Yvonne Sharp (S90)</b>	S90.002	Planning maps	Coastal Environment	Oppose	The Coastal Environment overlay is applied in a blanket manner that disregards long established settlements and applies rules for new builds or alterations that are inconsistent to the existing buildings and with the intent of the settlement	Delete Coastal Environment Overlay from built up areas (for example, Opito Bay), or create sublayers in the Coastal

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>zone.</p> <p>The Coastal environment overlay applies district wide and does not take into account the differences in the levels of development existing in particular areas (which have been established under the provisions in the current operative district plan). For this reason it is inappropriate to have blanket provisions applying throughout the Coastal environment overlay. For example, if retained, the provisions applying for Opito Bay should be changed to align with the level of existing development which has created a built up environment adjacent to the coast, i.e. it is not pristine.</p>	Environment Overlay to have regard to differing levels of development.
<b>Summit Forests New Zealand Limited (S148)</b>	S148.035	Planning maps	Coastal Environment	Not Stated	<p>The chapter on the Coastal Environment fails to provide equitably for all primary production activities. In particular, it fails to recognise that, where plantation forestry already exists within the Coastal Environment, it should be considered as a legitimate part of the landscape and provided for as a permitted activity subject to the provisions of the NES-PF.</p> <p>While the notes to this chapter refer to the Plan's ability to establish more stringent rules than the NES-PF, no justification for this has been provided in the section 32 report and, doing so, would fail to meet the wider policies and objectives of the Plan for example PRROZ-01, RPROZ-03, RPROZ-04, and RPROZ-P1.</p>	Delete any areas of existing plantation forestry from the coastal environment overlay mapping.
<b>Summit Forests New Zealand Limited (S148)</b>	S148.056	Planning maps	Coastal Environment	Not Stated	<p>The Plan's overlays for Outstanding Natural Landscapes, Outstanding, and High Natural Character, and Coastal Environment captures significant areas of SFNZ's plantation forests. This could create uncertainty and open SFNZ to challenge over its legitimate plantation forestry activities in these areas</p>	Delete any Coastal Environment overlay from plantation forest areas.
<b>NFS Farms Limited (S151)</b>	S151.004	Planning maps	Coastal Environment	Support	<p>The High Natural character overlay (inferred: coastal environment overlay) is proposed to apply along the coastal margins and in the gullies close to the coast on the submitters land at 123 Rangitane Road, Kerikeri 0294 (Lot 3 DP 184505) and 127 Rangitane road, Kerikeri 0294 (Lots 1</p>	Retain coastal environment overlay (as it relates to submitters landholdings (at 123 Rangitane Road, Kerikeri 0294 (Lot 3 DP 184505) and 127 Rangitane road,

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					and 3 DP 502469)). This overlay and associated provisions acknowledge the significant ecological and landscape qualities of the land and the potential to protect and enhance natural freshwater assets and indigenous vegetation.	Kerikeri 0294 (Lots 1 and 3 DP 502469) as notified.
<b>Bentzen Farm Limited (S167)</b>	S167.110	Planning maps	Coastal Environment	Oppose	The objectives, policies and rules in the Coastal Overlay in combination fail to recognise and provide for farming (including enabling people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural well-being) , and where the overlay applies to those parts of the property actively farmed, it therefore fails to achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991.	Delete the Coastal Overlay from the Bentzen Farms property (legally described as Lot 1 Deposited Plan 87944; Lot 3 Deposited Plan 479155; and Lot 4 Deposited Plan 479155 and Part Lot 4 Deposited Plan 38894 and Lot 5 Deposited Plan 38894 and Section 27-28 Block III Russell Survey District) if the alternative relief sought relating to the coastal objectives, policies and rules relating to farming activities is not met
<b>Matauri Trustee Limited (S243)</b>	S243.128	Planning maps	Coastal Environment	Oppose	The Proposed Plan mapping extends the Coastal Environment Overlay across Wainui Road, with an arbitrary straight sided triangle of land included on that side of the road. This triangle has no relationship with the coastal environment and does not satisfy the attributes and criteria in Appendix 1 of the RPS. Namely: 1. It is not an area where coastal processes, influences or qualities are significant, including coastal lakes, lagoons, tidal estuaries, saltmarshes, coastal wetlands, and the margins of these. 2. It is not an area at risk from coastal hazards. 3. It does not exhibit coastal vegetation and the habitat of indigenous coastal species including migratory birds, being farmed. 4. It does not have elements and features that contribute to the natural character, landscape, visual qualities or amenity values of the coastal environment, being inland from the dominant ridge. 5. It does not include items of cultural and historic heritage in the coastal marine area or on the coast	Delete part of the Coastal Environment Overlay applying to 2118 Wainui Road, Matauri Bay (Part Matauri No 2H Block), deleting the area along the southeastern boundary shown on the map attached to submission.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>(none are mapped in the planning documents and no archaeological sites are in this area as determined by Clough and Associates archaeological report).</p> <p>6. It is not an inter-related coastal marine and terrestrial system, including the intertidal zone</p> <p>7. It has no physical resources and built facilities, including infrastructure, that have modified the coastal environment.</p> <p>8. It is not a flat, low-lying area.</p> <p>A more logical position for the demarcation of the coastal environment would be the first dominant inland ridge seaward of this location. The area of Coastal Environment sought to be excluded is shown on an attached map.</p> <p>There is scope for this change because under Policy 4.5.1 of the Northland Regional Policy Statement, refinement of the maps in accordance with Method 4.5.4 is contemplated.</p> <p>The RPS states that "Where following further detailed assessment, an area in the Regional Policy Statement - Maps has been amended in accordance with Method 4.5.4, and the amended area is operative in the relevant district or regional plan, it shall supersede the relevant area in the Regional Policy Statement - Maps".</p> <p>The related Method specifies that the coastal environment, and areas of high and outstanding natural character within the coastal environment, and outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes as shown in the Regional Policy Statement -Maps may be changed, provided the changes are:</p> <p>(i) Undertaken using the attributes and criteria listed in Appendix 1; and</p> <p>(ii) Shown in the regional or district plan.</p>	
<p><b>Nicole Wooster (S259)</b></p>	<p>S259.023</p>	<p>Planning maps</p>	<p>Coastal Environment</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>A portion of the access to our property is via a peice of legal road, which has never been maintained by the council since it was formed in the 1930s as it is the end of the road and is only</p>	<p>Amend rules to provide for road upgrades as a permitted activity (inferred from submission), or alter the location of the coastal</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					used by us. We are not covered by the road designation as the requiring authority doesn't look after it. However, if we needed to upgrade it to provide better access or to get a larger vehicle in we would need to get a resource consent even though it's an existing road.	environment mapping to not include the road (also see S259.022)
<b>Russell Landcare Trust (S276)</b>	S276.018	Planning maps	Coastal Environment	Oppose	The coastal environment relies on regional council mapping, which deliberately understated the extent of the coastal environment. The Environment Court has confirmed this for Kaimaumu wetland, agreeing that all of that wetland is coastal environment, not just the thin strip shown in the Regional Council maps. This is of concern because the test in the coastal environment is an avoid adverse effects test (i.e. a higher threshold than outside of the coastal environment).	Amend extent of coastal environment to include all of the Kaimaumu wetland (not just the thin strip shown in Regional Council maps).
<b>Chris Sharp (S313)</b>	S313.002	Planning maps	Coastal Environment	Oppose	Doves Bay is a built up residential area and zoned both coastal settlement and rural lifestyle.. The Coastal environment overlay puts unreasonable conditions on this area that is made up of both single and multi storied buildings ranging in age from new to 50 years old. The Coastal Enviroments overlay disregards established settlements and places rules on new builds and alterations that are inconsistent with the existing buildings and the intent of the settlement zone.	Delete the Coastal Environment overlay for the Doves Bay area from the planning maps.
<b>Haititaimarangi Marae Kaitiaki Trust (S394)</b>	S394.062	Planning maps	Coastal Environment	Support in part	Carrington estate meets many of the coastal environment criteria specified in App1. The connectivity between this location and Karikari Moana is obvious and well known in terms of Haititaimarangi Marae/Te Whānau Moana and Te Rorohuri mātauranga.	Amend the maps to include the Carrington Estate zone within the coastal environment and include consequential amendments to the Carrington Estate zone provisions to align with the coastal environment provisions.
<b>Muriwhenua Incorporated (S420)</b>	S420.006	Planning maps	Coastal Environment	Not Stated	Deletion of the 'coastal environment' overlay from the Muriwhenua land, other than thatland requested to be zoned Māori Development rural that is within 500m of mean highwater spring , and the sites currently used for housing or business activity to ensure that the overlay does not apply to the new Māori Development Rural Settlement	Delete the 'coastal environment' overlay from Muriwhenua land, being Te Hapua 42 Block (title identifier 517692, affecting land at Te Hapua Road and Waharua Road, Te Hapua) and Section 1 SO Plan 470881, Mokaikai Block (title

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					zone sought through submission (also refer to submission points S420.004 and S420.005)	identifiers 726749, NA1A/1450, NA2108/28 and NA738/244, affecting land at Te Hapua). Note: This shall exclude land requested to be zoned Māori Development Rural that is within 500 metres of mean high waterspring , and the sites currently used for housing or business activity. (Also refer to submission point S420.005)
<b>Kapiro Residents Association (S427)</b>	S427.029	Planning maps	Coastal Environment	Oppose	Many of the coastal areas that were zoned in coastal zones in the ODP are proposed as rural zones in the PDP, and the Coastal Environment area now covers a rather narrow coastal fringe. These changes have a negative effect, removing many of the protections that exist for coastal areas under the RMA and NZCPS.	Amend planning maps to add coastal overlays, or similar mechanism, to all coastal areas visible from marine areas, so that coastal landscapes, coastal character and coastal environments will be protected appropriately.
<b>John Andrew Riddell (S431)</b>	S431.047	Planning maps	Coastal Environment	Not Stated	Although the Regional Policy Statement identifies the inland boundary of the coastal environment, it also provides for the coastal environment boundary to be revised where more detailed assessment of an area is applied. One example of this is where the Environment Court accepted that the coastal environment boundary for the Kaimaumu wetland extended further inland over all of the wetland. This proposed Plan does not show this. Policy CE-P1 does not preclude extending the coastal environment where application of the assessment criteria in APP-1 justifies it, regardless of whether it is so identified in the Regional Policy Statement or not.	Amend the coastal environment boundary to include all of the Kaimaumu Wetland (a wetland by the Rangaunu Harbour) within the overlay
<b>Brian Francis Steere (S508)</b>	S508.002	Planning maps	Coastal Environment	Oppose	Opito Bay is a built up coastal settlement with bachs and permanent housing on sections that range from 1000sqm to 3000sqm. The coastal environment overlay unduly restrict / applies rules on new construction /alterations that are inconsistent to the existing buildings	delete the coastal environment overlay from already well-established coastal settlements (such as Opito Bay)

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK) (S527)</b>	S527.024	Planning maps	Coastal Environment	Oppose	The Operative DP defined large areas of coastal land as coastal zones. In contrast, the mapped area of the PDP regards only a narrow band of land as 'Coastal environment'. Much of the coastal land in the ODP coastal zones is now Rural Production or other zone. This change greatly reduces the area of coastal land that can be protected by coastal provisions/rules. Large areas of coastal land visible from the marine area will have little or no protection for their visual qualities, character or other coastal values.	Amend to protected areas of coastal land visible from the marine area will have little or no protection for their visual qualities, character or other coastal values (inferred)
<b>Brownie Family Trust (S74)</b>	S74.005	Planning maps	Coastal Erosion (Zones 1-3)	Support	Coastal erosion hazards do need to be managed to ensure long term viability of development.	Retain the Coastal Erosion (Zones 1-3) overlays as notified
<b>Nicole Wooster (S259)</b>	S259.020	Planning maps	Coastal Erosion (Zones 1-3)	Support in part	We accept that coastal hazards exist and will change over time as sea level rises. However if any issue is established with the mapping we want the coastal hazards identified on our property reviewed and amended as appropriate.	Amend coastal hazard maps as appropriate to ensure that they are correctly identifying current and future risk.
<b>Sean Frieling (S357)</b>	S357.031	Planning maps	Coastal Erosion (Zones 1-3)	Oppose	The coastal erosion hazard 2 line maps are not drawn and established relative to the gabion basket heights. Change the maps for the coastal erosion hazard 2 line maps to be reflective of geology, as it is clear that different substrates erode at different rates, and also that the site contains gabion baskets that have lifted the site well above the surrounding properties, and has been established by a geotechnical engineer - PK engineering, in June 2017. See submission.	Amend the coastal erosion hazard 2 line where it runs past this site to reflect the PK engineering assessment that was also provided to Toby Kay at NRC when the coastal hazard mapping was done by NRC (13.6.17).
<b>Leah Frieling (S358)</b>	S358.038	Planning maps	Coastal Erosion (Zones 1-3)	Oppose	Change the mapping of the Coastal Erosion hazard 2 zone adjacent to 275 Foreshore Road, Ahipara (Lot 1 DP 431209) to be reflective of geology, as it is clear that different substrates erode at different rates, and also that the site contains gabion baskets that have lifted the site well above the surrounding properties, and has been established by a geotechnical engineer - PK engineering, in June 2017 A generic approach has been taken, instead of looking at the geology of the site, and therefore if it	Amend the Coastal Erosion hazard 2 line adjacent to 275 Foreshore Road, Ahipara (Lot 1 DP 431209).

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					will erode or not. The report from PK engineering specifically has considered potential erosion of the sub-strate, and it is clear that blue rock will not erode such as sand or other sedimentary rock may do so	
<b>LJ King Ltd (S464)</b>	S464.012	Planning maps	Coastal Erosion (Zones 1-3)	Oppose	A generic approach has been taken, instead of looking at the geology of the site, and therefore if it will erode or not. A report from PK engineering specifically has considered potential erosion of the sub-strate, and it is clear that blue rock will not erode such as sand or other sedimentary rock may do so.	Amend the Coastal Erosion Zone 2 line as it applies to 2, 4 and 5 Panorama Lane, Ahipara to reflect the geology of the area.
<b>Michael Foy (S472)</b>	S472.039	Planning maps	Coastal Erosion (Zones 1-3)	Oppose	A generic approach has been taken, instead of looking at the geology of the site, and therefore if it will erode or not. The report from PK engineering specifically has considered potential erosion of the sub-strate, and it is clear that blue rock will not erode such as sand or other sedimentary rock may do so. evidence by way of letter.	amend coastal erosion hazard 2 line maps for Gabion Basket heights, 275 Foreshore road , Ahipara.
<b>Elbury Holdings (S485)</b>	S485.013	Planning maps	Coastal Erosion (Zones 1-3)	Oppose	The coastal Erosion Hazard 2 line maps are not drawn and established relative to the gabion basket heights.	Amend Coastal Erosion Zone 2 Line to be reflective of geology at 2 Panorama Lane, 4 Panorama Lane and 5 Panorama Lane, Ahipara (as per engineering assessment in submission).
<b>Elbury Holdings (S519)</b>	S519.013	Planning maps	Coastal Erosion (Zones 1-3)	Oppose	The coastal Erosion Hazard 2 line maps are not drawn and established relative to the gabion basket heights	Amend Coastal Erosion Zone 2 Line to be reflective of geology at 2 Panorama Lane, 4 Panorama Lane and 5 Panorama Lane, Ahipara (as per engineering assessment in submission).
<b>Elbury Holdings (S541)</b>	S541.012	Planning maps	Coastal Erosion (Zones 1-3)	Oppose	The coastal Erosion Hazard 2 line maps are not drawn and established relative to the gabion basket heights.	Amend Coastal Erosion Zone 2 Line to be reflective of geology at 2 Panorama Lane, 4 Panorama Lane and 5 Panorama Lane, Ahipara (as per engineering assessment in submission).

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>LJ King Limited (S543)</b>	S543.012	Planning maps	Coastal Erosion (Zones 1-3)	Oppose	The coastal Erosion Hazard 2 line maps are not drawn and established relative to the gabion basket heights	Amend Coastal Erosion Zone 2 Line to be reflective of geology at 2 Panorama Lane, 4 Panorama Lane and 5 Panorama Lane, Ahipara (as per engineering assessment in submission).
<b>LJ King Limited (S547)</b>	S547.012	Planning maps	Coastal Erosion (Zones 1-3)	Oppose	The coastal Erosion Hazard 2 line maps are not drawn and established relative to the gabion basket heights.	Amend Coastal Erosion Zone 2 Line to be reflective of geology at 2 Panorama Lane, 4 Panorama Lane and 5 Panorama Lane, Ahipara (as per engineering assessment in submission).
<b>Brownie Family Trust (S74)</b>	S74.049	Planning maps	Coastal Flood (Zones 1-3) : 50 Year Scenario)	Support	Coastal hazards do need to be managed to ensure long term viability of development.	Retain the Coastal Flood (Zones 1-3) overlays as notified
<b>Te Rūnanga o Whaingaroa (S486)</b>	S486.097	Planning maps	Coastal Flood (Zones 1-3) : 50 Year Scenario)	Oppose	All flood risk maps included in the PDP were created at a scale of 1:250,000. This means there is insufficient accuracy to identify at-risk areas of an individual land parcel. This will place heavy financial burdens on tāngata whenua to gain expert analysis of each site and case by case. It would be more efficient for the Council to undertake these assessments alongside tāngata whenua.	Amend the planning maps to Improve the accuracy of all flood risk maps by surveying and ground truthing the at-risk areas before the plan becomes operative in collaboration with tāngata whenua.
<b>Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga (S331)</b>	S331.114	Planning maps	Designation	Support	The submitter supports all designations listed in the Plan's Designation section and shown in the Plan Maps.	Retain Designations as shown in planning maps, as proposed.
<b>Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (S356)</b>	S356.127	Planning maps	Designation	Support in part	Waka Kotahi notes the inclusion of designations of other Requiring Authorities. The boundaries of some of these designations appear to overlap the state highway designation boundaries. Waka Kotahi seeks confirmation from these Requiring Authorities that the boundaries of their designations are correct. Refer to the submission for examples of where other Requiring Authority designation overlaps with the state highway designations.	Confirmation of non Waka Kotahi designations that overlap with Waka Kotahi designations

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S416)</b>	S416.070	Planning maps	Designation	Support in part	This submission seeks to join up the railway designation in the GIS designation layer on the maps at several roads and structures over streams within the district. Most 'gap' errors occur in the northern section of the railway corridor, with few, if any, on the NAL south of Otiria. KiwiRail will provide an amended shapefile.	Amend the planning maps to correct errors and omissions for KiwiRail designations by joining layer so it forms one continuous network designation (refer to submission).
<b>KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S416)</b>	S416.071	Planning maps	Designation	Support in part	The objectives identifying Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes and Outstanding Natural Character is to ensure that these landscapes and their attributes are recognised and protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development. The benefits of infrastructure are provided irrespective of location. The Plan also recognises the functional need for infrastructure to be located within these areas, and that designated land transport corridors are generally highly modified areas.	Amend the planning maps to delete the following overlays from KiwiRail designations; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes</li> <li>• Outstanding Natural Character</li> </ul>
<b>Emily and Richard Fladgate (S12)</b>	S12.001	Planning maps	Heritage Area	Oppose	Opposes the new FNDC Kerikeri Heritage Area (B) in regards to the mapping of the proposed southwest boundary of the Kerikeri Heritage Area (B) as it affects our Inlet Rd property because: the lines were drawn based on desktop research only, the alignment is not logical, does not follow the overall pattern of wider deliniations (which is mostly along other property boundary lines), there is no adequate reasoning why the Heritage area should not stick to the existing property boundary. In 30 years since submitter has lived on property, they have not identified any archaeological sites, historic trees or buildings, nor any sites of cultural significance. Also there are no recorded sites on the far north maps. The natural contours of the land combined with an existing overland flow path makes the property boundary a clear cut naturally defined end of the Southwest line of the heritage area (see attachments to submission for more information).	Amend the extent of Kerikeri Heritage Area Overlay - Part B, to correspond with the existing property boundary of 83A and 99 Kerikeri Inlet Road (Lot 2 DP 380510) as shown in Attachment 5 to original submission.
<b>Bayswater Inn Ltd (S29)</b>	S29.007	Planning maps	Heritage Area	Oppose	40 Marsden Road, Paihia, should retain the provisions of the Operative District Plan that were imposed following an appeal to the Environment	Delete Heritage Overlay - Paihia Heritage Area - Part B from 40 Marsden Road, Paihia.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					Court 2005/2006. The new provisions in the Proposed District Plan should not apply.	
<b>Warren Bliss (S62)</b>	S62.001	Planning maps	Heritage Area	Support in part	Pouerua Heritage area and its values should be protected but disagree generally with the enlarged extension of the protection zone (from the original zone created by Dr Doug Sutton) - except that there is probable merit in extending the zone to the north of Pouerua to encompass a small cluster of heritage sites previously excluded. Considers that the extended area to the south of Pouerua has no relevance to this historic site - in particular the properties along Lakeland Lane. The majority of these properties are lifestyle blocks with modern buildings gardens and paddocks. There are no historic structures, stonefield gardens or sites of any significance to Maori. There are no volcanic rocks littering the area as there are in the other areas surrounding Pouerua. It is not fair or reasonable to penalise landowners by "lumping in" properties to a heritage area because its an easy line to draw on a map.	Amend the extent of the heritage area surrounding surrounding Pouerua, so that it is revised back to the original layout as per the area created by Dr Doug Sutton, except for possibly the north side extension from Pouerua. The review of the extent should have particular emphasis on the southern areas that encompass Lakeland Lane properties and should remove areas that have no heritage sites or resources on them. It may be acceptable to revise the boundary directly around lake Owhareiti itself - but not the Lakeland properties that come down to the lake.
<b>Murdoch Phillips (S171)</b>	S171.001	Planning maps	Heritage Area	Oppose	Opposes FNDC Heritage plan for Paihia. Our rates and consents are high enough without Council imposing more cost and time delays on us when requiring consents. Currently Council don't seem to have any concerns about people camping on our reserves but is happy to charge landowners more for their right to live here. If Council is going to have a Heritage Area in Paihia it should be all of Paihia not the divide and conquer proposal, it wants to implement.	Heritage Area A to stay. Heritage Area B wiped completely.
<b>Kerry Ludbrook (S220)</b>	S220.001	Planning maps	Heritage Area	Oppose	As a descendent of Henry Williams, the importance of the area is understood. Part of Lot 1 DP 194271 (Ludbrook Road, Pakaraka) should however be removed from the Pouerua Heritage Area as the land has been cultivated many times historically and it does not have archaeological significance. The land should retain its Rural Production zoning so that it can be farmed. The land does not include a residential unit so requires the flexibility	Delete the Pouerua Heritage Area overlay from Lot 1 DP 194271 (Ludbrook Road, Pakaraka)

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					to continue cropping or allow changes of grass swards and the establishment of a residential unit.	
<b>Ian Diarmid Palmer and Zejia Hu (S249)</b>	S249.001	Planning maps	Heritage Area	Oppose	<p>The rationale for, and the aerial extent of, the Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Part B was based on inadequate and incomplete expert evidence and analysis.</p> <p>The boundaries for the Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Part B do not adhere to any self-consistent logic.</p> <p>It is inappropriate to combine areas featuring colonial period European built historic heritage resources with areas featuring pre-contact Māori historic heritage in a single heritage area.</p> <p>Designating and area of land as a heritage area based on its Māori cultural connections and/or landscape attributes amounts to double counting contrary to the RMA.</p> <p>Justification for the entire Rangitoto Peninsula land being subject to the Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Part B overlay was in part based on an erroneous premise regarding the land's involvement in historically significant colonial European industrial enterprises.</p> <p>The section 32 heritage assessment did not evaluate the economic impact of imposing heritage area overlays over large tracts of land for the first time or assess the risk of not acting.</p>	Delete the Heritage Area Overlay from the Rangitoto Peninsula except for the land directly associated with and/or proximal to listed heritage resources.
<b>Te Hiku Community Board (S257)</b>	S257.011	Planning maps	Heritage Area	Oppose	We do not support the new heritage overlays at Mangonui and submit that there should not be restrictive rules outside of the existing heritage areas within Mangonui.	Delete Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Part B from the Planning Maps.
<b>Amber Hookway (S261)</b>	S261.001	Planning maps	Heritage Area	Oppose	The heritage area does not follow the boundary line and crosses into 211 Waikuku Road, Waimate. An objection was made at the time of receiving the first letter as did other neighbours who subsequently no longer have the heritage area on their property. The area has changed and is more on the property than previously. I request this Heritage area be removed completely from 211 Waikuku Road.	Delete heritage area from 211 Waikuku Road, Waimate.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>Wilson Hookway (S264)</b>	S264.001	Planning maps	Heritage Area	Oppose	The heritage area does not follow the boundary line and crosses into 211 Waikuku Road, Waimate. An objection was made at the time of receiving the first letter as did other neighbours who subsequently no longer have the heritage area on their property. The area has changed and is more on the property than previously. I request this Heritage area be removed completely from 211 Waikuku Road.	Delete heritage area from 211 Waikuku Road, Waimate.
<b>Alec Jack (S277)</b>	S277.002	Planning maps	Heritage Area	Oppose	The Lake Owhareiti Trust are, and represent, the Maori beneficial owners of the lake. Lake Owhareiti already has multiple layers of protection (ONF91, NRC environmental regulations, site of importance to Maori, etc) but the addition of Heritage Area restrictions would add cost & complexity to any future plans the trustees' might have - at a time when imminent Waitangi Settlements will at last enable them to fulfil their vision for their Lake. The lake level has lifted dramatically since it was first surveyed & mapped in the 19th century - any pre-European Maori heritage has long since been flooded or destroyed by European farm cultivation. The eucalypt plantation on a peninsula of our land titles (currently an island) was planted by my grandfather & uncle. Heritage Area restrictions would make it unaffordable for us to harvest those trees to enable us to retire the area in native trees. Lake Owhareiti has immeasurable cultural & environmental value but this does not warrant further restrictions on the basis of heritage.	Amend the Pouerua Heritage Area to remove Lake Owhareiti and reinstate the original boundary of Pouerua Heritage Precinct (which excluded Jacks Lake and Lake Owhareiti).
<b>Alec Jack (S277)</b>	S277.024	Planning maps	Heritage Area	Oppose	Jacks Lake is not a natural feature - it is man-made and was created by Ned Jack with financial assistance (50% subsidy for habitat creation) from the Acclimatization Society (now Fish and Game NZ) in 1975. I will provide multiple levels of evidence at the hearings stage. I also oppose the inclusion of our land immediately adjacent to Lake Owhareiti in the ONF91 classification. Lake Owhareiti itself dictates its boundary, not a land title, or a line on a map. The farmland adjacent to the lake isn't an outstanding natural feature.	Amend the Planning Maps to exclude Jacks Lake, and Lake Owhareiti foreshore area on our farm from area classified "ONF91 Pouerua (Pakaraka Mountain) scoria cone, lava field and lava-dammed lakes".

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>C and A Harman (S292)</b>	S292.001	Planning maps	Heritage Area	Oppose	The proposed Te Waimate Heritage area extends across a large portion of Lot 1 DP 2011442 and which is active primary production land with a land use capability of 2s1 being versatile soils. The National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land seeks to secure protection of highly productive soil and to extend the heritage overlay on this land would limit the use and therefore conflict with the National Policy Statement and Council's obligations under the RMA 1991. The heritage area introduces restrictions on structures and earthworks which affect productive land uses.	Amend extent of proposed Te Waimate Heritage area to reduce the extent of heritage area that applies to 208 Waikaramu Road, Ohaeawai (Lot 1 DP 201442) (as per plan attached to original submission).
<b>Danielle Hookway (S309)</b>	S309.001	Planning maps	Heritage Area	Oppose	The heritage area does not follow the boundary line and crosses into 211 Waikuku Road. An objection was made at the time of receiving the first letter as did other neighbours who no longer have the heritage area over their land. The area has changed and now covers more of the property than previously.	Amend proposed Te Waimate Heritage area to remove from the site at 211 Waikuku Road.
<b>Lianne Kennedy (S310)</b>	S310.001	Planning maps	Heritage Area	Oppose	The heritage area does not follow the boundary line and crosses into 211 Waikuku Road. An objection was made at the time of receiving the first letter as did other neighbours who no longer have the heritage area over their land. The area has changed and now covers more of the property than previously.	Amend proposed Te Waimate Heritage area to remove from the site at 211 Waikuku Road.
<b>Allen Hookway (S311)</b>	S311.001	Planning maps	Heritage Area	Oppose	The heritage area does not follow the boundary line and crosses into 211 Waikuku Road. An objection was made at the time of receiving the first letter as did other neighbours who no longer have the heritage area over their land. The area has changed and now covers more of the property than previously.	Amend proposed Te Waimate Heritage area to remove from the site at 211 Waikuku Road.
<b>Shirley Dryden (S326)</b>	S326.001	Planning maps	Heritage Area	Oppose	The proposed Pouerua Heritage overlay area is too large and encompasses many properties that have no historical significance. Lot 1 DP 194271 (inferred) (Ludbrook Road, Pakaraka) should not be in the heritage overlay. The land has been cultivated extensively and it does not have archaeological significance. The heritage area needs to be specific to each property. It is too restrictive to properties that	Delete the Pouerua Heritage Area overlay from Lot 1 DP 194271 (Ludbrook Road, Pakaraka)

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					have no historical significance. It needs local knowledge and expertise. The land should retain its Rural Production zoning so that it can be farmed. The land does not include a residential unit and this needs to be considered.	
<b>The Paihia Property Owners Group (S330)</b>	S330.001	Planning maps	Heritage Area	Oppose	The submitter opposes the Paihia Heritage Area Overlay Part A and Part B and considers that while the policy intent associated with the NZ Coastal Policy Statement and Regional Policy Statement are clear, the rationale and evidential basis for the proposed mapping is not considered to be appropriate at a district level where values on a site by site basis should be known assessed and confirmed to be true.	Delete the Paihia Heritage Area Overlay Part A and Part B.
<b>The Paihia Property Owners Group (S330)</b>	S330.002	Planning maps	Heritage Area	Oppose	The submitter opposes the Paihia Heritage Area Overlay Part A and Part B and considers that the Paihia Mission Heritage Area in the Operative District Plan went through a lengthy plan change process and considers the area and surrounds in far greater detail than the proposed district plan.	Insert the Paihia Mission Heritage Area from the Operative District Plan.
<b>Sean Frieling (S357)</b>	S357.011	Planning maps	Heritage Area	Oppose	Do not support the new heritage overlays at Mangonui, and submit that there should not be restrictive rules outside of the existing heritage areas within Mangonui.	Delete Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Part B from the Planning Maps.
<b>Leah Frieling (S358)</b>	S358.011	Planning maps	Heritage Area	Oppose	We do not support the new heritage overlays at Mangonui, and submit that there should not be restrictive rules outside of the existing heritage areas within Mangonui	Delete Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Part B from the Planning Maps.
<b>Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (S409)</b>	S409.016	Planning maps	Heritage Area	Support	The Proposed Plan is required to recognise and provide for the matters of national importance, in particular 6(f) "the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use and development" and s6(e) "the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga." HNZPT considers that the hybrid-plan format of the Proposed Plan, that includes: the identification of historic heritage; heritage area overlays; Kororareka Russell Township Zone and Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori issues (Overview), objectives, policies and rules each within a	Retain the spatial map layers for historic heritage

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					Section of the plan, is of assistance to the reader in understanding the background and reasons for the rules.	
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (S409)	S409.037	Planning maps	Heritage Area	Support in part	<p>Kororareka Russell Heritage Area and surrounds - It is extremely evident that the proposed heritage area will not protect Russell Peninsula from adverse and detrimental development. There are already examples of building development that is completely out of character and scale in the area. Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga requests the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o That the heritage area be considered when standing upon Te Maiki (Flagstaff Hill). From this vantage point one can see across Kororareka towards Waikare Inlet, eastward out to Motorua Island, northward to the Black Rocks and west towards Waitangi and Paihia. These views hafts need to be protected and conserved from inappropriate development especially those on ridgelines.</li> <li>o Pa sites need to be included in the Heritage Area. There is a rich history associated with pa sites.</li> <li>o We advocate a separate heritage layer for the entrance to the Russell Peninsula starting from the Russell Whakaparara Road intersection. This area is to provide a visual protection from further adverse development, including promotion of native visual buffer planting. Russell is situated on a peninsula and the plan needs to take into account the special character of this peninsula.</li> <li>o In addition to the boundary defined within the draft plan, we request that a further planning layer be applied to the east and north for the balance of the peninsula that will prevent development on the ridgelines, restrict exterior colours to the heritage colour palate and control reflectivity. This is to include Long Beach and the area behind. It is essential that development is considered from when viewed not only from land but also from the Bay.</li> </ul>	Amend the provisions and spatial extent of the Kororareka Russell Heritage Area and insert additional new sub-areas (including associated overview, objectives, policies and rules) as indicated in submission

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					o The planning controls in the draft district plan need to ensure that the viewshafts remain	
<b>Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (S409)</b>	S409.038	Planning maps	Heritage Area	Support in part	<p>Paihia Heritage Area - It should be noted that in the Paihia Cemetery in the rear yard of the Church of Paul and Henry Williams contains Maori burials. This is not referenced in the archaeologist's report.</p> <p>We support the recommendation of the consultant archaeologists for the inclusion of the Waitangi Islands - Motu o Rangī, Motuarahi, Motu Maire and Kuia Rongouru/Taylor Island because of their historical, contextual and spatial relationship. They are of significance to iwi and are listed with Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga as wahi tapu.</p> <p>The heritage area should also include the Paihia Village Green scenic reserve, and the historic library at 2 Williams Road.</p> <p>There needs to be development restrictions on the entire ridge (behind the Church) that overlooks the Bay. This is a prominent ridge that contains Pa, archaeology and other artifacts. It is the backdrop for the town and provides a visual escapement from the bay encapsulating the town.</p> <p>An additional sub area is recommended for the area south of the river Te Haumai to include the settlement of Tohitapu as also suggested by Plan Heritage Limited.</p>	Amend the provisions and spatial extent of the Paihia Heritage Area and insert additional new sub-areas (including associated overview, objectives, policies and rules) as indicated in submission
<b>Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (S409)</b>	S409.040	Planning maps	Heritage Area	Support in part	<p>Pouerua Historic Heritage Area</p> <p>o The proposed heritage area is a significant expansion on the current area, but that expansion is generally in a southern direction towards Moerewa that encompasses only a few recorded archaeological sites, inclusive of a pa site, but otherwise a landscape that does not appear to be of heritage value. The area does not contain any Stonefield sites and appears to be in modern pastoral farming. We would like to have clarification why this area is included in the report.</p> <p>o The boundary as extended slightly to the north does include a significant cultural landscape</p>	Amend the provisions and spatial extent of the Pouerua Heritage Area and insert additional new sub-areas (including associated overview, objectives, policies and rules) as indicated in submission

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>containing various pa sites and stone structures.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o It is evident that there needs to be a continuous connection between the proposed Pouerua Heritage Areathrough to State Highway 12 and north of State Highway 1 through to the proposed southern boundary of the proposed Te Waimate Historic Heritage Area. This would protect the foreground vista through to the ridge pa sites from State Highway 1.</li> <li>o The focus of this heritage area should be on the Maunga and the stone gardens with very strict controls. The balance area (proposed extension area) could be subject to less restrictive rules. The context of the area is that the volcanic soils have been the driver of the rich cultural landscape that includes, gardens, pa, kainga and early colonial buildings.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (S409)</b></p>	<p>S409.042</p>	<p>Planning maps</p>	<p>Heritage Area</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>Rawene Historic Heritage Area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Rawene township is situated at the northern end of a peninsula that leads into the Hokianga Harbour. Rawene's vehicle access is from Twin Coast Discovery Highway via State Highway 12 from the south and from Kohukohu to the north via the car ferry. Due to the prominent location of the township, it is visible from both the Hokianga Harbour and land. The township with its unique character, historic buildin_gs, and rich history is a tourism destination on the Twin Coast Discovery Highway. Many local business' cater for day travellers.</li> <li>o It seems that Plan Heritage Limited has defined the proposed heritage area boundary from "lots which fall within the early township that are distinctly different (earlier) subdivision form, and which are shown inhistorical aerial topography to have generally been developed by 1942". Unfortunately, that mapped area excludes some very important places.</li> <li>o Heritage New Zealand recommends that the proposed heritage area be expanded to include the Hokianga Health Enterprise Trust facility (hospital) - first free hospital service, the cemetery</li> </ul>	<p>Amend the provisions and spatial extent of the Rawene Heritage Area and insert additional new sub-areas (including associated overview, objectives, policies and rules) as indicated in submission</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>that contains the remains of ancestors (located diagonally opposite the hospital) and the Rawene Domain. In addition, adjacent to the camping ground contains a site of significance to Maori and needs to be incorporated into the heritage area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o A further sub area should include the entire peninsula and contain lesser rules that protect the entrance way view to the township by design, colour and shape and set back rules.</li> <li>o Furthermore, there needs to be restrictions the prevent development on the ridge line of the peninsula as the viewshafts need to be protected when looking to Rawene across the harbour</li> </ul> <p>Amend the spatial extent of the Kohukohu Heritage Area and insert additional new sub-areas (including associated overview, objectives, policies and rules) as indicated in submission</p>	
<b>Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (S409)</b>	S409.044	Planning maps	Heritage Area	Support in part	<p>Te Waimate Historic Heritage Area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o The proposed heritage area is an improvement on the current Heritage precinct however it still does not protect the landscape from undue development or change of land use.</li> <li>o Pastoral farming in New Zealand was first established at Te Waimate, including in the valley north of the Mission Station. This area is now under threat from horticultural farming practises that include structures associated with kiwi fruit and avocado orchards. The proposed heritage area excludes most of this valley. We request that the heritage area be extended to include the valley through to the top of the bush escarpment and ridge situated immediately north of the Mission Station.</li> <li>o We also recommend controls associated with the change of land use from pastoral farming to horticulture. Cropping need not be included.</li> </ul>	Amend the provisions and spatial extent of Te Waimate Historic Heritage Area and insert additional new sub-areas (including associated overview, objectives, policies and rules) as indicated in submission
<b>Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (S409)</b>	S409.048	Planning maps	Heritage Area	Support in part	<p>Mangonui and Rangitoto Peninsula Historic Heritage Area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o We are supportive of the proposed heritage areas insofar as the extent of the proposed boundaries for Mangonui and Rangitoto Peninsula/Butler Point Area, however we consider</li> </ul>	Amend the provisions and spatial extent of Mangonui and Rangitoto Peninsula Historic Heritage Area and insert additional new sub-areas (including associated overview, objectives, policies and rules) as

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>that the boundary needs to be extended to include the entire harbour and associated adjacent ridge line perimeter. Our comments are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The reason that both Maori and Europeans settled at Manganui and Rangitoto was because of the harbour itself. It provided shelter, ki moana, and was a gateway and stepping location for departures back to the Pacific and Hawaii and for trading. The entire harbour was utilised as evidenced by the recorded archaeology associated with Paewhenua Island, that included flaking floors, flax industry, and mill etc.</li> <li>- A number of pa sites including at Rangikapiti, Rangitoto, Taemaro Road (P04/70) and others are located at the entrance to and surrounding the harbour. Vistas to and from these pa sites need protection, including a prohibition on plantation planting on the pa sites - (P04/70) contains a pine plantation. These pa sites clearly demonstrate the spread of pre-European occupation around the perimeter of Manganui Harbour. These pa sites are related visually and through whakapapa.</li> <li>- It is important that the open areas of Butlers Point are protected from any further building development. This land is a backdrop to Mangonui Township and Rangitoto Pa. That area also contains a significant number of recorded archaeological sites.</li> <li>- Heritage New Zealand requests that the proposed heritage areas be progressed, but with additional sublayer comprising the balance of the harbour area up to the perimeter ridgeline. Controls need to be sufficiently assertive to prevent development upon the ridgelines, or protruding above the ridgelines, and adoption of recessive colours and non-reflective building materials in the sub-area. By doing so the landscape character of the harbour will be retained.</li> </ul>	indicated in submission
<b>Heritage New Zealand Pouhere</b>	S409.049	Planning maps	Heritage Area	Support in part	Additional Heritage Areas Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga requests that the following places also be included within	Insert new heritage areas (including associated mapping, overview, objectives, policies and rules) as

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>Taonga (S409)</b>					<p>the District Plan as heritage areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Waitangi,</li> <li>- Kaeo</li> <li>- Whangaroa Harbour area</li> <li>- Kawakawa Township</li> <li>- Oruru Valley</li> <li>- Omapere / Opononi</li> <li>- Te Ahu Ahu Area (Bounded by Remuera Settlement Road, SH 1 and SH 15 + Lake Omapere).</li> <li>- Northern War Sites</li> <li>- Ruapekpeka</li> <li>- Ohaewai</li> <li>- Okaihau</li> <li>- Puketutu</li> <li>- Waikaire</li> <li>- All islands within the Bay of Islands</li> <li>- Early contact sites.</li> <li>- Early settlement sites Mangahawea</li> <li>- Early European explorers Cook, Du Fresne</li> <li>- Te Rerenga Wairua/Cape Reinga</li> </ul>	indicated in submission
<b>Bell Family Trust (S450)</b>	S450.001	Planning maps	Heritage Area	Oppose	2 Kings Road, Paihia, has never been classified as a heritage site/area and there is no heritage attached to the property. This has a detrimental effect on what can be done on the property, its valuation and possible sale.	Delete the Paihia Heritage Area (Part B) from 2 Kings Road, Paihia (Lot 1 DP 42791)
<b>Michael Foy (S472)</b>	S472.011	Planning maps	Heritage Area	Oppose	We do not support the new heritage overlays at Mangonui, and submit that there should not be restrictive rules outside of the existing heritage areas within Mangonui.	Delete Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Part B from the Planning Maps.
<b>David Truscott (S476)</b>	S476.002	Planning maps	Heritage Area	Support	Heritage Area Part B for Rawene serves little purpose. The archeological heritage can be safeguarded in other ways as indicated in the S32 report. Council moved on from its former draft DP controls leaving a hollow justification for the designation. The boundary is not logical, relating to the 19th century road and section layout that does not need protection.	Delete the Heritage Area Part B for Rawene in favour of archaeological protection, which can be achieved by other means, as discussed in the s32 report.
<b>Don Mandeno (S532)</b>	S532.001	Planning maps	Heritage Area	Oppose	22 Marsden road was previously removed from the heritage area by the decision NO2014 NZ EnvC 129. the heritage is already well preserved	delete Paihia Heritage overlay from 22 Marsden road, Paihia

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited (S502)</b>	S502.114	Planning maps	Heritage Item	Not Stated	Historic Site 100 (Te Karuwha Parade, Waitangi - Treaty House Hobson Memorial Whare Runanga, Flagpole) is located on Lot 1 DP 326610. While located within the general vicinity of each other, the combination of all items into one record can be confusing and there is potential that a historic building or structure may be missed in assessment. As such we seek that Site 100 is split into 4 separate notations on the map such that it is clear what buildings are considered historic within the planning document. This is consistent with other historic items in the District where there are multiple listings on a site.	Amend mapping of Historic Site 100 (Te Karuwha Parade, Waitangi - Treaty House Hobson Memorial Whare Runanga, Flagpole) located on Lot 1 DP 326610. Create four separate 'site records' on the map such that it is clear what buildings are considered historic within the planning document. This is consistent with other historic items in the District where there are multiple listings on a site.
<b>Waitangi Limited (S503)</b>	S503.013	Planning maps	Heritage Item	Not Stated	Historic Site 100 (Te Karuwha Parade, Waitangi - Treaty House Hobson Memorial Whare Runanga, Flagpole) is located on Lot 1 DP 326610. While located within the general vicinity of each other, the combination of all items into one record can be confusing and there is potential that a historic building or structure may be missed in assessment. As such we seek that Site 100 is split into 4 separate notations on the map such that it is clear what buildings are considered historic within the planning document. This is consistent with other historic items in the District where there are multiple listings on a site.	Amend mapping of Historic Site 100 (Te Karuwha Parade, Waitangi - Treaty House Hobson Memorial Whare Runanga, Flagpole) located on Lot 1 DP 326610. Create four separate 'site records' on the map such that it is clear what buildings are considered historic within the planning document. This is consistent with other historic items in the District where there are multiple listings on a site.
<b>Denis Whooley and Jennifer Whooley (S75)</b>	S75.002	Planning maps	High Natural Character	Oppose	The photograph of 2195 Waikare Road, Russell/Kawakawa, that has been used to overlay High natural character 452 (Hillslopes with kanuka-mixed broadleaved forest. Some unsealed roading) is woefully out of date and does not reflect the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Several kilometres of roading in place</li> <li>- Acres of land clearance</li> <li>- Buildings insitu</li> <li>- Resource consents for buildings not yet constructed</li> </ul>	Delete High natural character 452 (Hillslopes with kanuka-mixed broadleaved forest. Some unsealed roading) from 2195 Waikare Road, Russell/Kawakawa
<b>Dandy Developments Limited (S142)</b>	S142.002	Planning maps	High Natural Character	Oppose	The submitter considers that for Lot 2 DP 195378, located at 458A Hihi Road, Hihi, the boundary of the High Natural Character Overlay (Reference 151) should not intrude into the property boundaries.	Amend the boundary of the High Natural Character Overlay (Reference 151) so that it does not intrude into the property boundaries of Lot 2 DP 195378, located at 458A

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						Hihi Road, Hihi.
<b>Summit Forests New Zealand Limited (S148)</b>	S148.054	Planning maps	High Natural Character	Not Stated	The Plan's overlays for High Natural Character captures significant areas of SFNZ's plantation forests. This could create uncertainty and open SFNZ to challenge over its legitimate plantation forestry activities in these areas.	Delete any High Natural Character overlay from plantation forest areas
<b>Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)</b>	S168.152	Planning maps	High Natural Character	Oppose	<p>The Proposed Plan mapping includes small areas of open grass and gardens on the property as High Natural Character. These do not exhibit any natural character values and should be excluded. Under Policy 4.5.1 of the Regional Policy, refinement of the maps in accordance with Method 4.5.4 is contemplated.</p> <p>The RPS states that "Where following further detailed assessment, an area in the Regional Policy Statement - Maps has been amended in accordance with Method 4.5.4, and the amended area is operative in the relevant district or regional plan, it shall supersede the relevant area in the Regional Policy Statement - Maps".</p> <p>The related method specifies that the coastal environment, and areas of high and outstanding natural character within the coastal environment, and outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes as shown in the Regional Policy Statement -</p> <p>Maps may be changed, provided the changes are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Undertaken using the attributes and criteria listed in Appendix 1; and</li> <li>(ii) Shown in the regional or district plan.</li> </ul> <p>As maintained grass and gardens, the areas sought to be removed do not demonstrate any of the attributes and criteria listed in Appendix 1 of the RPS.</p>	Amend the High Natural Character overlay on Lot 1 DP 36233 (being land owned by Setar Thirty Six at Moturua Island) to exclude areas of open grass and gardens.
<b>Zeja Hu (S242)</b>	S242.002	Planning maps	High Natural Character	Oppose	<p>The policies and rules in the 'Natural features and landscapes' chapter of the PDP have an impact on the future development options for 79C Peninsula Parade, Hihi (being legally described as Lot 1, DP 322506).</p> <p>The property is rated as vacant lifestyle. Amongst other overlays, the property is subject to</p>	Amend the Outstanding Natural Landscape overlay on 79C Peninsula Parade, Hihi (being legally described as Lot 1, DP 322506) and/or modify the PDP rules such that:

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>Outstanding Natural Landscape (ONL) and High Natural Character (HNC) overlays. Much of the property is bush covered and those areas are not developable for reasons stated in submission. The only potentially practically developable area (i.e. for residential unit) on the property will be subject to a proposed Outstanding Natural Landscape overlay.</p> <p>The rules in the PDP applying to this developable land area mean I would not have the right to construct a dwelling and undertake activities customarily associated with such on the property, particularly the combination of the Outstanding Natural Landscape and Coastal Environment overlays.</p> <p>Rule NFL-R1, would, given the circumstances described above, mean the construction of a residential unit on the property would be categorised as 'Non-Complying', as would, almost certainly, the minimum reasonably required earthworks associated with constructing any reasonably dimensioned dwelling, due to rule NFL-R3 and the extreme limitations associated with standard NFL-S3.</p> <p>Also, ironically, despite the property being proposed to be zoned Rural Production, NFL-R6 results in all farming activity on the property being categorised as 'Non-Complying'!</p> <p>As a consequence of the matters outlined above, it is demonstrably the case that without amendment, the PDP as Notified would have the effect of making the property incapable of reasonable use and would place an unfair and unreasonable burden on me (per RMA S.85 3B). In terms of the definition of 'reasonable use' in S. 85, I assert that permitting me to have the right to build a dwelling and all customary associated constructions and other associated activities on the property would not adversely affect the environment or any person significantly.</p> <p>The Northland Regional Landscape Assessment Workshop report for the ONL that covers the</p>	<p>undertaking other customary associated activities, and b. undertaking Farming activities</p> <p>on the non-bush covered areas of the property would be classed as a permitted or controlled activity, thereby avoiding the property being rendered incapable of reasonable use and avoiding placing an unfair and unreasonable burden on the landowner.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>property (Ref ONL 17, ONL Number 2847) does not specifically reference the pastured areas that are the areas where I am objecting to the impact of the ONL overlay (in conjunction with other overlays and other PDP rules). With regard to the eastern side of the harbour, the assessment largely focusses on the bush covered coastal fringe.</p> <p>There are already a number of dwellings and other structures in this area visible from the other side of the Mangonui Harbour that the FNDC has either given consent to, or allowed to be constructed without consent. These existing and in progress constructions and associated earthworks are clearly visible from the Rangikapiti Historic Reserve and from various vantage points on the harbour itself. It would be intolerable for me not to be permitted to build in this area where Council has tolerated unconsented (non-Permitted) building and earthworks activity for many years. Given the nature of the location and price of the land in this area, it is reasonable to assume any reasonable minded owner wishing to construct a dwelling on the property would ensure it was architecturally designed in keeping with the aesthetic values of the surrounds, with appropriate softening of the visual affects by native tree plantings etc (and compliance with relevant standards and rules in the PDP beyond the standards and rules that directly relate to this objection). It would not be a public 'eye sore' and therefore I should have the right to undertake such constructions and associated activities as permitted activities, or at worst as controlled activities.</p>	
<b>Margaret Ridge (S258)</b>	S258.001	Planning maps	High Natural Character	Oppose	The mapping boundaries for HCN439 include pastoral swards used historically for the low density grazing of stock.	Amend the boundary of HNC439 to remove pastoral areas so resource consent is not required for the existing activity of grazing.
<b>P S Yates Family Trust (S333)</b>	S333.110	Planning maps	High Natural Character	Oppose	The Proposed Plan mapping includes some open grassed areas on the properties as High Natural Character. These do not exhibit high natural	Amend the High Natural Character overlay on the subject properties at 1 and 23 Kokinga Point Road,

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					character values and should be excluded. These include but are not limited to the grassed cleared area at 1 Kokinga Point Road	Rawhiti, legally described as Lot 3 DP 71896 and Part Te Kokinga Block, to exclude existing open grassed areas from High Natural Character.
<b>Paihia Properties Holdings Corporate Trustee Limited and UP Management Ltd (S344)</b>	S344.017	Planning maps	High Natural Character	Not Stated	The HNCA overlay as it applies to the subject site does not accurately reflect the existing landform and vegetation of the subject site.	Amend the spatial extent of the HNCA to remove any land below the 12m contour line.
<b>Amanda Kennedy, Julia Kennedy Till and Simon Till (S353)</b>	S353.001	Planning maps	High Natural Character	Support	The reasons why it is believed that the proposed changes are more appropriate for this site are: - it better aligns with existing development, size of landholdings and underlying characteristics and qualities of the land; - the approach proposed is more consistent with high order Resource Management Act 1991 ('RMA') policies and plans; and - the approach proposed is more consistent with the purpose and principles of the RMA.	Retain parts of the High Natural Character overlay which applies to NA125B/204 (Lot 1 DP197131) and NA119C/48 (Lot 1 DP189675). If the primary relief above is not proposed, the submitters further seek that: the Management Plan approach be retained in the PDP, with further measures that enable sites (such as the Landholdings under consideration) to be appropriately developed.
<b>Owen Burn (S490)</b>	S490.001	Planning maps	High Natural Character	Oppose	The High Natural Character overlay at Orokawa 3A1, Orokawa Bay is inappropriate and impose unduly restrictive controls on the reasonable use and development of the site and adjacent land. The high natural character overlay does not reflect the existing state of the subject property or the surrounding land, which is that of a developed and modified human landscape containing dwellings located within extensively developed and landscaped grounds.	Delete the High Natural Character overlay from the property at Orokawa 3A1, Orokawa Bay (identified in the submission)
<b>Eric Kloet (S491)</b>	S491.001	Planning maps	High Natural Character	Oppose	The property at Waipohutukawa Bay (Lots 5 and 18 of DP 391213) is a developed and modified human landscape containing dwellings located	Delete the High Natural Character overlay from the property at Waipohutukawa Bay (Lots 5 and 18

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>within extensively developed and landscaped grounds.</p> <p>The area enjoys an attractive aesthetic, but due to the predominantly human landscape qualities exhibited by the specific property and others within close proximity, which include significant buildings and infrastructure as well as roading it cannot be considered to meet the high bar of having the landscape values ascribed to it over the whole of the subject site.</p> <p>The imposition of controls intended to manage development in highly sensitive areas are inappropriate in this context and will make the reasonable use and development of the property unfairly and unnecessarily constrained.</p> <p>Therefore, the High Natural Character overlay should be removed from this site such that the submitter can continue to use his land in a manner consistent with the present planning regimen.</p>	of DP 391213)
<b>Ironwood Trust Limited (S492)</b>	S492.001	Planning maps	High Natural Character	Oppose	<p>The High Natural Character overlay at Jack's Bay and Waipiro Bay (see submission) does not reflect the state of the subject property as it currently is, which is that of a developed and modified human landscape containing buildings and other domestic infrastructure with the majority of the land not having qualities that could reasonably be described as having high natural character or comprise an outstanding natural landscape.</p>	Delete the High Natural Character overlay from the property at Jack's Bay and Waipiro Bay (see submission)
<b>William Goodfellow (S493)</b>	S493.002	Planning maps	High Natural Character	Oppose	<p>In particular the submitter considers that these overlays do not reflect the state of the subject property or the surrounding land as it currently is, which is that of a developed and modified human landscape. In particular much of the land holding to the east of Rawhiti Road is given over to plantation forestry which has been recently harvested. In addition, land to the west of this road has recently been subdivided such that it will ultimately be developed for residential use. Accordingly, and as is evident from the aerial photograph below, the majority of the land is in reality devoid of any landscape qualities that could reasonably be described as</p>	Amend to remove High Natural Character from parcels on Rawhiti Road, Rawhiti (identified in the submission).

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					having high natural character or comprise an outstanding natural landscape.	
<b>Ian Jepson (S494)</b>	S494.002	Planning maps	High Natural Character	Oppose	Lot 3 DP 48494 has imposed upon it the HNC and ONL overlays. These overlays appear to have been painted with a rather 'broad brush' and do not reflect the state of the subject property as it currently is, which is that of a developed and modified human landscape containing dwellings, extensive lawns, outbuildings and roading. The majority of the site is devoid of any landscape qualities that could reasonably be described as having high natural character or comprise an outstanding natural landscape.	Amend to remove High Natural Character overlay from Lot 3 DP 48494.
<b>Ricky Faesen Kloet (S495)</b>	S495.001	Planning maps	High Natural Character	Oppose	The overlay appears to have been painted with a rather 'broad brush' and does not reflect the environment of the western end of Motuarohia Island and the subject property in particular. This part of Motuarohia Island is largely developed with holiday homes with domestic infrastructure. While these sites contain stands of bush these are discontinuous and do not create a coherent natural landscape unit. When considered in its entirety it does not exhibit the landscape qualities that could not reasonably be described as having high natural character. The overlay is inappropriate in this context and will make the reasonable use and development of the property unfairly and unnecessarily constrained.	Delete the High Natural Character overlay from Lot 6 DP 488661, Motuarohia Island.
<b>Mark John Wyborn (S497)</b>	S497.001	Planning maps	High Natural Character	Support in part	The submitter seeks that the HNC overlay be removed from that part of the submitter's property [illustrated in the submission] that do not have these qualities such that the submitter can continue to use and develop his land in a manner consistent with its current residential use.	Amend to remove High Natural Character from Orokawa 3C 2A Block NA17A/1419 (187A Manawaora Road, Russell) [as illustrated in submission].
<b>Victoria Yorke and Andre Galvin (S530)</b>	S530.002	Planning maps	High Natural Character	Not Stated	There is approximately 3ha of remnant forest and 3.9ha of previously 'human mediated' land where the property was once used as a quarry. The 3.9 ha is the area we would like the HNC409 restrictions removed, and that part of the lot be rezoned residential. see submission for report	Amend the boundary line for high natural character area (HNC409) on Lot 1 DP 53506 (Puketona Road, Haruru Falls) to reflect the landscape and history of the whenua.
<b>Lucklaw Farm Ltd (S551)</b>	S551.003	Planning maps	High Natural Character	Not Stated	Lucklaw Farms have concerns with respect to the accuracy and spatial extent of the ONC,	Amend and review the accuracy of the Draft Plan mapped HNC areas,

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					HNC areas mapped within the PDP, specifically those identified within the subject site and the adjoining Puwheke Beach. see submission for figures. show the discrepancies in overlay mapping of the three plans, with the Northland Regional Plan in particular not including any mapping of ONC or HNC within the subject site or the adjoining Puwheke Beach area, and the extent of the ONC overlay on Puwheke Beach being less in the PDP compared to the RPS. Lucklaw Farm acknowledges that the mapping of the ONL overlay is very similar between the PDP and the RPS.	including investigation and written clarification from NRC with respect to the discrepancies between the RPS and NRP
<b>Andr� Galvin (S567)</b>	S567.002	Planning maps	High Natural Character	Not Stated	There is approximately 3ha of remnant forest and 3.9ha of previously 'human mediated' land where the property was once used as a quarry. The 3.9 ha is the area we would like the HNC409 restrictions removed, and that part of the lot be rezoned residential. see submission for report	Amend the boundary line for high natural character area (HNC409) on Lot 1 DP 53506 (Puketona Road, Haruru Falls) to reflect the landscape and history of the whenua.
<b>Bellingham Quarries Ltd (S7)</b>	S7.001	Planning maps	Mineral Extraction	Support in part	Quarry operates under a NRC Land use consent (#AUT.006881.01.05). To allow for the progression of the mineral extraction of the site, so the quarries are not 'ring-fenced' without consideration to "ensure the existing mineral extraction activities can continue to operate and expand to support the social and economic well being of the district", and to ensure provisions are appropriate for the continued extraction of these mineral resources. The extensions will have no effect on neighbouring properties, as they extend back into the quarry owner's land parcel that the mineral zone is currently on.	Amend the current extent of the Mineral extraction overlay to enable the expansion of the Hobbs Road quarry (at 61 Hobbs Road, Totara North). The western and south-eastern boundaries should be amended to allow for expansion and stockpile sites (see attachments to submission for more details)
<b>Bellingham Quarries Ltd (S7)</b>	S7.002	Planning maps	Mineral Extraction	Support in part	Quarry operates under a FNDC land use consent #2070399 and an NRC consent #AUT 016797.01.02. The quarry is a very important rock resource for the North Hokianga, its remote location in an area that is deficient of quarries is necessary to help support the social and economic wellbeing of the district. The quarry is used for maintenance aggregate for council roads, forestry requirements and local domestic projects.	Insert Mineral extraction overlay over the existing Hollands Quarry site (approx. 20 hectares) at 286 Runaruna Road, Panguru (see attachment to submission for more details)

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>This consented and compliant rock resource should be subject to a mineral extraction overlay. The overlay would need to cover the whole property as described above and in the FNDC consent to allow the quarry to progress into the rock reserves.</p> <p>We note there is a proposed mineral extraction overlay on land immediately to the South-East of the property, that neighbouring land having once been a site of a working quarry, the quarry no-longer in use.</p> <p>Bellingham Quarries has been operating out of Hollands quarry since 2008 without any issues, we see no effects from applying a mineral extraction overlay on this property.</p>	
<b>Bellingham Quarries Ltd (S7)</b>	S7.003	Planning maps	Mineral Extraction	Oppose	<p>The quarry is operating under an NRC land Use Consent #AUT023774.01.02, Lawfully established since at least 1950 and probably earlier under the Quarries Act 1944. Factual material confirmed that there was a quarry in place from 1950 and that a mines inspector report was obtained on 1 July 1957. Bellingham Quarries Ltd purchased the quarry in 2013 understanding that the quarry was operating under existing use rights. Paranui Limeworks is a smaller scale limestone quarry with aggregate used for FNDC, forestry and domestic roads as well as producing agricultural lime for rural production units and avocado orchards. It is a limestone outcrop that is in demand due to its quality. Whilst there are neighbours to the property the effects are minor, there has been no complaints.</p>	Insert Mineral extraction overlay over the existing Paranui Limeworks quarry, 184 Taylor Road, Oruru (see attachments to submission for more details)
<b>Bellingham Quarries Ltd (S7)</b>	S7.004	Planning maps	Mineral Extraction	Support in part	<p>Quarry operates under a FNDC minerals zone and a NRC Land Use Consent #AUT.007288.01.04. A remote Quarry 77km North of Kaitaia located in a forestry block, an important resource given its distance from Kaitaia. The Proposed Mineral extraction overlay needs extending to appreciate the resource and the expansion of the quarry. The progression of the Quarry is currently to the Southern and South-Western boundaries, these boundaries need extending. The extensions will</p>	Amend current extent of the Mineral extraction overlay over the existing Tangoake Quarry, 538 Te Ahu Road, Te Kao to enable quarry expansion (see attachments to submission for more details)

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>have no effect on neighbouring properties, the progression is back into the quarry's landowner's title.</p> <p>The Landowner's have been consulted and support this submission</p>	
<b>Bellingham Quarries Ltd (S7)</b>	S7.005	Planning maps	Mineral Extraction	Support in part	<p>Quarry operates under a New Zealand Petroleum and Minerals Mining permit #41693, in a FNDC minerals zone and an NRC Land Use Consent #AUT006756.01.04. Te Hapua pt Allot 13 Psh of Muriwhenua Blk XVI Parengarenga SD.</p> <p>An important resource given its remote location and distance from Kaitaia, 100km. Located on Crown land administered by the Department of Conservation. The aggregate from the quarry is used for Waka Kotahi's state highways, council roads, forestry roads and local domestic projects.</p> <p>The quarry has recently (2014) been granted an extension of its area by New Zealand Petroleum and Minerals for its Mining Permit #41693 to 25.38 Hectares. The proposed mineral extraction area should have the same footprint as the mining permit for Te Hapua Quarry. That footprint allowing for the quarry to expand into the appropriate areas.</p> <p>The increased area has no more effects on neighbouring properties.</p>	Amend current extent of the Mineral extraction overlay over the existing Te Hapua Quarry, 5km up Te Hapua Road from Waitiki landing to enable quarry expansion (see attachments to submission for more details)
<b>Bellingham Quarries Ltd (S7)</b>	S7.006	Planning maps	Mineral Extraction	Support in part	<p>Reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) It is a very important resource for the district.</li> <li>2) It is a large scale existing and compliant mineral extraction site.</li> <li>3) The resource is a good quality rock, meeting the specifications of aggregates set out for Waka Kotahi's state highways, council road upgrades and ready-mix concrete plants.</li> <li>4) The property has other outcrops of rock outside the proposed extraction overlay that need to be recognised as future mineral extraction resources.</li> </ol>	Amend current extent of the Mineral extraction overlay over the existing Larmer Road quarry, 377 Larmer Road, Kaitaia to cover the whole property, and to enable quarry expansion (see attachments to submission for more details)

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>5) Activities such as access roading and overburden disposal sites need to be considered when designing the overlay.</p> <p>6) The whole property has been acknowledged by the NRC and mapped accordingly to appreciate the long term needs of infrastructure providers to operate, maintain, and enhance assets.</p> <p>7) The area defined in the FNDC Land Use Consent # 2170236-RMALUC has not been included in the overlay</p> <p>8) A 'whole of property' mineral extraction overlay will not create anymore effects on neighbouring residences, the separation distance of the quarry's mineral extraction will increase from residential neighbours as the expansion continues.</p> <p>9) There have been no objections from adjoining property owners for consents granted.</p>	
<p><b>Imerys Performance Minerals Asia Pacific (S65)</b></p>	<p>S65.003</p>	<p>Planning maps</p>	<p>Mineral Extraction</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>The overlay and underlying zoning approach requires Imerys's to consider multiple sets of provisions which are not considered to confusing and 'frustrate' the outcomes Council seeks to achieve. The Landholdings under consideration have multiple underlying zones (Rural Production &amp; Maori Purpose) as well as consideration of the MEO. For an extension to a quarry, the underlying zone rules cause an unnecessary change to the activity status of the application. The rationale for this is not clear, particularly for existing and consented activities. To add further, the general requirement for a new mineral extraction activity to default to Discretionary, is considered particularly onerous, especially where the Minerals, or proposed MEO, has already been applied. The Overview for the MEO is supported as it promotes the rationale and importance of minerals. The Landholdings have been zoned Minerals (either completely or partially) and this zoning approach is considered sufficient in highlighting to other landholdings or property owners in the surrounds that such activity either will take place, or is taking place currently. Any</p>	<p>delete mineral extraction overlay from Matauri Bay Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- ROT NA18D/1020 (Lot 1 DP 62019 ) ;</li> <li>- ROT NA31B/294 ( Pt Lot 1 DP 54194);</li> <li>- ROT NA93D/602( Pt Lot 1 DP 50232 ) [ In part ] ;</li> <li>- ROT NA15D/1478 (Pt Lot 5 DP 50235 ) [ In part ] ;</li> <li>- ROT 501460 ( Mahimahi E 5 )</li> </ul>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>new mineral extraction activity also has to contend with the requirements of the Northland Regional Council, and it is considered that the requirements of the MEO seek to duplicate, in many respects, the requirements and matters of consideration that the Regional Council manage. This unnecessary duplication is not warranted. The existing approach to the management of Minerals is far simpler, more effective, and more efficient than that which is proposed.</p>	
<p><b>Imerys Performance Minerals Asia Pacific (S65)</b></p>	<p>S65.004</p>	<p>Planning maps</p>	<p>Mineral Extraction</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>The overlay and underlying zoning approach requires Imerys's to consider multiple sets of provisions which are not considered to confusing and 'frustrate' the outcomes Council seeks to achieve</p> <p>The Landholdings under consideration have multiple underlying zones (Rural Production &amp; Maori Purpose) as well as consideration of the MEO.</p> <p>For an extension to a quarry, the underlying zone rules cause an unnecessary change to the activity status of the application. The rationale for this is not clear, particularly for existing and consented activities.</p> <p>To add further, the general requirement for a new mineral extraction activity to default to Discretionary, is considered particularly onerous, especially where the Minerals, or proposed MEO, has already been applied. The Overview for the MEO is supported as it promotes the rationale and importance of minerals. The Landholdings have been zoned Minerals (either completely or partially) and this zoning approach is considered sufficient in highlighting to other landholdings or</p>	<p>delete mineral extraction overlay from Mangakaretu Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- ROT NA93B/909 ( Section 5 SO 64268 ) [ In part ]</li> <li>- ROT NA28A/1047 ( Section 36 SO 48086 )</li> </ul>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>property owners in the surrounds that such activity either will take place, or is taking place currently. Any new mineral extraction activity also has to contend with the requirements of the Northland Regional Council, and it is considered that the requirements of the MEO seek to duplicate, in many respects, the requirements and matters of consideration that the Regional Council manage. This unnecessary duplication is not warranted. The existing approach to the management of Minerals is far simpler, more effective, and more efficient than that which is proposed.</p>	
<b>Michael Jurlina (S365)</b>	S365.001	Planning maps	Mineral Extraction	Oppose	<p>The Mineral Extraction overlay applies to a small section of 4873B State Highway 10, Kaingaroa. It is believed that the inclusion of this segment is due to historical quarrying activity on two adjacent properties to the north, being Sec 1 SO Plan 30459 and Sec 1 SO Plan 39879 (NA77D/161) and Lot 1 DP 70397 (NA27A/882). This quarry has not been in operation for an extended period of time, and submitter is not aware of any plans to reinstate the quarry. Therefore there is no logical reason to include 4873B State Highway 10 within the overlay. Retention of the overlay will only result in unnecessary restrictions on property.</p>	<p>Amend the maps so that the Mineral Extraction overlay does not encroach into 4873B State Highway 10 (SH10), Kaingaroa (Pt Sec 41 and Pt Sec 44 Blk VIII Rangaunu SD NA91D/255), deleting the overlay from the property.</p>
<b>Ventia Ltd (S424)</b>	S424.001	Planning maps	Mineral Extraction	Support in part	<p>Whilst the PDP mapping for the MEO is supported as currently drafted, Ventia understand the significant resources available within the Puketona Quarry. NA97B/387 contains further aggregate resource that could keep the quarry operational for decades to come. In this respect they would seek that the entire site be considered as part of the MEO. Provision of the resources to the community are important in many aspects of the economy. The extension of the MEO would give Ventia further certainty to invest in the quarry and it ensures there are appropriate aggregate</p>	<p>Amend the extent of the Mineral Extraction Overlay over the entire area of NA97B/387.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					resources in the Northland region for current and future generations.	
<b>Colin Robert Jay and Daryl Judith Jay (S533)</b>	S533.001	Planning maps	Mineral Extraction	Support	There is no provision for further expansion of Hobbs Quarry, with the Mineral Extraction overlay limited to the existing working area (Hobbs Road, being Lots 1 and 2 DP 191921, Pt Lot 1 DP 208032 BLK XI Mangonui SD, BKLK IV Maunga-Taniwha SD residue). With the exception of the northeastern boundary, the boundaries of the overlay are not identifiable or definite enough to be accurate.	Amend the southern and western boundaries of the Mineral Extraction overlay area mapped for Hobbs Quarry (Hobbs Road, being Lots 1 and 2 DP 191921, Pt Lot 1 DP 208032 BLK XI Mangonui SD, BKLK IV Maunga-Taniwha SD residue), changes sought indicated within submission.
<b>Denis Whooley and Jennifer Whooley (S75)</b>	S75.003	Planning maps	Outstanding Natural Character	Oppose	The photograph of 2195 Waikare Road, Russell/Kawakawa, that has been used to overlay Outstanding natural character 109 (Hillslopes with native conifer/mixed broadleaved forest including kauri & rimu emergents) is woefully out of date and does not reflect the following: - Several kilometres of roading in place - Acres of land clearance - Buildings insitu - Resource consents for buildings not yet constructed	Delete Outstanding natural character 109 (Hillslopes with native conifer/mixed broadleaved forest including kauri & rimu emergents) from 2195 Waikare Road, Russell/Kawakawa
<b>Summit Forests New Zealand Limited (S148)</b>	S148.055	Planning maps	Outstanding Natural Character	Not Stated	the Plan's overlays for Outstanding Natural Landscapes, Outstanding, and High Natural Character, and Coastal Environment captures significant areas of SFNZ's plantation forests. This could create uncertainty and open SFNZ to challenge over its legitimate plantation forestry activities in these areas.	Delete any Outstanding Natural Character overlay from plantation forest areas.
<b>Lucklaw Farm Ltd (S551)</b>	S551.002	Planning maps	Outstanding Natural Character	Not Stated	Lucklaw Farms have concerns with respect to the accuracy and spatial extent of the ONC, HNC areas mapped within the PDP, specifically those identified within the subject site and the adjoining Puwheke Beach. see submission for figures. show the discrepancies in overlay mapping of the three plans, with the Northland Regional Plan in particular not including any mapping of ONC or HNC within the subject site or the adjoining Puwheke Beach area, and the extent of the ONC overlay on Puwheke Beach being less in the PDP compared to the RPS. Lucklaw Farm	Amend and review the accuracy of the Draft Plan mapped ONC areas including investigation and written clarification from NRC with respect to the discrepancies between the RPS and NRP.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					acknowledges that the mapping of the ONL overlay is very similar between the PDP and the RPS.	
<b>Lucklaw Farm Ltd (S551)</b>	S551.006	Planning maps	Outstanding Natural Character	Oppose		ONC area "OC44" should be mapped in accordance with the mapping shown in the RPS
<b>PF Olsen Limited (S91)</b>	S91.013	Planning maps	Outstanding Natural Feature	Oppose	Plantation forests and plantation forestry activities are primary production activities in a working rural landscape. Where plantation forest already exists within an Outstanding Natural Feature, it should be considered as a permitted activity and the associated plantation forest activities should also be permitted.	Delete any areas of plantation forest from the Outstanding Natural Features overlay mapping.
<b>Summit Forests New Zealand Limited (S148)</b>	S148.031	Planning maps	Outstanding Natural Feature	Not Stated	The chapter on Outstanding Natural Landscapes (ONL) and Outstanding Natural Features (ONF) fails to provide equitably for all primary production activities. In particular, it fails to recognise that, where plantation forestry already exists within an ONL or ONF, it should be considered as a legitimate part of the landscape and provided for as a permitted activity subject to the provisions of the NES-PF	Delete any areas of existing plantation forestry for the ONF overlay mapping
<b>Alec Jack (S277)</b>	S277.024	Planning maps	Outstanding Natural Feature	Oppose	Jacks Lake is not a natural feature - it is man-made and was created by Ned Jack with financial assistance (50% subsidy for habitat creation) from the Acclimatization Society (now Fish and Game NZ) in 1975. I will provide multiple levels of evidence at the hearings stage. I also oppose the inclusion of our land immediately adjacent to Lake Owhareiti in the ONF91 classification. Lake Owhareiti itself dictates its boundary, not a land title, or a line on a map. The farmland adjacent to the lake isn't an outstanding natural feature.	Amend the Planning Maps to exclude Jacks Lake, and Lake Owhareiti foreshore area on our farm from area classified "ONF91 Pouerua (Pakaraka Mountain) scoria cone, lava field and lava-dammed lakes".
<b>Muriwhenua Incorporated (S420)</b>	S420.007	Planning maps	Outstanding Natural Feature	Not Stated	Not stated	Delete the outstanding natural features classification and outstanding natural landscape overlays from the Māori Purposes Rural Settlement zone area proposed through submission point S420.004. In addition, delete the outstanding natural features

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						classification and outstanding natural landscape overlays from that part of the Te Hāpua and Shenwood Forests that is greater than 500 metres from the coast.
<b>Denis Whooley and Jennifer Whooley (S75)</b>	S75.001	Planning maps	Outstanding Natural Landscape	Oppose	The photograph of 2195 Waikare Road, Russell/Kawakawa, that has been used to overlay Outstanding natural landscape 57 (Russell Forest and bush remnants) is woefully out of date and does not reflect the following: -Several kilometres of roading in place -Acres of land clearance -Buildings insitu -Resource consents for buildings not yet constructed	Delete Outstanding natural landscape 57 (Russell Forest and bush remnants) from 2195 Waikare Road, Russell/Kawakawa
<b>PF Olsen Limited (S91)</b>	S91.012	Planning maps	Outstanding Natural Landscape	Oppose	Plantation forests and plantation forestry activities are primary production activities in a working rural landscape. Where plantation forest already exists within an Outstanding Natural Landscape, it should be considered as a permitted activity and the associated plantation forest activities should also be permitted.	Delete any areas of plantation forest from the Outstanding Natural Landscapes overlay mapping.
<b>Summit Forests New Zealand Limited (S148)</b>	S148.030	Planning maps	Outstanding Natural Landscape	Not Stated	The chapter on Outstanding Natural Landscapes (ONL) and Outstanding Natural Features (ONF) fails to provide equitably for all primary production activities. In particular, it fails to recognise that, where plantation forestry already exists within an ONL or ONF, it should be considered as a legitimate part of the landscape and provided for as a permitted activity subject to the provisions of the NES-PF	Delete any areas of existing plantation forestry for the ONL overlay mapping
<b>Summit Forests New Zealand Limited (S148)</b>	S148.053	Planning maps	Outstanding Natural Landscape	Not Stated	The Plan's overlays for Outstanding Natural Landscapes captures significant areas of SFNZ's plantation forests. This could create uncertainty and open SFNZ to challenge over its legitimate plantation forestry activities in these areas.	Delete any Outstanding Natural Landscape overlay from plantation forest areas
<b>Zejia Hu (S242)</b>	S242.001	Planning maps	Outstanding Natural Landscape	Oppose	The policies and rules in the 'Natural features and landscapes' chapter of the PDP have an impact on the future development options for 79C Peninsula Parade, Hihi (being legally described as	Amend the Outstanding Natural Landscape overlay on 79C Peninsula Parade, Hihi (being legally described as Lot 1, DP

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>Lot 1, DP 322506).</p> <p>The property is rated as vacant lifestyle. Amongst other overlays, the property is subject to Outstanding Natural Landscape (ONL) and High Natural Character (HNC) overlays. Much of the property is bush covered and those areas are not developable for reasons stated in submission. The only potentially practically developable area (i.e. for residential unit) on the property will be subject to a proposed Outstanding Natural Landscape overlay.</p> <p>The rules in the PDP applying to this developable land area mean I would not have the right to construct a dwelling and undertake activities customarily associated with such on the property, particularly the combination of the Outstanding Natural Landscape and Coastal Environment overlays.</p> <p>Rule NFL-R1, would, given the circumstances described above, mean the construction of a residential unit on the property would be categorised as 'Non-Complying', as would, almost certainly, the minimum reasonably required earthworks associated with constructing any reasonably dimensioned dwelling, due to rule NFL-R3 and the extreme limitations associated with standard NFL-S3.</p> <p>Also, ironically, despite the property being proposed to be zoned Rural Production, NFL-R6 results in all farming activity on the property being categorised as 'Non-Complying'!</p> <p>As a consequence of the matters outlined above, it is demonstrably the case that without amendment, the PDP as Notified would have the effect of making the property incapable of reasonable use and would place an unfair and unreasonable burden on me (per RMA S.85 3B). In terms of the definition of 'reasonable use' in S. 85, I assert that permitting me to have the right to build a dwelling and all customary associated constructions and other associated activities on the property would not adversely affect the</p>	<p>322506) and/or modify the PDP rules such that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. constructing a dwelling and undertaking other customary associated activities, and</li> <li>b. undertaking Farming activities on the non-bush covered areas of the property would be classed as a permitted or controlled activity, thereby avoiding the property being rendered incapable of reasonable use and avoiding placing an unfair and unreasonable burden on the landowner.</li> </ul>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>environment or any person significantly.</p> <p>The Northland Regional Landscape Assessment Workshop report for the ONL that covers the property (Ref ONL 17, ONL Number 2847) does not specifically reference the pastured areas that are the areas where I am objecting to the impact of the ONL overlay (in conjunction with other overlays and other PDP rules). With regard to the eastern side of the harbour, the assessment largely focusses on the bush covered coastal fringe.</p> <p>There are already a number of dwellings and other structures in this area visible from the other side of the Mangonui Harbour that the FNDC has either given consent to, or allowed to be constructed without consent. These existing and in progress constructions and associated earthworks are clearly visible from the Rangikapiti Historic Reserve and from various vantage points on the harbour itself. It would be intolerable for me not to be permitted to build in this area where Council has tolerated unconsented (non-Permitted) building and earthworks activity for many years. Given the nature of the location and price of the land in this area, it is reasonable to assume any reasonable minded owner wishing to construct a dwelling on the property would ensure it was architecturally designed in keeping with the aesthetic values of the surrounds, with appropriate softening of the visual affects by native tree plantings etc (and compliance with relevant standards and rules in the PDP beyond the standards and rules that directly relate to this objection). It would not be a public 'eye sore' and therefore I should have the right to undertake such constructions and associated activities as permitted activities, or at worst as controlled activities.</p>	
<p><b>Amanda Kennedy, Julia Kennedy Till</b></p>	<p>S353.002</p>	<p>Planning maps</p>	<p>Outstanding Natural Landscape</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>The reasons why it is believed that the proposed changes are more appropriate for this site are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it better aligns with existing development, size of</li> </ul>	<p>Retain parts of the Outstanding Natural Landscape which applies to NA125B/204 (Lot 1 DP 197131). If the primary relief above is not</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>and Simon Till (S353)</b>					landholdings and underlying characteristics and qualities of the land;  - the approach proposed is more consistent with high order Resource Management Act 1991 ('RMA') policies and plans; and  - the approach proposed is more consistent with the purpose and principles of the RMA.	proposed, the submitters further seek that: the Management Plan approach be retained in the PDP, with further measures that enable sites (such as the Landholdings under consideration) to be appropriately developed.
<b>Muriwhenua Incorporated (S420)</b>	S420.009	Planning maps	Outstanding Natural Landscape	Not Stated	Not stated	Delete the outstanding natural features classification and outstanding natural landscape overlays from the Māori Purposes Rural Settlement zone area proposed through submission point S420.004. In addition, delete the outstanding natural features classification and outstanding natural landscape overlays from that part of the Te Hāpua and Shenwood Forests that is greater than 500 metres from the coast.
<b>Owen Burn (S490)</b>	S490.002	Planning maps	Outstanding Natural Landscape	Oppose	The Outstanding Natural Landscape overlay at Orokawa 3A1, Orokawa Bay is inappropriate and impose unduly restrictive controls on the reasonable use and development of the site and adjacent land. The high natural character overlay does not reflect the existing state of the subject property or the surrounding land, which is that of a developed and modified human landscape containing dwellings located within extensively developed and landscaped grounds	Delete the Outstanding Natural Landscape overlay from the property at Orokawa 3A1, Orokawa Bay (identified in the submission)
<b>Eric Kloet (S491)</b>	S491.002	Planning maps	Outstanding Natural Landscape	Oppose	The property at Waipohutukawa Bay (Lots 5 and 18 of DP 391213) is a developed and modified human landscape containing dwellings located within extensively developed and landscaped grounds. The area enjoys an attractive aesthetic, but due to the predominantly human landscape qualities	Delete the Outstanding Natural Landscape overlay from the property at Waipohutukawa Bay (Lots 5 and 18 of DP 391213)

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>exhibited by the specific property and others within close proximity, which include significant buildings and infrastructure as well as roading it cannot be considered to meet the high bar of having the landscape values ascribed to it over the whole of the subject site.</p> <p>The imposition of controls intended to manage development in highly sensitive areas are inappropriate in this context and will make the reasonable use and development of the property unfairly and unnecessarily constrained.</p> <p>Therefore, the Outstanding Natural Landscape overlay should be removed from this site such that the submitter can continue to use his land in a manner consistent with the present planning regimen.</p>	
<b>Ironwood Trust Limited (S492)</b>	S492.002	Planning maps	Outstanding Natural Landscape	Oppose	<p>The Outstanding Natural Landscape overlay at Jack's Bay and Waipiro Bay (see submission) does not reflect the state of the subject property as it currently is, which is that of a developed and modified human landscape containing buildings and other domestic infrastructure with the majority of the land not having qualities that could reasonably be described as having high natural character or comprise an outstanding natural landscape</p>	Delete the Outstanding Natural Landscape overlay from the property at Jack's Bay and Waipiro Bay (see submission)
<b>William Goodfellow (S493)</b>	S493.001	Planning maps	Outstanding Natural Landscape	Oppose	<p>In particular the submitter considers that these overlays do not reflect the state of the subject property or the surrounding land as it currently is, which is that of a developed and modified human landscape. In particular much of the land holding to the east of Rawhiti Road is given over to plantation forestry which has been recently harvested. In addition, land to the west of this road has recently been subdivided such that it will ultimately be developed for residential use. Accordingly, and as is evident from the aerial photograph below, the majority of the land is in reality devoid of any landscape qualities that could reasonably be described as having high natural character or comprise an outstanding natural landscape.</p>	Amend to remove Outstanding Natural Landscape from parcels on Rawhiti Road, Rawhiti (identified in the submission).

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>Ian Jepson (S494)</b>	S494.001	Planning maps	Outstanding Natural Landscape	Oppose	Lot 3 DP 48494 has imposed upon it the HNC and ONL overlays. These overlays appear to have been painted with a rather 'broad brush' and do not reflect the state of the subject property as it currently is, which is that of a developed and modified human landscape containing dwellings, extensive lawns, outbuildings and roading. The majority of the site is devoid of any landscape qualities that could reasonably be described as having high natural character or comprise an outstanding natural landscape.	Amend to remove Outstanding Natural Landscape from Lot 3 DP 48494.
<b>Ricky Faesen Kloet (S495)</b>	S495.002	Planning maps	Outstanding Natural Landscape	Oppose	The overlay appears to have been painted with a rather 'broad brush' and does not reflect the environment of the western end of Motuarohia Island and the subject property in particular. This part of Motuarohia Island is largely developed with holiday homes with domestic infrastructure. While these sites contain stands of bush these are discontinuous and do not create a coherent natural landscape unit. When considered in its entirety it does not exhibit the landscape qualities that could not reasonably be described as having high natural character. The overlay is inappropriate in this context and will make the reasonable use and development of the property unfairly and unnecessarily constrained.	Delete the Outstanding Natural Landscape overlay from Lot 6 DP 488661, Motuarohia Island.
<b>Philip Thornton (S496)</b>	S496.001	Planning maps	Outstanding Natural Landscape	Oppose	The submitter considers that the ONL overlay should be removed from this site such that the submitter can continue to use his land in a manner consistent with its evident landscape characteristics.	Amend to remove Outstanding Natural Landscape from Waipohutukawa Bay, Bay of Islands (Lot 4 DP 391213) [as illustrated in submission].
<b>Mark John Wyborn (S497)</b>	S497.002	Planning maps	Outstanding Natural Landscape	Support in part	The submitter seeks that the ONL overlay be removed from that part of the submitter's property [illustrated in the submission] that do not have these qualities such that the submitter can continue to use and develop his land in a manner consistent with its current residential use.	Amend to remove Outstanding Natural Landscape from Orokawa 3C 2A Block NA17A/1419 (187A Manawaora Road, Russell) [as illustrated in submission].
<b>Kaitaia Business Association (S501)</b>	S501.002	Planning maps	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	Amend the extent of the 'pedestrian frontage' area in Kaitaita, extending it to include the existing business

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					district. In particular the main street of Kaitaia which is identified in submission as being the Pedestrian Frontage area.	district
<b>Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S561)</b>	S561.122	Planning maps	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 submission to ensure the frontage is in an appropriate location and is complemented on both sides of Raihara Street.
<b>Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S561)</b>	S561.123	Planning maps	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.
<b>Imerys Performance Minerals Asia Pacific (S65)</b>	S65.005	Planning maps	River Flood Hazard Zone (10 Year ARI Event)	Oppose	The Natural Hazard Maps seem to have, in error, covered an existing operational clay dam within the Landholdings. This is detailed below It is clear that this is an operational dam on the Landholdings and it is unclear how this is implicated by a River Flood Hazard event. The overlay should be removed.	delete river flood hazard zone (10 year ARI event ) from Matauri Bay Road - ROT NA18D/1020 (Lot 1 DP 62019 ); - ROT NA31B/294 ( Pt Lot 1 DP 54194); - ROT NA93D/602( Pt Lot 1 DP 50232 ) [ In part ] ;

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						- ROT NA15D/1478 (Pt Lot 5 DP 50235 ) [ In part ]; - ROT 501460 ( Mahimahi E 5 )
<b>Te Runanga o Ngai Takoto Trust (S390)</b>	S390.084	Planning maps	River Flood Hazard Zone (10 Year ARI Event)	Oppose	The submitter opposes all flood risk maps included in the PDP were created at a scale of 1:250,000. This means there is insufficient accuracy to identify at-risk areas of an individual land parcel. This will place heavy financial burdens on tāngata whenua to gain expert analysis of each site and case by case. It would be more efficient for the Council to undertake these assessments alongside tāngata whenua.	Improve the accuracy of all flood risk maps by surveying and ground truthing the at-risk areas before the plan becomes operative in collaboration with tāngata whenua.
<b>Te Rūnanga o Whaingaroa (S486)</b>	S486.098	Planning maps	River Flood Hazard Zone (10 Year ARI Event)	Oppose	All flood risk maps included in the PDP were created at a scale of 1:250,000. This means there is insufficient accuracy to identify at-risk areas of an individual land parcel. This will place heavy financial burdens on tāngata whenua to gain expert analysis of each site and case by case. It would be more efficient for the Council to undertake these assessments alongside tāngata whenua.	Amend the planning maps to Improve the accuracy of all flood risk maps by surveying and ground truthing the at-risk areas before the plan becomes operative in collaboration with tāngata whenua.
<b>Te Rūnanga Ā Iwi O Ngapuhi (S498)</b>	S498.085	Planning maps	River Flood Hazard Zone (10 Year ARI Event)	Oppose	The submitter opposes all flood risk maps included in the PDP were created at a scale of 1:250,000. This means there is insufficient accuracy to identify at-risk areas of an individual land parcel. This will place heavy financial burdens on tāngata whenua to gain expert analysis of each site and case by case. It would be more efficient for the Council to undertake these assessments alongside tāngata whenua.	Improve the accuracy of all flood risk maps by surveying and ground truthing the at-risk areas before the plan becomes operative in collaboration with tāngata whenua.
<b>Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S561)</b>	S561.001	Planning maps	River Flood Hazard Zone (10 Year ARI Event)	Support in part	Kāinga Ora seek that River Flood Hazard Area maps are removed from the FNPDP and placed in a non-statutory layer available via a GIS viewer. This is a consistent approach to identify such hazards countrywide and provides for regular updates to hazard information without the requirement to go through Plan Changes to update the planning maps. At the same time, further investigation needs to be carried out into flood risk particularly given the significant flooding extent experienced in parts of the District. This	Delete all River Flood Hazard Area maps from the FNPDP and placed in a non-statutory layer available via a GIS viewer.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					review should address the depth of flood waters, velocity, timing of flooding to identify locations of high risk and low risk and amend zoning in those locations accordingly.	
<b>Imerys Performance Minerals Asia Pacific (S65)</b>	S65.006	Planning maps	River Flood Hazard Zone (100 Year ARI Event)	Oppose	The Natural Hazard Maps seem to have, in error, covered an existing operational clay dam within the Landholdings. This is detailed below It is clear that this is an operational dam on the Landholdings and it is unclear how this is implicated by a River Flood Hazard event. The overlay should be removed	delete river flood hazard zone (100 year ARI event ) from Matauri Bay Road - ROT NA18D/1020 (Lot 1 DP 62019 ); - ROT NA31B/294 ( Pt Lot 1 DP 54194); - ROT NA93D/602( Pt Lot 1 DP 50232 ) [ In part ] ; - ROT NA15D/1478 (Pt Lot 5 DP 50235 ) [ In part ] ; - ROT 501460 ( Mahimahi E 5 )
<b>Mark and Emma Klinac (S140)</b>	S140.002	Planning maps	River Flood Hazard Zone (100 Year ARI Event)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the zoning of Lot 2 DP 321759 & Lot 3 DP 321759 (1/2 share); and Lot 1 DP 321759 & Lot 3 DP 321759 (1/2 share) as Flood Hazard (10 Year ARI Event & 100 Year ARI Event) Zone as the site has only been subjected to flooding on one occasion, during Cyclone Bola. Since then, flood protection has occurred throughout the Kerikeri / Waipapa Region resulting in less flooding effects to the region.	Delete the flood hazard zoning of Lot 2 DP 321759 & Lot 3 DP 321759 (1/2 share); and Lot 1 DP 321759 & Lot 3 DP 321759 (1/2 share).
<b>Nicole Wooster (S259)</b>	S259.002	Planning maps	River Flood Hazard Zone (100 Year ARI Event)	Oppose	The flood hazard maps incorrectly identify a river flood hazard next to the submitter's house that was built in 1970s and at most this is an overland flow path in heavy rain which is very shallow and disappears immediately. The property has been in the family since 1902 and is not affected by river flooding. The mapping identifies much larger areas of flooding than what actually occurs. It is over representing the flood areas. The orchard areas do not flood for example, nor does much of the farmland due to the drainage networks in place even in extreme weather events.	Amend river flood hazards maps in consultation with submitter to correct and take into account existing drainage and other flood mitigation infrastructure.
<b>Te Rūnanga o Whaingaroa (S486)</b>	S486.099	Planning maps	River Flood Hazard Zone (100 Year ARI Event)	Oppose	All flood risk maps included in the PDP were created at a scale of 1:250,000. This means there is insufficient accuracy to identify at-risk areas of an individual land parcel. This will place heavy	Amend the planning maps to Improve the accuracy of all flood risk maps by surveying and ground truthing the at-risk areas before the

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					financial burdens on tāngata whenua to gain expert analysis of each site and case by case. It would be more efficient for the Council to undertake these assessments alongside tāngata whenua.	plan becomes operative in collaboration with tāngata whenua.
<b>Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited (S554)</b>	S554.050	Planning maps	River Flood Hazard Zone (100 Year ARI Event)	Oppose	<p>Flood modelling by Northland Regional Council identifies the Site is subject to a flood hazard, as is surrounding land. In support of the Proposal, KFO commissioned assessments to determine the maximum area of land on the Site needed and the feasibility of engineered solutions to manage the flood hazard.</p> <p>The Proposal proposes a floodway to convey floodwaters and mitigate the impact of flood hazard outside the site. The alignment of this floodway generally follows the alignment of the existing overland flow path once it has collected floodwaters that spilled across SH10. The proposed floodway is defined spatially using an Overlay.</p> <p>The Overlay relates to rules in the proposed Precinct that will require the land area for flood hazard management to be defined and secured alongside the first development consent on the land and ahead of any building.</p>	Delete the River Flood Hazard Zone Overlay (100 Year ARI Event) and apply the overlay in Figure 3 of the Section 32 Report, based on the site-specific flood hazard assessment prepared in support of the Structure Plan and Precinct.
<b>Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S561)</b>	S561.002	Planning maps	River Flood Hazard Zone (100 Year ARI Event)	Support in part	<p>Kāinga Ora seek that River Flood Hazard Area maps are removed from the FNPDP and placed in a non-statutory layer available via a GIS viewer. This is a consistent approach to identify such hazards countrywide and provides for regular updates to hazard information without the requirement to go through Plan Changes to update the planning maps. At the same time, further investigation needs to be carried out into flood risk particularly given the significant flooding extent experienced in parts of the District. This review should address the depth of flood waters, velocity, timing of flooding to identify locations of high risk and low risk and amend zoning in those locations accordingly.</p>	Delete all River Flood Hazard Area maps from the FNPDP and placed in a non-statutory layer available via a GIS viewer.
<b>Heritage New Zealand</b>	S409.018	Planning maps	Sites and Areas of	Support	The Proposed Plan is required to recognise and provide for the matters of national importance, in	Retain the spatial map layers for Sites and areas of significance to

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>Pouhere Taonga (S409)</b>			Significance to Māori		particular 6(f) "the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use and development" and s6(e) "the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga." HNZPT considers that the hybrid-plan format of the Proposed Plan, that includes: the identification of historic heritage; heritage area overlays; Kororareka Russell Township Zone and Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori issues {Overview}, objectives, policies and rules each within a Section of the plan, is of assistance to the reader in understanding the background and reasons for the rules.	Maori
<b>J L Hayes and Sons Ltd (S557)</b>	S557.001	Planning maps	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Support in part	I prefer Section 8.3.3, Option 3: Proposed Approach (in the Tangata Whenua: Section 32 Report). However, it is a waste of time. The Council does not act on a resource consent ignoring the site when the hand changes had.	Retain Site of Cultural Significance to Māori (MS06-20) on 282 Totara North Road, Kaeo.
<b>Te Runanga o Ngai Takoto Trust (S390)</b>	S390.065	Planning maps	Treaty Settlement Area of Interest	Support	The submitter supports the Treaty Settlement Land Overlay in principle. It is agreed, as stated in the Tāngata Whenua s32 Report, that the TSL Overlay, "Assists to remove some of the constraints and barriers associated with developing Māori land or Treaty Settlement Land."	Retain the Treaty Settlement Land Overlay and related plan provisions, subject to amendments submitted.
<b>Ngamaia Farms Ltd (S3)</b>	S3.002	Planning maps	Treaty Settlement Land	Oppose	It is unclear why the PDP E-Maps consider the site subjected to the Treaty Settlement Land Overlay. The land under consideration has not been returned through a Treaty Settlement process. We assume that the mapping system has identified an overlap at the margins of the site where some Treaty Settlement Land is located. Attributing this site with such an overlay will cause confusion should activities be carried out. This error should be removed.	amend the zoning of the following properties to exclude the treaty settlement land overlay - NA48C/1396 (Section 60 Block X Takahue Survey District); - NA30A/294 (Section 52 and Part Section 32 Block X Takahue Survey District) - NA1034/213 (Section 36 Block X Takahue Survey District; and - NA26A/1387 (Section 35 and Section 40 Block X Takahue Survey District).
<b>Michael John Winch (S67)</b>	S67.008	Planning maps	Treaty Settlement Land	Oppose	oppose the Treaty Settlement Overlay on my my land at Totara North (Allot 25 Parish of Totara).This would appear to be an error in the	Delete Treaty Settlement Overlay on my my land at Totara North (Allot

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					GIS mapping. My land is bordered to the north and east by Conservation land that may be subject to a Treaty Claim. My land is private and cannot be subject to any Treaty Claim	25 Parish of Totara)
<b>Reuben Wright (S178)</b>	S178.002	Planning maps	Treaty Settlement Land	Oppose	The Treaty Settlement Land overlay identified on Section 1 SO 65376 should not apply as the land was sold by local hapu who received the land as part of a Treaty settlement to the current owner over 12 months ago. The land is therefore no longer subject to any claim or currently owed by hapu/iwi as part of any Treaty settlement.	Amend to remove the Treaty Settlement Land Overlay as it affects Section 1 SO 65376.
<b>Te Aupōuri Commercial Development Ltd (S339)</b>	S339.058	Planning maps	Treaty Settlement Land	Not Stated	TACDL note that their site of interest as shown in Figure 1 has not been mapped as TSL. TACDL seek that the TSL be applied to this site of interest for the following reasons: -The land is owned and managed by TACDLand there is no intention for this land to be sold or disposed of; and -This land was purchased by Te Aupōuriutilising their financial redress as part oftheir Treaty Settlement therefore meetingthe criteria for its identification.	Amend the mapping of the Treaty Settlement land overlay to include identify 5891 held in Record of Title NA75B/196 (refer to Figure 1 of the submission), being 5891 Far North Road, Ngataki.
<b>Te Rūnanga Ā Iwi O Ngapuhi (S498)</b>	S498.066	Planning maps	Treaty Settlement Land	Support	The submitter supports the Treaty Settlement Land Overlay in principle. It is agreed, as stated in the Tāngata Whenua s32 Report, that the TSL Overlay, "Assists to remove some of the constraints and barriers associated with developing Māori land or Treaty Settlement Land."	Retain the Treaty Settlement Land Overlay and related plan provisions, subject to amendments submitted.
<b>Z Energy Limited (S336)</b>	S336.032	Planning maps	Airport Zone	Support	The Airport zone specifically applies to the Bay of Islands and Kaitia airports to ensure their operation is protected from disruption from other activities and are protected from reverse sensitivity issues	Retain the Airport zoning for Kerikeri airport refuelling facility - Wiroa Road, Kerikeri
<b>Carrington Estate Jade LP and Carrington Farms Jade LP (S351)</b>	S351.001	Planning maps	Carrington Estate Zone	Support	The submitter supports the Carrington Estate Zone as depicted on the planning maps and as they apply to the Carrington Estate Jade LP and Carrington Farms Jade LP land at Whatuwhiwi.	Retain Carrington Estate Zone as proposed and as applied to the Carrington Estate Jade LP and Carrington Farms Jade LP land at Whatuwhiwi.
<b>Haititaimaran gai Marae</b>	S394.063	Planning maps	Carrington Estate Zone	Support in part	Carrington estate meets many of the coastal environment criteria specified in App1. The connectivity between this location and	Amend the maps to include the Carrington Estate zone within the coastal environment and include

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>Kaitiaki Trust (S394)</b>					Karikari Moana is obvious and well known in terms of Haititaimarangi Marae/Te Whānau Moana and Te Rorohuri mātauranga.	consequential amendments to the Carrington Estate zone provisions to align with the coastal environment provisions.
<b>Arvida Group Limited (S165)</b>	S165.001	Planning maps	General Residential Zone	Support	The listed sites are owned by Arvida Group Limited and form part of the Te Puna Waiora Retirement Village which is being constructed in reliance on resource consents held over the majority of these sites. The General Residential Zone is the most appropriate zone because retirement villages (as defined in the Interpretation section of the Proposed District Plan (PDP)) are provided for as restricted discretionary activities within this zone.	retain proposed General Residential Zone for the listed sites. a) Lot 1 DP 173449 and Lot 2 DP 435929 (57C Hall Road) b) Lot 1 DP 435929 (59 Hall Road) c) Lot 1 DP 163762 (56 Hall Road) d) Lot 1 DP 164771 (No road name) e) Lot 2 DP 149521 (22 Limelight Lane) f) Lot 1 DP 177383 (35 Limelight Lane) g) Northern portion of Lot 2 DP 321732 (30 Limelight Lane)
<b>Russell Protection Society (INC) (S179)</b>	S179.107	Planning maps	General Residential Zone	Oppose	anomaly - there is no indication given on the map as to why these properties are zoned General Residential, since these properties have similar characteristics to the surrounding Kororareka Russell Township zoned lands.	Delete General Residential zoning 16/26A/26B Gould Street and 24B/24C Florance Ave, zone Kororaeka Russell Township
<b>River Edge Properties Limited (S219)</b>	S219.002	Planning maps	General Residential Zone	Support	A review of the proposed plan zoning in relation to 514 Puketona Road, Haruru, (being legally described as Lot 1 DP 531141) has been completed. The proposed zoning is Rural Production with a small portion of land zoned also zoned General Residential. It is contended that the zoning is better suited as a lifestyle zone with a rural bias and on this basis, this submission, requests the change. The proposed zoning which is sought is Rural Residential and would apply to the entire site. The reasons as to why this zoning is appropriate are as follows: - The proposed zoning for the site includes General Residential and Rural Production and is sought to be changed to Rural Residential as this will provide a transition from developed General Residential located within the Watea residential	Delete the Rural Production and General Residential mixed zoning of 514 Puketona Road, Haruru, (being legally described as Lot 1 DP 531141) and apply a Rural Residential zoning to the whole property.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>development to larger and productive Rural Production zoned land to the west of the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Part of the site is proposed to be zoned General Residential and there is a preference for adjoining land to be Rural Residential rather than transitioning straight to Rural Production where reverse sensitivity issues could ensue.</li> <li>- The land is not productive and does not contain highly versatile soils. It can only be used for low level pastoral grazing with this parcel of land subdivided and sold off from the main pastoral farming lot (located on the southern side of Puketona Road) for this reason. It is noted that the productive pastoral farming lot on the southern side is proposed to be zoned Rural Residential.</li> <li>- The land located to the west of the site are a number of lifestyle properties which end at Lily Pond Lane. There are a number of 2,000m<sup>2</sup> lots with some also slightly larger. This area is similar in character which in reviewing the intent of the Rural Residential Zone reflects these attributes. The re-zoning would increase the potential of the site to provide for social and economic well-being.</li> <li>- The future development of Watea/Haruru is to progress west providing that core infrastructure can be provided. A Rural Residential zoning offers this future intensification and provides an interim transition.</li> <li>- The former landing strip located on the site has modified the lot's contours</li> <li>- The zoning would enable the lot to have domestic levels farming activities and onsite servicing.</li> <li>- Rezoning the land to Rural Residential would not conflict with the relevant objectives and policies of the zone.</li> </ul>	
<b>Stephen Manley (S223)</b>	S223.001	Planning maps	General Residential Zone	Oppose	<p>The zoning inconsistent with PDP, objectives and general residential, or if considered more appropriate Rural Residential, in order to provide a transition to the Rural Production areas.</p> <p>None of the (Rural Production) objectives are</p>	Amend rezone of 72 Kokohuia Road, Omapere to [General] Residential Zone, or failing that, to be Rural Residential Zone.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>achieved with the site and adjoining sites and the current zone and land location / land parcel size are inconsistent with the objectives and current/potential use of the sites.</p> <p>Refer to submission for site specifications and relevant further reasons that Rural Production Zone is inappropriate or inconsistent with the PDP.</p>	
<p><b>New Zealand Maritime Parks Ltd (S251)</b></p>	<p>S251.016</p>	<p>Planning maps</p>	<p>General Residential Zone</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>NZMPL opposes the application of the General Residential zone to their site of interest, being 14 Baffin Street, Opuā.</p> <p>NZMPL note that the Opuā/Pahia/Haruru are identified as requiring additional business land to meet the expected demand of the area. The Urban Section 32 details a need to provide an additional 6ha of commercial land over in the next 20 years, with a minimum of 5ha required in the medium term. In addition to this, the same Statistical Area 2 (SA2) unit requires an additional 8ha of industrial land over the life of this District Plan, and 10ha overall in the long term. In NZMPL seek that FNDC apply the Mixed Use zone to the site of interest for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-The application of the GRZ is not the most appropriate for the site given the natural hazard constraints that apply;</li> <li>-The demand for business land in the Opuā is projected to grow in the short, medium and long term;</li> <li>-The site of interest is adjacent to and contiguous with land zoned for MUZ on the corner of Baffin and Kellet Street;</li> <li>-The site is in close adjacent to Opuā's industrial park and will enable the establishment of compatible commercial activities in proximity to Opuā's industrial and commercial area; and</li> <li>-The application of the MUZ will provide a transition and buffer to adjacent residential activities located in the GRZ.</li> </ul>	<p>Delete General Residential zoning of 14 Baffin Street, Opuā (legally described as Section 9 Block XXII Town of Opuā) and zone Mixed Use.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>Simon Ulrich (S308)</b>	S308.001	Planning maps	General Residential Zone	Oppose	The zoning of the site is not appropriate. Rural Residential would be a better fit for the type of property as three sides of it already have established private dwellings and are zoned as such.	Amend zoning of submitters land at 15 Melissa Road, Tokerau Beach / 11 Simon Ulrich Road (Lot 2 DP 486193) and 22 Simon Ulrich Road (54ha) (Pt Lots 1 2 DP432296 Sec 19 PT SEC 18 BLK III RANGAUNU SD AND LOT 1 DP 69650 LOT 1 DP486193), Karikari Peninsula, to Rural Residential zone to enable subdivision of property into sections between 2000 sqm and 4000 sqm.
<b>Far North Holdings Limited (S320)</b>	S320.003	Planning maps	General Residential Zone	Not Stated	The submitter considers that the appropriate zoning for all of the Far North Holdings Ltd (FNHL) landholdings, in the location identified as the Bay of Islands Marina, is the Mixed Use Zone as this zone better reflects existing consented and proposed land uses. (s32 assessment provided with submission).	Amend the zoning of the sites owned by Far North Holdings Ltd(FNHL), in the location identified as the Bay of Islands Marina, which are zoned General Residential to Mixed Use Zone.
<b>The Paihia Property Owners Group (S330)</b>	S330.005	Planning maps	General Residential Zone	Support	The submitter generally supports the enabling intent of the General Residential 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 General Residential zone as they apply to Paihia township with minimal overlays and restrictions.
<b>Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust (S338)</b>	S338.002	Planning maps	General Residential Zone	Not Stated	The area currently owned by the Bing family should be zoned as a combination of Mixed Use and Residential zones, with a lower height limit than the CBD, such as 7m or two stories. Ideally it should provide several green corridor walkways and cycleways (e.g. on the margins of the intermittent stream) to create links between the CBD, Kerikeri River margin and westwards to Fairway Drive. Adjacent to the river reserve there should include a large green public space with native trees, restful areas, and cafés and restaurant facilities (low impact facilities). This area should be designed in a sensitive manner to be in keeping with the conservation areas around the river, particularly the natural character and high ecological values of the river margins, large	Amend the General Residential zoning applying to all of the land commonly referred to as the 'Bing' property, being 126B Kerikeri Road (Part Lot 2, Part Lot 5-6 and Part Lot 8-10 Deposited Plan 33905). Zone the land to include a combination of Mixed Use and Residential zones, with revised standards applying.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					areas of native trees/vegetation and wildlife in the vicinity, and the historical and cultural areas downstream.	
<b>Carrington Estate Jade LP and Carrington Farms Jade LP (S351)</b>	S351.002	Planning maps	General Residential Zone	Support	The submitter supports the General Residential Zone as it applies to the Carrington Estate Jade LP and Carrington Farms Jade LP land at Whatuwhiwi.	Retain the General Residential Zone, as proposed and as it applies to the Carrington Estate Jade LP and Carrington Farms Jade LP land at Whatuwhiwi.
<b>Leah Frieling (S358)</b>	S358.006	Planning maps	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.
<b>Ian Bridle (S361)</b>	S361.001	Planning maps	General Residential Zone	Support in part	Refer to the full submission for specific details for reasons in relation to the decision sought which include, but not limited to, the following: the rezoning of The Ridge to General Residential Zone is the most appropriate method for achieving the Strategic Direction and objectives of the PDP (e.g. UFD-O2, RRZ-O1, RRZ-O3, GRZ-O1, GRZ-O2, GRZ-O4); the impermeable coverage limitation is overly restrictive for the ridge development; availability of all Council infrastructure services at the Ridge; and geographical considerations - close proximity to The Ridge to Kerikeri CBD.	Amend to rezone from Rural Residential Zone to General Residential Zone for all properties accessed from The Ridge, Kerikeri 0230 (refer to Attachment 2 of the submission).
<b>BR and R Davies (S400)</b>	S400.001	Planning maps	General Residential Zone	Support	Supports the proposal to zone 337B Kerikeri Road General Residential	Retain General Residential zoning of 337B Kerikeri Road (PT Lot 2 DP 86081)
<b>Roman Catholic Bishop of the Diocese of Auckland (S413)</b>	S413.002	Planning maps	General Residential Zone	Support	The existing sites are serviced and located within an area of residential development.	Proposed zoning of the sites Lot 2 & 3 DP 165788 and Lot 2 DP 343569 (Tawanui Road refer attachment 2) remain as General Residential.
<b>LMD Planning Consultancy (S419)</b>	S419.002	Planning maps	General Residential Zone	Support	The existing sites are serviced and located within an area of residential development	Retain the zoning of 164 and 166 Broadway, Kaikohe, and 45 Tawanui Road, Kaikohe (Lots 2 and 3 DP 165788 and Lot 2 DP 343569)

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						as General Residential
<b>Kapiro Residents Association (S430)</b>	S430.003	Planning maps	General Residential Zone	Not Stated	Zoning of SNAs and similar sites that are already protected through the resource consenting process, and sites that will be added by future consenting, should be zoned (or automatically rezoned) in a special zoning or overlay for protected SNAs and similar ecological sites and/or given status similar to a Reserve on private property, in order to protect ecological values at the site	Insert a new zone or overlay for SNAs and similar sites that are already protected through the resource consenting process, and sites that will be added by future consenting, alternatively assign status similar to a Reserve on private property
<b>John Andrew Riddell (S431)</b>	S431.025	Planning maps	General Residential Zone	Not Stated	Not stated	Rezone 24B and 24C Florance Avenue and 16, 26A and 26B Gould Street from General Residential to Kororāreka Russell Township
<b>Kapiro Conservation Trust (S449)</b>	S449.004	Planning maps	General Residential Zone	Support in part	The area currently owned by the Bing family should be zoned as a combination of Mixed Use and Residential zones, with a lower height limit than the CBD, such as 7m or two stories. Ideally it should provide several green corridor walkways and cycleways (e.g. on the margins of the intermittent stream) to create links between the CBD, Kerikeri River margin and westwards to Fairway Drive. Adjacent to the river reserve there should include a large green public space with native trees, restful areas, and cafés and restaurant facilities (low impact facilities). This area should be designed in a sensitive manner to be in keeping with the conservation areas around the river, particularly the natural character and high ecological values of the river margins, large areas of native trees/vegetation and wildlife in the vicinity, and the historical and cultural areas downstream.	Amend the General Residential zoning applying to all of the land commonly referred to as the 'Bing' property, being 126B Kerikeri Road (Part Lot 2, Part Lot 5-6 and Part Lot 8-10 Deposited Plan 33905). Zone the land to include a combination of Mixed Use and residential zones, with revised standards applying to address the matters outlined in the submission.
<b>Michael Foy (S472)</b>	S472.006	Planning maps	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.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>Turnstone Trust (S499)</b>	S499.001	Planning maps	General Residential Zone	Support in part	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.	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).
<b>Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK) (S522)</b>	S522.003	Planning maps	General Residential Zone	Support in part	The area currently owned by the Bing family should be zoned as a combination of Mixed Use and Residential zones, with a lower height limit than the CBD, such as 7m or two stories. Ideally it should provide several green corridor walkways and cycleways (e.g. on the margins of the intermittent stream) to create links between the CBD, Kerikeri River margin and westwards to Fairway Drive. Adjacent to the river reserve there should include a large green public space with native trees, restful areas, and cafés and restaurant facilities (low impact facilities). This area should be designed in a sensitive manner to be in keeping with the conservation areas around the river, particularly the natural character and high ecological values of the river margins, large areas of native trees/vegetation and wildlife in the	Amend the General Residential zoning applying to all of the land commonly referred to as the 'Bing' property, being 126B Kerikeri Road (Part Lot 2, Part Lot 5-6 and Part Lot 8-10 Deposited Plan 33905). Zone the land to include a combination of Mixed Use and Residential zones, with revised standards applying.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					vicinity, and the historical and cultural areas downstream.	
<b>Carbon Neutral NZ Trust (S529)</b>	S529.004	Planning maps	General Residential Zone	Support in part	The area currently owned by the Bing family should be zoned as a combination of Mixed Use and Residential zones, with a lower height limit than the CBD, such as 7m or two stories. Ideally it should provide several green corridor walkways and cycleways (e.g. on the margins of the intermittent stream) to create links between the CBD, Kerikeri River margin and westwards to Fairway Drive. Adjacent to the river reserve there should include a large green public space with native trees, restful areas, and cafés and restaurant facilities (low impact facilities). This area should be designed in a sensitive manner to be in keeping with the conservation areas around the river, particularly the natural character and high ecological values of the river margins, large areas of native trees/vegetation and wildlife in the vicinity, and the historical and cultural areas downstream.	Amend the General Residential zoning applying to all of the land commonly referred to as the 'Bing' property, being 126B Kerikeri Road (Part Lot 2, Part Lot 5-6 and Part Lot 8-10 Deposited Plan 33905). Zone the land to include a combination of Mixed Use and Residential zones, with revised standards applying.
<b>Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S561)</b>	S561.110	Planning maps	General Residential Zone	Support in part	A Medium Density Residential Zone surrounding the Kerikeri town centre is sought by Kāinga Ora in order to support residential and commercial investment and growth in Kerikeri. The proposed spatial extent of the Medium Density Residential Zone is shown in Appendix 3 and Appendix 4 of this Submission. While it is noted in the s32 analysis that the PDP review has demonstrated that sufficient land for housing can be provided through the zoning proposed in the PDP without allowing three level development across the entire General Residential zone (s32 analysis p18), Kerikeri is recognised as the key centre in the Far North District and providing for medium density in this location is consistent with the guidance in the NPS-UD and RMA Enabling Housing Act. The introduction of this new residential zone for Kerikeri will therefore recognise Kerikeri as an established urban centre, different in size and	Insert a new Medium Density Residential Zone in Kerikeri, with the spatial extent as proposed in Appendix 3 and Appendix 4 of this submission. The proposed spatial extent for Medium Density Residential Zone is defined as the area within 300m - 500m distance from the edge of the proposed Town Centre Zone, and adjusted to following road or natural boundaries where more practical. Retain the remaining area of the proposed General Residential Zone in Kerikeri, as shown in Appendix 3 and Appendix 4 of this submission.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					functions (head offices, district community facilities and in proximity to airport) which sets it apart from other townships in Far North and provide certainty to developers as to the typologies anticipated in Kerikeri, to enable the provision of a wide range of housing types and affordability in an established urban environment, responding to likely urban growth.	
<b>The Paihia Property Owners Group (S565)</b>	S565.007	Planning maps	General Residential Zone	Support	The Submitters generally support the enabling intent of many of the urban zones proposed by the PDP. However, when considered alongside the myriad of other controls, believe that the PDP unnecessarily constrains and confuses their intent, aims and objectives. As outlined above, should additional provisions and overlays be warranted, these must be appropriately considered and selected based on a higher degree of evidence and assessment as they relate specifically to Paihia.	Retain the General Residential zone as it applies to Paihia and only apply overlays that are considered and selected based on a higher degree of evidence and assessment.
<b>Tristan Simpkin (S288)</b>	S288.018	Planning maps	Heavy Industrial Zone	Support	Supports Waipapa extension of Heavy and Light Industrial Zones. Excellent Inclusion.	Retain Waipapa extension of Heavy and Light Industrial Zones.
<b>Z Energy Limited (S336)</b>	S336.029	Planning maps	Heavy Industrial Zone	Support	The Heavy Industrial zone provides for and accommodates a range of activities, with a limited focus on pedestrians and the provision of public spaces. It allows for large areas of car parking and/or outdoor storage and acknowledges the potential presence of hazardous substances.	Retain Heavy Industrial zoning of Z Waipapa Truck Stop at 1913 State Highway 10, Waipapa
<b>Waipapa Pine Limited and Adrian Broughton Trust (S342)</b>	S342.001	Planning maps	Heavy Industrial Zone	Support	The submitters property has been zoned Rural Production under the ODP which has necessitated a number of resource consent applications. The ability to plan and forecast long term operational and market requirements has been hampered through this resource consent regime. The new Heavy Industrial Zone provides some relief and certainty for the submitters operations and is supported to the extent detailed in this submission.	Support heavy industrial zoning for ROT 306630 (Lot 2 DP 376253 & Lot 3 DP 343062); ROT 306629 (Lot 1 DP 376253 )

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>Marshall Investments Trustee (2012) Limited (S378)</b>	S378.001	Planning maps	Heavy Industrial Zone	Support	The submitters property has been zoned Rural Production under the ODP which has necessitated several resource consent applications. The ability to plan and forecast long term operational and market requirements has been hampered through this resource consent regime. The new Heavy Industrial Zone provides some relief and certainty for the submitters operations and is supported to the extent detailed in this submission.	Retain the Heavy Industrial zone on ROT 580088 (Lot 2 DP 453153); and Retain the provisions within the Heavy Industrial zone
<b>LD Family Investments Limited (S384)</b>	S384.002	Planning maps	Heavy Industrial Zone	Oppose	Refer to full submission for detailed reason(s) for decision sought which include, but not limited to, the following: Light Industrial Zone better aligns with existing development, size of landholdings and surrounding land uses; the land is not consistent with the Heavy Industrial Zone; and a Light Industrial Zone is more consistent with the purpose and principles of the RMA.	Amend to rezone from Heavy Industrial Zone to Light Industrial Zone the following properties on Pataka Lane, Waipapa: ROT 176693, Lot 2 DP 343062; ROT NA126B/185, Lot 2 DP 198909; ROT NA126B/184, Lot 1 DP 198909; and ROT 176692, Lot 1 DP 554121.
<b>Elaine Collinson (S35)</b>	S35.001	Planning maps	Horticulture Zone	Oppose	The areas off of Kapiro Road that have been suggested to be designated as Horticulture should either remain as Rural Production or convert to Rural Residential. A lot of the sections are smaller than 1ha and already have a house on them. These sections are unlikely to be reverted to horticultural use and are limiting the current home owners from pursuing avenues such as subdivision or additional building. Submitter lives down Conifer Lane and is wanting to put a granny flat (	<p>Amend the zoning of the land off Kapiro Road, Kerikeri from Horticulture Zone, to Rural Production or Rural Residential, or alternatively limit what is going to be Horticultural Zone based on the size of the property (>5ha).
<b>Natalie Todd (S38)</b>	S38.001	Planning maps	Horticulture Zone	Oppose	Opposes Rural Production land being rezoned to Horticulture along the north side of Wiroa Road and west side of Waimate North Road. All of these properties are already lifestyle blocks and have development on them which makes it unlikely that they will be used for Horticulture purposes.	Amend zoning for the land along north side of Wiroa Road and west side of Waimate North Road, Kerikeri from Horticulture to Rural Production Zone.
<b>Robert Sintes (S61)</b>	S61.001	Planning maps	Horticulture Zone	Oppose	Lot 1 DP 564639 (90 Wiroa Road) and Lot 2 DP 564639 (90A Wiroa Road) are inappropriately included in the Horticulture zone (and by default many surrounding homes/lot areas are also	Delete the Horticulture zoning of Lot 1 DP 564639 (90 Wiroa Road) and Lot 2 DP 564639 (90A Wiroa Road),

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>incapable of any realistic horticultural activity). Through a recent subdivision application, the soils on the above properties were identified by a soil scientist as incompatible with any sustainable horticultural production, covered in rocks and surrounded by existing homes on small blocks of land 2 acres (and other smaller sites), creating more than minor adverse reverse sensitivity effects for those homes under the proposed zoning, given the surrounding residential intensity. Combination of reverse sensitivity issues for surrounding neighbours if 90 and 90A Wiroa Road is rezoned as proposed.</p> <p>90 and 90A Wiroa Road are already serviced by three phase power and access exceeding Council standard. 90A Wiroa Road already has in place, an approved registered engineer's spoil tests for a home's on-site sewage.</p> <p>90 and 90A Wiroa Road are around 4km from Kerikeri centre, surrounded by houses of varying densities.</p> <p>Proposed zoning is incompatible with outcomes for existing homes and known ground conditions. In combination, demographics of current and ever-increasing residential spread and demand suggests current planning methods may not be sufficiently detailed, and an 'on ground' analysis may be useful.</p> <p>90 and 90A Wiroa Road fall with the criteria for Rural Residential zoning, as outlined in the section 32 report.</p>	zone Rural Residential.
<p><b>Matthew Edward Arthur and Jennifer Ellen Arthur (S64)</b></p>	S64.001	Planning maps	Horticulture Zone	Oppose	<p>The Rural Residential Zone is a more appropriate zone for this site because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) It better aligns with existing development, size of landholdings and surrounding land uses.</li> <li>b) There is no existing horticultural use, and the land is not suitable for such usage.</li> <li>c) The land is not consistent with the Horticulture Zone provisions.</li> <li>d) Rural Residential zoning is more consistent with higher order Resource Management Act 1991 ('RMA') policies and plans.</li> </ul>	Amend zoning of land at 244 Waimate North Road, Kerikeri (Lot 1 DP 202943), from Horticulture Zone to Rural Residential Zone.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					e) Rural Residential zoning is more consistent with the purpose and principles of the RMA	
<p><b>Alan Myles Ingham Willis (S66)</b></p>	<p>S66.001</p>	<p>Planning maps</p>	<p>Horticulture Zone</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>I oppose the proposed rezoning to Horticulture of the lower part of Pungaere Road. I believe a Rural Residential zoning would be more appropriate for the area of Pungaere Road including Koropewa Road, Ngapuhi Road and Riverstream Drive. Council proposes rezoning as Rural Residential land to the east of SH10 from Waipapa to around 500m beyond Pungaere Road. Including lower Pungaere Road in this zoning would be congruent and make sense from a sustainability perspective. Further west the zoning could remain as Rural Production, which already allows for horticulture. Lower Pungaere Road is not well suited to horticulture. A number of residents have HAIL reports that state their soil is 'not of horticultural value'. Eucalypts have had a negative impact on soil quality in places, and the historic use of Pungaere Road as a skid road for logging Puketi forest has removed much of the topsoil close to the road margins. In addition, many of the sections on lower Pungaere Road and Koropewa Road are already too small to be viable for commercial horticulture operations. The reasonably high number of people living in the area means that reverse sensitivity is already an issue. Council should be looking to protect people not thwart them. Rezoning in order to limit ratepayers' ability to complain rather than acknowledging their real concerns seems disrespectful. Given the area's proximity to Waipapa, a change of zoning that encourages residential development would be more appropriate. Pungaere Road begins less than 500 metres north of Waipapa, making for easy access by bicycle or on foot, especially if Council were to provide footpaths. Increased housing near to Waipapa rather than closer to already congested Kerikeri as Council has proposed would allow for greater use of local shops, businesses and the new sports field with minimal travelling and reduced carbon emissions.</p>	<p>Amend the Horticultural zone to rural residential zone for the area of Pungaere Road including Koropewa Road, Ngapuhi Road and Riverstream Drive</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>This would be in line with Council's Far North 2100 strategy, which states, 'Council has a goal to support Far North businesses and communities of the Far North towards a carbon zero 2050. In particular Council's stated objective of 'Plan urban areas around walking instead of planning around roads', would seem to fit this situation.</p> <p>New Zealand is a signatory to the United Nations 2030 Agenda. Council must be aware that planning should take into account our commitment to the agenda's 17 sustainable development goals, which include making human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable, and taking action to combat climate change and its impact.</p>	
<p><b>Imago Inocente and Dan Karl Farnham (S87)</b></p>	<p>S87.001</p>	<p>Planning maps</p>	<p>Horticulture Zone</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>The submitter opposes the Horticulture zoning of the area of Pungaere Road, Waipapa, including Koropewa Road, Ngapuhi Road and Riverstream Drive. The submitter considers that the Rural Production zone provides for horticulture. The area consists of small lifestyle blocks and that a change of zoning that encourages residential development would be more appropriate given the proximity of the area to Waipapa.</p>	<p>Amend zoning of the area of Pungaere Road including Koropewa Road, Ngapuhi Road and Riverstream Drive from Horticulture Zone to Rural Residential Zone.</p>
<p><b>Puketotara Lodge Ltd (S188)</b></p>	<p>S188.001</p>	<p>Planning maps</p>	<p>Horticulture Zone</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>The Horticulture Zone (HZ) is not an appropriate zone for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- HZ does not achieve the purpose of the RMA insofar as it does not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources;</li> <li>- HZ fails to give effect to the National Planning Standards and the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL);</li> <li>- HZ Section 32 evaluation is incomplete and flawed (refer specifics in full submission)</li> <li>- PDP does not provide strategic direction or policy support for the suite of rural zones proposed, nor does it support the Horticultural Zone</li> <li>- HZ provisions are not sufficiently different from the Rural Production Zone (and in some instances are more permissive).</li> </ul>	<p>Delete the proposed Horticulture Zone in its entirety, rezoning areas Rural Production, General Rural, Commercial or Rural Residential Zones as appropriate.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>Audrey Campbell-Frear (S209)</b>	S209.001	Planning maps	Horticulture Zone	Oppose	<p>The Horticulture Zone (HZ) is not an appropriate zone for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- HZ does not achieve the purpose of the RMA insofar as it does not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources;</li> <li>- HZ fails to give effect to the National Planning Standards and the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL);</li> <li>- HZ Section 32 evaluation is incomplete and flawed (refer specifics in full submission)</li> <li>- PDP does not provide strategic direction or policy support for the suite of rural zones proposed, nor does it support the Horticultural Zone</li> <li>- HZ has only been proposed within the Kerikeri area</li> <li>- HZ provisions are not sufficiently different from the Rural Production Zone (and in some instances are more permissive).</li> </ul>	Delete the proposed Horticulture Zone in its entirety, rezoning areas Rural Production, General Rural, Commercial or Rural Residential Zones as appropriate.
<b>Hall Nominees Ltd (S252)</b>	S252.001	Planning maps	Horticulture Zone	Oppose	<p>The Horticulture zone is not an appropriate zone for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The Horticulture zone does not achieve the purpose of the RMA insofar as it does not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources;</li> <li>b. The Horticulture zone fails to give effect to the National Planning Standards and the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL);</li> <li>c. The Horticulture zone section 32 evaluation is incomplete and flawed: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The evaluation does not provide sufficient level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance of creating a special purpose zone;</li> <li>ii. The evaluation fails to consider the full range of zoning options and identify reasonably practicable options to achieve objectives;</li> <li>iii. The evaluation fails to evaluate appropriate zone criteria and boundaries;</li> </ol> </li> <li>d. The PDP does not provide strategic direction or policy support for the suite of rural zones proposed, nor does it support the Horticultural</li> </ol>	Delete the proposed Horticulture zone in its entirety, rezoning areas Rural Production, General Rural, Commercial or Rural Residential zones as appropriate.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>Zone;</p> <p>e. The Horticulture zone has only been proposed within the Kerikeri area; and</p> <p>f. The Horticulture zone provisions are not sufficiently different from the Rural Production zone (and in some instances are more permissive).</p> <p>The proposed Horticulture zone fails to give effect to the National Planning Standards and does not comply with the zone framework standard 8, mandatory direction 3. While FNDC have proposed the Horticulture zone as a "special purpose zone", the proposed Horticulture zone does not comply with of the special purpose zone criteria as required under mandatory direction 3:</p> <p>a. Are significant to the district, region or country</p> <p>Comment: The proposed Horticulture zone has been applied selectively to the Kerikeri area and has not been mapped throughout the district despite there being other areas of current or future intensive horticulture.</p> <p>b. Are impracticable to be managed through another zone</p> <p>Comment: Horticultural land could be managed via both the Rural Production zone or the General Rural zone. The purpose of the Rural Production zone is to provide for areas predominantly used for primary production activities, whilst the General Rural zone is to provide for primary production activities and a range of activities that support primary production. Council has not utilised the General Rural zone, nor has section 32 evaluation been undertaken to consider this option.</p> <p>c. Are impractical to be managed through a combination of spatial layers.</p> <p>Comment: A review of the proposed Rural Production zone and Horticulture zone provisions has confirmed that there is very little difference between the provisions of the two zones, therefore it is entirely</p>	

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>possible to manage horticultural land by way of a zone (and a spatial layer if there is section 32 justification for a spatial response). FNDC have established zone criteria to support the mapping and identification of the Horticulture zone including that the land must be located within the Kerikeri/Waipapa area. This criterion is contrary to the NPS-HPL. Whilst it is acknowledged that the NPS-HPL was released following the PDP notification for submission, Council must give effect to the NPS-HPL and this policy statement sufficiently provides for the protection of highly productive land, rendering the Horticulture Zone defunct.</p> <p>Under the National Planning Standards, the strategic direction provisions are key to understand the balance and trade-offs between often conflicting matters of national, regional and local importance. The proposed Strategic Direction objectives and policies are silent with respect to the proposed rural zones. The Overview Section 32 evaluation does not include any evaluation of the proposed objectives. The National Planning Standards provide a number of rural zone options which have not been evaluated within the Rural Environment section 32. In the absence of complete section 32 evaluation, it is not possible to understand why Council have chosen the suite of zones proposed. The purpose of the Horticulture zone is to manage land fragmentation and reverse sensitivity effects and achieve greater protection of highly productive land. The proposed Horticulture zone (particularly that west of Kerikeri Road) is already fragmented not only by existing residential and commercial activities, but by smaller allotments.</p> <p>The Horticulture zone includes land that is not viable for horticulture due to factors such as soil type, lot sizes, and proximity of rural residential neighbours restricting the ability to spray (reverse sensitivity).</p>	

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
<p><b>Hall Nominees Ltd (S252)</b></p>	<p>S252.005</p>	<p>Planning maps</p>	<p>Horticulture Zone</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>Rural Residential zone is the most appropriate zoning in the mapped location because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The properties located within this area are consistent with the intended purpose of the Rural Residential Zone.</li> <li>b. The character and amenity of this area is consistent with the PDP zoned land Rural Residential zone.</li> <li>c. The proposed Horticulture zone fails to enable sustainable use and development of the properties within this area.</li> </ul> <p>The Rural Residential Zone is indented to provide for development around existing urban areas where they are contiguous with the urban environment, to cater for growth and to provide a transition between urban and rural zones. The area to be rezoned will achieve these outcomes. The Section 32 Rural Environments does not provide any further zone criteria, nor does it provide any justification or evaluation of the extent or zone boundaries.</p> <p>The Rural Residential zone should extend to incorporate existing allotments which are Rural Residential in character, nature and amenity along the eastern side of Kerikeri Road south of Maraenui Road in the mapped location.</p> <p>This area is fragmented with existing smaller allotment sizes. Rezoning additional land to Rural Residential zone will contribute additional residential capacity.</p> <p>The area is materially compromised for rural production activities due to the existing fragmentation and potential for reverse sensitivity effects.</p>	<p>Delete the Horticulture zone on the edge of Kerikeri and rezone the land Rural Residential in accordance with the Map in Appendix 1 to the submission, i.e., to the southeast of the intersection of Maraenui Drive and Kerikeri Road.</p>
<p><b>Anton Kusanic (S260)</b></p>	<p>S260.001</p>	<p>Planning maps</p>	<p>Horticulture Zone</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>The proposed rezoning of the current Rural Production Zone to horticulture appears to have been made in haste and without ground truthing. Little or no consideration appears to have been given to protecting areas that meet the soil profiles and water requirements for horticulture practice outside of Kerikeri. There are other areas where opportunity lies that won't have the residential</p>	<p>Amend the proposed Horticulture Zoning considering the bigger long-term picture. In particular rezone all Horticulture Zoned land along Onekura Road, Pungaere and offshoots from proposed Horticulture Zone to Rural Lifestyle</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>intensity issues that are going to be created by the proposed changes in the Kerikeri District. For areas in the Kerikeri District that have been proposed for change from Rural Production to Horticulture I wish to raise the following points:</p> <p>Water: the current proposed horticulture zones appear to have been identified based on the ability to assess water from current supplies, ie follow the Kerikeri Irrigation scheme line. this water supply from our experience is not readily available in commercial quantities and in terms of a water source for vulnerable crops during the summer months is not reliable.</p> <p>Land suitability: the proposed maps identifying the proposed horticulture zones take a very broad brush approach, zones of hilly, scrubby, south facing, poor quality soils have been included. Has soil quality/type been considered in the identification of the proposed zone changes?</p> <p>Housing densities: Areas proposed for horticulture have already been developed, in some places smaller blocks already exist as a result of resource consent being granted by FNDC. Encouraging horticulture, through inhibiting other use of the land, in these areas will have an impact on residential properties that have already been approved by Council.</p> <p>Impact on SNAs, PNAs and conservation areas: The proposed maps have identified areas of natural importance as being in the horticulture zone, how does the Council propose to maintain protection of these sites?</p>	Zone.
<p><b>Michael Francis Toft, Robert George Vellenoweth and Colleen Wendy, Wardlaw, AJ Maloney Trustee</b></p>	S266.001	Planning maps	Horticulture Zone	Oppose	<p>The reasons why it is believed that the Rural Residential Zone is a more appropriate zone for the Landholdings are:</p> <p>a) It better aligns with existing development, size of landholdings and surrounding land uses.</p> <p>b) There is no existing horticultural use on any of these Landholdings and the land is not suitable for such usage.</p>	<p>rezone the following properties from Horticulture zone to Rural Residential zone</p> <p>NA127A/757 57 McCaughan Road NA123A/757 63 McCaughan Road,</p> <p>NA123A/748 79 McCaughan Road</p> <p>NA123A/749 93 McCaughan Road</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
<p>Limited,  <b>Donald Frank Orr, Vivien Marie Coad, Deanna Lee MacDonald, Dianne Catherine Hamilton, Robert Hamilton, Timothy George Sopp, Mathew Robert Hill, Barry Charles Young, Joan Catherine Young, Campbell Family Trustee Limited (S266)</b></p>					<p>c) The land is not consistent with the Horticulture Zone provisions.  d) Rural Residential zoning is more consistent with higher order Resource Management Act 1991 ('RMA') policies and plans.  e) Rural Residential zoning is more consistent with the purpose and principles of the RMA.  We briefly expand on these reasons in the following sections.  These matters will be fleshed out further in the evidence we call in support of our position at the hearing.  Better aligns with existing development, size of landholdings and surrounding land uses  Amending the zoning of the land, and perhaps other sites of a similar nature, would redefine, but cement, the rural residential character that presently exists.  The existing land uses are a mixture of rural residential activities. These Landholdings are generally not of a size and have already been previously subdivided to an extent where reversion to horticultural use is extremely unlikely.  No existing horticultural use and land is not suitable for such usage  The Landholdings are not currently used for horticulture, nor are many of the existing and developed sites within the surrounds.  It is understood that the general area has some of the components which make the activity of horticulture potentially viable.</p>	<p>NA123A/454 49E McCaughan Road,  NA124C/709 49B McCaughan Road  NA110C/920 41 McCaughan Road  NA124C/708 37F McCaughan Road, KERIKERI</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>This includes versatile soils, access to water, and access to other matters (i.e transport routes) that may make such horticultural activities viable.</p> <p>It is understood that the Regional Policy Statement for Northland 2016 based versatile soils off the New Zealand Land Resource Inventory.</p> <p>It is noted that this is based off mapping at a scale of 1:50,000. It is considered that this scale is appropriate for regional level planning, but at a district and site-specific level, mapping at such a scale should not be supported as rationale for rezoning areas of land within the Horticulture Zone.</p> <p>With reference to Annexure 1, the existing land uses on the Landholdings and surrounds are considered as lifestyle, according to the mapping, and in our view more appropriately considered as rural residential when considering the size of the allotments and existing residential development. The current level of residential development, fragmented allotments already approved and developed, and lack of clear site-specific rationale that confirms that the Landholdings under consideration (and other sites) do in fact have versatile soils, leads to the conclusion that they are not suitable for horticultural use.</p> <p>Land is not consistent with Horticulture Zone provisions</p> <p>Key objectives and policies for the Horticulture</p>	

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>Zone seeks to manage its long-term availability and protection for the benefit of future generations, avoid land sterilisation that reduces the potential for highly productive land, avoids fragmentation of land and reverse sensitivity effects, does not exacerbate natural hazards, maintains rural character and amenity, and is serviced by on site infrastructure.</p> <p>In the context of the Landholdings and surrounds under consideration, it is considered to be difficult to achieve the intent of the zone. The primary reason for this is that the Landholdings and surrounds have already been fragmented, and perhaps sterilised to a point where 'retrofitting' zoning to suit the underlying soils characteristics (amongst a range of other things) is unlikely to result in a reversion from residential to horticultural activities.</p> <p>In this specific instance, the promoted protection intent of the zone is neglecting the reality on the ground. In terms of benefits for current and future generations, it appears that the rationale has been to consider this against an economic framework i.e what is the productive property area required to achieve a viable economic return. This above is considered in more detail in Economic Analysis Report 2020, particularly section 4.1.4 and Table 31 which concludes that:</p>	

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>o Kiwifruit orchards would need to have a productive area of between 7ha and 16ha respectively. These align closely with the current median sized horticultural property (7ha) and average sized horticultural property (17ha) (Figure 34).</p> <p>o Vineyards would need to have a productive area of between 11ha and 25ha respectively.</p> <p>o Dairy farming properties would need to have a productive area of between 46ha and 103ha respectively. The upper value is not dissimilar to the current median and average dairy farm property size (94ha and 126ha respectively) (Figure 35).</p> <p>o Sheep and beef properties would need to have a productive area of between 242ha and 538ha respectively. This is considerable larger than the estimated median and average sheep and beef property sizes currently in the district (Figure 36). This implies that the majority of the current sheep and beef properties may be making even smaller household returns (i.e. less than \$45,000 per annum). Other income sources may be relevant.</p> <p>o Arable crop/grain farming properties would need to have a productive area of between 70ha and 155ha respectively.</p> <p>o Other livestock farms (but particularly deer farming properties) would need a productive area of between 126ha and 280ha.</p> <p>This table and section are provided in Annexure 2.</p>	

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>Based on Council's own evidence, it seems counter-intuitive to support a zone change to Horticulture with respect to the Landholdings, given their size, existing residential use, and surrounding activities. Overall, the zone provisions are not appropriate for the Landholdings.</p> <p>Land is consistent with Rural Residential Zone provisions</p> <p>The Rural Residential Zone:</p> <p>a) Is predominantly used for rural residential activities and smallscale farming.</p> <p>b) Predominant character of the zone is maintained and enhanced and includes peri-urban scale residential activities, small scale farming activities with limited building and structures, smaller lot sizes than anticipated in the Rural Production and Rural Lifestyle zones, and a diver range of rural residential environments.</p> <p>c) Helps to meet the demand for growth around urban centres, whilst ensuring the ability of land to be rezoned for urban development is not compromised; and</p> <p>d) Has land use and subdivision where it maintains rural residential character and amenity, supports a range of rural residential and small-scale farming activities, and is managed to control reverse sensitivity issues.</p> <p>The Landholdings (and surrounds) are predominantly used for a mixture of residential activities, with scope for</p>	

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>small scale farming activities (although this is not currently present on the Landholdings). The predominant character is rural residential, and this is evidenced on the Landholdings and in the surrounds. Rezoning the land to Rural Residential will assist with Council in its efforts to promote land for residential use. As the Landholdings can be self-serviced, there is no unintended drag on Council infrastructure. Further subdivision of the Landholdings would not result in reverse sensitivity effects. Rural residential development can act as a buffer between the rural lifestyle uses and horticultural uses that are present in the surrounds. More consistent with higher order RMA policies and plans In terms of the recently promulgated NPS for Highly Productive Soils, there are numerous requirements and exemptions therein which are relevant to the Landholdings under consideration. Section 3.4 Mapping highly productive land contemplates a mapping exercise at a level of detail that 'identified individual parcels of land'. As mentioned above, this level of assessment has not been undertaken for the Landholdings, but further evidence may be provided to confirm this on behalf of the Landowners. The NPS also contains exemptions for activity on sites subject to permanent or long-term constraints (see 3.10). This allows an avenue for site specific matters, such as underlying</p>	

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>development, existing fragmentation and surrounding land uses to be appropriately considered. The Landholdings and the surrounds certainly contain many of the items within the exemptions that would not dismiss that potential for the Landholdings to be zoned rural residential.</p> <p>The RPS does promote higher order action in that subdivision, use and development should be located, designed and built in a planned and co-ordinated manner which ensures that subdivision in a primary production zone (i.e proposed Horticulture Zone) does not materially reduce the potential for soil-based primary production on land with highly versatile soils, or if they do, the net public benefit exceeds the reduced potential for soil based primary production activities.</p> <p>It is evidenced within Council's own expert opinion, that the Landholdings could not appropriately generate sufficient returns to consider meeting the policy (refer Policy 5.1.1(f) of the RPS). Additional subdivision or land use on the Landholdings would likely generate more than \$45,000 in annual household considered as a lower limit in the Economic Analysis Report, 2020. More consistent with the RMA</p> <p>The RMA seeks to enable people to provide for their economic, social, cultural and well-being while ensuring natural and physical resources remain available for future generations, and adverse</p>	

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>effects are appropriately avoided, remedied or mitigated.</p> <p>The proposed Horticulture zoning of the Landholdings does not achieve the sustainable management of resources. As already noted, the current characteristics of the Landholdings and surrounds make it unusable for a horticultural purpose, and do not allow the owners to provide for their economic or social wellbeing. Nor does the zoning allow for the zone intent to be met, based on the underlying development, characteristics and factors present.</p> <p>The Rural Residential zoning would be more consistent with the purpose and principles of the RMA as it would enable these matters to be provided for in a coherent and more consistent manner than when considered against the provision intent and aims of the Horticulture Zone.</p>	
<b>Solid Landholdings Limited (S275)</b>	S275.001	Planning maps	Horticulture Zone	Oppose	<p>The reasons why it is believed that the Rural Residential zone is a more appropriate zone for this site are:</p> <p>a) It better aligns with existing development, size of landholdings and surrounding land uses.</p> <p>b) There is no existing horticultural use, and the land is not suitable for such usage.</p> <p>c) The land is not consistent with the Horticulture zone provisions.</p> <p>d) Rural Residential zoning is more consistent with higher order Resource Management Act 1991 ('RMA') policies and plans.</p> <p>e) Rural Residential zoning is more consistent with the purpose and principles of the RMA.</p>	Delete the Horticulture zone from 390 Kapiro Road, Kerikeri (legally described as Lot 3 DP 313168) and zone the land Rural Residential
<b>Trent Simpkin (S284)</b>	S284.001	Planning maps	Horticulture Zone	Oppose	<p>Kerikeri Horticulture Zone is too large and broad. The new Horticulture zone around Kerikeri is approximately 70-75 square kilometres.</p>	Amend the entire application of the zoning of Horticulture Zone surrounding Kerikeri (some 70-75 square kilometers) to look at areas

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					Submitter has two objections: 1) It's based upon info at a large scale (soil versatility maps) which aren't correct in a number of places such that its application is not suitable. 2) Many of the properties it has been placed upon (for example - Blue Gum Lane) is now used for other purposes i.e. rural residential. It is not a worthwhile zone to be plastering around the outskirts of Kerikeri on sites that will never be used for horticulture again. The reason these two points matter is that the zone rules themselves are restrictive; no minor residential units, no air bnb renting out without consent, and commercial/industrial activities are all non complying.	more closely and tailor the zoning to the landuse. Rezone land used for residential activities within the proposed Horticulture Zone (e.g. Blue Gum Lane) from Horticulture Zone to Rural Residential Zone. A broad-brush approach based on soil versatility maps should not be used (see map attached to original submission).
<b>Trent Simpkin (S284)</b>	S284.005	Planning maps	Horticulture Zone	Oppose	Blue Gum Lane has proposed zoning of 'Horticulture'. In reality, the majority of Blue Gum lane is being used for Residential purposes, so it should be zoned Rural Residential. This is another case of 'lazy zoning' where the activity currently occurring on the site (residential dwellings in this purpose) should drive the zoning for that area. Blue Gum lane will never return to Horticultural Activities, and it is clearly Rural Residential activities, so the zoning should reflect this. Changing it to Horticulture not only restricts the landowners on their small blocks of land but also means more resource consents and applications to council to get any activities approved in the area.	Amend zoning of land at Blue Gum Lane, Kerikeri from Horticulture Zone to Rural Residential Zone. This includes land at 2-17 Manoko Place, 7-80 Blue Gum Lane, 1574, 1556A, 1556B, 1556C, 1608, 1608C, 1608E, 1626 State Highway 10, Kerikeri, (see map attached to original submission).
<b>Tristan Simpkin (S288)</b>	S288.001	Planning maps	Horticulture Zone	Oppose	Kerikeri Horticulture Zone is too large and broad. The new Horticulture zone around Kerikeri is approximately 70-75 square kilometres.  Submitter has two objections: 1) It's based upon info at a large scale (soil versatility maps) which aren't correct in a number of places such that its application is not suitable. 2) Many of the properties it has been placed upon (for example - Blue Gum Lane) is now used for other purposes i.e. rural residential. It is not a worthwhile zone to be plastering around the outskirts of Kerikeri on	Amend the entire application of the zoning of Horticulture Zone surrounding Kerikeri (some 70-75 square kilometers) to look at areas more closely and tailor the zoning to the landuse. Rezone land used for residential activities within the proposed Horticulture Zone (e.g. Blue Gum Lane) from Horticulture Zone to Rural Residential Zone. A broad-brush approach based on soil versatility maps should not be used

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					sites that will never be used for horticulture again. The reason these two points matter is that the zone rules themselves are restrictive; no minor residential units, no air bnb renting out without consent, and commercial/industrial activities are all non complying.	(see map attached to original submission).
<b>Tristan Simpkin (S288)</b>	S288.005	Planning maps	Horticulture Zone	Oppose	Blue Gum Lane has proposed zoning of 'Horticulture'. In reality, the majority of Blue Gum lane is being used for Residential purposes, so it should be zoned Rural Residential. This is another case of 'lazy zoning' where the activity currently occurring on the site (residential dwellings in this purpose) should drive the zoning for that area. Blue Gum lane will never return to Horticultural Activities, and it is clearly Rural Residential activities, so the zoning should reflect this. Changing it to Horticulture not only restricts the landowners on their small blocks of land but also means more resource consents and applications to council to get any activities approved in the area.	Amend zoning of land at Blue Gum Lane, Kerikeri from Horticulture Zone to Rural Residential Zone. This includes land at 2-17 Manoko Place, 7-80 Blue Gum Lane, 1574, 1556A, 1556B, 1556C, 1608, 1608C, 1608E, 1626 State Highway 10, Kerikeri, (see map attached to original submission).
<b>Two M Investments Limited (S317)</b>	S317.001	Planning maps	Horticulture Zone	Support	The submitter supports the Horticulture Special Purpose Zone over the landholding identified as Lot 2 DP 192231.	Retain the Horticulture Special Purpose Zone as it applies to the landholding identified as Lot 2 DP 192231.
<b>Adrian and Sue Knight (S325)</b>	S325.001	Planning maps	Horticulture Zone	Oppose	The Horticulture Zone does not achieve the purpose of the RMA and fails to give effect to the National Planning Standards and the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land. The Horticulture Zone section 32 evaluation is incomplete and flawed. The PDP does not provide strategic direction or policy support for the suite of rural zones proposed, nor does it support the Horticultural Zone. The Horticulture Zone has only been proposed within the Kerikeri area and the provisions are not sufficiently different from the Rural Production Zone (and in some instances are more permissive).	Delete the proposed Horticulture Zone in its entirety, rezoning areas Rural Production, General Rural, Commercial or Rural Residential zones as appropriate.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust (S338)</b>	S338.036	Planning maps	Horticulture Zone	Not Stated	<p>We consider that clusters of existing residential lifestyle properties in the Horticulture zone could be zoned as Rural Lifestyle. In effect this would create several islands of Rural Lifestyle zone within the Horticulture zone.</p> <p>The PDP policies/rules relating to Rural Living zone should retain the potential for some of this land to be returned to agricultural production at a future date, if owners wish, so further residential development on productive land in existing residential areas of the Horticulture zone is undesirable.</p> <p>Satellite property maps can be used to identify clusters of existing residential lifestyle properties in the Horticulture zone.</p> <p>Clusters of existing small residential lifestyle properties lying within the area proposed as Horticulture zone could be classed as Rural Lifestyle zone in cases where they meet specific criteria.</p>	<p>Delete the zoning of some properties within the Horticulture zone, and rezone Rural Lifestyle where they meet specific criteria, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing small residential lifestyle property less than 2.5 ha, and</li> <li>• Without commercial agricultural/horticultural production, and</li> <li>• Part of an existing cluster of at least 8 or so residential lifestyle properties clustered around a road or access lane.</li> </ul> <p>A secondary dwelling on existing larger residential lifestyle properties could be allowed in the Horticulture zone as a discretionary activity, but not within productive horticultural areas</p>
<b>Blair and Deanne Rogers (S366)</b>	S366.001	Planning maps	Horticulture Zone	Oppose	<p>The area identified in the submission has been recently subdivided into smaller lots and is the location of existing and proposed concentrated rural-residential activities. The area is adjacent to an existing enclave of rural-residential properties further south on Arthur Taylor Place and on the eastern side of Waimate North Road. Lot 5 DP 540206 has subdivision approval for a further eight rural lifestyle lots.</p> <p>The development of this land for horticulture activities other than the existing site at Lot 1 DP 525899 at the corner of Wiroa Road and Waimate North Road, is unlikely due to the presence of rural-residential activities and the potential for reverse sensitivity effects.</p> <p>It is not clear if there is irrigation water supply</p>	<p>Amend and rezone the area identified in the submission as Rural Production zone; or</p> <p>In the alternative, delete the proposed 'Horticulture Zone' in its entirety, as a planning method that has been applied inconsistently and inappropriately across the Far North District.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>available to these properties.                      The class type of soil has not been determined.                      The alternative proposed Rural Production zone would enable ongoing existing horticulture activities in this location and would not restrict future horticulture activity.                      The alternative Rural Production Zone would restrict further fragmentation of land to below 4 hectares, which would be a non-complying activity.</p>	
<b>C Otway Ltd (S393)</b>	S393.001	Planning maps	Horticulture Zone	Oppose	<p>The Horticulture Zone is not an appropriate zone for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The Horticulture Zone does not achieve the purpose of the RMA insofar as it does not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources;</li> <li>b. The Horticulture Zone fails to give effect to the National Planning Standards and the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL);</li> <li>c. The Horticulture Zone section 32 evaluation is 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 creating a special purpose zone;</li> <li>ii. The evaluation fails to consider the full range of 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>d. The PDP does not provide strategic direction or policy support for the suite of rural zones proposed, nor does it support the Horticultural Zone;</li> <li>e. The Horticulture Zone has only been proposed within the Kerikeri area; and</li> <li>f. Horticulture Zone provisions are not sufficiently different from the Rural Production Zone (and in some instances are more permissive).</li> </ul> <p>The proposed Horticulture Zone fails to give effect</p>	Delete the proposed Horticulture Zone in its entirety, amending zoned areas to Rural Production, General Rural, Commercial or Rural Residential as appropriate.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>to the National Planning Standards and does not comply with the zone framework standard 8, mandatory direction 3. While FNDC have proposed the Horticulture Zone as a "special purpose zone", the proposed Horticulture Zone does not comply with all of the special purpose zone criteria as required under mandatory direction 3:</p> <p>a. Are significant to the district, region or country            Comment:            The proposed Horticulture Zone has been applied selectively to the Kerikeri area and has not been mapped throughout the district despite there being other areas of current or future intensive horticulture.</p> <p>b. Are impracticable to be managed through another zone            Comment:            Horticultural land could be managed via both the Rural Production zone or the General Rural Zone. The purpose of the Rural Production Zone is to provide for areas predominantly used for primary production activities<sup>2</sup>, whilst the General Rural Zone is to provide for primary production activities and a range of activities that support primary production. Council has not utilised the General Rural Zone, nor has section 32 evaluation been undertaken to consider this option.</p> <p>a Are impractical to be managed through a combination of spatial layers.            Comment:            A review of the proposed Rural Production Zone and Horticulture Zone provisions has confirmed that there is very little difference between the provisions of the two zones, therefore it is entirely possible to manage horticultural land by way of a zone (and a spatial layer if there is section 32 justification for a spatial response).            FNDC have established zone criteria to support the mapping and identification of the Horticulture</p>	

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>Zones including that the land must be located within the Kerikeri Waipapa area. This criterion is contrary to the NPS-HPL. Whilst it is acknowledged that the NPS-HPL was released following the PDP notification for submission, Council must give effect to the NPS-HPL and this policy statement sufficiently provides for the protection of highly productive land, rendering the Horticulture Zone defunct.</p> <p>Under the National Planning Standards, the strategic direction provisions are key to understand the balance and trade-offs between often conflicting matters of national, regional and local importance. The proposed Strategic Direction objectives and policies are silent with respect to the proposed rural zones. The Overview Section 32 evaluation does not include any evaluation of the proposed objectives. The National Planning Standards provide a number of rural zone options which have not been evaluated within the Rural Environment section 32. In the absence of complete section 32 evaluation, it is not possible to understand why Council have chosen the suite of zones proposed.</p> <p>The purpose of the Horticulture Zone is to manage land fragmentation and reverse sensitivity effects and achieve greater protection of highly productive land<sup>6</sup>. The proposed Horticulture Zone (particularly that west of Kerikeri Road) is already fragmented not only by existing residential and commercial activities, but by smaller allotments. The Horticulture Zone includes land that is not viable for horticulture due to factors such as soil type, lot sizes, and proximity of rural residential neighbours restricting the ability to spray (reverse sensitivity).</p>	
<b>Kathleen Jones (S417)</b>	S417.002	Planning maps	Horticulture Zone	Oppose	Some land rezoned from Rural Residential zone to Horticulture zone is not suitable for horticulture and in some instances is creating a toxic environment for current residents.	Amend Horticulture zoning to revert residential land not suitable for horticulture back to Rural Residential zone (inferred).

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>Kapiro Residents Association (S427)</b>	S427.026	Planning maps	Horticulture Zone	Support in part	<p>The following roads have existing residential lifestyle properties that do not have commercial-scale orchards or visible agricultural production, clustered around a road or access lane - these could be zoned as Rural Living islands within the Horticulture zone:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Blue Gum Lane</li> <li>-Conifer Lane</li> <li>-Equestrian Drive, east side &amp; northern area</li> <li>-Ironbark Road, west &amp; northern area</li> <li>-McCaughan Road, southern area</li> <li>-Ness Road, several clusters</li> </ul>	<p>Amend zoning for clusters of existing small residential lifestyle properties from Horticulture Zone to Rural Lifestyle Zone where they meet the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing small residential lifestyle property less than 2.5ha, and</li> <li>• Without commercial agricultural/horticultural production,</li> <li>• Part of an existing cluster of at least 8 or so residential lifestyle properties clustered around a road or access lane [inferred].</li> </ul>
<b>Kapiro Conservation Trust (S449)</b>	S449.039	Planning maps	Horticulture Zone	Oppose	<p>We consider that clusters of existing residential lifestyle properties in the Horticulture zone could be zoned as Rural Lifestyle. In effect this would create several islands of Rural Lifestyle zone within the Horticulture zone.</p> <p>The PDP policies/rules relating to Rural Living zone should retain the potential for some of this land to be returned to agricultural production at a future date, if owners wish, so further residential development on productive land in existing residential areas of the Horticulture zone is undesirable.</p> <p>Satellite property maps can be used to identify clusters of existing residential lifestyle properties in the Horticulture zone.</p> <p>Clusters of existing small residential lifestyle properties lying within the area proposed as Horticulture zone could be classed as Rural Lifestyle zone in cases where they meet specific criteria.</p>	<p>Delete the zoning of some properties within the Horticulture zone, and rezone Rural Lifestyle where they meet specific criteria, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing small residential lifestyle property less than 2.5 ha, and</li> <li>• Without commercial agricultural/horticultural production, and</li> <li>• Part of an existing cluster of at least 8 or so residential lifestyle properties clustered around a road or access lane.</li> </ul> <p>A secondary dwelling on existing larger residential lifestyle properties could be allowed in the Horticulture zone as a discretionary activity, but</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						not within productive horticultural areas
<b>New Zealand Eco Farms Ltd (S456)</b>	S456.001	Planning maps	Horticulture Zone	Support in part	<p>The proposed zoning does not give effect to the RPS. Highly versatile soils, as defined under the RPS, are mapped within the NZLRIS database. As indicated in Figure 2, it is only the southern portions of the sites that are identified as containing these versatile soils. The proposed Horticultural Zoning has been applied to the entirety of the site including land that is not identified as being highly versatile. The proposed zoning does not give effect to the NPS-HPL. The proposed zoning will include land that is not identified as being 'highly productive' under the PDP. This appears to be the result of the Horticultural Zoning being applied to the entirety of the farm, irrespective of underlying soil composition.</p> <p>The proposed zoning is not consistent with the policy direction contained within the HZ chapter of the PDP. Policy HZ-P1 requires council to identify a Horticulture Zone in the Kerikeri/Waipapa area using the following criteria:                      presence of highly productive land suitable for horticultural use;                      access to a water source, such as an irrigation scheme or dam able to support horticultural use;                      and                      infrastructure available to support horticultural use</p> <p>The proposal to rezone the entirety of this site HZ does not give effect to policy HZ-P1, as much of the land within the farm is not identified as containing highly productive land</p>	<p>rezone                      74 Sandys Road, Waipapa. The farm is held in two separate titles referenced RT 989168 (Lot 9 DP 560482, Lot 2 DP 468688, Lot 3 DP 468688, Lot 4 DP 527025 and Section 52 Blk XII Kaeo SD) and NA93A/957 (Lot 2 DP 156008). The farm has a combined area of 117.6311ha from Horticulture zone to reflect the mapped highly versatile soils/ highly productive land                      or</p> <p>As an alternative to the relief sought above, the Horticultural Zone should be abandoned in favour of the Rural Production Zone.</p>
<b>Karen and Graeme Laurie (S471)</b>	S471.001	Planning maps	Horticulture Zone	Oppose	<p>The Horticulture Zone (HZ) is not an appropriate zone for the following reasons:                      - HZ does not achieve the purpose of the RMA insofar as it does not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources;                      - HZ fails to give effect to the National Planning Standards and the National Policy Statement for</p>	Delete the proposed Horticulture Zone in its entirety, rezoning areas Rural Production, General Rural, Commercial or Rural Residential Zones as appropriate.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- HZ Section 32 evaluation is incomplete and flawed (refer specifics in full submission)</li> <li>- PDP does not provide strategic direction or policy support for the suite of rural zones proposed, nor does it support the Horticultural Zone</li> <li>- HZ provisions are not sufficiently different from the Rural Production Zone (and in some instances are more permissive).</li> </ul>	
<b>Robert Keith Beale (S475)</b>	S475.001	Planning maps	Horticulture Zone	Oppose	<p>The Horticulture Zone (HZ) is not an appropriate zone for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- HZ does not achieve the purpose of the RMA insofar as it does not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources;</li> <li>- HZ fails to give effect to the National Planning Standards and the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL);</li> <li>- HZ Section 32 evaluation is incomplete and flawed (refer specifics in full submission)</li> <li>- PDP does not provide strategic direction or policy support for the suite of rural zones proposed, nor does it support the Horticultural Zone</li> <li>- HZ provisions are not sufficiently different from the Rural Production Zone (and in some instances are more permissive).</li> </ul>	Delete the proposed Horticulture Zone in its entirety, rezoning areas Rural Production, General Rural, Commercial or Rural Residential Zones as appropriate.
<b>Breakwater Trust (S500)</b>	S500.001	Planning maps	Horticulture Zone	Oppose	<p>29 Koropewa Road, Waipapa (Lot 3 DP 202022) has been rezoned to Horticulture in the Proposed District Plan. It is anticipated that this is due to the Councils Land cover and Land use maps indicating that the soils are highly versatile (2s1) A soil report completed by AgFirst Northland Ltd concluded:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 The soils on site are more in line with Class 4s2 soils which are not highly versatile</li> <li>2 The site is not highly productive</li> <li>3 The site is surrounded by Residential housing development and commercial and industrial development within nearby Waipapa. Introduction of any production activity on the site would likely cause reverse sensitivity effects.</li> </ol>	<p>Amend the zoning of 29 Koropewa Road, Waipapa (Lot 3 DP 202022) from Horticulture to Rural Residential.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend the zoning of the nine lots between 29 Koropewa Road, Waipapa, and Highway 10, from Horticulture to Rural Residential (being 9, 13, 23, 25, 29A and 35 Koropewa Road, 1, 3 and 5 Pungaere Road, and 2079 State Highway 10 (inferred))</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>Further to above, the site area is not sufficient to make a profit from productive land use. 29 Koropewa Road is unable to meet the criteria of Policy HZ-P1 which outlines the basis for zoning land Horticulture. As it cannot meet the criteria, a Rural Residential zoning is sought.</p> <p>The Rural Residential zone is less than 300m from the site, across the State Highway. To ensure that the site is not a zone anomaly we seek that the land between the subject site and the State Highway which has also been zoned Horticulture, also be rezoned to Rural Residential. These sites range from 2,000m<sup>2</sup> through to 1.3ha. Similar to the subject site these properties are all too small to be considered highly productive land suitable for horticultural use.</p>	
<b>Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited (S502)</b>	S502.101	Planning maps	Horticulture Zone	Oppose	<p>A soil report has been completed at 22 Pungaere Road as part of a recent subdivision, and at 29 Koropewa Road. Both soil reports indicate that the sites do not contain highly versatile soils. It has been determined that none of these sites within this area can meet criteria (a) in HZ-P1. The way in which the policy is worded is that in order to be zoned horticultural you need to comply with (a), (b) and (c). As the allotments in this area are unable to comply, these sites should not be zoned horticultural. Given the size of these allotments no productive activity could be established, and if one was attempted it is likely that there would be reverse sensitivity issues.</p>	<p>Amend the Horticulture zone for sites identified in the submission to Rural Residential zone:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1, 3, 5, 10, 12B, 22, 25 and 36 Pungaere Rd; and</li> <li>• 9, 13, 16, 23, 25, 29, 29A, 29B, 33, 38, 41, 43 Koropewa Rd</li> </ul>
<b>Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited (S502)</b>	S502.102	Planning maps	Horticulture Zone	Oppose	<p>There are a number of smaller sites dotted along the zone boundary (identified in the submission) which range from 3000m<sup>2</sup> - 3.2ha similar to the example above, all do not meet the criteria of a site with land that could be highly productive given the available area is less than 7ha for kiwifruit. In looking further beyond these sites, through to the State Highway, there is only one single property zoned Horticulture which is greater than 7ha. As a result we do not consider that the application of the horticultural zone to these sites meets</p>	<p>Amend the Horticulture zone in the vicinity of Access Rd Kerikeri, as identified in the submission, to Rural Residential zone.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					Councils Policy for the zone. As such, we seek that the horticultural zone is removed from these sites, and replaced with the Rural Residential zone. In the event this stance is not accepted we seek that the Rural Residential zone boundary be extended to capture those sites which are already of a rural residential size, or which gain access off Access Road.	
<b>Antony Egerton and Stefanie Egerton (S506)</b>	S506.001	Planning maps	Horticulture Zone	Support	As the owners of the property at 494A Kerikeri Road, Kerikeri, we are happy that FNDC has taken the initiative to protect high quality soils that are necessary for the continuation of orchards in Kerikeri. It shows FNDC support to 'care about food-growing abilities at our doorstep' for future generations to be fed from. It is consistent with the Northland Regional Policy Statement and the newly released National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land which aims to protect versatile soils for food production for New Zealanders.	Retain the Horticulture Zone as identified in the Proposed District Plan's zone maps.
<b>Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK) (S522)</b>	S522.025	Planning maps	Horticulture Zone	Oppose	<p>We consider that clusters of existing residential lifestyle properties in the Horticulture zone could be zoned as Rural Lifestyle. In effect this would create several islands of Rural Lifestyle zone within the Horticulture zone.</p> <p>The PDP policies/rules relating to Rural Living zone should retain the potential for some of this land to be returned to agricultural production at a future date, if owners wish, so further residential development on productive land in existing residential areas of the Horticulture zone is undesirable.</p> <p>Satellite property maps can be used to identify clusters of existing residential lifestyle properties in the Horticulture zone.</p> <p>Clusters of existing small residential lifestyle properties lying within the area proposed as Horticulture zone could be classed as Rural Lifestyle zone in cases where they meet specific criteria.</p>	

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>Carbon Neutral NZ Trust (S529)</b>	S529.038	Planning maps	Horticulture Zone	Oppose	<p>We consider that clusters of existing residential lifestyle properties in the Horticulture zone could be zoned as Rural Lifestyle. In effect this would create several islands of Rural Lifestyle zone within the Horticulture zone.</p> <p>The PDP policies/rules relating to Rural Living zone should retain the potential for some of this land to be returned to agricultural production at a future date, if owners wish, so further residential development on productive land in existing residential areas of the Horticulture zone is undesirable.</p> <p>Satellite property maps can be used to identify clusters of existing residential lifestyle properties in the Horticulture zone.</p> <p>Clusters of existing small residential lifestyle properties lying within the area proposed as Horticulture zone could be classed as Rural Lifestyle zone in cases where they meet specific criteria.</p>	<p>Delete the zoning of some properties within the Horticulture zone, and rezone Rural Lifestyle where they meet specific criteria, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing small residential lifestyle property less than 2.5 ha, and</li> <li>• Without commercial agricultural/horticultural production, and</li> <li>• Part of an existing cluster of at least 8 or so residential lifestyle properties clustered around a road or access lane. A secondary dwelling on existing larger residential lifestyle properties could be allowed in the Horticulture zone as a discretionary activity, but not within productive horticultural areas</li> </ul>
<b>Roger Atkinson (S534)</b>	S534.001	Planning maps	Horticulture Zone	Oppose	<p>The Horticulture zone is not an appropriate zone for the following reasons:</p> <p>a. The Horticulture zone does not achieve the purpose of the RMA insofar as it does not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources;</p> <p>b. The Horticulture zone fails to give effect to the National Planning Standards and the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL);</p> <p>c. The Horticulture Zone section 32 evaluation is incomplete and flawed:</p> <p>i. The evaluation does not provide sufficient level of detail that corresponds to the scale and</p>	<p>Delete the proposed Horticulture zone in its entirety, rezoning areas Rural Production, General Rural, Commercial or Rural Residential as appropriate.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>significance of creating a special purpose zone;</p> <p>ii. The evaluation fails to consider the full range of 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>d. The PDP does not provide strategic direction or policy support for the suite of rural zones proposed, nor does it support the Horticultural Zone;</p> <p>e. The Horticulture zone has only been proposed within the Kerikeri area; and</p> <p>f. The Horticulture zone provisions are not sufficiently different from the Rural Production Zone (and in some instances are more permissive).</p>	
<p><b>Roger Atkinson (S534)</b></p>	<p>S534.006</p>	<p>Planning maps</p>	<p>Horticulture Zone</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>Rural Residential Zone is the most appropriate zoning in the mapped location because:</p> <p>a. The properties located within this area are consistent with the intended purpose of the Rural Residential Zone.</p> <p>b. The PDP mapped extent the Rural Residential Zone does not follow a logical and defensible boundary.</p> <p>c. The character and amenity of this area is consistent with the PDP zoned land Rural Residential Zone, establishing a coherent peri-urban pattern and character to Kerikeri.</p> <p>d. These properties do not fit with the proposed zone criteria of the Horticulture Zone.</p> <p>e. The proposed Horticulture Zone fails to enable sustainable use and development of the properties within this area.</p>	<p>Delete Horticulture zoning of land to the west of Maraenui Drive and to the south of Access Road, as per Appendix 1 of submission, zone Rural Residential.</p>
<p><b>John and Rose Whitehead (S535)</b></p>	<p>S535.001</p>	<p>Planning maps</p>	<p>Horticulture Zone</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>Rural Residential Zone is the most appropriate zoning in the mapped location because:</p> <p>a. The properties located within this area are</p>	<p>Delete Horticulture zoning of land to the west of Maraenui Drive and to the south of Access Road, as per Appendix 1 of submission, zone</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>consistent with the intended purpose of the Rural Residential Zone.</p> <p>b. The PDP mapped extent the Rural Residential Zone does not follow a logical and defensible boundary.</p> <p>c. The character and amenity of this area is consistent with the PDP zoned land Rural Residential Zone, establishing a coherent peri-urban pattern and character to Kerikeri.</p> <p>d. These properties do not fit with the proposed zone criteria of the Horticulture Zone.</p> <p>e. The proposed Horticulture Zone fails to enable sustainable use and development of the properties within this area.</p>	Rural Residential.
<p><b>John and Rose Whitehead (S535)</b></p>	S535.002	Planning maps	Horticulture Zone	Oppose	<p>The Horticulture zone is not an appropriate zone for the following reasons:</p> <p>a. The Horticulture zone does not achieve the purpose of the RMA insofar as it does not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources;</p> <p>b. The Horticulture zone fails to give effect to the National Planning Standards and the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL);</p> <p>c. The Horticulture Zone section 32 evaluation is incomplete and flawed:</p> <p>i. The evaluation does not provide sufficient level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance of creating a special purpose zone;</p> <p>ii. The evaluation fails to consider the full range of 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>d. The PDP does not provide strategic direction or policy support for the suite of rural zones proposed, nor does it support the Horticultural Zone;</p>	Delete the proposed Horticulture zone in its entirety, rezoning areas Rural Production, General Rural, Commercial or Rural Residential as appropriate.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>e. The Horticulture zone has only been proposed within the Kerikeri area; and</p> <p>f. The Horticulture zone provisions are not sufficiently different from the Rural Production Zone (and in some instances are more permissive).</p>	
<b>Levin Stones Holding Limited, Keri Keri Park Lodge Limited (S549)</b>	S549.004	Planning maps	Horticulture Zone	Oppose	<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 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).</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).</p>
<b>Levin Stones Holding Limited, Keri Keri Park Lodge Limited (S549)</b>	S549.005	Planning maps	Horticulture Zone	Oppose	<p>Rural Residential Zone is the most appropriate zoning along the western side of Kerikeri Road south of Access Road to SH10 because:</p> <p>a. There are properties located within this area that are consistent with the intended purpose of the Rural Residential Zone.</p> <p>b. The character and amenity of this area is consistent with the PDP zoned land Rural Residential Zone.</p>	<p>Amend to review the Rural Residential zone on the edge of Kerikeri and rezone land to Rural Residential along the western side of Kerikeri Road south of Access Road to SH10.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					c. The proposed Horticulture Zone fails to enable sustainable use and development of the properties within this area.	
<b>Te Whatu Ora - Health New Zealand, Te Tai Tokerau (S42)</b>	S42.017	Planning maps	Hospital Zone	Oppose	To be effective the Hospital zone must be applied to the correct landholdings.	Amend the planning maps as necessary and/or make such other amendments so as to achieve the intent of the submission so that the following landholdings are shown as Hospital Zone: CT NA807/182, Section 25 SBRS S OF Kawakawa Part Section 13 Block XVI Kawakawa SD Lot 1 DP 79488 Lot 1 DP 65762 BLK XIV MANGAMUKA SD PT LOT 1 DP 36075 SECS 75-78 PTS 79 82 83 RAWENE SUBS BLK XIV MANGAMUKA SD <del>Part Section 20 SBRS OF Kawakawa Lot 1 DP 63855 Lot 2 DP 63855 Part Section 20 SBRS OF Kawakawa</del>
<b>Far North District Council (S368)</b>	S368.001	Planning maps	Kauri Cliffs Zone	Oppose	The 'Natural Heritage Environment' subzone has been incorrectly applied within the Kauri Cliffs zone. The 'Natural Heritage Environment' subzone needs to be removed and replaced with the 'Natural Open Space' zone in accordance with the section 32 for the Kauri Cliffs zone.	Amend to rezone the 'Natural Heritage Environment' subzone within the Kauri Cliffs zone with the 'Natural Open Space' zone.
<b>Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (S409)</b>	S409.017	Planning maps	Kororāreka Russell Township Zone	Support	The Proposed Plan is required to recognise and provide for the matters of national importance, in particular 6(f) "the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use and development" and s6(e) "the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga." HNZPT considers that the hybrid-plan format of the Proposed Plan, that includes: the identification of historic heritage; heritage area overlays; Kororareka Russell Township Zone and Sites and	Retain the spatial map layers for Kororareka Russell Township Marae

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					Areas of Significance to Maori issues {Overview), objectives, policies and rules each within a Section of the plan, is of assistance to the reader in understanding the background and reasons for the rules.	
<b>Douglas Percy and Theodora Symes (S19)</b>	S19.001	Planning maps	Light Industrial Zone	Oppose	Consider that proposed zoning is intended to create a green zone as opposed to aligning with neighbouring surrounds. This doesn't make sense when the area is screened from the general public by the commercial premises already dotted along the south side of Waipapa Road. This area is the bridge between outer Kerikeri and Waipapa and infill housing makes more sense in this area than further urban sprawl beyond the boundaries of Kerikeri and Waipapa in all directions.	Amend the zoning of all land along the southern side of Waipapa Road, including Waitotara Drive, between State Highway 10 and Kerikeri River, which is not marked for recreation to Rural Residential zone (inferred)
<b>Ti Toki Farms Limited (S262)</b>	S262.001	Planning maps	Light Industrial Zone	Support	The submitter supports the Light Industrial zoning as it applies to Lot 1 DP 102334 and adjoining properties as it is consistent with some of the existing land use activities.	Retain the Light Industrial zoning as it applies to Lot 1 DP 102334 and adjoining properties
<b>Tristan Simpkin (S288)</b>	S288.019	Planning maps	Light Industrial Zone	Support	Supports Waipapa extension of Heavy and Light Industrial Zones. Excellent Inclusion.	Retain Waipapa Extension of Heavy and Light Industrial Zones.
<b>Far North Holdings Limited (S320)</b>	S320.001	Planning maps	Light Industrial Zone	Not Stated	The submitter considers that the appropriate zoning for all of the Far North Holdings Ltd (FNHL) landholdings, in the location identified as the Bay of Islands Marina, is the Mixed Use Zone as this zone better reflects existing consented and proposed land uses. (s32 assessment provided with submission)	Amend the zoning of the sites owned by Far North Holdings Ltd (FNHL), in the location identified as the Bay of Islands Marina, which are zoned Light Industrial to Mixed Use Zone.
<b>Z Energy Limited (S336)</b>	S336.023	Planning maps	Light Industrial Zone	Support	Not stated	Retain the Light Industrial zoning of Caltex Awanui Truck Stop - State Highway 1, Awanui
<b>Bunnings Limited (S371)</b>	S371.005	Planning maps	Light Industrial Zone	Support	Bunnings supports the Light Industrial zoning of the Bunnings Waipapa site (391 Waipapa Road)	Retain the Light Industrial zoning of the Bunnings Waipapa site (391 Waipapa Road)
<b>LD Family Investments Limited (S384)</b>	S384.001	Planning maps	Light Industrial Zone	Support	Refer to full submission for detailed reason(s) for decision sought which include, but not limited to, the following: Light Industrial Zone better aligns with existing development, size of landholdings	Retain Light Industrial Zone for the following property on Waipapa Road, Waipapa: ROT 96274, Lot 1 DP 554121.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					and surrounding land uses; the land is not consistent with the Heavy Industrial Zone; and a Light Industrial Zone is more consistent with the purpose and principles of the RMA.	
<b>Warwick John Ross (S398)</b>	S398.001	Planning maps	Light Industrial Zone	Oppose	The property is currently zoned industrial in the ODP. Contact was made with FNDC 30 October 2022 regarding the rezoning to sport and active recreation and was informed it is a mapping error. This submission is needed to rezone back to industrial.	Amend the zone from 'sport and active recreation' to 'light industrial'
<b>Glenn Alan Jerkovich (S412)</b>	S412.001	Planning maps	Light Industrial Zone	Oppose	This property (8 and 9 Enterprise Street, Kaikohe) is and has always being zoned Industrial for the 30 years I have owned it, as shown in the current operative District Plan, and wish to keep it the same as it is now.	Amend the zoning for 8 (Lot 4 DP 73952) and 9 (Lot 5 DP 73952) Enterprise Street, Kaikohe, from Sport and Active Recreation Zone to [Light] Industrial Zone.
<b>Ngawha Generation Limited (S432)</b>	S432.001	Planning maps	Light Industrial Zone	Not Stated	<p>NGL considers that this zoning request is appropriate for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Given the consented and future operations intended for the site, Light Industrial Zoning OR a bespoke Special Purpose Zoning would most efficiently and effectively enable those operations and the regionally significant economic, social and environmental benefits associated with it;</li> <li>-The zoning sought promotes the sustainable management of natural and physical resources on the site;</li> <li>-The zoning sought is consistent with Part 2 of the RMA;</li> <li>-The zoning sought is appropriate in terms of section 32 of the RMA;</li> <li>- The zoning sought represents an efficient use and development of natural and physical resources;</li> <li>- The zoning sought appropriately avoids, remedies or mitigates adverse effects on the</li> </ul>	Amend the zoning at Ngāwha Springs to Light Industrial Zone or a Special Purpose Zone (similar to that applied to the Ngāwha Innovation Park to the north operated by Far North Holdings) to extend to Ngawha Generation Limited land holdings as per Attachment 2 to the submission.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>environment; and</p> <p>- The zoning sought is consistent with the balance of the PDP, in particular the Strategic Direction section of the Plan.</p>	
<b>Ngawha Generation Limited (S432)</b>	S432.029	Planning maps	Light Industrial Zone	Not Stated	<p>NGL considers that this zoning request is appropriate for the following reasons:</p> <p>- Given the consented and future operations intended for the site, Light Industrial Zoning OR a bespoke Special Purpose Zoning would most efficiently and effectively enable those operations and the regionally significant economic, social and environmental benefits associated with it;</p> <p>-The zoning sought promotes the sustainable management of natural and physical resources on the site;</p> <p>-The zoning sought is consistent with Part 2 of the RMA;</p> <p>-The zoning sought is appropriate in terms of section 32 of the RMA;</p> <p>- The zoning sought represents an efficient use and development of natural and physical resources;</p> <p>- The zoning sought appropriately avoids, remedies or mitigates adverse effects on the environment; and</p> <p>- The zoning sought is consistent with the balance of the PDP, in particular the Strategic Direction section of the Plan.</p>	Amend the zoning at Ngāwha Springs to Light Industrial Zone or a Special Purpose Zone (similar to that applied to the Ngāwha Innovation Park to the north operated by Far North Holdings) to extend to Ngawha Generation Limited land holdings as per Attachment 2 to the submission.
<b>J L Hayes and Sons Ltd (S147)</b>	S147.001	Planning maps	Māori Purpose - Rural Zone	Support in part	<p>Providing planning maps is important, but they need to be accurate and provide information for sections of the Plan. Most of the Maps show Rural Production zone when at least half is in native bush and regeneration.</p>	When SNA are discussed, it is important to know what other vegetation is in the area. Maori purpose zones are shown with much Maori land not shown.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>Suzanne Linda Ashmore (S169)</b>	S169.001	Planning maps	Māori Purpose - Rural Zone	Oppose	<p>Lot 58 DP 451540 Matauri Bay Road is held in Fee Simple as a Māori Freehold title. I am ethnically Pakeha New Zealand and have no genealogical connection to the hapu of Matauri Bay who are Ngati Kura. My property cannot be zoned Māori Purpose Rural because that zone prevents me from exercising my basic property rights over this urban lot.</p> <p>By imposing the Māori Purpose Rural Zone over privately owned land the Council has failed to understand the provisions of Te Ture Whenua Act in respect of Māori freehold land which can be owned by non-Māori. This zone an abrogation of my rights as a landowner and contrary to my human rights under the laws of Aotearoa New Zealand.</p> <p>The Matauri Bay subdivision is fully served with an urban wastewater reticulation and treatment system using the Innoflow system which the Council owns and operates.</p> <p>The appropriate zone for the urban subdivided land at Matauri Bay under the provisions of the PDP is General Residential</p>	Delete Maori Purpose - Rural zone from Lot 58 DP 451540, Matauri Bay Road (CFR 575734), and all residential lots in the Matauri Bay 2008 urban subdivision, and zone General Residential.
<b>Cavalli Properties Limited (S177)</b>	S177.001	Planning maps	Māori Purpose - Rural Zone	Oppose	<p>Eleven sections within the Matauri subdivision have been zoned Māori Purpose - Rural. The sections are owned by non-Māori which is provided for by Te Ture Whenua Māori Act, however, the proposed zoning prevents any non-Māori owner from exercising their basic property rights over these urban lots.</p> <p>By imposing the Māori Purpose Rural Zone over privately owned land the Council has failed to understand the provisions of Te Ture Whenua Act in respect of Māori freehold land which can be owned by non-Māori. This zone an abrogation of my rights as a landowner and contrary to my human rights under the laws of Aotearoa New Zealand.</p> <p>The Matauri Bay subdivision is fully served with an urban wastewater reticulation and treatment system using the Innoflow system which the Council owns and operates.</p>	Amend to zone the Company's entire Matauri subdivision, including privately owned lots, to general Residential in keeping with the instruction of the PDP to provide the General Residential zone over serviced urban land where wastewater management is provided and authorised by the Council as is the case at Matauri Bay.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					The appropriate zone for the urban subdivided land at Matauri Bay under the provisions of the PDP is General Residential.	
<b>Taheke 38 Ahu Whenua Trust (S376)</b>	S376.001	Planning maps	Māori Purpose - Rural Zone	Oppose	Nga Puhī/ Ngāti Pakau have not ceded sovereignty to our whenua wai. We do not consent to your district plan pertaining to our whenua. We decline and do not accept any authority other than direct whakapapa to our tupuna. We Taheke38 Ahu Whenua Trust maintain authority and Kaitiakitanga over our whenua in Hokianga.	remove Māori land titles from the proposed district plan. We (Taheke38 Ahu Whenua Trust inferred) the tangata whenua, Kaitiaki do not cede authority over our whenua or waters.
<b>Te Runanga o Ngai Takoto Trust (S390)</b>	S390.011	Planning maps	Māori Purpose - Rural Zone	Support in part	The submitter supports in part the Māori Purpose - Rural Zone which seeks to provide for the use and development of Māori land to support the social, cultural and economic aspirations of tāngata whenua and enable a range of activities to be undertaken. However, the submitter does not support rules that restrict the ability or opportunity for tāngata whenua to develop bearing in mind that prior to having this development potential the surrounding landscapes and landuse has already predetermined what is permitted and what is non-complying.	Retain the Māori Purpose - Rural Zone.
<b>Te Runanga o Ngai Takoto Trust (S390)</b>	S390.075	Planning maps	Māori Purpose - Rural Zone	Support	The submitter supports the principle of a Māori Purpose - Rural Zone (inferred).	Retain the Māori Purpose - Rural Zone.
<b>Muriwhenua Incorporated (S420)</b>	S420.001	Planning maps	Māori Purpose - Rural Zone	Not Stated	Muriwhenua strongly supports the concept embodied within the Proposed District Plan of providing specialist zones for Māori purposes. The Proposed Plan currently provides for a Māori Purposes Urban zone and a Māori Purposes Rural zone.	Retain the Maori Purpose - Rural zoning of Te Hapua 42 Block (title identifier 517692, affecting land at Te Hapua Road and Waharua Road, Te Hapua). PLEASE NOTE - this shall exclude land identified on diagram 5 of the submission for which a new 'Māori Purpose Rural Settlement' zone' is sought; or such alternative zone or precinct to achieve the equivalent relief sought in the submission. Refer to submission point S420.004.
<b>Muriwhenua Incorporated (S420)</b>	S420.004	Planning maps	Māori Purpose - Rural Zone	Not Stated	The Te Hāpua community currently houses approximately 200 people. The current housing area is within an identified area of sea level rise	Delete the Maori Purpose - Rural zoning of parts of Te Hapua 42 Block (title identifier 517692,

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>risk.</p> <p>This submission seeks to obtain appropriate zoning and planning provisions which will facilitate the housing of the Muriwhenua community at Te Hāpua, and provide the opportunity for economic development. It requests in part a new 'Maori Purpose Rural Settlement' zone (MPRS), and in part a 'Māori Development Rural' zone.</p> <p>There are cultural and social reasons why Muriwhenua wishes to house its people in a village operation. That enables Muriwhenua to support its people through the social and community services that we provide including potentially a marae or at least a whare manaaki. It enables us to provide a café or other food and beverage facilities and core basic shops. By setting our people in a village, it enables support through residents of the elderly and young. A significantly higher level of support than could occur if, as under the current zone, people are spread out in well separated homes. Finally, the village concept has a smaller environmental footprint on the land with a small, appropriately scaled settlement requiring less land per capita than a disaggregated spread facility</p> <p>This zone would provide for a similar range of activities as the Māori Purpose Urban and Rural zones, but would provide for residential development at higher intensity and would provide for greater intensity of economic development than the Māori Purpose Rural zone.</p> <p>Muriwhenua consider that the creation of a bespoke zone but built on the Māori Purposes zones is the appropriate method to achieve the cultural, planning and resource management outcomes. However, if the Council's preference is to create a different method, such as a special precinct applying to the Muriwhenua lands, then the submitter would accept that as an alternate methodology</p>	<p>affecting land at Te Hapua Road and Waharua Road, Te Hapua). The parts are as identified in Diagram 5 to the submission and a new zone with provisions outlined in the submission is sought, referred to as a 'Maori Purpose Rural Settlement' zone.</p> <p>Or such alternative zone or precinct to achieve the equivalent relief sought in the submission. (Also refer to submission point S420.005).</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>Te Rūnanga Ā Iwi O Ngāpuhi (S498)</b>	S498.012	Planning maps	Māori Purpose - Rural Zone	Support in part	The submitter supports in part the Māori Purpose - Rural Zone which seeks to provide for the use and development of Māori land to support the social, cultural and economic aspirations of tāngata whenua and enable a range of activities to be undertaken. However, the submitter does not support rules that restrict the ability or opportunity for tāngata whenua to develop bearing in mind that prior to having this development potential the surrounding landscapes and landuse has already predetermined what is permitted and what is non-complying.	Retain the Māori Purpose - Rural Zone.
<b>Te Rūnanga Ā Iwi O Ngāpuhi (S498)</b>	S498.076	Planning maps	Māori Purpose - Rural Zone	Support	The submitter supports the principle of a Māori Purpose - Rural Zone (inferred).	Retain the Māori Purpose - Rural Zone.
<b>Nathaniel John Jull (S86)</b>	S86.001	Planning maps	Māori Purpose - Urban Zone	Oppose	The submitter opposes the zoning of 62 Albert Street Kawakawa (Legal Description-Section 126 Block XVI Kawakawa SD) as Māori Purpose Zone - Urban as the property is not Māori Freehold Land under Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993. The submitter has provided a copy of the certificate of title to verify this.	Amend the zone of 62 Albert Street Kawakawa (Legal Description-Section 126 Block XVI Kawakawa SD) from Māori Purpose Zone - Urban to General Residential zone.
<b>Te Runanga o Ngai Takoto Trust (S390)</b>	S390.012	Planning maps	Māori Purpose - Urban Zone	Support in part	The submitter supports in part the Māori Purpose - Urban Zone which seeks to provide for the use and development of Māori land to support the social, cultural and economic aspirations of tāngata whenua and enable a range of activities to be undertaken. However, the submitter does not support rules that restrict the ability or opportunity for tāngata whenua to develop bearing in mind that prior to having this development potential the surrounding landscapes and landuse has already predetermined what is permitted and what is non-complying.	Retain Māori Purpose - Urban Zone.
<b>Te Runanga o Ngai Takoto Trust (S390)</b>	S390.076	Planning maps	Māori Purpose - Urban Zone	Support	The submitter supports the principle of a Māori Purpose - Urban Zone (inferred).	Retain the Māori Purpose - Urban Zone.
<b>Te Rūnanga Ā Iwi O Ngāpuhi (S498)</b>	S498.013	Planning maps	Māori Purpose - Urban Zone	Support in part	The submitter supports in part the Māori Purpose - Urban Zone which seeks to provide for the use and development of Māori land to support the social, cultural and economic aspirations of	Retain Māori Purpose - Urban Zone.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					tāngata whenua and enable a range of activities to be undertaken. However, the submitter does not support rules that restrict the ability or opportunity for tāngata whenua to develop bearing in mind that prior to having this development potential the surrounding landscapes and landuse has already predetermined what is permitted and what is non-complying.	
<b>Te Rūnanga Ā Iwi O Ngāpuhi (S498)</b>	S498.077	Planning maps	Māori Purpose - Urban Zone	Support	The submitter supports the principle of a Māori Purpose - Urban Zone (inferred).	Retain the Māori Purpose - Urban Zone.
<b>Doug's Opuā Boatyard (S21)</b>	S21.002	Planning maps	Mixed Use Zone	Support in part	Maritime Exemption Areas in Opuā that are zoned Industrial under the Operative District Plan have been zoned Light Industrial under the Proposed District Plan. 1 Richardson Street, Opuā, is no longer a commercial site and should not be zoned Mixed Use.	Amend the zoning of 1 Richardson Street, Opuā, from Mixed Use zone to the Light Industrial zone
<b>Mhairi Wylde and Ted Davis (S72)</b>	S72.001	Planning maps	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.
<b>Brownie Family Trust (S74)</b>	S74.001	Planning maps	Mixed Use Zone	Oppose	The proposed zoning does not fit within existing development in the area. The existing residential developments are not compatible with the proposed provisions for the Mixed-Use zone.	Amend the zoning of 132 -150 Marsden Road, and the land extending from Davis Crescent to Marsden Road; from Mixed Use to General Residential, as illustrated on Attachment 1 to submission.
<b>Brownie Family Trust (S74)</b>	S74.002	Planning maps	Mixed Use Zone	Oppose	152-154 Marsden Road (inferred) is a reserve and should be zoned as one of the Open Space and Recreation Zones to ensure appropriate protection and treatment.	Amend the zoning of 152 -154 Marsden Road from Mixed Use to Open Space and Recreation

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>Good Journey Limited (S82)</b>	S82.003	Planning maps	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.
<b>Puketotara Lodge Ltd (S188)</b>	S188.003	Planning maps	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.
<b>Puketotara Lodge Ltd (S188)</b>	S188.004	Planning maps	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.	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). 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

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>frm 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).</p>
<b>Audrey Campbell-Frear (S209)</b>	S209.003	Planning maps	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.
<b>Audrey Campbell-Frear (S209)</b>	S209.004	Planning maps	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 10to 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</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>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><b>Hall Nominees Ltd (S252)</b></p>	<p>S252.004</p>	<p>Planning maps</p>	<p>Mixed Use Zone</p>	<p>Oppose</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 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>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</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						submission.
<b>Te Hiku Community Board (S257)</b>	S257.006	Planning maps	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.
<b>Nicole Butler (S305)</b>	S305.002	Planning maps	Mixed Use Zone	Oppose	Supports Māori purpose zones. Our whenua Māori is zoned under Māori purpose zone. However our ahūwhenua Trust has other whenua we have been able to acquire (contiguous) to our Whenua Māori that we wish to be included in the Māori purpose zone (283 and 313 Ngawha Springs Rd and we hold the lease for the recreation reserve between 283 and 313 that will ultimately be returned either via settlement or in agreement with FNDC). Note that definition of Māori land under Te Ture Whenua Māori includes general land owned by Māori. the Trust has successfully redeveloped Ngawha Springs and has a master plan for the development of other properties. The submitter is also interested in the difference between the mixed use zone (as 283 currently zoned) and Māori purposes zone and which would most advantageous to our development aspirations. Submitter is also interested in process to create its own special zone as has Carrington, Kauri Cliffs, Ngawha Innovation Park.	Amend zoning of land at 283 Ngawha Springs Road, Ngawha Springs from Mixed Use Zone to Maori Purpose Zone, provided the Maori Purpose Zone will be most advantageous for the Trusts development aspirations.
<b>Far North Holdings Limited (S320)</b>	S320.002	Planning maps	Mixed Use Zone	Not Stated	The submitter considers that the appropriate zoning for all of the Far North Holdings Ltd (FNHL) landholdings, in the location identified as the Bay of Islands Marina, is the Mixed Use Zone as this zone better reflects existing consented and proposed land uses. (s32 assessment provided with submission).	Retain the zoning of the sites owned by Far North Holdings Ltd(FNHL), in the location identified as the Bay of Islands Marina, which are zoned Mixed Use Zone.
<b>Far North Holdings Limited (S320)</b>	S320.006	Planning maps	Mixed Use Zone	Not Stated	The submitter considers that the Far North Holdings Ltd (FNHL) landholding, identified as Opuā Commercial Estate, is appropriately zoned as Mixed-Use Zone as this zone reflects existing	Retain the Mixed Use Zone of the sites owned by Far North Holdings Ltd(FNHL), identified as Opuā Commercial Estate.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					consented and proposed land uses. (s32 assessment provided with submission).	
<b>Adrian and Sue Knight (S325)</b>	S325.003	Planning maps	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.</p> <p>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>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:</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 the submission.</p> <p>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:</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 the submission.</p>
<b>The Paihia Property Owners Group (S330)</b>	S330.006	Planning maps	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	Retain the Mixed Use zone as they apply to Paihia township with minimal overlays and restrictions.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					appropriately considered and selected based on a higher degree of evidence and assessment, as they relate specifically to Paihia.	
<b>Z Energy Limited (S336)</b>	S336.008	Planning maps	Mixed Use Zone	Support	The mixed use zoning is considered appropriate in a wider sense but there is an inherent tension between service stations and zonings that are pedestrian and streetscape orientated. Service stations and truck stops are by nature vehicle orientated and whilst these developments can be attractive, they have functional requirements which mean that they do not conform to traditional "streetscape" standards (e.g.: provision of verandahs and building to the front boundary). This is reflected in the specific comments in relation to policies and standards below.	Retain the Mixed Use zoning of Z Kaikohe at 45 Broadway, Kaikohe; Z Kaikohe at 141-145 Commerce Street, Kaitaia; Z Taipa at 570 State Highway 10, Taipa; and the Caltex Kawakawa Truck Stop at 4 Station Road, Kawakawa
<b>Carrington Estate Jade LP and Carrington Farms Jade LP (S351)</b>	S351.003	Planning maps	Mixed Use Zone	Support	The submitter supports the Mixed Use Zone, as depicted on the planning maps and as it applies to the Carrington Estate Jade LP and Carrington Farms Jade LP land at Whatuwhiwhi.	Retain the Mixed Use Zone, as proposed and as as it applies to the Carrington Estate Jade LP and Carrington Farms Jade LP land at Whatuwhiwhi.
<b>Sean Frieling (S357)</b>	S357.006	Planning maps	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.
<b>Foodstuffs North Island Limited (S363)</b>	S363.018	Planning maps	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.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>Foodstuffs North Island Limited (S363)</b>	S363.019	Planning maps	Mixed Use Zone	Not Stated	The submitter is concerned that the Light Industrial Zone of the site of the Four Square Waipapa located at 1993 State Highway 10, Waipapa, does not provide for supermarkets as a permitted.	Amend the zoning of the site of the Four Square Waipapa located at 1993 State Highway 10, Waipapa, from the Light Industrial Zone to a more appropriate and enabling commercial zone.
<b>C Otway Ltd (S393)</b>	S393.002	Planning maps	Mixed Use Zone	Oppose	<p>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>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.</p> <p>The approach to commercial zoning within the PDP has resulted in the inability to utilise the</p>	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.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					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>C Otway Ltd (S393)</b>	S393.003	Planning maps	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 activities and establish logical zone boundaries to enable appropriate business land capacity and development.
<b>C Otway Ltd (S393)</b>	S393.004	Planning maps	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.	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:

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					The PDP should 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.
<b>Gone North Limited (S453)</b>	S453.001	Planning maps	Mixed Use Zone	Oppose	The Mixed Use spot zone for this property is isolated from the rest of the Mixed Use and Commercial Zones within the Heritage Precinct of Kohukohu. The building sited on the land parcel fills the entire site and there is no buffer between this and the scheduled Heritage Residence located immediately next door. All surrounding land is zoned General Residential. I am concerned that future use of the property and building under a Mixed Use Zone will impact significantly on the quiet enjoyment of the neighbouring residence. Mixed use zoning will impact unreasonably on the amenity values of all the surrounding residential land, by adversely affecting fire safety, traffic and parking and noise/hours of operation etc. The proposed Mixed Use spot zoning is contrary to sound resource management practice. The proposed zoning of this small site is clearly contrary to objective MUZ-O4, in that adverse environmental effects generated by activities within the site cannot be effectively managed at the zone boundaries. Such a small site has little or no redevelopment potential for mixed uses, with no opportunity to create setbacks to protect neighbours' amenity.	Amend the zoning on part of 1368 Kohukohu Rd, Kohukohu ("The Herald Building" site also known as 1366 Kohukohu Road) from Mixed Use to General Residential
<b>Allan Bruce Thorpe (S459)</b>	S459.001	Planning maps	Mixed Use Zone	Oppose	The proposed Mixed Use zoning of the property on part of 1368 Kohukohu Road ("The Herald Building" site also known as 1366 Kohukohu Road) is of concern as it seems at odds with the Residential nature of the surroundings. My concerns are: the potential loss of the long-standing residential nature of this immediate area; the further disruption of traffic and particularly parking in this area;	Amend the zoning of the property on part of 1368 Kohukohu Road ("The Herald Building" site also known as 1366 Kohukohu Road) from Mixed Use to General Residential

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>an overall concern with the traffic manoeuvres - turning, delivering, at a corner already involving a blind spot, a pub and post office on opposing sides, and a further blind entry to the town at 1350 Kohukohu Road (approx).</p> <p>Also of concern is the lack of consultation with long term residents, such as myself on the social problems associated with proposed changes.</p>	
<b>LJ King Ltd (S464)</b>	S464.017	Planning maps	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.
<b>Karen and Graeme Laurie (S471)</b>	S471.003	Planning maps	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.
<b>Karen and Graeme Laurie (S471)</b>	S471.004	Planning maps	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).</p> <p>If relief not sought is not accepted, that FNCD establish an overlay/precinct or similar, or amend the provisions of the applicable</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>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).</p>
<p><b>Robert Keith Beale (S475)</b></p>	<p>S475.003</p>	<p>Planning maps</p>	<p>Mixed Use Zone</p>	<p>Oppose</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>	<p>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.</p>
<p><b>Robert Keith Beale (S475)</b></p>	<p>S475.004</p>	<p>Planning maps</p>	<p>Mixed Use Zone</p>	<p>Oppose</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 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).</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>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<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).</p>
<b>Alistair Kenneth Lambie (S478)</b>	S478.001	Planning maps	Mixed Use Zone	Support in part	<p>The Mixed Use spot zoning for part of 1368 Kohukohu Road, Kohukohu, is isolated from the rest of the Mixed Use and Commercial zones in the Heritage Precinct of Kohukohu. The building sited on the land parcel fills the entire site and there is no buffer between this and the Heritage Residence located immediately next door. All surrounding land is zoned General Residential. I am concerned that future use of the building under a Mixed Use zone will impact significantly on the quiet enjoyment of the neighbouring residence. Mixed Use zoning will impact unreasonably on the amenity values of all the surrounding residential land, by adversely affecting fire safety, traffic and parking and noise/hours of operation etc. The proposed Mixed Use spot zoning is contrary to sound resource management practice. The proposed zoning of this small site is clearly contrary to objective MUZ-O4, in that adverse environmental effects generated by activities within site cannot be effectively managed at the zone boundaries. Such a small site has little or no redevelopment potential for mixed uses, with no opportunity to create setbacks to protect neighbours' amenity. The site is most suitable for General Residential Zoning in all respects.</p>	Amend the zoning of the property on part of 1368 Kohukohu Road ("The Herald Building" site also known as 1366 Kohukohu Road) from Mixed Use to General Residential.
<b>Elbury Holdings (S485)</b>	S485.018	Planning maps	Mixed Use Zone	Support in part	<p>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</p>	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.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited (S502)</b>	S502.111	Planning maps	Mixed Use Zone	Not Stated	<p>Given the high historical importance of Waitangi Estate is it has a number of overlays which apply to the site. If left with the underlying zone and general overlays, the rules assessment would be difficult to undertake as each overlay stipulates that the more restrictive rule is applicable. This would result in very minor activities which are generally enabled being captured and requiring consent.</p> <p>The existing Rural Production zone may directly conflict with the Waitangi Trust Board Act's preamble which has set aside the site for a specific purpose.</p> <p>The multiple layers make any planning assessment difficult as in all cases the most stringent rules in any overlay apply. This means that more enabling rules imposed under certain overlays tailored for a particular activity cannot be utilized which results in almost all activities requiring consent as a Discretionary or Non-Complying activity.</p> <p>A more tailored approach will provide clarity as at present the Proposed District Plan makes everyday management and maintenance activities require consent.</p> <p>We have an opportunity to tailor make some rules which are specific to the Waitangi Estate and help give effect to the deed established in 1932. Given the fact that no other zones in the District Plan would be appropriate given the specific nature of this site, and moreover that the other spatial layers would cause undue confusion and perverse outcomes in terms of the activities they would capture, we consider that the use of a special purpose zone is most suitable to this site. We therefore seek that a Special Purpose Zone or Precinct be applied to the Estate.</p>	<p>Delete the zoning that applies to the Waitangi Treaty Grounds (including the Treaty House, Hobson Memorial, Whare Runanga and Flagpole, and regarded as including Lots 1 - 3 of DP 326610, and Lots 1 and 2 of DP 152502) and insert/create a new Waitangi Grounds Special Purpose zone</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Insert a new Precinct over the Waitangi Treaty Grounds</p> <p>OR</p> <p>In the event the Waitangi Treaty Grounds is not set aside for special zoning and/or precinct:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• rezone Lots 2 and 3 DP 326610 Sport and Active Recreation (to accommodate the existing golf club)</li> <li>• amend the rules applying to the Waitangi Treaty Ground to clarify when resource consent is required.</li> </ul>
<b>Waitangi Limited (S503)</b>	S503.010	Planning maps	Mixed Use Zone	Not Stated	<p>Given the high historical importance of Waitangi Estate is it has a number of overlays which apply to the site. If left with the underlying zone and general overlays, the rules assessment would be difficult to undertake as each overlay stipulates</p>	<p>Delete the zoning that applies to the Waitangi Treaty Grounds (including the Treaty House, Hobson Memorial, Whare Runanga and Flagpole, and regarded as including</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>that the more restrictive rule is applicable. This would result in very minor activities which are generally enabled being captured and requiring consent.</p> <p>The existing Rural Production zone may directly conflict with the Waitangi Trust Board Act's preamble which has set aside the site for a specific purpose.</p> <p>The multiple layers make any planning assessment difficult as in all cases the most stringent rules in any overlay apply. This means that more enabling rules imposed under certain overlays tailored for a particular activity cannot be utilized which results in almost all activities requiring consent as a Discretionary or Non-Complying activity.</p> <p>A more tailored approach will provide clarity as at present the Proposed District Plan makes everyday management and maintenance activities require consent.</p> <p>We have an opportunity to tailor make some rules which are specific to the Waitangi Estate and help give effect to the deed established in 1932. Given the fact that no other zones in the District Plan would be appropriate given the specific nature of this site, and moreover that the other spatial layers would cause undue confusion and perverse outcomes in terms of the activities they would capture, we consider that the use of a special purpose zone is most suitable to this site. We therefore seek that a Special Purpose Zone or Precinct be applied to the Estate.</p>	<p>Lots 1 - 3 of DP 326610, and Lots 1 and 2 of DP 152502) and insert/create a new Waitangi Grounds Special Purpose zone</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Insert a new Precinct over the Waitangi Treaty Grounds</p> <p>OR</p> <p>In the event the Waitangi Treaty Grounds is not set aside for special zoning and/or precinct:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• rezone Lots 2 and 3 DP 326610 Sport and Active Recreation (to accommodate the existing golf club)</li> <li>• amend the rules applying to the Waitangi Treaty Ground to clarify when resource consent is required.</li> </ul>
<p><b>The General Trust Board of the Diocese of Auckland (S514)</b></p>	<p>S514.002</p>	<p>Planning maps</p>	<p>Mixed Use Zone</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>128 Kerikeri Road is zoned as Residential under the Operative Plan. The proposed Mixed Use Zone under the Proposed Plan is opposed.</p> <p>The site is currently used for residential purposes and, it is intended that the site will continue to be used for residential purposes. The Mixed Use zone is not an appropriate zone for this site as it does not support the current and anticipated future residential use of this site.</p>	<p>Delete the Mix Use zoning of 128 Kerikeri Road, zone General Residential (inferred)</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>Elbury Holdings (S519)</b>	S519.018	Planning maps	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.
<b>Roger Atkinson (S534)</b>	S534.002	Planning maps	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>
<b>Roger Atkinson (S534)</b>	S534.005	Planning maps	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 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	<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;</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Rezone land to an appropriate Commercial or Mixed Use zone to</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>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>legitimise and enable tourist and horticulture based commercial activities to occur:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. along both sides of Kerikeri Road from the roundabout with State Highway 10 to Kerikeri town centre; and</li> <li>b. at the Redwoods in accordance with the map in Appendix 1.</li> </ul> <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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. along both sides of Kerikeri Road from the roundabout with State Highway 10 to Kerikeri town centre; and</li> <li>b. at the Redwoods in accordance with the map in Appendix 1.</li> </ul>
<p><b>John and Rose Whitehead (S535)</b></p>	<p>S535.003</p>	<p>Planning maps</p>	<p>Mixed Use Zone</p>	<p>Oppose</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</li> </ul> </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>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>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><b>John and Rose Whitehead (S535)</b></p>	<p>S535.006</p>	<p>Planning maps</p>	<p>Mixed Use Zone</p>	<p>Oppose</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 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>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>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;</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						and  b. at the Redwoods in accordance with the map in Appendix 1.
<b>Elbury Holdings (S541)</b>	S541.016	Planning maps	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.
<b>LJ King Limited (S543)</b>	S543.017	Planning maps	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.
<b>LJ King Limited (S547)</b>	S547.017	Planning maps	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
<b>Levin Stones Holding Limited, Keri Keri Park Lodge Limited (S549)</b>	S549.002	Planning maps	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.
<b>Levin Stones Holding</b>	S549.003	Planning maps	Mixed Use Zone	Oppose	The Section 32 Evaluation - Urban Environment does not include any specified zone criteria; as	Amend by reviewing the notified Mixed Use Zone (MUZ) boundary

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Limited, Keri Keri Park Lodge Limited (S549)					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.	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.
Jane E Johnston (S560)	S560.005	Planning maps	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.
Jane E Johnston (S560)	S560.006	Planning maps	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.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S561)	S561.111	Planning maps	Mixed Use Zone	Not Stated	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,	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.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>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 other centres are affected more significantly.</p>	
<p><b>Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S561)</b></p>	<p>S561.124</p>	<p>Planning maps</p>	<p>Mixed Use Zone</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>14 Park Road, Kaikohe, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25 and 27 Mangakahia Road, Kaikohe, 2A, 3, 4A, 4B, 5, 8 and 10 Guerin Street, Kaikohe are all currently zoned Residential in the Operative Plan and in the FNPDP are zoned Mixed Use. As noted in the Kāinga Ora submission, amendments are sought to the Mixed Use zone provisions to ensure that residential buildings and activities are not restricted on the ground floor of properties (with the exception of sites with the pedestrian frontage identified on the planning maps). Should the Council not make the amendments to the Mixed Use zone as sought, then Kāinga Ora request the zoning of these sites remain residential.</p>	<p>Amend the zoning of 14 Park Road, Kaikohe, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25 and 27 Mangakahia Road, Kaikohe, 2A, 3, 4A, 4B, 5, 8 and 10 Guerin Street, Kaikohe from Mixed Use to General Residential unless Council makes the amendment sought to the Mixed Use zone provisions.</p>
<p><b>The Paihia Property Owners Group (S565)</b></p>	<p>S565.006</p>	<p>Planning maps</p>	<p>Mixed Use Zone</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>The Submitters generally support the enabling intent of many of the urban zones proposed by the PDP. However, when considered alongside the myriad of other controls, believe that the PDP unnecessarily constrains and confuses their intent, aims and objectives. As outlined above, should additional provisions and overlays be warranted, these must be appropriately considered and selected based on a higher</p>	<p>Retain the Mixed use zone as it applies to Paihia and only apply overlays that are considered and selected based on a higher degree of evidence and assessment.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					degree of evidence and assessment as they relate specifically to Paihia.	
<b>Ngamaia Farms Ltd (S3)</b>	S3.001	Planning maps	Natural Open Space Zone	Oppose	Given that the site is an active beef farm, with other rural production activities associated with the site, it seems that the Natural Open Space zone has been applied in error across our clients' landholdings. There is no apparent justification for the increase in extent. In the 'Overview' section for the Natural Open Space zone, it notes that "The Natural Open Space zone generally applies to public land that is administered by government agencies and includes a variety of parks and historic reserves". Our client's land does not meet the rationale for such zoning and as such should be removed, with a reversion back to the Rural Production Zone.	Amend the zoning so that all of the following records of title are Rural Production zone - NA48C/1396 (Section 60 Block X Takahue Survey District); - NA30A/294 (Section 52 and Part Section 32 Block X Takahue Survey District) - NA1034/213 (Section 36 Block X Takahue Survey District; and - NA26A/1387 (Section 35 and Section 40 Block X Takahue Survey District).
<b>Mr Lewis Thomas Grant, Mr Jake Ryan Lockwood, Mr Luke Stephen Lockwood and Mr Stephen Graham Lockwood (S32)</b>	S32.001	Planning maps	Natural Open Space Zone	Oppose	The Motukiekie Owners consider that the Proposed Plan in its current form will not: (a) promote the sustainable management of resources, and therefore will not achieve the purpose and principles of the Resource Management Act 1991 ("RMA"); (b) meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (c) enable social, economic and cultural wellbeing; (d) avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects on the environment; and (e) represent the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan, in terms of section 32 of the RMA. Natural Open Space Zone for Motukiekie Island as currently proposed is not appropriate for the following reasons: (a) Motukiekie Island is privately-owned land intended for private accommodation and recreational purposes; (b) the land use provisions are inappropriately restrictive in the context of privately owned land. This is especially so given that residential activity may not be allowed; (c) parts of Motukiekie Island contain vegetation	Amend the Moturoa Island Zone to include appropriate references to Motukiekie Island; or  Amend to create a new Motukiekie Island Zone that is consistent with the approach taken for the Moturoa Island Zone.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>that is not representative of a Natural Open Space zoning; and</p> <p>(d) parts of Motukiekie Island are already used for activities that do not sit comfortably with Natural Open Space zoning, such as the existing house, associated utilities, and jetty. The Council may have mistakenly thought Motukiekie Island was public land, resulting in this inappropriate Natural Open Space zoning. This misunderstanding may have been caused by the fact that Motukiekie Island used to be held by the Department of Conservation on a long-term lease. That is no longer the case.</p> <p>The most appropriate solution is to provide a zone consistent with that which applies to Moturoa Island (the Moturoa Island Zone) for Motukiekie Island, or expand the Moturoa Island Zone to include Motukiekie Island. This addresses the shortcomings and inconsistencies of applying the Natural Open Space Zone and provides a more durable planning solution. In particular, it recognises the private ownership and use of Motukiekie Island, and enables and encourages the ongoing conservation work.</p> <p>The objectives and policies of the Moturoa Island Zone are appropriate for Motukiekie Island because both Moturoa Island and Motukiekie Island are privately owned, are used for private accommodation and recreation, are undergoing conservation work, and have the same Coastal Environment and Natural Environment overlays. Therefore, it is efficient and appropriate to apply a consistent zone to Moturoa Island Zone.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that Motukiekie Island is smaller and less developed than Moturoa Island. On this basis, it would be appropriate to amend (or supplement) Policy MIZ-P1 as it applies to Motukiekie Island to reflect that a lesser number of residential units are enabled, compared to the number of units enabled on Moturoa Island.</p> <p>The suitability of the Natural Open Space Zone</p>	

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>compared with that of other zones for Motukiekie Island does not appear to have been assessed or considered by the Council in proposing a zone for Motukiekie Island. The Motukiekie Owners are willing to work with the Council to determine the appropriate number, extent and location for identified building platforms, determine the appropriate areas to be identified and reserved for conservation activities, and develop a 'Development Plan'.</p> <p>An alternative option is to create a new Motukiekie Island Zone that recognises the private ownership and use of the island, and enables and encourages the Motukiekie Owners' conservation work. However, this would largely reflect the Moturoa Island Zone, so it may not be necessary to create an entirely new zone.</p>	
<p><b>Mr Lewis Thomas Grant, Mr Jake Ryan Lockwood, Mr Luke Stephen Lockwood and Mr Stephen Graham Lockwood (S32)</b></p>	<p>S32.002</p>	<p>Planning maps</p>	<p>Natural Open Space Zone</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>The suitability of the Natural Open Space Zone compared with that of other zones for Motukiekie Island does not appear to have been assessed or considered by the Council in proposing a zone for Motukiekie Island. The Motukiekie Owners are willing to work with the Council to determine the appropriate number, extent and location for identified building platforms, determine the appropriate areas to be identified and reserved for conservation activities, and develop a 'Development Plan'.</p>	<p>Amend in accordance with S32.001 and identify an appropriate number of building platforms on Motukeikei Island for additional development.</p>
<p><b>Living Waters - Bay of Islands (S303)</b></p>	<p>S303.001</p>	<p>Planning maps</p>	<p>Natural Open Space Zone</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>Some of the zoning applications in the online mapping are inadequately protective of the natural values present or, in some cases, zoning is completely missing. Part of the problem appears to be a protocol that only one zone can be applied to each property or allotment, even though part of that property may be subject to a permanent conservation covenant (eg. QE11 Open Space Covenant or Reserves Act covenant). Another aspect is that unformed legal roads (reserved from sale as part of the Queen's Chain of water margin access and protection) are not zoned at all, even</p>	<p>Amend zoning to apply the more appropriately protective Natural Open Space zoning to lands permanently protected by QE11 Open Space Covenants (eg Wairoro Park Covenant at Aucks Road is currently zoned Rural Lifestyle), Reserves Act Covenants (eg. Tangatapu wetland covenant is currently zoned Rural Production) and FNDC Covenant encumbrances (eg. Omata Estate Covenants are</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					when they are subject to an FNDC Management Agreement requiring their ecological restoration (eg. by Living Waters-BOI). The rationale appears to be that they do not have a surveyed allotment number. However, each of them does actually have an FNDC Parcel number as a unique identifier, and these are specified in, for example, the Management Agreement between Living Waters-BOI and FNDC (eg. ULR #5230964 on the boundary of northwestern Waikare Inlet; FNDC Reserves Act covenant #5152163 at Tangatapu, adjoining the Whangamumu Walkway). Another anomaly noticed while scanning water margin mapping was that there has been some misunderstanding of the boundaries between the Coastal Marine Area (Regional Council) and the adjoining terrestrial land in Opuā. For example #7 Beechey Street (adjoining the FNDC toilet block beside the Opuā ferry ramp) is zoned Rural Production, despite it being rental residential units largely on poles above open water.	currently zoned Rural Production). Apply the more appropriately protective Natural Open Space zoning to Unformed Legal Roads with indigenous vegetation adjoining the Coastal Marine Area and rivers and lakes to give better effect to natural character protection and restoration imperatives in RMA s.6(a) and NZCPS Policies 11, 13 & 14. Apply more appropriate zonings to properties adjoining (or within) the Coastal Marine Area at Opuā.
<b>Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust (S338)</b>	S338.046	Planning maps	Natural Open Space Zone	Not Stated	The area around Waipapa Landing and Cherry Park house grounds should be recognised and preserved as a public recreational reserve.	Delete the Natural Open Space zoning of the area around Waipapa Landing and Cherry Park house grounds, and zone Sport and Active Recreation
<b>Muriwhenua Incorporated (S420)</b>	S420.003	Planning maps	Natural Open Space Zone	Not Stated	Muriwhenua strongly supports the concept embodied within the Proposed District Plan of providing specialist zones for Māori purposes. The Proposed Plan currently provides for a Māori Purposes Urban zone and a Māori Purposes Rural zone.	Delete the Natural Open Space zoning of Section 1 SO Plan 470881, Mokaikai Block (title identifiers 726749, NA1A/1450, NA2108/28 and NA738/244, affecting land at Te Hapua) and zone Maori Purpose - Rural (or such alternative zone or precinct to achieve the equivalent relief sought in submission).
<b>Kapiro Conservation Trust (S442)</b>	S442.170	Planning maps	Natural Open Space Zone	Support in part	Some zoning does not provide adequate environmental protection and incentives for reserves or permanently covenanted land (e.g.,	Amend the zoning for ecological restoration projects in areas such

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					some ecological restoration projects are inappropriately zoned (e.g., rural living or production).	as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pipiroa wetland on the Russell Peninsula,</li> <li>• Wairoro Park QE11 covenant on the Russell Peninsula,</li> <li>• Tangatapu wetlands and hillside FNDC covenant at the start of the walkway to Whangamumu from 717 Rawhiti Road</li> </ul> zoning the areas as natural open space to provide for better protection and reduced rates.
<b>Kapiro Conservation Trust (S449)</b>	S449.046	Planning maps	Natural Open Space Zone	Oppose	The area around Waipapa Landing and Cherry Park house grounds should be recognised and preserved as a public recreational reserve.	Delete the Natural Open Space zoning of the area around Waipapa Landing and Cherry Park house grounds, and zone Sport and Active Recreation
<b>Pacific Eco-Logic (S451)</b>	S451.026	Planning maps	Natural Open Space Zone	Support in part	Some zoning does not provide adequate environmental protection and incentives for reserves or permanently covenanted land (e.g., some ecological restoration projects are inappropriately zoned (e.g., rural living or production))	Amend the zoning for ecological restoration projects in areas such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pipiroa wetland on the Russell Peninsula,</li> <li>• Wairoro Park QE11 covenant on the Russell Peninsula,</li> <li>• Tangatapu wetlands and hillside FNDC covenant at the start of the walkway to Whangamumu from 717 Rawhiti Road</li> </ul> zoning the areas as natural open space to provide for better protection and reduced rates

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK) (S522)</b>	S522.046	Planning maps	Natural Open Space Zone	Oppose	The area around Waipapa Landing and Cherry Park house grounds should be recognised and preserved as a public recreational reserve.	Delete the Natural Open Space zoning of the area around Waipapa Landing and Cherry Park house grounds, and zone Sport and Active Recreation
<b>Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust (S338)</b>	S338.045	Planning maps	Open Space Zone	Not Stated	The area around Waipapa Landing and Cherry Park house grounds should be recognised and preserved as a public recreational reserve.	Delete the Open Space zoning of the area around Waipapa Landing and Cherry Park house grounds, and zone Sport and Active Recreation
<b>Kapiro Conservation Trust (S449)</b>	S449.045	Planning maps	Open Space Zone	Oppose	The area around Waipapa Landing and Cherry Park house grounds should be recognised and preserved as a public recreational reserve.	Delete the Open Space zoning of the area around Waipapa Landing and Cherry Park house grounds, and zone Sport and Active Recreation
<b>Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK) (S522)</b>	S522.030	Planning maps	Open Space Zone	Oppose	The area around Waipapa Landing and Cherry Park house grounds should be recognised and preserved as a public recreational reserve.	Delete the Open Space zoning of the area around Waipapa Landing and Cherry Park house grounds, and zone Sport and Active Recreation
<b>Carbon Neutral NZ Trust (S529)</b>	S529.044	Planning maps	Open Space Zone	Oppose	The area around Waipapa Landing and Cherry Park house grounds should be recognised and preserved as a public recreational reserve	Delete the Open Space zoning of the area around Waipapa Landing and Cherry Park house grounds, and zone Natural Open Space
<b>Waitoto Development Limited (S263)</b>	S263.001	Planning maps	Orongo Bay Zone	Support	The submitter considers that the Orongo Bay Special Purpose Zone over the landholdings identified as Lot 20 DP 437503 effectively replicates the operative district plan zone.	Retain the Orongo Bay Special Purpose Zone over the landholdings identified as Lot 20 DP 437503.
<b>Picture Perfect Properties Ltd (S16)</b>	S16.001	Planning maps	Rural Lifestyle Zone	Oppose	A small portion of land (at 10 Peacock Garden Drive) has been included in the title that is not Residential like the majority of the property, in which case this would make perfect sense for it to be included as Residential zoned.	Amend zoning of property at 10 Peacock Garden Drive, Kerikeri from Rural Lifestyle to General Residential Zone (so that the whole property is zoned General Residential).
<b>Trent Simpkin (S22)</b>	S22.003	Planning maps	Rural Lifestyle Zone	Oppose	The zoning of existing subdivided land should reflect the state that the land is now in. these should be Rural Residential as they will never be	Amend the zoning for the 8000 - 12000m2 lots at Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove and

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					used again for Rural Production, and is a perfect place for Kerikeri to expand with onsite sewer/stormwater disposal without having to install more infrastructure.	Kingfisher Drive, Kerikeri from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential (see map attached to original submission).
<b>Trent Simpkin (S24)</b>	S24.001	Planning maps	Rural Lifestyle Zone	Oppose	Nearly all of the land that was zoned Coastal Living (minimum discretionary lot size 5000m2) has been changed to Rural Lifestyle (minimum discretionary lot size 2ha which is 4x the size). All this land that could be subdivided down into 5,000m2 lots (under the Operative District Plan (inferred)), with the new Rural Lifestyle zone can only be as small as 20,000m2. The Far North needs to be growing, not shrinking, so we need to provide more properties for people to live on. New developments and parcels of land mean more rates for FNDC, increasing income and making our district a better, more vibrant place. See attachments as examples - Taipa, Kerikeri Inlet, Rangitane River Park, Paihia, Orongo Bay, Opuā. Also Ahipara.	Amend all Rural Lifestyle zoned land (District-wide (inferred)) to Rural Residential (and let the coastal environment rules cover coastal issues); OR reduce the Rural Lifestyle Zone Discretionary minimum lot size to 5,000m2 (see attachments to original submission as examples)
<b>Christopher Thomas Kaye (S56)</b>	S56.001	Planning maps	Rural Lifestyle Zone	Oppose	The submitter opposes the proposed Rural Lifestyle zoning of 478 Hihi Road, Hihi (Lot 1 DP 492201). The submitter considers that the proposed zoning is not compatible with existing residential development and agricultural activity in the immediate area and is not consistent with the objectives RLZ-01 and RLZ-02. Also RLZ-R3 is not consistent with the existing residential activity in the immediate area. It is considered that the use of this property for low density residential use is more consistent with the objectives RRZ-01 and RRZ-02 and that RRZ-R3 is consistent with the residential activities in the surrounding environment.	Amend the zoning of 478 Hihi Road, Hihi (Lot 1 DP 492201) from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential.
<b>Deidre Putt (S68)</b>	S68.001	Planning maps	Rural Lifestyle Zone	Oppose	The zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487, Kapiro Road, known as Tubbs farm, needs to take full account of the finite, essential natural resource (good quality soil) present at this site. A primary purpose of the RMA (s5) is to protect natural resources and safeguard the life-supporting capacity of soil.	Amend the zoning on Lot 1001 DP 532487 (known as Tubbs farm) from rural lifestyle zone to Horticulture zone or Rural Production zone.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>A large part of Lot 1001 has good quality soil (volcanic soil and LUC Class 2 land) - it is one of a few remaining large blocks of Class 2 land in the District.</p> <p>Good agricultural soil is a strictly finite natural resource. Less than 3% of the land area in the Far North District is top grade (Class 1&amp;2). Retaining good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being.</p> <p>Lot 1001 borders the Horticulture zone so it would be logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on good land should be avoided because it fragments land and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability.</p> <p>FNDC's submission to MPI on highly productive land in 2019 recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive".</p> <p>Residential development on Lot 1001 is inappropriate for many reasons -</p> <p>In legal terms, there is no functional need for residential development on this particular site. There are alternative sites, on lower quality land, that are much more suitable for residential development.</p> <p>The council has not produced an assessment addressing all the long-term costs associated with the loss of good soil/land at this site, taking into account RMA s5, factors identified by MfE and expert reports about adverse effects of fragmentation &amp; loss of productive land.</p> <p>Development will create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring</p>	

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>producers.                      Development will generate many other adverse effects - such as residential sprawl in a rural area that lacks appropriate infrastructure; large amount of traffic and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on kiwi &amp; ecological values, water quality, landscape, character and amenity values.                      Good soil needs to be zoned for productive agricultural use. The only appropriate zone for Lot 1001 DP 532487 is the Horticulture zone or Rural Production zone.</p>	
<p><b>Jeffrey Putt (S76)</b></p>	<p>S76.001</p>	<p>Planning maps</p>	<p>Rural Lifestyle Zone</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>The zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487, Kapiro Road, known as Tubbs farm, needs to take full account of the finite, essential natural resource (good quality soil) present at this site.                      A primary purpose of the RMA (s5) is to protect natural resources and safeguard the life-supporting capacity of soil.                      A large part of Lot 1001 has good quality soil (volcanic soil and LUC Class 2 land) - it is one of a few remaining large blocks of Class 2 land in the District.                      Good agricultural soil is a strictly finite natural resource. Less than 3% of the land area in the Far North District is top grade (Class 1&amp;2).                      Retaining good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being.                      Lot 1001 borders the Horticulture zone so it would be logical to include it in the Horticulture zone.                      Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site.                      Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on good land should be avoided because it fragments land and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability.                      FNDC's submission to MPI on highly productive land in 2019 recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last</p>	<p>Amend the zoning on Lot 1001 DP 532487 (known as Tubbs farm) from rural lifestyle zone to Horticulture zone or Rural Production zone.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive".</p> <p>Residential development on Lot 1001 is inappropriate for many reasons -</p> <p>In legal terms, there is no functional need for residential development on this particular site.</p> <p>There are alternative sites, on lower quality land, that are much more suitable for residential development.</p> <p>The council has not produced an assessment addressing all the long-term costs associated with the loss of good soil/land at this site, taking into account RMA s5, factors identified by MfE and expert reports about adverse effects of fragmentation &amp; loss of productive land.</p> <p>Development will create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers.</p> <p>Development will generate many other adverse effects - such as residential sprawl in a rural area that lacks appropriate infrastructure; large amount of traffic and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on kiwi &amp; ecological values, water quality, landscape, character and amenity values.</p> <p>Good soil needs to be zoned for productive agricultural use. The only appropriate zone for Lot 1001 DP 532487 is the Horticulture zone or Rural Production zone.</p>	
<b>Christopher Baker (S83)</b>	S83.001	Planning maps	Rural Lifestyle Zone	Oppose	<p>The zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487, Kapiro Road, known as Tubbs farm, needs to take full account of the finite, essential natural resource (good quality soil) present at this site.</p> <p>A primary purpose of the RMA (s5) is to protect natural resources and safeguard the life-supporting capacity of soil.</p> <p>A large part of Lot 1001 has good quality soil (volcanic soil and LUC Class 2 land) - it is one of a few remaining large blocks of Class 2 land in the District.</p> <p>Good agricultural soil is a strictly finite natural resource. Less than 3% of the land area in the Far</p>	Amend the zoning on Lot 1001 DP 532487(known as Tubbs farm) and zone it Horticulture zone or Rural Production zone.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>North District is top grade (Class 1&amp;2). Retaining good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being.</p> <p>Lot 1001 borders the Horticulture zone so it would be logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on good land should be avoided because it fragments land and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. FNDC's submission to MPI on highly productive land in 2019 recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive".</p> <p>Residential development on Lot 1001 is inappropriate for many reasons -</p> <p>In legal terms, there is no functional need for residential development on this particular site. There are alternative sites, on lower quality land, that are much more suitable for residential development.</p> <p>The council has not produced an assessment addressing all the long-term costs associated with the loss of good soil/land at this site, taking into account RMA s5, factors identified by MfE and expert reports about adverse effects of fragmentation &amp; loss of productive land.</p> <p>Development will create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers.</p> <p>Development will generate many other adverse effects - such as residential sprawl in a rural area that lacks appropriate infrastructure; large amount of traffic and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on kiwi &amp; ecological values, water quality,</p>	

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>landscape, character and amenity values.                      Good soil needs to be zoned for productive agricultural use. The only appropriate zone for Lot 1001 DP 532487 is the Horticulture zone or Rural Production zone.</p>	
<p><b>Dianne Margret Pope (S88)</b></p>	<p>S88.001</p>	<p>Planning maps</p>	<p>Rural Lifestyle Zone</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>The zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487, Kapiro Road, known as Tubbs farm, needs to take full account of the finite, essential natural resource (good quality soil) present at this site.                      A primary purpose of the RMA (s5) is to protect natural resources and safeguard the life-supporting capacity of soil.                      A large part of Lot 1001 has good quality soil (volcanic soil and LUC Class 2 land) - it is one of a few remaining large blocks of Class 2 land in the District.                      Good agricultural soil is a strictly finite natural resource. Less than 3% of the land area in the Far North District is top grade (Class 1&amp;2).                      Retaining good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being.                      Lot 1001 borders the Horticulture zone so it would be logical to include it in the Horticulture zone.                      Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site.                      Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on good land should be avoided because it fragments land and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability.                      FNDC's submission to MPI on highly productive land in 2019 recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive".                      Residential development on Lot 1001 is inappropriate for many reasons -                      In legal terms, there is no functional need for</p>	<p>Amend the zoning on Lot 1001 DP 532487 (known as Tubbs farm) from rural lifestyle zone to Horticulture zone or Rural Production zone.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>residential development on this particular site. There are alternative sites, on lower quality land, that are much more suitable for residential development.</p> <p>The council has not produced an assessment addressing all the long-term costs associated with the loss of good soil/land at this site, taking into account RMA s5, factors identified by MfE and expert reports about adverse effects of fragmentation &amp; loss of productive land. Development will create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers.</p> <p>Development will generate many other adverse effects - such as residential sprawl in a rural area that lacks appropriate infrastructure; large amount of traffic and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on kiwi &amp; ecological values, water quality, landscape, character and amenity values. Good soil needs to be zoned for productive agricultural use. The only appropriate zone for Lot 1001 DP 532487 is the Horticulture zone or Rural Production zone.</p>	
<p><b>Ian Harold Pope (S89)</b></p>	<p>S89.001</p>	<p>Planning maps</p>	<p>Rural Lifestyle Zone</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>The zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487, Kapiro Road, known as Tubbs farm, needs to take full account of the finite, essential natural resource (good quality soil) present at this site.</p> <p>A primary purpose of the RMA (s5) is to protect natural resources and safeguard the life-supporting capacity of soil.</p> <p>A large part of Lot 1001 has good quality soil (volcanic soil and LUC Class 2 land) - it is one of a few remaining large blocks of Class 2 land in the District.</p> <p>Good agricultural soil is a strictly finite natural resource. Less than 3% of the land area in the Far North District is top grade (Class 1&amp;2). Retaining good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being.</p> <p>Lot 1001 borders the Horticulture zone so it would</p>	<p>Amend the zoning on Lot 1001 DP 532487 (known as Tubbs farm) from rural lifestyle zone to Horticulture zone or Rural Production zone.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>be logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on good land should be avoided because it fragments land and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. FNDC's submission to MPI on highly productive land in 2019 recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive".</p> <p>Residential development on Lot 1001 is inappropriate for many reasons -</p> <p>In legal terms, there is no functional need for residential development on this particular site. There are alternative sites, on lower quality land, that are much more suitable for residential development.</p> <p>The council has not produced an assessment addressing all the long-term costs associated with the loss of good soil/land at this site, taking into account RMA s5, factors identified by MfE and expert reports about adverse effects of fragmentation &amp; loss of productive land. Development will create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers.</p> <p>Development will generate many other adverse effects - such as residential sprawl in a rural area that lacks appropriate infrastructure; large amount of traffic and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on kiwi &amp; ecological values, water quality, landscape, character and amenity values.</p> <p>Good soil needs to be zoned for productive agricultural use. The only appropriate zone for Lot 1001 DP 532487 is the Horticulture zone or Rural Production zone.</p>	

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>Lynley Newport (S135)</b>	S135.001	Planning maps	Rural Lifestyle Zone	Support in part	<p>The Rural Lifestyle Zone is a sound concept that has been under applied across the district. It has been severely restricted to only a few areas and can and should be applied elsewhere, especially where there are enclaves of rural land already in blocks of less than 8ha which, according to the Council's own proposed minimum lot sizes, is a size no longer suitable for rural production use. The zoning should be applied to land already meeting the criteria outlined in RLZ-02, particularly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Low density residential activities;</li> <li>- Small scale farming activities with limited buildings and structures;</li> <li>- Smaller lot sizes than Rural Production Zone;</li> </ul> <p>The zoning could also apply to rural land that is not highly productive or contain highly versatile soils.</p> <p>If land is not suitable for economically sustainable productive purposes because of poor soil, other inhibiting factors that render productive use not practical, and/or small lot sizes, then why not utilise the land for rural lifestyle use. This would not be contrary to any central government or regional council mandates.</p> <p>The Council appears to wrongly assume that all land zoned Rural Production is suitable for Rural Production use.</p> <p>The Council is clearly out of touch with its rural community (most of its district).</p>	Amend the zoning of the district to identify additional areas that can and should be zoned Rural Lifestyle.
<b>Dandy Developments Limited (S142)</b>	S142.001	Planning maps	Rural Lifestyle Zone	Oppose	<p>The submitter considers that the zoning of Lot 2 DP 195378 located at 458A Hihi Road, Hihi, should not be Rural Lifestyle but is more appropriate as Rural Residential Zone. The Rural Residential zoning better reflects the existing surrounding environment which contains existing rural residential development.</p>	Amend the zoning of Lot 2 DP 195378 located at 458A Hihi Road, Hihi from Rural Lifestyle Zone to Rural Residential Zone.
<b>Terry Clarke (S144)</b>	S144.001	Planning maps	Rural Lifestyle Zone	Oppose	<p>The zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487, Kapiro Road, known as Tubbs farm, needs to take full account of the finite, essential natural resource (good quality soil) present at this site.</p>	Amend the zoning on Lot 1001 DP 532487(known as Tubbs farm) from rural lifestyle zone to Horticulture

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>A primary purpose of the RMA (s5) is to protect natural resources and safeguard the life-supporting capacity of soil.</p> <p>A large part of Lot 1001 has good quality soil (volcanic soil and LUC Class 2 land) - it is one of a few remaining large blocks of Class 2 land in the District.</p> <p>Good agricultural soil is a strictly finite natural resource. Less than 3% of the land area in the Far North District is top grade (Class 1&amp;2).</p> <p>Retaining good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being.</p> <p>Lot 1001 borders the Horticulture zone so it would be logical to include it in the Horticulture zone.</p> <p>Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site.</p> <p>Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on good land should be avoided because it fragments land and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability.</p> <p>FNDC's submission to MPI on highly productive land in 2019 recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive".</p> <p>Residential development on Lot 1001 is inappropriate for many reasons -</p> <p>In legal terms, there is no functional need for residential development on this particular site.</p> <p>There are alternative sites, on lower quality land, that are much more suitable for residential development.</p> <p>The council has not produced an assessment addressing all the long-term costs associated with the loss of good soil/land at this site, taking into account RMA s5, factors identified by MfE and expert reports about adverse effects of</p>	<p>zone or RuralProduction zone.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>fragmentation &amp; loss of productive land.                      Development will create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers.                      Development will generate many other adverse effects - such as residential sprawl in a rural area that lacks appropriate infrastructure; large amount of traffic and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on kiwi &amp; ecological values, water quality, landscape, character and amenity values.                      Good soil needs to be zoned for productive agricultural use. The only appropriate zone for Lot 1001 DP 532487 is the Horticulture zone or Rural Production zone.</p>	
<p><b>Fiona Clarke (S145)</b></p>	<p>S145.001</p>	<p>Planning maps</p>	<p>Rural Lifestyle Zone</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>The zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487, Kapiro Road, known as Tubbs farm, needs to take full account of the finite, essential natural resource (good quality soil) present at this site.                      A primary purpose of the RMA (s5) is to protect natural resources and safeguard the life-supporting capacity of soil.                      A large part of Lot 1001 has good quality soil (volcanic soil and LUC Class 2 land) - it is one of a few remaining large blocks of Class 2 land in the District.                      Good agricultural soil is a strictly finite natural resource. Less than 3% of the land area in the Far North District is top grade (Class 1&amp;2).                      Retaining good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being.                      Lot 1001 borders the Horticulture zone so it would be logical to include it in the Horticulture zone.                      Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site.                      Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on good land should be avoided because it fragments land and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability.                      FNDC's submission to MPI on highly productive</p>	<p>Amend the zoning on Lot 1001 DP 532487(known as Tubbs farm) from rural lifestyle zone to Horticulture zone or RuralProduction zone.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>land in 2019 recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive".</p> <p>Residential development on Lot 1001 is inappropriate for many reasons -</p> <p>In legal terms, there is no functional need for residential development on this particular site. There are alternative sites, on lower quality land, that are much more suitable for residential development.</p> <p>The council has not produced an assessment addressing all the long-term costs associated with the loss of good soil/land at this site, taking into account RMA s5, factors identified by MfE and expert reports about adverse effects of fragmentation &amp; loss of productive land.</p> <p>Development will create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers.</p> <p>Development will generate many other adverse effects - such as residential sprawl in a rural area that lacks appropriate infrastructure; large amount of traffic and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on kiwi &amp; ecological values, water quality, landscape, character and amenity values.</p> <p>Good soil needs to be zoned for productive agricultural use. The only appropriate zone for Lot 1001 DP 532487 is the Horticulture zone or Rural Production zone.</p>	
<b>Nina Naera (S152)</b>	S152.001	Planning maps	Rural Lifestyle Zone	Oppose	<p>Rezoning would allow more housing to be developed on Koutu Terrace, Koutu. There is little new land zoned for housing in Koutu, which means teachers and families of the new Te Kura Kaupapa Māori o Hokianga (built by the Ministry of Education at Koutu Point, with capacity for 200 students) have limited ability to locate near the school. Much of the built-on land in Koutu (on Koutu Loop and Koutu Point Roads), as per the council's e-plan, is adversely affected in some way</p>	<p>Amend the zoning of land for the following 16 properties on Koutu Terrace, Opononi from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential:- Lot 1 Koutu Point Road, Opononi 0473- Lots 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, DP 192999, Koutu Terrace, Opononi 0473 - 15 Koutu Terrace, Opononi 0473 (Lot 7 DP 192999)- 24 Koutu Terrace, Opononi 0473</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>by River Flood Hazards or Coastal Flooding. Therefore, for the future proofing of the settlement, more residential zoning is requested. At the moment, the 16 sections on Koutu Terrace are zoned Rural Lifestyle, meaning the sections which are all around one hectare in size can only take one residence. By zoning the road to Rural Residential, and considering the extended potential through discretionary as well as permitted activities under that zoning, the short Koutu Terrace road could support up to 40 or so households. The suggestion is consistent with the nine significant resource management issues that FNDC aims to address in this new District Plan. The area needs to be future-proofed for development, supporting the Kaupapa of the school and area with appropriate allocation of land in a modest level of intensification. Koutu Terrace is perfectly placed for self-contained houses under the sort of low-density intensification that Rural Residential zoning, or similar would provide.</p>	<p>(Lot 4 DP 192999)- 40 and 41 Koutu Terrace, Opononi 0473 (Lots 12 and 15 DP 192999)</p>
<p><b>Denyse Pope (S162)</b></p>	<p>S162.001</p>	<p>Planning maps</p>	<p>Rural Lifestyle Zone</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>The zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487, Kapiro Road, known as Tubbs farm, needs to take full account of the finite, essential natural resource (good quality soil) present at this site. A primary purpose of the RMA (s5) is to protect natural resources and safeguard the life-supporting capacity of soil. A large part of Lot 1001 has good quality soil (volcanic soil and LUC Class 2 land) - it is one of a few remaining large blocks of Class 2 land in the District. Good agricultural soil is a strictly finite natural resource. Less than 3% of the land area in the Far North District is top grade (Class 1&amp;2). Retaining good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. Lot 1001 borders the Horticulture zone so it would be logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also</p>	<p>Amend the zoning on Lot 1001 DP 532487 (known as Tubbs farm) from rural lifestyle zone to Horticulture zone or Rural Production zone.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>protect the essential natural resource at this site. Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on good land should be avoided because it fragments land and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. FNDC's submission to MPI on highly productive land in 2019 recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive".</p> <p>Residential development on Lot 1001 is inappropriate for many reasons -</p> <p>In legal terms, there is no functional need for residential development on this particular site. There are alternative sites, on lower quality land, that are much more suitable for residential development.</p> <p>The council has not produced an assessment addressing all the long-term costs associated with the loss of good soil/land at this site, taking into account RMA s5, factors identified by MfE and expert reports about adverse effects of fragmentation &amp; loss of productive land.</p> <p>Development will create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers.</p> <p>Development will generate many other adverse effects - such as residential sprawl in a rural area that lacks appropriate infrastructure; large amount of traffic and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on kiwi &amp; ecological values, water quality, landscape, character and amenity values.</p> <p>Good soil needs to be zoned for productive agricultural use. The only appropriate zone for Lot 1001 DP 532487 is the Horticulture zone or Rural Production zone.</p>	
<b>Shane Allen (S176)</b>	S176.001	Planning maps	Rural Lifestyle Zone	Oppose	Rezoning would allow more housing to be developed on Koutu Terrace, Koutu. There is little new land zoned for housing in Koutu, which	Amend the zoning of land for the following 16 properties on Koutu Terrace from Rural Lifestyle to Rural

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>means teachers and families of the new Te Kura Kaupapa Māori o Hokianga (built by the Ministry of Education at Koutu Point, with capacity for 200 students) have limited ability to locate near the school. Much of the built-on land in Koutu (on Koutu Loop and Koutu Point Roads), as per the council's e-plan, is adversely affected in some way by River Flood Hazards or Coastal Flooding. Therefore, for the future proofing of the settlement, more residential zoning is requested. At the moment, the 16 sections on Koutu Terrace are zoned Rural Lifestyle, meaning the sections which are all around one hectare in size can only take one residence. By zoning the road to Rural Residential, and considering the extended potential through discretionary as well as permitted activities under that zoning, the short Koutu Terrace road could support up to 40 or so households. The suggestion is consistent with the nine significant resource management issues that FNDC aims to address in this new District Plan. The area needs to be future-proofed for development, supporting the Kaupapa of the school and area with appropriate allocation of land in a modest level of intensification. Koutu Terrace is perfectly placed for self-contained houses under the sort of low-density intensification that Rural Residential zoning, or similar would provide.</p>	<p>Residential:- Lot 1 Koutu Point Road, Opononi 0473- Lots 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, DP 192999, Koutu Terrace, Opononi 0473 - 15 Koutu Terrace, Opononi 0473 (Lot 7 DP 192999)- 24 Koutu Terrace, Opononi 0473 (Lot 4 DP 192999)- 40 and 41 Koutu Terrace, Opononi 0473 (Lots 12 and 15 DP 192999)</p>
<p><b>Kerikeri Peninsula Conservation Charitable Trust (S180)</b></p>	<p>S180.004</p>	<p>Planning maps</p>	<p>Rural Lifestyle Zone</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>The blocks current zone is general coastal, and the southern end of the site is Coastal environment. Rural Lifestyle or any other residential zone is totally inappropriate for a protected SNA site.</p>	<p>rezone lot 3 DP 415575 (Kurapari Rd) from rural Lifestyle zone to a special zoning for SNA and similar ecological sites and /or given status similar to a Reserve on private property</p>
<p><b>Craig and Mary Sawers (S181)</b></p>	<p>S181.001</p>	<p>Planning maps</p>	<p>Rural Lifestyle Zone</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>The zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487, Kapiro Road, known as Tubbs farm, needs to take full account of the finite, essential natural resource (good quality soil) present at this site. A primary purpose of the RMA (s5) is to protect natural resources and safeguard the life-supporting capacity of soil.</p>	<p>Amend the zoning on Lot 1001 DP 532487 (known as Tubbs farm) from rural lifestyle zone to Horticulture zone or Rural Production zone.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>A large part of Lot 1001 has good quality soil (volcanic soil and LUC Class 2 land) - it is one of a few remaining large blocks of Class 2 land in the District.</p> <p>Good agricultural soil is a strictly finite natural resource. Less than 3% of the land area in the Far North District is top grade (Class 1&amp;2). Retaining good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being.</p> <p>Lot 1001 borders the Horticulture zone so it would be logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on good land should be avoided because it fragments land and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. FNDC's submission to MPI on highly productive land in 2019 recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive".</p> <p>Residential development on Lot 1001 is inappropriate for many reasons -</p> <p>In legal terms, there is no functional need for residential development on this particular site. There are alternative sites, on lower quality land, that are much more suitable for residential development.</p> <p>The council has not produced an assessment addressing all the long-term costs associated with the loss of good soil/land at this site, taking into account RMA s5, factors identified by MfE and expert reports about adverse effects of fragmentation &amp; loss of productive land.</p> <p>Development will create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring</p>	

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					producers. Development will generate many other adverse effects - such as residential sprawl in a rural area that lacks appropriate infrastructure; large amount of traffic and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, character and amenity values. Good soil needs to be zoned for productive agricultural use. The only appropriate zone for Lot 1001 DP 532487 is the Horticulture zone or Rural Production zone.	
<b>The Shooting Box Limited (S187)</b>	S187.096	Planning maps	Rural Lifestyle Zone	Oppose	Refer to the full submission for specific reasoning in relation to rezoning on Part Lot 1 Deposited Plan 53930 (4.2152 hectares); and Lot 1 Deposited Plan 97835 and Lot 1 Deposited Plan 71896 (9715 m2).	Rezone from Rural Production to Rural Lifestyle the two properties owned by the Shooting Box Limited at 20 Kokinga Point Road, Rawhiti in the Eastern Bay of Islands. identified in its submission and legally described as Part Lot 1 Deposited Plan 53930 (4.2152 hectares); and Lot 1 Deposited Plan 97835 and Lot 1 Deposited Plan 71896 (9715 m2).
<b>Richard G A Palmer (S248)</b>	S248.001	Planning maps	Rural Lifestyle Zone	Oppose	the property is bordered by land which is zoned general residential and mixed use including houses, shops and the Heads Hotel. The current zoning is illogical, particularly given the residential land to the east	rezone 341 Hokianga Harbour Drive to general Residentail or mixed use
<b>Trent Simpkin (S284)</b>	S284.004	Planning maps	Rural Lifestyle Zone	Oppose	The proposed zoning is Rural Lifestyle, which has a minimum lot size of 2Ha. I suggest the zoning should be Rural Residential. 2Ha lots are quite literally a waste of land. Kerikeri needs to grow, and these parcels of land are an obvious location for growth.  There are two items here: 1) The existing lots on Blue Penguin Drive and Fernbird Grove vary in size from 8000m2 to 2.6Ha, with most of them being between 8000-9000m2. This is terrible use of land, and if was rezoned to be Rural Residential, these landowners could subdivide allowing better use of these 8000m2 lots, which should have four homes on them, not one. 2) The	Amend zoning of all land accessed from Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, and the land between there and Redcliffs Road, Kerikeri from Rural Lifestyle Zone to Rural Residential Zone. This includes properties at 1-33 Blue Penguin Drive, 1-24 Fernbird Grove, 1-4 Spoonbill Drive, 15 Skudders Beach Road, 11, 29, 37, 43, 44, 48, 53, 55, 65A, 65B, 65C, 65D Kingfisher Road, Lot 1 and Lot 2, Kingfisher Drive, and Lot 1001, Kapiro Road, Kerikeri (see map attached to

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>large block of land between Redcliffs road and Blue Penguin - this also should be Rural Residential zoned.</p> <p>There is a lot of discussion around the cost of sections and property in and around Kerikeri. By stifling development, this will reduce supply, and therefore increase prices yet further. Kerikeri is, and will, continue to grow as its a desirable place to live in New Zealand. The new zoning maps need to reflect that and allow for that growth to happen over the next 10-15years.</p>	original submission).
<b>Trent Simpkin (S284)</b>	S284.008	Planning maps	Rural Lifestyle Zone	Oppose	<p>Taipa Heights/Cable Bay Area Should be Rural Residential, not Rural Lifestyle. The land was 'Coastal Living' zoned land in the current District Plan, which allowed subdivision down to 5000m2. The proposed plan has zoned it Rural Lifestyle, meaning a minimum lot size of 2Ha. There is no logical reason why the minimum lot size on all this land has been increased by 4x, and many of the lots within this area are of a 'Rural Residential' size already. We need to be encouraging subdivision in areas like this, to stimulate growth and the Far North economy.</p>	Amend zoning for all land currently zoned Rural Lifestyle Zone within the Taipa Heights/Cable Bay area from Rural Lifestyle Zone to Rural Residential Zone. This includes all properties accessed from Taipa Heights Drive, Olive View Heights Drive, Stratford Drive (see map attached to original submission)
<b>Trent Simpkin (S284)</b>	S284.009	Planning maps	Rural Lifestyle Zone	Oppose	<p>It is clear from the zone maps that no thought has been given to Ahipara's future growth plans. Just because the projected population growth stats may not show growth in some areas around the Far North doesnt mean that land shouldn't be rezoned to allow development - because development drives increased population, more rates for FNDC and a better lifestyle for the local people with access to better services. the land behind the Ahipara village was Coastal Living (min 5000m2 lots) and is now Rural Lifestyle (min 2Ha lots) - Why can't it be rural residential? all new development would be self serviced onsite so it needs opening up.</p>	Amend zoning of land at 1-25 Weka Street, Ahipara, 2-15 Albatross Alley, Ahipara and Lot 1, Albatross Alley, Ahipara from Rural Lifestyle Zone to Rural Residential Zone (see map attached to original submission).
<b>Trent Simpkin (S284)</b>	S284.011	Planning maps	Rural Lifestyle Zone	Oppose	<p>It is clear from the zone maps that no thought has been given to Ahipara's future growth plans. Just because the projected population growth stats may not show growth in some areas around the Far North doesnt mean that land shouldn't be</p>	Amend zoning of land at 1 Kotare Street, 1 and 2 Kaka Street, 166-182 Takahe Road, 1A-C Moa Street, 42 and 65 Kiwi Street, 230 - 1418 Sandills Road, and Lot 5

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					rezoned to allow development - because development drives increased population, more rates for FNDC and a better lifestyle for the local people with access to better services. the land behind the ahipara village was Coastal Living (min 5000m2 lots) and is now Rural Lifestyle (min 2Ha lots) - Why can't it be rural residential? all new development would be self serviced onsite so it needs opening up.	Sandills Road, Ahipara, from Rural Lifestyle and Rural Production Zone to Rural Residential Zone (see map attached to original submission)
<b>Trent Simpkin (S284)</b>	S284.014	Planning maps	Rural Lifestyle Zone	Oppose	Tokerau/Whatuwhiwi needs Rural Residential zoning. The area behind the houses along the Tokerau foreshore is asking to be rezoned - Rural Residential - as circled in red on my attached map. Also - what was Coastal Living zoned land allowing subdivisions down to 5000m2 - has been changed to rural lifestyle with a min size of 2Ha. All of this land should be zoned Rural Residential, not Lifestyle or Production. FNDC needs to allow our townships to grow to help drive development and more thriving communities. Using the rural residential zone to transition between dense residential zoning and rural production makes a township 'feel good'.	Amend zoning of land between Inland Road and Tokerau Beach Road to Rural Residential Zone. Use the Rural Residential Zone to transition between dense residential zoning and Rural Production zone.
<b>Trent Simpkin (S284)</b>	S284.017	Planning maps	Rural Lifestyle Zone	Oppose	Residential areas which are serviced should be zoned General Residential, not other zones. There should be an overlay map completed showing the serviced areas with infrastructure and the new zones proposed. All areas with sewer infrastructure should be rezoned to General Residential to allow further development and sites to be created. Stratford Drive, and Dudley Crescent in Cable Bay are examples.	Amend zoning of all land with access to sewer services at Stratford Drive and Dudley Crescent at Cable Bay from Rural Lifestyle Zone to General Residential Zone. This includes land at 66 to 177 Stratford Drive, 19 to 52 Dudley Crescent and 3 to 26 Sunrise Place (inferred) (refer to map attached to original submission).
<b>Tristan Simpkin (S286)</b>	S286.001	Planning maps	Rural Lifestyle Zone	Oppose	Nearly all of the land that was zoned Coastal Living throughout the whole District (minimum discretionary lot size 5000m2) has been changed to Rural Lifestyle (minimum discretionary lot size 2ha which is 4x the size of the current rule). This affects the following townships/areas: Ahipara, Opononi, Koutu, Houhora, Pukenui, Taipa, Cable Bay, Coopers Beach, Hihi, Whangaroa,	Either 1) Rural lifestyle zone discretionary minimum lotsize needs to be 5,000m2 - so at least the potential of the land does not get worse than it is at present; or 2)(preferred) all the land that was zoned Coastal Living be rezoned to Rural Residential, and let the

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>Mahinepua, Wainui, Blue Penguin/Fernbird, Rangitane River Park, Kerikeri Inlet/Wharau Rd, and a lot of land around Russell &amp; Paihia &amp; Orongo Bay. Each of the above townships/areas would have land in or on the fringes of it severely reduced in development and growth potential, which is exactly what the Far North coastal towns need. Submitter opposes this rezoning and can only conclude that no one has actually thought about the negative implications this will have on the growth of our coastal towns. All this land that could be subdivided down currently into 5,000m2 lots, with the new Rural Lifestyle zone can only be as small as 20,000m2 (2ha). Who wants 2ha with their back by the beach?</p> <p>The Far North needs to be growing, not shrinking, so we need to provide more properties for people to live on. Further to that, the current Coastal Living zoned land has already had a reasonable amount of development under the current zoning, so why don't we intensify where houses are already, which means our Rural &amp; Horticultural land can be further preserved from development.</p>	<p>Coastal environment rules cover any coastal issues.</p>
<p><b>Tristan Simpkin (S288)</b></p>	<p>S288.004</p>	<p>Planning maps</p>	<p>Rural Lifestyle Zone</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>The proposed zoning is Rural Lifestyle, which has a minimum lot size of 2Ha. I suggest the zoning should be Rural Residential. 2Ha lots are quite literally a waste of land. Kerikeri needs to grow, and these parcels of land are an obvious location for growth.</p> <p>There are two items here: 1) The existing lots on Blue Penguin Drive and Fernbird Grove vary in size from 8000m2 to 2.6Ha, with most of them being between 8000-9000m2. This is terrible use of land, and if was rezoned to be Rural Residential, these landowners could subdivide allowing better use of these 8000m2 lots, which should have four homes on them, not one. 2) The large block of land between Redcliffs road and Blue Penguin - this also should be Rural Residential zoned.</p> <p>There is a lot of discussion around the cost of sections and property in and around Kerikeri. By</p>	<p>Amend zoning of all land accessed from Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, and the land between there and Redcliffs Road, Kerikeri from Rural Lifestyle Zone to Rural Residential Zone. This includes properties at 1-33 Blue Penguin Drive, 1-24 Fernbird Grove, 1-4 Spoonbill Drive, 15 Skudders Beach Road, 11, 29, 37, 43, 44, 48, 53, 55, 65A, 65B, 65C, 65D Kingfisher Road, Lot 1 and Lot 2, Kingfisher Drive, and Lot 1001, Kapiro Road, Kerikeri (see map attached to original submission); or if the entire area is too large; amend the zone to rural residential for at least Blue Penguin Drive and Fernbird Grove; and the rest</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					stifling development, this will reduce supply, and therefore increase prices yet further. Kerikeri is, and will, continue to grow as its a desirable place to live in New Zealand. The new zoning maps need to reflect that and allow for that growth to happen over the next 10-15years.	(currently undeveloped) balance could be left in the new zoning Rural Lifestyle.
<b>Tristan Simpkin (S288)</b>	S288.008	Planning maps	Rural Lifestyle Zone	Oppose	Taipa Heights/Cable Bay Area Should be Rural Residential, not Rural Lifestyle. The land was 'Coastal Living' zoned land in the current District Plan, which allowed subdivision down to 5000m2. The proposed plan has zoned it Rural Lifestyle, meaning a minimum lot size of 2Ha. There is no logical reason why the minimum lot size on all this land has been increased by 4x, and many of the lots within this area are of a 'Rural Residential' size already. We need to be encouraging subdivision in areas like this, to stimulate growth and the Far North economy.	Amend zoning for all land currently zoned Rural Lifestyle Zone within the Taipa Heights/Cable Bay area from Rural Lifestyle Zone to Rural Residential Zone. This includes all properties accessed from Taipa Heights Drive, Olive View Heights Drive, Stratford Drive (see map attached to original submission). (TPG to provide address list).
<b>Tristan Simpkin (S288)</b>	S288.009	Planning maps	Rural Lifestyle Zone	Oppose	It is clear from the zone maps that no thought has been given to Ahipara's future growth plans. Just because the projected population growth stats may not show growth in some areas around the Far North doesnt mean that land shouldn't be rezoned to allow development - because development drives increased population, more rates for FNDC and a better lifestyle for the local people with access to better services. the land behind the Ahipara village was Coastal Living (min 5000m2 lots) and is now Rural Lifestyle (min 2Ha lots) - Why can't it be rural residential? all new development would be self serviced onsite so it needs opening up.	Amend zoning of land at 1-25 Weka Street, Ahipara, 2-15 Albatross Alley, Ahipara and Lot 1, Albatross Alley, Ahipara from Rural Lifestyle Zone to Rural Residential Zone (see map attached to original submission).
<b>Tristan Simpkin (S288)</b>	S288.011	Planning maps	Rural Lifestyle Zone	Oppose	It is clear from the zone maps that no thought has been given to Ahipara's future growth plans. Just because the projected population growth stats may not show growth in some areas around the Far North doesnt mean that land shouldn't be rezoned to allow development - because development drives increased population, more rates for FNDC and a better lifestyle for the local people with access to better services. the land behind the ahipara village was Coastal Living (min	Amend zoning of land at 1 Kotare Street, 1 and 2 Kaka Street, 166-182 Takahe Road, 1A-C Moa Street, 42 and 65 Kiwi Street, 230 - 1418 Sandills Road, and Lot 5 Sandills Road, Ahipara, from Rural Lifestyle and Rural Production Zone to Rural Residential Zone (see map attached to original submission)

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					5000m2 lots) and is now Rural Lifestyle (min 2Ha lots) - Why can't it be rural residential? all new development would be self serviced onsite so it needs opening up.	
<b>Tristan Simpkin (S288)</b>	S288.014	Planning maps	Rural Lifestyle Zone	Oppose	Tokerau/Whatuwhiwi needs Rural Residential zoning. The area behind the houses along the Tokerau foreshore is asking to be rezoned - Rural Residential - as circled in red on my attached map. Also - what was Coastal Living zoned land allowing subdivisions down to 5000m2 - has been changed to rural lifestyle with a min size of 2Ha. All of this land should be zoned Rural Residential, not Lifestyle or Production. FNDC needs to allow our townships to grow to help drive development and more thriving communities. Using the rural residential zone to transition between dense residential zoning and rural production makes a township 'feel good'.	Amend zoning of land between Inland Road and Tokerau Beach Road to Rural Residential Zone. Use the Rural Residential Zone to transition between dense residential zoning and Rural Production zone. (TPG to provide address list based on map provided).
<b>Tristan Simpkin (S288)</b>	S288.017	Planning maps	Rural Lifestyle Zone	Oppose	Residential areas which are serviced should be zoned General Residential, not other zones. There should be an overlay map completed showing the serviced areas with infrastructure and the new zones proposed. All areas with sewer infrastructure should be rezoned to General Residential to allow further development and sites to be created. Stratford Drive, and Dudley Crescent in Cable Bay are examples.	Amend zoning of all land with access to sewer services at Stratford Drive and Dudley Crescent at Cable Bay from Rural Lifestyle Zone to General Residential Zone. This includes land at 66 to 177 Stratford Drive, 19 to 52 Dudley Crescent and 3 to 26 Sunrise Place (inferred) (refer to map attached to original submission).
<b>Tristan Simpkin (S288)</b>	S288.020	Planning maps	Rural Lifestyle Zone	Oppose	Peacock Garden Drive / south side Kerikeri has the zone showing as Rural Lifestyle. This area is in very close proximity to the town centre (under 1 km), and is on reticulated services, so this zoning is clearly a mistake - it should be Residential. Land zoned with a 2ha min lot size, under 1km from the town centre is not a good use of land.	Amend zoning of land at 2, 8A, 8B and 8C Peacock Garden Drive, 135 Hone Heke Road, and all land at 165 - 209 Kerikeri Road, Kerikeri from Rural Lifestyle Zone to General Residential Zone (see map attached to original submission)
<b>Karl Todd (S314)</b>	S314.001	Planning maps	Rural Lifestyle Zone	Oppose	In the wake of the establishment Te Kura Kaupapa Māori o Hokianga, the one area that could be further developed to enhance community growth for the school and district is the current under utilised subdivision that comprises Koutu Terrace. Over the last 12 years not many of the 16	Reconsider overall zoning potential of Koutu (including rezoning 16 properties accessed from Koutu Terrace from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential (inferred)) and look at ways to optimise and enhance the

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					properties along Koutu Terrace have been developed, with many of them having a minimum size of 8,000 sqm and compounded by its infertile soil, establishes the sites to be uneconomic to produce with an encumbrance tenure to consistently maintain and present well. With Koutu Terrace already having roading infrastructure wouldn't this make sense to take advantage and further enhance development due to its favourable contour and close proximity to the kura that would potentially establish and attract more families and teachers? Rezoning would allow more housing to be developed on Koutu Terrace, Koutu. Lets not waste and under utilise this beautiful taonga. It would be submissive for the Koutu area to not encourage the full potential for further land development release and coincide with the opportunity Te Kura Kaupapa Māori o Hokianga presents to the community.	beautification of the area.
<b>Far North Holdings Limited (S320)</b>	S320.008	Planning maps	Rural Lifestyle Zone	Not Stated	The submitter considers that the appropriate zoning for all of the Far North Holdings Ltd (FNHL) landholdings, including the site identified as the Opuā Marine Business Park, is the Mixed Use Zone as this zone better reflects existing consented and proposed land uses. (s32 assessment provided with submission).	Amend the zoning of the site owned by Far North Holdings Ltd(FNHL), including the site identified as the Opuā marine Business Park, from the Rural Lifestyle zone to the Mixed Use zone.
<b>Per Lugnet (S321)</b>	S321.001	Planning maps	Rural Lifestyle Zone	Oppose	The residential area consisting of Albatross Alley, Poseidon Way and the end of Weka Street in Ahipara should be zoned Residential. This would be consistent with the Strategic Direction, and would contribute to meeting growth demands for housing by utilising existing infrastructure, Objectives GRZ-O1, O2.	Amend by rezoning the area consisting of Albatross Alley, Poseidon Way and the end of Weka Street in Ahipara to Residential so existing residential infrastructure can be utilised.
<b>Ed and Inge Amsler (S341)</b>	S341.001	Planning maps	Rural Lifestyle Zone	Oppose	Refer to full submission for specific reasons for decision sought which include, but not limited to, the following: the General Residential Zone better aligns with topography and surrounding land uses; the availability and presence of existing infrastructure; there is no true rural lifestyle use present on the site, nor are there significant vegetated landscapes; the General Residential Zone is more consistent with higher order RMA	Amend to rezone across ROT NA68D/600 (6 Bedggood Close) from Rural Lifestyle Zone to General Residential Zone.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>policies and plans and the purpose and principles of the RMA; the site is not impacted by any designations or special overlays except for the Coastal Environment, which provides specific controls for development; rezoning the land as requested is not inconsistent with Regional Policy Statement for Northland and the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement; and the current and proposed Rural Lifestyle Zone of the site does not achieve the sustainable management of resources, and the General Residential Zone would be more consistent with the purpose and principles of the RMA.</p>	
<p><b>Neil Construction Limited (S349)</b></p>	<p>S349.001</p>	<p>Planning maps</p>	<p>Rural Lifestyle Zone</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>The Submitter is concerned that the Rural Lifestyle Zone is not an appropriate zoning for the land it owns, or for the land to the east that has previously been subdivided. The Submitter's 68.2940ha landholding is not in the coastal environment, and is not subject to any other overlays related to natural features or landscapes or any particular constraints that would make more intensive rural residential development inappropriate. The land is essentially the same in terms of its characteristics as the land it adjoins to the south, which is proposed to be identified as Rural Residential Zone. Its inclusion within the proposed Rural Residential Zone would enable a coherent and unbroken band of rural residential land surrounding the urban area of Kerikeri to the north and wrapping around the coastal edge. The requested rezoning to Rural Residential Zone would provide defensible boundaries to the zone in the form of the Rangitane River, the Kerikeri Inlet, and Redcliffs Road. The relatively challenging contour of the land and its mixed soil quality mean that its use for any significant productive rural purpose is remote, particularly if it is subdivided to the extent that is anticipated by the proposed Rural Lifestyle Zone. Established rural residential development to the south and east will impose significant potential for reverse sensitivity effects that would further constrain</p>	<p>Amend the zoning of land currently zoned Rural Lifestyle at Lot 1 1001, Kapiro Rd, Kerikeri and the properties serviced by Fernbird Grove, Blue Penguin Drive, Spoonbill Drive and Fantail Rise (refer submission) to Rural Residential.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					productive use of the land. A better outcome in these circumstances is to utilise the land more efficiently for rural residential use, adding much needed housing to Kerikeri in a way that does not impose any burden on the community in terms of providing or funding infrastructure. The proposed Rural Lifestyle Zone would still result in fragmentation of rural land, but would simply use the land in a manner that is inefficient.	
<b>Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew (S386)</b>	S386.028	Planning maps	Rural Lifestyle Zone	Oppose	As detailed in section 2.2.7 of the submission, Ballantyne & Agnew oppose the RPROZ of their site at 249 Aucks Road for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sites on the western and northern boundary are not zoned for the RPROZ and are more suitably zoned RSZ or RLZ;</li> <li>- The site contains soils classified LUC 6e 9, and fall outside of the definition of highly versatile;</li> <li>- The section 32 evaluation does not provide analysis or direction on how mapping decisions have been made;</li> <li>- RLZ has been applied to sites across the road, extending beyond the site by more than 300m. This creates a mismatch in development expectations within the area, and it is considered that including the site in the RLZ will assist in making a defensible boundary for the settlement of Okiato.</li> </ul>	rezone from Rural Production to Rural Lifestyle
<b>Kapiro Residents Association (S426)</b>	S426.001	Planning maps	Rural Lifestyle Zone	Oppose	The zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 (agricultural farmland known as Tubbs farm, Kapiro Road) needs to take full account of the good quality soil on this site, a finite valuable natural resource. A primary purpose of the RMA (s5) is to protect natural resources and safeguard the life-supporting capacity of soil. A large part of Lot 1001 has good quality soil (volcanic soil and LUC Class 2 land) - it is one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 land in the District. Good agricultural soil is a strictly finite natural resource. Less than 3% of the land area in the FarNorth District is top grade (Class 1&2). Retaining good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future	Amend the zoning on Lot 1001 DP 532487 (known as Tubbs farm) from rural lifestyle zone to Horticulture zone or Rural Production zone.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. Lot 1001 borders the Horticulture zone so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Or, alternatively, Rural Production zone would also protect the natural resource at the site. Government reports have concluded that creating new lifestyle blocks and residential development on good quality land is a national problem - it fragments land and leads to the permanent loss of productive land. FNDC's submission to MPI on highly productive land in 2019 acknowledged the cumulative loss of good land. FNDC stated that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive".</p> <p>Residential development on Lot 1001 is inappropriate for many reasons -</p> <p>In legal terms, there is no functional need for residential development on this particular site. There are alternative sites on lower quality land that is more suitable for residential development. The council has not produced an assessment addressing all the long-term costs associated with the loss of good soil/land at this site due to adverse effects of fragmenting and losing productive land identified by MPI, MfE and expert reports. Development will create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. Development on this site will generate many other adverse effects - such as urban sprawl in a rural environment; large amount of additional traffic on Landing Road one-lane bridge and Kapiro Road; effects on kiwi &amp; ecological values, water quality, landscape, character and amenity values.</p> <p>Good soil needs to be zoned for productive agricultural use. The only appropriate zone for the farmland at Lot 1001 DP 532487 is the Horticulture zone or Rural Production zone.</p>	

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
<p><b>Kapiro Conservation Trust (S444)</b></p>	<p>S444.001</p>	<p>Planning maps</p>	<p>Rural Lifestyle Zone</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>The zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 (agricultural farmland known as Tubbs farm, Kapiro Road) needs to take full account of the good quality soil on this site, a finite valuable natural resource.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A primary purpose of the RMA (s5) is to protect natural resources and safeguard the life-supporting capacity of soil.</li> <li>- A large part of Lot 1001 has good quality soil (volcanic soil and LUC Class 2 land) - it is one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 land in the District.</li> <li>- Good agricultural soil is a strictly finite natural resource. Less than 3% of the land area in the Far North District is top grade (Class 1&amp;2).</li> <li>- Retaining good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being.</li> <li>- Lot 1001 borders the Horticulture zone so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Or alternatively, Rural Production zone would also protect the natural resource at the site.</li> <li>- Government reports have concluded that creating new lifestyle blocks and residential development on good quality land is a national problem - it fragments land and leads to the permanent loss of productive land.</li> <li>- FNDC's submission to MPI on highly productive land in 2019 acknowledged the cumulative loss of good land. FNDC stated that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive".</li> </ul> <p>Residential development on Lot 1001 is inappropriate for many reasons -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In legal terms, there is no functional need for residential development on this particular site.</li> </ul> <p>There are alternative sites on lower quality land that is more suitable for residential development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The council has not produced an assessment</li> </ul>	<p>Amend the Rural Lifestyle zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 (known as Tubbs farm) to either the Horticulture zone or Rural Production zone.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>addressing all the long-term costs associated with the loss of good soil/land at this site due to adverse effects of fragmenting and losing productive land identified by MPI, MfE and expert reports.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Development will create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers.</li> <li>- Development on this site will generate many other adverse effects - such as urban sprawl in a rural environment; large amount of additional traffic on Landing Road one-lane bridge and Kapiro Road; effects on kiwi &amp; ecological values, water quality, landscape, character and amenity values.</li> </ul> <p>In conclusion: Good soil needs to be zoned for productive agricultural use. The only appropriate zone for the farmland at Lot 1001 DP 532487 is the Horticulture zone or Rural Production zone.</p>	
<b>Kapiro Conservation Trust (S448)</b>	S448.004	Planning maps	Rural Lifestyle Zone	Oppose	<p>SNAs and similar sites that are already protected through the resource consenting process, and sites that will be added by future consenting, should be zoned in a special zoning or overlay for protected SNAs and similar ecological sites or given status similar to a Reserve on private property, in order to protect ecological values at the site.</p>	Amend zoning of Lot 3 DP 415575, Kurapari Road, Rangitane from Rural Lifestyle Zone to a special zoning for SNA's or to apply a status similar to a Reserve on private property to the site.
<b>Yvonne Steinemann (S455)</b>	S455.001	Planning maps	Rural Lifestyle Zone	Support in part		retain this zone when it is appropriately situated near good roads between towns and the larger farming rural areas. large land block should not be subdivided when they are remote
<b>Te Waka Pupuri Putea Trust (S477)</b>	S477.019	Planning maps	Rural Lifestyle Zone	Support	<p>TWPTT as proprietor of 202 Okahu Road, Kaitaia (being Part Lot 1 DP 50012) support the proposed rezoning of the property and those appropriately appurtenant to within the Rural Lifestyle zone. This rezoning will provide an opportunity for the development of this property for a more appropriate land use than that for which it is currently zoned.</p>	Retain the Rural Lifestyle zoning of 202 Okahu Road, Kaitaia (being Part Lot 1 DP 50012) and those properties appropriately appurtenant to within the Rural Lifestyle zone

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
<p><b>Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK) (S526)</b></p>	<p>S526.001</p>	<p>Planning maps</p>	<p>Rural Lifestyle Zone</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>The zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 (agricultural farmland known as Tubbs farm, Kapiro Road) needs to take full account of the good quality soil on this site, a finite valuable natural resource. A primary purpose of the RMA (s5) is to protect natural resources and safeguard the life-supporting capacity of soil.</p> <p>A large part of Lot 1001 has good quality soil (volcanic soil and LUC Class 2 land) - it is one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 land in the District.</p> <p>Good agricultural soil is a strictly finite natural resource. Less than 3% of the land area in the Far North District is top grade (Class 1&amp;2). Retaining good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being.</p> <p>Lot 1001 borders the Horticulture zone so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Or alternatively, Rural Production zone would also protect the natural resource at the site.</p> <p>Government reports have concluded that creating new lifestyle blocks and residential development on good quality land is a national problem - it fragments land and leads to the permanent loss of productive land.</p> <p>FNDC's submission to MPI on highly productive land in 2019 acknowledged the cumulative loss of good land. FNDC stated that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive".</p> <p>Residential development on Lot 1001 is inappropriate for many reasons -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In legal terms, there is no functional need for residential development on this particular site.</li> </ul> <p>There are alternative sites on lower quality land that is more suitable for residential development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The council has not produced an assessment</li> </ul>	<p>Amend the zoning on Lot 1001 DP 532487 (known as Tubbs farm) and zone it Horticulture zone or Rural Production zone.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>addressing all the long-term costs associated with the loss of good soil/land at this site due to adverse effects of fragmenting and losing productive land identified by MPI, MfE and expert reports.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Development will create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers.</li> <li>- Development on this site will generate many other adverse effects - such as urban sprawl in a rural environment; large amount of additional traffic on Landing Road one-lane bridge and Kapiro Road; effects on kiwi &amp; ecological values, water quality, landscape, character and amenity values.</li> </ul> <p>Good soil needs to be zoned for productive agricultural use. The only appropriate zone for the farmland at Lot 1001 DP 532487 is the Horticulture zone or Rural Production zone.</p>	
<p><b>Carbon Neutral NZ Trust (S529)</b></p>	<p>S529.110</p>	<p>Planning maps</p>	<p>Rural Lifestyle Zone</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>The zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 (agricultural farmland known as Tubbs farm, Kapiro Road) needs to take full account of the good quality soil on this site, a finite valuable natural resource.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-A primary purpose of the RMA (s5) is to protect natural resources and safeguard the life-supporting capacity of soil.</li> <li>-A large part of Lot 1001 has good quality soil (volcanic soil and LUC Class 2 land) - it is one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 land in the District.</li> <li>-Good agricultural soil is a strictly finite natural resource. Less than 3% of the land area in the Far North District is top grade (Class 1&amp;2).</li> <li>-Retaining good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being.</li> <li>-Lot 1001 borders the Horticulture zone so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Or alternatively, Rural Production zone would also protect the natural resource at the site.</li> <li>-Government reports have concluded that creating</li> </ul>	<p>Amend the zoning of lot 1001 DP 532487 (known as Tubbs Farm) from Rural Lifestyle to be re-zoned in Horticulture zone or Rural Production</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>new lifestyle blocks and residential development on good quality land is a national problem - it fragments land and leads to the permanent loss of productive land.</p> <p>-FNDC's submission to MPI on highly productive land in 2019 acknowledged the cumulative loss of good land. FNDC stated that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential land rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining infinite resource and other rural land that is highly productive.</p> <p>Residential development on Lot 1001 is inappropriate for many reasons -</p> <p>-In legal terms, there is no functional need for residential development on this particular site. There are alternative sites on lower quality land that is more suitable for residential development.</p> <p>-The council has not produced an assessment addressing all the long-term costs associated with the loss of good soil/land at this site due to adverse effects of fragmenting and losing productive land identified by MPI, MfE and expert reports.</p> <p>-Development will create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers.</p> <p>-Development on this site will generate many other adverse effects - such as urban sprawl in a rural environment; large amount of additional traffic on Landing Road one-lane bridge and Kapiro Road; effects on kiwi &amp; ecological values, water quality, landscape, character and amenity values.</p> <p>In conclusion: Good soil needs to be zoned for productive agricultural use. The only appropriate zone for the farmland at Lot 1001 DP 532487 is the Horticulture zone or Rural Production zone.</p>	
<p><b>Robert Shaun Clarke (S531)</b></p>	<p>S531.001</p>	<p>Planning maps</p>	<p>Rural Lifestyle Zone</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>The one area most in need of change is the zoning that would allow more housing to be developed on Koutu Terrace, Koutu. There are 16 properties in the private hands of about as many</p>	<p>Delete Rural Lifestyle zoning of Koutu Terrace, Koutu (South Hokianga), zone Rural Residential</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>owners on Koutu Terrace now, and only a couple have been built on in the past 10 years. In that time, Te Kura Kaupapa Maori o Hokianga has been built by the Ministry of Education at Koutu Point. This new Kura for the Hokianga community has a capacity of 200 students, which it is rapidly growing towards. The economic ecosystem that can and should be developed and supported in the surrounds of such an important facility has inadequate space designated. Most significantly, there is little new land zoned for housing, which means teachers and families have limited ability to locate near the school.</p> <p>Much of the built-on land in Koutu (on Koutu Loop and Koutu Point Roads), as per the council's e-plan, is adversely affected in some way by River Flood Hazards or Coastal Flooding. Therefore, for the future proofing of the settlement, more residential zoning is requested.</p> <p>At the moment, the 16 sections on Koutu Terrace are zoned Rural Lifestyle, meaning the sections which are all around one hectare in size can only take one residence. By zoning the road to Rural Residential, and considering the extended potential through discretionary as well as permitted activities under that zoning, the short Koutu Terrace road could support up to 40 or so households.</p> <p>The suggestion is consistent with the nine significant resource management issues that FNDC aims to address in this new District Plan. In particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Increased capacity for building on Koutu Terrace would acknowledge current and future demand for Kura-related teacher and family accommodation, but would also address the well acknowledged shortage of worker accommodation in the South Hokianga (which is holding back the development of the district in this area);</li> </ul>	

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>·Not foreseeing and providing for demand adequately will see Council having to waste resources retrospectively fixing the capacity issue by processing Proposed Plan Changes later;</p> <p>·Koutu Terrace is actually positioned on a very significant terrace which has all the sections raised well above the River Flood Zone and Coastal Flood threats in the e-plan, meaning homes and structures on this terrace would be future-proofed for climate change (and allow for potential coastal retreat);</p> <p>·The terrace is also a natural feature for a zone demarcation, and offers potential home- owners natural views of the coast and settlement, without the risks of actually being on the coastline;</p> <p>·The soil-type on Koutu Terrace is poor for horticulture, having been sluiced for kauri gum historically (but, as per the resource consent, the properties are suitable for aerobic wastewater management with ample space);</p> <p>·From an iwi perspective, Koutu Terrace has an archaeological clearance already after having been thoroughly investigated during the original resource consenting process;</p> <p>·The scale, character and amenity of the existing coastal 'settlement' at Koutu does not lend itself to quality housing development or intensification, and a new release of land would seem more appropriate.</p> <p>Overall, Koutu Terrace has vast plots of land which have been sold but not really developed, in an area which is obviously intensifying in association with the new Kura Kaupapa. This seems sub-optimal, and maybe even wasteful. The area needs to be future-proofed for development, supporting the Kaupapa of the school and area with appropriate allocation of land in a modest level of intensification. Koutu Terrace is perfectly placed for self-contained houses under the sort of low-density intensification that Rural Residential zoning, or similar would provide</p>	

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
<p><b>Kathryn and Al Panckhurst (S537)</b></p>	<p>S537.001</p>	<p>Planning maps</p>	<p>Rural Lifestyle Zone</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>The zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 (agricultural farmland known as Tubbs farm, Kapiro Road) needs to take full account of the good quality soil on this site, a finite valuable natural resource.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A primary purpose of the RMA (s5) is to protect natural resources and safeguard the life supporting capacity of soil.</li> <li>- A large part of Lot 1001 has good quality soil (volcanic soil and LUC Class 2 land) - it is one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 land in the District.</li> <li>- Good agricultural soil is a strictly finite natural resource. Less than 3% of the land area in the Far North District is top grade (Class 1&amp;2).</li> <li>- Retaining good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being.</li> <li>- Lot 1001 borders the Horticulture zone so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Or alternatively, Rural Production zone would also protect the natural resource at the site.</li> <li>- Government reports have concluded that creating new lifestyle blocks and residential development on good quality land is a national problem - it fragments land and leads to the permanent loss of productive land.</li> <li>- FNDC's submission to MPI on highly productive land in 2019 acknowledged the cumulative loss of good land. FNDC stated that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive".<sup>1</sup></li> </ul> <p>Residential development on Lot 1001 is inappropriate for many reasons -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In legal terms, there is no functional need for residential development on this particular site. There are alternative sites on lower quality land that is more suitable for residential development.</li> <li>- The council has not produced an assessment</li> </ul>	<p>Delete the Rural Lifestyle zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 (agricultural farmland known as Tubbs farm, Kapiro Road), rezone Horticulture or Rural Production</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>addressing all the long-term costs associated with the loss of good soil/land at this site due to adverse effects of fragmenting and losing productive land identified by MPI, MfE and expert reports.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Development will create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers.</li> <li>- Development on this site will generate many other adverse effects - such as urban sprawl in a rural environment; large amount of additional traffic on Landing Road one-lane bridge and Kapiro Road; effects on kiwi &amp; ecological values, water quality, landscape, character and amenity values.</li> </ul> <p>In conclusion: Good soil needs to be zoned for productive agricultural use. The only appropriate zones for the farmland at Lot 1001 DP 532487 are Horticulture zone or Rural Production zone.</p>	
<p><b>John Neison (S558)</b></p>	<p>S558.001</p>	<p>Planning maps</p>	<p>Rural Lifestyle Zone</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>The zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487, Kapiro Road, known as Tubbs farm, needs to take full account of the finite, essential natural resource (good quality soil) present at this site.</p> <p>A primary purpose of the RMA (s5) is to protect natural resources and safeguard the life-supporting capacity of soil.</p> <p>A large part of Lot 1001 has good quality soil (volcanic soil and LUC Class 2 land) - it is one of a few remaining large blocks of Class 2 land in the District.</p> <p>Good agricultural soil is a strictly finite natural resource. Less than 3% of the land area in the Far North District is top grade (Class 1&amp;2).</p> <p>Retaining good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being.</p> <p>Lot 1001 borders the Horticulture zone so it would be logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. Government reports and studies have concluded</p>	<p>Amend the zoning on Lot 1001 DP 532487 (known as Tubbs farm) from rural lifestyle zone to Horticulture zone or Rural Production zone.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on good land should be avoided because it fragments land and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. FNDC's submission to MPI on highly productive land in 2019 recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive".</p> <p>Residential development on Lot 1001 is inappropriate for many reasons -</p> <p>In legal terms, there is no functional need for residential development on this particular site. There are alternative sites, on lower quality land, that are much more suitable for residential development.</p> <p>The council has not produced an assessment addressing all the long-term costs associated with the loss of good soil/land at this site, taking into account RMA s5, factors identified by MfE and expert reports about adverse effects of fragmentation &amp; loss of productive land. Development will create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers.</p> <p>Development will generate many other adverse effects - such as residential sprawl in a rural area that lacks appropriate infrastructure; large amount of traffic and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on kiwi &amp; ecological values, water quality, landscape, character and amenity values. Good soil needs to be zoned for productive agricultural use. The only appropriate zone for Lot 1001 DP 532487 is the Horticulture zone or Rural Production zone.</p>	
<p><b>Jeff Christensen (S564)</b></p>	<p>S564.001</p>	<p>Planning maps</p>	<p>Rural Lifestyle Zone</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>The zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487, Kapiro Road, known as Tubbs farm, needs to take full account of the finite, essential natural resource (good quality soil) present at this site. A primary purpose of the RMA (s5) is to protect</p>	<p>Amend the zoning on Lot 1001 DP 532487 (known as Tubbs farm) from rural lifestyle zone to Horticulture zone or Rural Production zone.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>natural resources and safeguard the life-supporting capacity of soil.</p> <p>A large part of Lot 1001 has good quality soil (volcanic soil and LUC Class 2 land) - it is one of a few remaining large blocks of Class 2 land in the District.</p> <p>Good agricultural soil is a strictly finite natural resource. Less than 3% of the land area in the Far North District is top grade (Class 1&amp;2).</p> <p>Retaining good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being.</p> <p>Lot 1001 borders the Horticulture zone so it would be logical to include it in the Horticulture zone.</p> <p>Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site.</p> <p>Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on good land should be avoided because it fragments land and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability.</p> <p>FNDC's submission to MPI on highly productive land in 2019 recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive".</p> <p>Residential development on Lot 1001 is inappropriate for many reasons -</p> <p>In legal terms, there is no functional need for residential development on this particular site.</p> <p>There are alternative sites, on lower quality land, that are much more suitable for residential development.</p> <p>The council has not produced an assessment addressing all the long-term costs associated with the loss of good soil/land at this site, taking into account RMA s5, factors identified by MfE and expert reports about adverse effects of fragmentation &amp; loss of productive land.</p>	

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>Development will create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers.</p> <p>Development will generate many other adverse effects - such as residential sprawl in a rural area that lacks appropriate infrastructure; large amount of traffic and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on kiwi &amp; ecological values, water quality, landscape, character and amenity values.</p> <p>Good soil needs to be zoned for productive agricultural use. The only appropriate zone for Lot 1001 DP 532487 is the Horticulture zone or Rural Production zone.</p>	
<b>Northland Proprietors Trust (S4)</b>	S4.001	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	<p>Submitter wants the whole section to be zoned General Residential rather than split zoning of General Residential and Rural Production as notified. Existing sewer line runs through the rural production zoned area. Further rationale for the change was submitted in the IAF proposal.</p>	<p>Amend the zoning for 39 Harold Avenue, Kaikohe, from Rural Production to General Residential (so that the whole site is zoned General Residential)</p>
<b>Kylie Stewart (S8)</b>	S8.001	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	<p>Property is currently zoned as Rural Production. This is due to the land previously being one large farm that has been subdivided many years ago. Our land and the land surrounding us can by no means be classed as 'productive' in a rural sense, given the sizes of the land parcels that have been broken up. It would make more sense to have us zoned as Rural Lifestyle. Submitter understands that productivity is not the only consideration when it comes to the zoning decision, however believes that this issue should be looked at. Given the housing shortage in the Far North, submitter considers that Council is ham-stringing people that would otherwise complete works on their land to provide more housing opportunities by keeping them in the wrong zone. Submitter also holds a portion of land in native bush on the property, and would be willing and more than happy to put a clause in to keep this safe, as they have no intention of doing any damage to this. Submitter simply wants more options when it comes to how they can conduct themselves on their own land.</p>	<p>Amend zoning of property at 5770 State Highway 10 Awanui (Lot 2, DP 556502 and Lot 1, DP 415104) from Rural Production to Rural Lifestyle Zone.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>Douglas Percy and Theodora Symes (S19)</b>	S19.002	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	Consider that proposed zoning is intended to create a green zone as opposed to aligning with neighbouring surrounds. This doesn't make sense when the area is screened from the general public by the commercial premises already dotted along the south side of Waipapa Road. This area is the bridge between outer Kerikeri and Waipapa and infill housing makes more sense in this area than further urban sprawl beyond the boundaries of Kerikeri and Waipapa in all directions.	Amend the zoning of all land along the southern side of Waipapa Road, including Waitotara Drive, between State Highway 10 and Kerikeri River, which is not marked for recreation to Rural Residential zone (inferred)
<b>Doug's Opua Boatyard (S21)</b>	S21.001	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Support in part	1/5 Beechy Street, Opua, has a proposed zoning of Rural Production. The property is supported by pilings over the coastal marine area	Amend the zoning of 1/5 Beechy Street, Opua
<b>Trent Simpkin (S22)</b>	S22.001	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	The zoning of existing subdivided land should reflect the state that the land is now in. There is no point zoning a completed residential subdivision 'Rural Production' because it will never be used in a Rural Production manner in the future.	Amend the zoning for the 400-1600m2 lots at 11 - 31 Wharo Way, Ahipara from Rural Production Zone to General Residential Zone. Retain coastal environment overlay (see map attached to original submission)
<b>Trent Simpkin (S22)</b>	S22.002	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	The zoning of existing subdivided land should reflect the state that the land is now in. These should be Rural Residential as they will never be used again for Rural Production, and is a perfect place for Kerikeri to expand with onsite sewer/stormwater disposal without having to install more infrastructure.	Amend the zoning for the 8000m2 - 2 ha lots at Waitorara Drive, Kerikeri from Rural Production Zone to Rural Residential Zone (see map attached to original submission)
<b>Seeka Limited (S34)</b>	S34.002	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	Northland Horticulture Limited, a subsidiary company of Seeka Limited own the property located at 311 Kapiro Road, Kerikeri. The site contains an existing kiwifruit Packhouse and Coolstores an further development of the site for Coolstores is planned in the near future. Submitter notes that site is currently zoned Rural and is also shown as being zoned Rural on the Proposed District Planning Maps (correction note: PDP zoning is Horticulture Processing). Seeka considers that a Horticultural Processing zoning of the site would be more appropriate given the existing developed land use and proposed future expansions.	Amend the zoning of the property at 311 Kapiro Road, Kerikeri (Lot 1 DP 347737) from Rural Production to Horticultural Processing.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Des and Lorraine Morrison (S44)	S44.001	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	<p>1. Amending the zoning of the Land would redefine the urban boundary in a more logical way. Open plan areas (including the camping ground and future marae site) are incorporated into residential and town zoning and shifting the urban boundary to follow the external boundaries of the Land, would follow the ridgeline and better reflect the location of these properties within the Russell Town Basin. 2. The Land is all able to be serviced via the existing Russell township infrastructure. There are existing powerlines to all sites, and both James Street and Pukematu Lane are sealed. James Street is formed and sealed to the boundaries of the Camping Ground and 19 James Street. From there to the entrance of 24 James Steet it is a private metalled lane on the surveyed paper road. A stormwater soak hole/drainage pit is located at the entry to James Street. While the Land is not currently connected to the town wastewater system, it is eligible to be. Drinking water, like most of Russell is provided by way of rainwater tanks. Three of the four blocks comprising the Land, namely 24 James Street, 34 and 36 Pukematu Lane are also subject to an infrastructure designation (KL-230) in favour of Kordia Ltd. This infrastructure and its ongoing locational requirements for operation, access, and maintenance is not a Rural Production Zone activity. 3. None of the four blocks are currently used for a rural production purpose and nor, to the respective owners' knowledge, have they been previously used as such. The relatively small sizes of the blocks (1.21, 2.63, 1.14, and 3.26 ha respectively), the topography, steep contours, existing bush cover, poor soil fertility, proximity to urban residential and open plan zones, and existence of the infrastructure designation make them unsuitable for rural production. 4. Land is not consistent with rural production zone provisions. Key objectives and policies of the Rural Production zone look to preserve suitable land for primary production, which has a functional</p>	Delete the Rural Production zoning of 19 and 24 James Street, and 34 and 36 Pukematu Lane, Russell, zone Kororāreka Russell Township zone.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>need to be in a rural environment, to protect that land from subdivision and fragmentation, and to avoid issues of reverse sensitivity with urban communities. As noted, the Land is already compromised. The small block sizes, contour, lack of soil fertility, proximity to urban zones, and infrastructure requirements mitigate against these properties meeting the requirements of the Rural Production Zone. 5. Land is subject to High Natural Character and Coastal Environment overlays. The Kororāreka Russell Township zone currently includes areas which are subject to both overlays, and the provisions of that zone have specific objectives, policies and rules controlling development in such areas. Accordingly, the presence of the overlays will ensure that any development appropriately recognises and protects the special characteristics of the Land. 6. The Land is consistent with and would assist in the achievement of the Kororareka Russell Township provisions. In particular: (a) there are already long-established residential uses on the Land; (b) while there are no scheduled historic heritage sites on the Land the heritage area overlay appears to follow/slightly cross the western boundary of 19 James Street and the southern boundary of 24 James Street. (c) there is an area of 19 James Street that was previously used during World War 2 as an access track to look-out posts. The track is located beside a degraded wetland and freshwater spring area on the eastern boundary of the property adjacent to the Open Plan zone of the proposed Marae (MS 10-49). The area is currently overgrown and subject to weed infestation. Enabling a greater level of development on the property would provide greater resources to be brought to bear to restore and protect these areas. It would also provide the potential for access to be opened to these areas, which could support the future marae development on the adjoining block (such as through providing access for mahinga kai</p>	

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>purposes) as well as potentially public access if the land were later vested as reserve. The existing and proposed rural production zoning would make these outcomes unfeasible. (d) the presence of the overlays and the provisions of the zone will ensure that the Land is developed in a manner that maintains the special characteristics and amenity of the area. Subdivision is limited by the overlays and would be strategically executed to position residential and non-residential buildings, accessways, outside of the High natural character boundaries. (e) all four properties have areas of native bush on-site. Providing for a greater level of development on these properties would enable the cost and resource involved in maintaining and enhancing the significant bush areas to be spread among a greater number of owners. (f) the contours and existing natural bush on site provide opportunities for functional high amenity development which complements the character and amenity of the zone. (g) consolidating land use and subdivision around the existing township would avoid/mitigate future sprawl and sporadic patterns of development. (h) location of these properties in the Russell township basin puts them near required infrastructure - existing sealed roads, wastewater, stormwater systems and electricity, broadcasting, telecommunications as noted above. (i) development of these properties would function as a transition between urban and rural production land use activities. 7. The land will provide additional growth capacity. The Northland region has been growing at a rate higher (and in some years significantly higher) than the national average growth rate since 2014.1 In 2018 and 2019 it had the highest growth rate in the country. It is important that the FNDP is future looking and makes sufficient land available to meet the needs of its growing population over the 10-year period of the plan. It is also important that this land is proximate to existing urban zoned land in towns to avoid urban sprawl. Rezoning the</p>	

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>Land Kororāreka Township zone will provide additional capacity for Russell township, while ensuring that development remains proximate to the township, and urban sprawl is avoided. 8. More consistent with higher order RMA policies and plans. Like the proposed district plan, the Regional Policy Statement for Northland and the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement both seek to consolidate urban development within or adjacent to existing coastal settlement and avoid sprawling or sporadic patterns of development. Rezoning the Land Kororāreka Russell Township zone is consistent with these policies for the reasons noted above. The National Environmental Standards for Freshwater are designed in part to protect existing inland wetlands. However, that protection is only triggered where a use is proposed on site to which the standards apply. As noted above, enabling a further level of development would provide a means to restore and protect the wetland area in a manner consistent with the standards. 9. More consistent with the RMA. The current and proposed rural production zoning of the Land does not achieve the sustainable management of resources. As already noted, the current shape, size, contours and other characteristics of the Land make it unusable for a rural production purpose, and do not allow the owners to provide for their economic or social wellbeing. Nor does it ensure the protection and enhancement of those special characteristics of the Land, such as the wetland on 19 James Street, or the areas of high quality existing native bush. Kororāreka Russell Township zoning would be more consistent with the purpose and principles of the RMA as it would enable these matters to be provided for and it also offers opportunities to enhance cultural wellbeing (such as through the remediation of the wetland, restoration of the WWII track, and provision of public/marae access to the area).</p>	

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
<p><b>Puketona Business Park Limited (S45)</b></p>	<p>S45.001</p>	<p>Planning maps</p>	<p>Rural Production Zone</p>	<p>Not Stated</p>	<p>759 State Highway 10, Oromahoe, is currently zoned Rural Production in the Operative District Plan however has been in non-productive use since at least the 1970s, when it is understood the existing motel/visitor accommodation on the site was lawfully established. PBPL is shortly to pursue a consent application to authorise new, non-productive uses on the site which will represent efficient use of land in this location - acknowledging that the Rural Production zone is not fit for purpose nor appropriate given the historic and proposed use of the site.</p> <p>The LRIS Portal identifies the site as having the Land Use Capability classification of 3w6, which recognises that the site's "dominant physical limitation" is wetness. Surrounding land is variously classified as 6e9, 4e7 and further north-west, 3e11. This flood hazard, combined with its small site size and long-term non-productive use, confirm that the site is very unlikely to ever be utilised for productive purposes or in a manner that accords with the Rural Production zone of the PDP. Retention of the proposed Rural Production zoning of the site results in PBPL's stated intent to continue using the site for non-productive uses (albeit in a different use) being contrary to the planning framework the PDP is seeking to establish.</p> <p>PBPL considers that the surrounding environment, taking into account existing long-established non-productive uses and even including residential activity, can accommodate light industrial activities that could locate on the site as of right, were the zoning to change. Therefore, whilst this may represent a spot-zoning (if the Council does not see fit to re-zone further land around the highway intersection), it does not require any corresponding bespoke provisions to manage potential adverse effects from use of the site as light industrial.</p>	<p>Delete the Rural Production zoning of 759 State Highway 10, Oromahoe, (being Lot 1 DP 170731), zone the property Light Industrial.</p> <p>Rezone other sites that have long established commercial activities centred around the intersection of State highways 10/11 to Light Industrial.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>Jeff and Robby Kemp (S51)</b>	S51.002	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	Contextually there is a discord in zoning the properties RPZ when assessed against other site in the vicinity. By example all sites north of Waipapa Road area zoned Rural Residential. There is no differential between those properties along Waipapa Road and those along Waitotara Drive. The approach of the PDP should be to reflect what exists or should be created on the ground to that described within the applicable zone. Zoning the properties as RPZ creates an aberration and is in conflict with the intent and purpose of the Rural Production Zone. The land is not highly productive and the flood mitigation measures have abated this hazard which can in nay event be mitigated through design and layout of activities on the sites.	Amend the land in Waitotara Drive zoned Rural Production to Rural Residential Zone, identified in Figure 1 of the submission.
<b>Rebecca Stilton (S52)</b>	S52.001	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	Lots 9 and 19 DP 381292 (Title 325706) are currently zoned General Coastal under the ODP. The General Coastal zoning was incorrect and does not align with all other lots within Ahipara. The PDP changes the zoning to Rural Production which is not appropriate given the underlying subdivision includes residentially zoned lots and all residential zoning requirements have been met.	Delete the Rural Production zoning of two sections on Wharo Way, Ahipara (being Lots 9 and 19 DP 381292), zone General Residential.
<b>Jacqueline and Timothy Partington (S54)</b>	S54.001	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	Opposed to the re-zoning of 31 Wharo Way, Ahipara (Lot 15 DP 381292) from Coastal Living in the operative district plan to Rural Production with a Coastal Environment overlay in the proposed district plan.	Amend the zoning of 31 Wharo Way (Lot 15 DP 381292), Ahipara, to General Residential zone.
<b>RHL &amp; LM Ferguson Family Trust (S57)</b>	S57.001	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	The submitter opposes the zoning of 95 Marchant Road, Hihi as Rural Production zone. The submitter does not consider the property to be viable as primary production and considers that it meets all of the criteria for the Rural Lifestyle zone.	Amend the zoning of 95 Marchant Road, Hihi from Rural Production to Rural Lifestyle.
<b>Imerys Performance Minerals Asia Pacific (S65)</b>	S65.001	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	The zoning / overlay approach proposed causes results in confused and frustrated provisions which cause unnecessary consent requirements. The proposed overlay approach does not give sufficient recognition and enablement of existing and lawfully established activities The existing approach (with proposed amendments) is more	rezone Maturi bay road - ROT NA18D/1020 (Lot 1 DP 62019 ); - ROT NA31B/294 ( Pt Lot 1 DP 54194); - ROT NA93D/602( Pt Lot 1 DP 50232 ) [ In part ] ;

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					consistent with higher order Resource Management Act 1991 ('RMA') policies and plans Promoting new quarrying activities. The existing approach (with proposed amendments) is more consistent with the purpose and principles of the RMA	- ROT NA15D/1478 (Pt Lot 5 DP 50235 ) [ In part ]; - ROT 501460 ( Mahimahi E 5 ) from Rural Production and Maori Purpose - Rural zones to retain existing (operative) Minerals zone
<b>Imerys Performance Minerals Asia Pacific (S65)</b>	S65.002	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	The reasons why it is believed that the existing framework associated with the Mineral Zone under the Operative District Plan (with amendments) is more appropriate for the landholdings then what is proposed are: The zoning / overlay approach proposed causes results in confused and frustrated provisions which cause unnecessary consent requirements The proposed overlay approach does not give sufficient recognition and enablement of existing and lawfully established activities. Promoting new quarrying activities The existing approach (with proposed amendments) is more consistent with higher order Resource Management Act 1991 ('RMA') policies and plans The existing approach (with proposed amendments) is more consistent with the purpose and principles of the RMA	rezone Mangakaretu Road - ROT NA93B/909 ( Section 5 SO 64268 ) [ In part ] - ROT NA28A/1047 ( Section 36 SO 48086 ) from Rural Production to existing (operative ) mineral zone
<b>Michael John Winch (S67)</b>	S67.019	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Support	I oppose the Rural Production zoning of my land and surrounding properties at Henderson Bay. My land and the surrounding properties comprise 4 to 6 ha blocks of land largely covered with a mix of native and exotic trees. Most of the properties have residential units. The land is not suitable for farming or productive forestry and should not be zoned Rural Production. The land and current land use is more appropriately zoned Rural Lifestyle.	Rezone from Rural Production to Rural Lifestyle the area of land on Otaipango Road and the end of Henderson Bay Road (Lots 1 to 31 DP 72042, Lots 1 & 2 DP 336030 and Lots 1 & 2 DP 410588) shown below.
<b>Brian and Katherine Susan Hutching (S70)</b>	S70.001	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	The submitter opposes the Rural Production zoning of the area bounded by Waipapa Road to the north, State Highway 10 to the west, and the Kerikeri River to the east, but excluding the new Light Industrial zone in the northwestern corner and the new Sport and Recreation zone next to State Highway 10. The Rural Production zoning does not reflect the current land use which is predominately residential. Almost all properties	Amend the zoning of the area bounded by Waipapa Road to the north, State Highway 10 to the west, and Kerikeri River to the east (but excluding the new Light Industrial zone in the northwestern corner and the new Sport and Recreation zone next to State Highway 10) from Rural Production zone to Rural

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					are 0-2 hectares in size with only 3 larger lots of approximately 5 hectares each, one of which is to become the Harvest Christian School. No properties are economically viable as rural production units. Three businesses operate in the area: a door & window factory, a roofing business and a childcare centre. There is also a Jehovah's Witness church. None are related to rural production. Retaining the Rural Production zoning in proximity to the new Rural Residential and Sport & Recreation zones on the boundaries of the area risks reverse sensitivity issues.	Residential.
<b>Chris and Nicola Robertson (S78)</b>	S78.001	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	Land at Redcliffs Road, Te Kowhai Point Road and Rangitane Road is not Rural Production in the sense of soil quality or land contour and is mostly not suitable for intensive farming. A very high percentage of the land on this peninsula is used for lifestyle living and is only suitable for lifestyle living. This will protect our coastlines and future proof this community for future growth.	Amend zoning of all land at Redcliffs Road, Te Kowhai Point Road and Rangitane Road from Rural Production Zone to Rural Lifestyle Zone.
<b>John and Rachel Stewart (S81)</b>	S81.001	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	Property has been kept as Rural Production and is not a production unit/site and should not be zoned as such. Some sites on the other side of Okahu Road that have been changed to Rural Residential are in fact larger than our site, so it does not make sense. Several sites surrounding ours are much smaller than ours and are still zoned as Rural Production when clearly they are not. Some of these smaller sites need to be changed to Rural Residential also. It seems crazy this particular site is not given rural residential due to the lack of housing available in this area. Infrastructure in this area is also self-sufficient with own sewerage and water tank systems.	amend zoning of 481A Kaitaia-Awaroa road from Rural Production to Rural Residential
<b>James Guy Ellingham and Deborah Ellingham (S84)</b>	S84.001	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	The following land is currently zoned Rural Production with the proposed plan continuing that zoning - the area bounded by Waipapa Road to the north, State Highway 10 to the west, and the Kerikeri River to the east (but excluding the new Light Industrial zone in the northwest corner and the new Sport and Recreation zone next to State Highway 10). The zoning should be changed to	Amend the zoning of the area bounded by Waipapa Road to the north, State Highway 10 to the west, and the Kerikeri River to the east (but excluding the new Light Industrial zone in the northwest corner and the new Sport and Recreation zone next to State

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>Rural Residential for the following reasons: -The Rural Production zoning does not reflect the current land use which is predominately residential. -Almost all properties are 0-2 hectares in size with only three larger lots of approximately 5 hectares each, one of which is to become the Kerikeri Christian School. No properties are economically viable as rural production units. Three businesses operate in the area: a door and window factory, a roofing business and a childcare centre. There is also a Jehovah's Witness church. None are related to rural production. -Zoning this area as Rural Production continues the discord between the purpose, objectives and policies of that zoning and the current land use. Conflict has occurred where businesses complying with the current zoning have established themselves and created adverse effects for the neighbouring residential properties, most of whom predate the businesses. - Retaining the Rural Production zoning in proximity to the new Rural Residential and Sport and Recreation zones on the boundary of the area risks reverse sensitivity issues. Zoning the area Rural Residential will mitigate this risk. -It has been suggested that the reason for maintaining the Rural Production zoning for this area on the southern side of Waipapa Road, while designating the northern side as Rural Residential, is to do with the susceptibility of parts of the area to 100-year flooding. This is inappropriate when the new plan contains a full set of provisions designed to mitigate the risks from natural hazards. These should be used to limit development where appropriate, rather than applying a zoning restriction that unfairly affects all properties. -The area is ideally located for residential housing to serve both Waipapa and Kerikeri. It includes the proposed Kerikeri Christian School at 351 Waipapa Road and is across the road from the future third Kerikeri Primary School at 334 Waipapa Road.</p>	<p>Highway 10), from Rural Production to Rural Residential</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>Riki and Sharon Waiariki (S85)</b>	S85.001	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	Approved residential subdivision creating 9 Wharo Way, Ahipara (being Lot 4 DP 381292, title 325701) is presently split between Residential and General Coastal. General Coastal zoning was incorrect and not aligned to all the other lots within Ahipara. All Residential zoning requirements have been met. Proposed District Plan erroneously changes the current zoning to Rural Production. Rural Production is not appropriate for the development lots on Wharo Way	Delete the Rural Production zoning of 9 Wharo Way, Ahipara (being Lot 4 DP 381292, title 325701), zone Residential.
<b>Riki and Sharon Waiariki (S85)</b>	S85.002	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	Approved residential subdivision creating 9 Wharo Way, Ahipara (being Lot 4 DP 381292, title 325701) is presently split between Residential and General Coastal. General Coastal zoning was incorrect and not aligned to all the other lots within Ahipara. All Residential zoning requirements have been met. Proposed District Plan erroneously changes the current zoning to Rural Production. Rural Production is not appropriate for the development lots on Wharo Way	Delete the Rural Production zoning of properties on Wharo Way within DP 381292, zone Residential.
<b>Ernie Cottle (S92)</b>	S92.002	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	Contextually there is a discord in zoning the properties RPZ when assessed against other site in the vicinity. By example all sites north of Waipapa Road area zoned Rural Residential. There is no differential between those properties along Waipapa Road and those along Waitotara Drive. The approach of the PDP should be to reflect what exists or should be created on the ground to that described within the applicable zone. Zoning the properties as RPZ creates an aberration and is in conflict with the intent and purpose of the Rural Production Zone. The land is not highly productive and the flood mitigation measures have abated this hazard which can in nay event be mitigated through design and layout of activities on the sites	Amend the land in Waitotara Drive zoned Rural Production to Rural Residential Zone, identified in Figure 1 of the submission.
<b>Mark and Emma Klinac (S140)</b>	S140.001	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	The submitter opposes the zoning of Lot 2 DP 321759 & Lot 3 DP 321759 (1/2 share); and Lot 1 DP 321759 & Lot 3 DP 321759 (1/2 share) as Rural Production Zone as the proposed zoning will effectively create a Rural Production 'island' adjoined by potential Heavy Industrial Zoned	Amend the zoning of Lot 2 DP 321759 & Lot 3 DP 321759 (1/2 share); and Lot 1 DP 321759 & Lot 3 DP 321759 (1/2 share) to Heavy Industrial Zone.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					properties on the landholdings and subsequent heavy industrial activities.	
<b>Mary Stanners (S141)</b>	S141.001	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Support	The submitter considers that the proposed zone of Rural Production for the Henderson Bay area is the most appropriate for this area and will provide the most protection to the integrity of the coastal environment.	Retain the Rural Production Zone for the Henderson Bay area.
<b>NFS Farms Limited (S151)</b>	S151.001	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Support	The proposed zoning is supported in principle, but only on the basis that the zone rules and other relevant provisions strike a reasonable balance between the rural production, conservation and rural living requirements.	Retain the Rural Production zoning of land at 123 Rangitane Road, Kerikeri 0294 (Lot 3 DP 184505) and 127 Rangitane Road, Kerikeri 0294 (Lots 1 and 3 DP 502469)
<b>Green Inc Ltd (S164)</b>	S164.001	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	The existing plan despite 1B-05 creates a strong disincentive to restoring indigenous ecosystems as current planning will likely result in those areas becoming SNAs with associated restrictive controls. In contrast, where the land is managed to retain and improve pasture, controls on use are minimal. The vision for Tupou is to retain pasture and food and wool production on the flatter better quality soils and return the steep erodible hill country to native ecosystems. These will then be managed as functioning native ecosystems that can generate carbon and biodiversity credits. They will also be used for ecotourism including high end accommodation. Pest animal and weed control is an Integral part of the plan. The native ecosystems planned include forest, wetlands, a lake and ponds, coastal ecosystems including dunes and cliff faces. Some areas would be left open to retain views and fire breaks. Currently the property has 5 putative SNAs although all are severely compromised with pests (pigs, possums, rats, stoats, rabbits) and weeds (especially pampas). The development we plan will turn up to 700+ hectares into high quality and functioning native ecosystems that could all potentially have the values associated with an SNA. My submission is that such endeavors and developments need to be "promoted and enabled" (1B-05) in a way that allows ongoing development. Small areas of clearance, erection of buildings and	amend zoning of Tupou from Rural Production to a new special zone such as managed ecological zone or a special purpose zone for Tupou. Tupou NA11D/1151 NA42C/379 NA55B/383 NA71D/247 NA102A/98 NA102A/99 NA102A/100 NA115C/434 NA136/174 NA136/235 NA140/216 NA262/283 NA315/329 NA340/269 NA357/153 NA245/209

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>formation of roads and tracks should be permitted activities as long as the basic justification of "net biodiversity gains" is included. Including people in nature is a clear way to assist nature. The owners have already demonstrated this model under more conventional rules at Tahī (www.tahinz.com). Restrictions on many actions were unreasonable compared with that applied to neighbours who had retained poor quality pasture without weed or pest control. The proposed District Plan has special zones for other major developments such as Corrington and Kauri Cliffs that make provision for specific development needs. Hastings District Council have included a special zone for nature conservation activities (poorly named as Nature Preservation Zone). A more general zone can act as an option toward 1B-05 that can encourage others to act similarly although it is unlikely that other properties will have the breadth of ecosystems found at Tupou or the desire to include ecotourism and accommodation. Also many will not be able to fund the intensive levels of pest control planned for Tupou. A key issue is that the zoning removes the need to classify the area as an SNA with the associated restrictive controls. Clearance to a certain level is a permitted activity for buildings, roads and tracks. Enhancing accommodation offerings is a permitted activity Pest control is a required activity Archaeological and taonga sites for local hapu are not modified. All actions fit under on umbrella of "net biodiversity gain" Other conditions, permissions and requirements will need to be developed but these are best worked through with Council Planners.</p>	
<p><b>Grace Anne Sturgess (S166)</b></p>	<p>S166.001</p>	<p>Planning maps</p>	<p>Rural Production Zone</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>The FNDC subdivision of this 2 ha allotment on the 10 November 2004 was on the basis that it was to be zoned Rural Residential. The FNDC PDP now proposes that this property is zoned Rural Production. My submission is that this use of this land which is adjacent to a residential area</p>	<p>Amend the zoning for 2B Motutara Drive from Rural Production to Rural Residential</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					is not compatible with the purpose, character and amenity of a Rural Production zone.	
<b>Bentzen Farm Limited (S167)</b>	S167.109	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	<p>The description of the Rural Lifestyle zone apply to the properties at Ōmarino where subdivision consent was granted in 2006 (by way of an Environment Court Consent Order). The property was subsequently subdivided to lots no smaller than 4ha. The specific objectives of the Rural Lifestyle Zone are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA in respect of Ōmarino. There is no risk of incompatible activities within the property, or externally (noting in particular that rural production activities are distant from the property). Objective RLZ-O4 Land use and subdivision in the Rural Lifestyle Zone does not compromise the effective and efficient operation of primary production activities in the adjacent Rural Production Zones. The Rural Production Zone (as currently drafted in the Proposed Plan) fails to recognise existing and potentially future rural residential opportunities, where this does not compromise rural production activities. In the alternative, a new Special Purpose Zone: Ōmarino could an equally appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991, provided it appropriately recognises the particular circumstances of Ōmarino, including providing for residential dwellings and associated buildings in accordance with the conditions of the resource consent, the Management Plans, consent notices and Design Guidelines which apply to the property.</p>	<p>Delete the Rural Production zoning of the following properties at Ōmarino, Manawaora Road (as mapped in the submission), and zone either Rural Lifestyle or create new Special Purpose Zone Ōmarino :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lot 1 Deposited Plan 391213</li> <li>Lot 2 Deposited Plan 391213</li> <li>Lot 3 Deposited Plan 391213</li> <li>Lot 4 Deposited Plan 391213</li> <li>Lot 5 Deposited Plan 391213</li> <li>Lot 6, 21 Deposited Plan 391213</li> <li>Lot 7 Deposited Plan 391213</li> <li>Lot 8, 20 Deposited Plan 391213</li> <li>Lot 9 Deposited Plan 391213</li> <li>Lot 10 Deposited Plan 391213</li> <li>Lot 11 Deposited Plan 391213</li> <li>Lot 12 Deposited Plan 391213</li> <li>Lot 14 Deposited Plan 391213</li> <li>Lot 15 Deposited Plan 391213</li> <li>Lot 17, 19 Deposited Plan 391213</li> <li>Lot 18 Deposited Plan 391213</li> <li>Lot 16 Deposited Plan 512589</li> <li>Lot 25 Deposited Plan 512589</li> </ul> <p>If a new Special Purpose Zone: Ōmarino is created - amend Part 3 - Area Specific Matters to include appropriate objectives, policies and rules to enable residential activity and associated buildings as a controlled activity where they are in accordance with resource consents granted for Ōmarino and consent notices applying on the titles and located on a consented house site, and to enable conservation, recreation and common facilities.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)</b>	S168.149	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	<p>The Proposed Plan describes the Rural Lifestyle zone as being characterised by open space and vegetated landscapes, interspersed by farm buildings, structures and residential units. It states that areas suitable for rural lifestyle living have been identified because they are already fragmented with residential land uses, are on low value soils or where consent has already been granted to undertake more dense living than anticipated in the Rural Production zone. These circumstances equally apply to the Setar Thirty Six and adjoining private titles. The specific objectives of the Rural Lifestyle zone are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA in respect of this property and are more appropriate because (with reference to these objectives and policies): Objective RLZ-O1 The Rural Lifestyle Zone is used predominantly for low density residential activities and small scale farming activities that are compatible with the rural character and amenity of the zone. The density is already established through the existing lot size. Development sits well with the existing coastal character of the local environment. Objective RLZ-O2 The predominant character and amenity of the Rural Lifestyle zone is characterised by: a. low density residential activities; b. small scale farming activities with limited buildings and structures; c. smaller lot sizes than anticipated in the Rural Production zone; d. a general absence of urban infrastructure; e. rural roads with low traffic volumes; f. areas of vegetation, natural features and open space. The property aligns with each of these features. Objective RLZ-O3 The role, function and predominant character and amenity of the Rural Lifestyle zone is not compromised by incompatible activities. There is no risk of incompatible activities within the property, or externally being an island with no productive land uses. Objective RLZ-O4 Land</p>	Delete the Rural Production zoning of Lot 1 DP 36233 (being land owned by Setar Thirty Six at Moturua Island) and zone the land Rural Lifestyle

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>use and subdivision in the Rural Lifestyle Zone does not compromise the effective and efficient operation of primary production activities in the adjacent Rural Production zones. As noted above, there are no rural production activities. In contrast, for the reasons set out in this submission, the Rural Production zone (as currently drafted in the Proposed Plan) fails to recognise existing and potentially future rural residential opportunities, where they will clearly not compromise rural production activities in this location.</p>	
<p><b>Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)</b></p>	<p>S168.150</p>	<p>Planning maps</p>	<p>Rural Production Zone</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>The Proposed Plan describes the Rural Lifestyle zone as being characterised by open space and vegetated landscapes, interspersed by farm buildings, structures and residential units. It states that areas suitable for rural lifestyle living have been identified because they are already fragmented with residential land uses, are on low value soils or where consent has already been granted to undertake more dense living than anticipated in the Rural Production zone. These circumstances equally apply to the Setar Thirty Six and adjoining private titles. The specific objectives of the Rural Lifestyle zone are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA in respect of this property and are more appropriate because (with reference to these objectives and policies): Objective RLZ-O1 The Rural Lifestyle Zone is used predominantly for low density residential activities and small scale farming activities that are compatible with the rural character and amenity of the zone. The density is already established through the existing lot size. Development sits well with the existing coastal character of the local environment. Objective RLZ-O2 The predominant character and amenity of the Rural Lifestyle zone is characterised by: a. low density residential activities; b. small scale farming activities with limited buildings and structures; c. smaller lot sizes than anticipated in the Rural Production zone; d. a general absence</p>	<p>Delete the Rural Production zoning of Lot 1 DP 57873 (being land owned by Setar Thirty Six at Moturua Island) and zone the land Rural Lifestyle</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>of urban infrastructure; e. rural roads with low traffic volumes; f. areas of vegetation, natural features and open space. The property aligns with each of these features. Objective RLZ-O3 The role, function and predominant character and amenity of the Rural Lifestyle zone is not compromised by incompatible activities. There is no risk of incompatible activities within the property, or externally being an island with no productive land uses. Objective RLZ-O4 Land use and subdivision in the Rural Lifestyle Zone does not compromise the effective and efficient operation of primary production activities in the adjacent Rural Production zones. As noted above, there are no rural production activities. In contrast, for the reasons set out in this submission, the Rural Production zone (as currently drafted in the Proposed Plan) fails to recognise existing and potentially future rural residential opportunities, where they will clearly not compromise rural production activities in this location.</p>	
<p><b>Setar Thirty Six Limited (S168)</b></p>	<p>S168.151</p>	<p>Planning maps</p>	<p>Rural Production Zone</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>The Proposed Plan describes the Rural Lifestyle zone as being characterised by open space and vegetated landscapes, interspersed by farm buildings, structures and residential units. It states that areas suitable for rural lifestyle living have been identified because they are already fragmented with residential land uses, are on low value soils or where consent has already been granted to undertake more dense living than anticipated in the Rural Production zone. These circumstances equally apply to the Setar Thirty Six and adjoining private titles. The specific objectives of the Rural Lifestyle zone are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA in respect of this property and are more appropriate because (with reference to these objectives and policies): Objective RLZ-O1 The Rural Lifestyle Zone is used predominantly for low density residential activities and small scale farming activities that are compatible with the rural</p>	<p>Delete the Rural Production zoning of Lot 2 DP 57873 (being land owned by Setar Thirty Six at Moturua Island) and zone the land Rural Lifestyle</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>character and amenity of the zone. The density is already established through the existing lot size. Development sits well with the existing coastal character of the local environment. Objective RLZ-O2 The predominant character and amenity of the Rural Lifestyle zone is characterised by: a. low density residential activities; b. small scale farming activities with limited buildings and structures; c. smaller lot sizes than anticipated in the Rural Production zone; d. a general absence of urban infrastructure; e. rural roads with low traffic volumes; f. areas of vegetation, natural features and open space. The property aligns with each of these features. Objective RLZ-O3 The role, function and predominant character and amenity of the Rural Lifestyle zone is not compromised by incompatible activities. There is no risk of incompatible activities within the property, or externally being an island with no productive land uses. Objective RLZ-O4 Land use and subdivision in the Rural Lifestyle Zone does not compromise the effective and efficient operation of primary production activities in the adjacent Rural Production zones. As noted above, there are no rural production activities. In contrast, for the reasons set out in this submission, the Rural Production zone (as currently drafted in the Proposed Plan) fails to recognise existing and potentially future rural residential opportunities, where they will clearly not compromise rural production activities in this location.</p>	
<p><b>Doug's Opua Boatyard (S185)</b></p>	<p>S185.001</p>	<p>Planning maps</p>	<p>Rural Production Zone</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>Opposed to any change to the Trust land of the Waitangi National Trust Board from its primary purpose of providing public access to and along the CMA in conjunction with its historical purpose.</p>	<p>Amend the zoning of the Trust land of the Waitangi National Trust Board, Waitangi - as a minimum, land that was designated Conservation in the ODP should be maintained and/or reinstated as "Natural Open Space" and/or even be extended to the treaty coastal grounds boundary along the golf course to the north and/or even</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						further along the coastal margin of the golf course to wherever that land adjoins private land.
<b>Borders Real Estate Northland (S212)</b>	S212.001	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	The submitter opposes the Rural Production zone as it applies to the south side of Waipapa Road, between the Kerikeri River and the mixed-use zone and requests that it be Rural-Residential to be consistent with the north side of Waipapa Road.	Delete Rural Production zone as it applies to the south side of Waipapa Road, between the Kerikeri River and the mixed use zone and apply the Rural-Residential zone to the area.
<b>Timothy and Dion Spicer (S213)</b>	S213.001	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Support	Dion and Timothy Spicer support the proposed zoning of Lot 2 DP 203376, where the RPZ zoning of the southern portion of the site will be retained. Overall, it is considered that the proposed zoning represents a largely positive change for the site as it promotes the continuation of production activities on the 210ha block.	Retain the RPZ zoning of the site - Lot 2 DP 203376
<b>River Edge Properties Limited (S219)</b>	S219.001	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Support	A review of the proposed plan zoning in relation to 514 Puketona Road, Haruru, (being legally described as Lot 1 DP 531141) has been completed. The proposed zoning is Rural Production with a small portion of land zoned also zoned General Residential. It is contended that the zoning is better suited as a lifestyle zone with a rural bias and on this basis, this submission, requests the change. The proposed zoning which is sought is Rural Residential and would apply to the entire site. The reasons as to why this zoning is appropriate are as follows: - The proposed zoning for the site includes General Residential and Rural Production and is sought to be changed to Rural Residential as this will provide a transition from developed General Residential located within the Watea residential development to larger and productive Rural Production zoned land to the west of the site. - Part of the site is proposed to be zoned General Residential and there is a preference for adjoining land to be Rural Residential rather than transitioning straight to Rural Production where reverse sensitivity issues could ensue. - The land is not productive and	Delete the Rural Production and General Residential mixed zoning of 514 Puketona Road, Haruru, (being legally described as Lot 1 DP 531141), and apply a Rural Residential zoning to the whole property.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>does not contain highly versatile soils. It can only be used for low level pastoral grazing with this parcel of land subdivided and sold off from the main pastoral farming lot (located on the southern side of Puketona Road) for this reason. It is noted that the productive pastoral farming lot on the southern side is proposed to be zoned Rural Residential. - The land located to the west of the site are a number of lifestyle properties which end at Lily Pond Lane. There are a number of 2,000m<sup>2</sup> lots with some also slightly larger. This area is similar in character which in reviewing the intent of the Rural Residential Zone reflects these attributes. The re-zoning would increase the potential of the site to provide for social and economic well-being. - The future development of Watea/Haruru is to progress west providing that core infrastructure can be provided. A Rural Residential zoning offers this future intensification and provides an interim transition. - The former landing strip located on the site has modified the lot's contours - The zoning would enable the lot to have domestic levels farming activities and onsite servicing. - Rezoning the land to Rural Residential would not conflict with the relevant objectives and policies of the zone.</p>	
<p><b>Shirley Dryden (S221)</b></p>	<p>S221.001</p>	<p>Planning maps</p>	<p>Rural Production Zone</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>Lot 12 DP 431913 (Rangitane Road) should be zoned Rural Lifestyle as it is too small to be farmed (being 8.8 hectares). The neighbours on three sides are either zoned Rural Lifestyle or are 1 hectare in area. The land has stunning views but is boggy and impossible to farm economically. Council needs to save larger blocks with better soil types.</p>	<p>Delete the Rural Production zoning of Lot 12 DP 431913 (Rangitane Road), zone Rural Lifestyle</p>
<p><b>Wendover Two Limited (S222)</b></p>	<p>S222.082</p>	<p>Planning maps</p>	<p>Rural Production Zone</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>The zone is inappropriately named "Rural Production". Large parts of the district that is zoned this is not suitable for rural production and certainly is not retained for rural production purposes. The zone should be renamed to "General Rural" which more accurately reflects the wider range of activities that occur in the rural environments of the Far North. These activities</p>	<p>Amend the "Rural Production" zone in every instance in the Proposed District Plan to "General Rural" zone.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>are provided for in the zone as drafted (at least by the rules), but not recognised in the zone name. This is not to diminish the importance of rural production activities and these should be enabled and protected by the objectives and policies of the zone. The zone name however should recognise the broader range of land uses which occur in rural parts of the district; including bush blocks, smaller titles, residential activity and land holding which are unsuitable for rural production uses. It is important to strengthen the District's economy by providing for a range of land use activities in the rural area; however, accepting the priority is to sustain the productive capacity of the soil and the rural character and amenity values that are key elements. The National Planning Standards "Zone Framework Standard" refers to the "General rural zone" which is a better fit. There is more to it than the name, with the stated primary objective of the zone being that it "is used for primary production activities, ancillary activities that support primary production and other compatible activities that have a functional need to be in a rural environment". That puts undue emphasis on farming activities and does not recognise the broad applicability of the zone in many unproductive areas. This point is taken up further in this submission.</p>	
<p><b>Wendover Two Limited (S222)</b></p>	<p>S222.095</p>	<p>Planning maps</p>	<p>Rural Production Zone</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>The Proposed Plan fails to recognise or provide for residential development in accordance with the resource consents issued for Mataka Station. A bespoke Special Purpose zone for Mataka Station Precinct is appropriate because it will appropriately recognise and provide for the circumstances of the property, which distinguishes it from other rural properties in the district as described in this submission.</p>	<p>Insert a new Special Purpose Zone "Mataka Station Precinct" under Part 3 - Area Specific Matters of the Proposed Plan to apply to the whole of Mataka Station, which is Lot 1-32 DP 323083 and Lot 43 DP 363154 created by Resource Consent 2041080 at Rangihoua Road, (inferred) Include appropriate objectives, policies and rules to enable residential activity and buildings as a permitted activity where they are in accordance with resource</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>consents granted for Mataka Station and located on a consented house site and to enable farming, conservation, recreation and common facilities. The Precinct should include:</p> <p>a) Provision for other activities appropriate for this locality including farming and other rural production activities;</p> <p>b) Appropriate permitted activity standards for dwellings and other structures, consistent with the resource consents granted to date; and</p> <p>c) Overview, objectives and policies for the new Special Purpose zone that address the matters raised in this submission.</p>
<p><b>Ian Diarmid Palmer and Zejia Hu (S244)</b></p>	<p>S244.001</p>	<p>Planning maps</p>	<p>Rural Production Zone</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>The location and characteristics of the land on the Rangitoto Peninsula are such that its proposed zoning as 'Rural Production' is inappropriate and accordingly is contrary to the requirements of Part 2 of the RMA. The Rangitoto Peninsula is an area of some 59 hectares, of which approximately 51 hectares is privately owned. The peninsula is currently relatively highly fragmented, consisting of 26 separate Primary Parcels, of which 21 are privately owned. These privately owned parcels are held in 13 different titles, which are represented in 12 separate Sites (as that term is defined in the PDP). Three of the 12 Sites are owned by us (the submitters). The Rural Environment Section 32 Report associated with the PDP quotes the National Planning Standards in defining 'Rural Production zone' as - Areas used predominantly for primary production activities that rely on the productive nature of the land and intensive indoor primary production .... The corresponding definitions of General Rural (not used in the FNDC's PDP) and Rural Lifestyle</p>	<p>Delete the Rural Production zoning of the privately owned land on the Rangitoto Peninsula (i.e. land on the eastern side of the Mangonui Harbour to the west of the Hihi urban area and including Butler Point) and zone the land Rural Lifestyle.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>zones exclude the above emphasised text. This clearly implies that to be zoned Rural Production the potential primary production activities on such land must be commercially viable having regard to various aspects, but particularly soil quality and Site size. For the reasons detailed in the submission, the peninsula land does not meet the definition for Rural Production and therefore should not be so zoned. In Conclusion: It is demonstrable that the peninsula land does not meet the definition of Rural Production zoning as stated in the relevant National Planning Standard, but it does comfortably meet the definition specified in that same standard for Rural Lifestyle zoning. It is equally demonstrable that the peninsula land is not Highly Productive land which could have otherwise been justification for the Rural Production zoning decision. In conclusion, for the plethora of reasons detailed in the submission, it is abundantly clear that the RPZ Land has been wrongly zoned Rural Production in the FNDC's Notified PDP, and accordingly, is contrary to the requirements of Part 2 of the RMA.</p>	
<p><b>IDF Developments Limited (S253)</b></p>	<p>S253.001</p>	<p>Planning maps</p>	<p>Rural Production Zone</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>The Rural Production zone is effectively the default zone in the PDP where other proposed zones are not applicable or appropriate. The land is being currently used for productive purposes and the productive intent enabled within the Rural Production zone is generally supported.</p>	<p>Retain the Rural Production zoning of the following properties at Pururu Road:                      - ROT 948625 (Lot 2 DP 550435);                      - ROT NA30C/2 (Lot 11 DP 72578);                      - ROT NA28C/843( Lot 12 DP 72578);                      - ROT NA31A/1347 (Section 7 Block V Kerikeri SD )</p>
<p><b>Te Hiku Community Board (S257)</b></p>	<p>S257.024</p>	<p>Planning maps</p>	<p>Rural Production Zone</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>The Planning Maps show the Rural Production Zone in some areas e.g. Awanui that are serviced by sewerage, footpaths, refuse collection etc. If this zoning continues, it will severely constrain future urban development, and this should be corrected by amending the planning maps to a more appropriate urban zoning.</p>	<p>Amend the Planning Maps by removing the Rural Production Zone from areas developed with infrastructure for urban development and substitute an appropriate urban zone;                      OR amend Rural Production Zone objectives, policies and rules as</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						separately submitted.
<b>Trent Simpkin (S284)</b>	S284.002	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	Oppose the proposition to zone Waitotara Drive 'Rural Production', and suggest that it should be zoned 'Rural Residential'. The land was subdivided in mid 2000 and properties range from 8000m <sup>2</sup> to 1.2ha, most of which are developed with dwellings and lawns. It is clearly not being used for 'Rural Production' purposes and will ever be able to be in future. Bordering the proposed sports complex, which is appropriately zoned 'Sport and Active Recreation' (which is supported). It makes complete sense that Waitotara Drive is one of the 'ready to go' places for Waipapa to expand its housing stock into. Any flood prone land can be mitigated through minimum Finished Floor Level requirements at subdivision stage. All the properties to the North of Waipapa road are zoned Rural Residential, so doing the same to Waitotara is logical. The land is not highly productive.	Amend zoning of all land at Waitotara Drive, Waipapa from Rural Production Zone to Rural Residential Zone, including property addresses 45 - 147 Waitotara Drive and 279, 289, 291, 293, 299, 305, 309, 317, 331B, 331C, 331D, 331, 361 and 363 Waipapa Road, and land identified as Lot 2 Waipapa Road, Kerikeri, Lot 1, Lot 6 and Lot 17 Waitotara Drive, Kerikeri (see map attached to original submission).
<b>Trent Simpkin (S284)</b>	S284.003	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Support in part	Supports the proposed Rural Residential zoning of the interior of this road. However suggests a small addition to the Southern corner of this, to include a pocket of land which is zoned Rural Production, and is not, and will not be used for such purposes going forward. Opening up Rural Residential land ensures no extra cost for FNDC to install services, as all sites are self-serviced.	Retain the inside of the Okahu Road Loop, Kaitaia as Rural Residential Zone, but amend the small pocket of properties south of Okahu Road (465, 449, 481A, 481B, 481C and 483 Kaitaia-Awaroa Road, 499, 501, 509 and 521 and 521A Okahu Road), from Rural Production Zone to Rural Residential Zone.
<b>Trent Simpkin (S284)</b>	S284.006	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	No thought has been given to any expansion plans for Rangiputa. The land zoned Residential is already residential (and full) and then the only option around that is Rural Production. Small settlements like this need to have expansion zoning, as well as the larger towns. This can be done with Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle Zoning, allowing 2000m <sup>2</sup> and 2Ha lots, which don't require servicing.	Amend to expand on the Rangiputa zoning and allow for a band of Rural Residential and possibly Rural Lifestyle zoned land.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>Trent Simpkin (S284)</b>	S284.007	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	Kaitaia General Residential Zone Needs Expanding . There has been no new land zoned "General Residential" in and around the Kaitaia town. If we create the land to be developed, then new subdivisions will be created, drawing new people and an increased population to Kaitaia. Kaitaia has space and room to grow. The lack of developable land means that its rare for a section to come on the market. As the attached screenshot shows, nearly all of the residential zoned land has been cut down to Residential sizes. The only large blocks left are schools and the local cemetery. Population projections should not drive zoning - because if we create the property, people will come.	Amend zoning surrounding Kaitaia to expand the residential zones to allow more new subdivisions to be created.
<b>Trent Simpkin (S284)</b>	S284.012	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	It is clear from the zone maps that no thought has been given to Ahipara's future growth plans. Just because the projected population growth stats may not show growth in some areas around the Far North doesnt mean that land shouldn't be rezoned to allow development - because development drives increased population, more rates for FNDC and a better lifestyle for the local people with access to better services. Wharo Way and the land on the hillside above Ahipara should be zoned General Residential.	Amend zoning at 11-31 Wharo Way, Ahipara and 18 Highfields, 29, 31D, 39, 59 Reef View Road and 41, 51, 63 Tasman Heights from Rural Production Zone to General Residential Zone.
<b>Trent Simpkin (S284)</b>	S284.013	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	There are only a couple of large blocks of land in haruru which are zoned Rural Residential. Although this might seem 'alot of land' it is very reliant on these owners having the time/money/capacity to develop these. Therefore more land should be rezoned to 'rural residential' as alot of this land is already unsuitable to be used for Rural production purposes (and it isn't - alot of it is being used for lifestyle blocks and houses - so rural production zoning it is simply lazy.) Zoning land 'rural residential' has little impact on FNDC. All the sites are self serviced. No infrastructure needed.	Amend zoning of land surrounding Haruru (on Puketona Road, Sharyn Nelson Drive, Retreat Road, Jameson Esplanade, Tui Glen Road and Haruru Falls Road) from Rural Production Zone to Rural Residential Zone (see map attached to original submission)
<b>Tristan Simpkin (S288)</b>	S288.002	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	Oppose the proposition to zone Waitotara Drive 'Rural Production', and suggest that it should be zoned 'Rural Residential'. The land was	Amend zoning of all land at Waitotara Drive, Waipapa from Rural Production Zone to Rural

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					subdivided in mid 2000 and properties range from 8000m2 to 1.2ha, most of which are developed with dwellings and lawns. It is clearly not being used for 'Rural Production' purposes and will ever be able to be in future. Bordering the proposed sports complex, which is appropriately zoned 'Sport and Active Recreation' (which is supported). It makes complete sense that Waitotara Drive is one of the 'ready to go' places for Waipapa to expand its housing stock into. Any flood prone land can be mitigated through minimum Finished Floor Level requirements at subdivision stage. All the properties to the North of Waipapa road are zoned Rural Residential, so doing the same to Waitotara is logical. The land is not highly productive.	Residential Zone, including property addresses 45 - 147 Waitotara Drive and 279, 289, 291, 293, 299, 305, 309, 317, 331B, 331C, 331D, 331, 361 and 363 Waipapa Road, and land identified as Lot 2 Waipapa Road, Kerikeri, Lot 1, Lot 6 and Lot 17 Waitotara Drive, Kerikeri (see map attached to original submission).
<b>Tristan Simpkin (S288)</b>	S288.003	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Support	Supports the proposed Rural Residential zoning of the interior of this road. However suggests a small addition to the Southern corner of this, to include a pocket of land which is zoned Rural Production, and is not, and will not be used for such purposes going forward. Opening up Rural Residential land ensures no extra cost for FNDC to install services, as all sites are self-serviced.	Retain the inside of the Okahu Road Loop, Kaitaia as Rural Residential Zone, but amend the small pocket of properties south of Okahu Road (465, 449, 481A, 481B, 481C and 483 Kaitaia-Awaroa Road, 499, 501, 509 and 521 and 521A Okahu Road), from Rural Production Zone to Rural Residential Zone.
<b>Tristan Simpkin (S288)</b>	S288.006	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	No thought has been given to any expansion plans for Rangiputa. The land zoned Residential is already residential (and full) and then the only option around that is Rural Production. Small settlements like this need to have expansion zoning, as well as the larger towns. This can be done with Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle Zoning, allowing 2000m2 and 2Ha lots, which don't require servicing.	Amend to expand on the Rangiputa zoning and allow for a band of Rural Residential and possibly Rural Lifestyle zoned land.
<b>Tristan Simpkin (S288)</b>	S288.012	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	It is clear from the zone maps that no thought has been given to Ahipara's future growth plans. Just because the projected population growth stats may not show growth in some areas around the Far North doesn't mean that land shouldn't be rezoned to allow development - because development drives increased population, more	Amend zoning at 11-31 Wharo Way, Ahipara and 18 Highfields, 29, 31D, 39, 59 Reef View Road and 41, 51, 63 Tasman Heights from Rural Production Zone to General Residential Zone.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					rates for FNDC and a better lifestyle for the local people with access to better services. Wharo Way and the land on the hillside above Ahipara should be zoned General Residential.	
<b>Tristan Simpkin (S288)</b>	S288.013	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	There are only a couple of large blocks of land in haruru which are zoned Rural Residential. Although this might seem 'alot of land' it is very reliant on these owners having the time/money/capacity to develop these. Therefore more land should be rezoned to 'rural residential' as alot of this land is already unsuitable to be used for Rural production purposes (and it isn't - alot of it is being used for lifestyle blocks and houses - so rural production zoning it is simply lazy.) Zoning land 'rural residential' has little impact on FNDC. All the sites are self serviced. No infrastructure needed.	Amend zoning of land surrounding Haruru (on Puketona Road, Sharyn Nelson Drive, Retreat Road, Jameson Esplanade, Tui Glen Road and Haruru Falls Road) from Rural Production Zone to Rural Residential Zone (see map attached to original submission) (TPG to provide address list based on map provided).
<b>Izrael Robertson (S291)</b>	S291.001	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	Proposed zoning is not appropriate. Seeks rezoning based on objectives and policies of hte area. Mostly want to split the property into two titles. This subdivision would not be out of the ordinary given the surrounding development. Submitter also runs a locally owned business harvesting beachcast seaweeds that employs local youth and adults from top half of property, and has local hapu on board.	Amend zoning of land at 143 Kokohuia Road, Omapere from Rural Production to another zone (not stated) that would enable the submitter to split the property into two separate titles.
<b>Gray Gilraine Holdings Limited (S295)</b>	S295.001	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	Concerns are raised with an evident lack of additional land designated within the proposed zone maps for Rural Residential purposes in proximity to Kerikeri Township. Local authority decision making must ensure economic wellbeing, and the more land released for development purposes will have a positive influence on supply and demand economics. It is understood that certain limitations apply to land with versatile soils in proximity to Kerikeri Township, yet it appears large areas of land southeast of Shepherd Road have been disregarded; having not only poor soil qualities (4e7 and 6e9) but upholding a raft of planning criterion, such as low traffic count roading, minimal wetland areas, absence of heritage or amenity values, proximity to the	Amend zoning of land in proximity to Kerikeri township (south-east of Shepherd Road) from Rural Production to Rural Residential, including properties at 99 and 101 Shepherd Road, 19 Okura Drive, 27C Riddell Road, Kerikeri (refer to map attached to submission). Extend the Rural Residential Zone to capture a further 100ha (this may equate to about 200+ household equivalents).

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					recently upgraded community wastewater scheme, and unique location isolated by existing greenbelt cordon (state forest - Lot 2 DP 63173 and Pt Section 9 Blk II Kawakawa.)	
<b>Stephen Manley (S299)</b>	S299.001	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	Proposed Rural Production zoning for 72 Kokohuia Road, Omapere, and adjoining properties is inconsistent with objectives of the zoning and a more appropriate zone would be General Residential or Rural Residential to provide for an appropriate transition to Rural Production zone. 72 Kokohuia Road is 6,756m <sup>2</sup> and the adjoining sites despite being zoned as part of the Rural Production zone are significantly smaller than 20ha. The land is not currently used for rural production and the size of land parcels are insufficient for rural production, there is no transition to rural production from the general residential sites, therefore, there is potential for nearby general residential premises to be negatively impacted if activities consistent with Rural Production zoning were undertaken at these sites. Furthermore, 72 Kokohuia Road has on-site infrastructure, is connected to services including wastewater and stormwater, is within the rollout of Fibre internet and has power. Therefore, the size of land and use of land is more consistent with residential than rural production and its neighbouring residential/urban dwellings. The site has access to the Kokohuia waterline, therefore, this will not impact on the town water supply. Permissible activities within Rural Production zone have the potential to impact on the livability and quiet expected of adjoining residential properties. Omapere and Opononi have infrastructure to support the town. it is reasonably foreseeable that the growth of the town will continue to move inland due to coastal erosion etc. For these reasons the proposed zoning does not seem appropriate or consistent with the proposed district plan.	Delete Rural Production zoning of 72 Kokohuia Road, Omapere, and zone either General Residential or Rural Residential. Adjoining properties to be similarly considered.
<b>Nicole Butler (S305)</b>	S305.001	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	Supports Māori purpose zones. Our whenua Māori is zoned under Māori purpose zone. However our ahuwheua Trust has other whenua	Amend zoning of land at 313 Ngawha Springs Road, Ngawha Springs from Rural Production to

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					we have been able to acquire (contiguous) to our Whenua Māori that we wish to be included in the Māori purpose zone (283 and 313 Ngawha Springs Rd and we hold the lease for the recreation reserve between 283 and 313 that will ultimately be returned either via settlement or in agreement with FNDC). Note that definition of Māori land under Te Ture Whenua Māori includes general land owned by Māori. The Trust has successfully redeveloped Ngawha Springs and has a master plan for the development of other properties. Submitter is also interested in process to create its own special zone as has Carrington, Kauri Cliffs, Ngawha Innovation Park.	Maori Purpose Zone.
<b>Simon Urlich (S308)</b>	S308.002	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	The zoning of the site is not appropriate. Rural Residential would be a better fit for the type of property as three sides of it already have established private dwellings and are zoned as such.	Amend zoning of submittersland at 15 Melissa Road, Tokerau Beach / 11 Simon Urlich Road (Lot 2DP 486193) and 22 Simon Urlich Road (54ha) (Pt Lots 1 2 DP432296 Sec 19 PTSEC 18 BLK III RANGAUNU SD AND LOT 1 DP 69650 LOT 1 DP 486193), Karikari Peninsula, to Rural Residential zone to enable subdivision of property into sectionsbetween 2000 sqm and 4000 sqm.
<b>Colwyn Shortland (S315)</b>	S315.001	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	The neighbouring properties are also seeking to be rezoned and the reasons for the submission are set out in the submission made by DS and LA Morrison (Sub# 44), including that 1) 1. Amending the zoning of the Land would redefine the urban boundary in a more logical way, 2) The Land is all able to be serviced via the existing Russell township infrastructure. 3) 3. None of the four blocks are currently used for a rural production purpose and nor, to the respective owners' knowledge, have they been previously used as such, and 4) Land is not consistent with rural production zone provisions.	Amend zoning of land at 34 Pukematu Lane, Russell from Rural Production zone to Kororareka Russell Township Zone.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>FNR Properties Limited (S319)</b>	S319.001	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	The submitter considers the Rural Production Zone as it applies to the properties legally described as Lots 2 & 3 DP 547587 as residential intensity and subdivision are significantly reduced which will severely restrict development opportunities in an area where expansion should be accommodated. It is considered that rezoning the sites to General Residential Zone (GRZ) would be more appropriate as this would recognize the immediate need for more housing in the district and assist to alleviate the current housing crisis. Rezoning the site to the GRZ is considered appropriate given the site adjoins the GRZ to the north and east.	Delete Rural Production Zone as it applies to all of the properties legally described as Lots 2 and 3 DP 547587 and apply the General Residential Zone. If not the entire site then rezone at least the eastern half of the site.
<b>Far North Holdings Limited (S320)</b>	S320.007	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Not Stated	The submitter considers that the appropriate zoning for all of the Far North Holdings Ltd (FNHL) landholdings, including the site identified as the Colenso Triangle, is the Mixed Use zone as this zone better reflects existing consented and proposed land uses. (s32 assessment provided with submission).	Amend the zoning of the site owned by Far North Holdings Ltd(FNHL), site identified as the Colenso Triangle, from Rural Production zone to Mixed Use zone.
<b>Per Lugnet (S323)</b>	S323.001	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	The area west of the southern end of Taipa View Road (south of the existing Rural Residential zone) should be zoned Rural Residential. This would be the logical conclusion of the Taipa View Rd subdivision. The area can be serviced by utilising and extending existing infrastructure to meet demand for growth in the area, Objectives RRZ-O1 to RRZO4.	Amend the Rural Production zoning area west of the southern end of Taipa View Road (south of the existing Rural Residential zone) to Rural Residential
<b>Kerry Ludbrook (S327)</b>	S327.001	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	Lot 12 DP 431913 (Rangitane Road) should be zoned Rural Lifestyle as it is too small to be farmed (being 8.8 hectares) and the very wet soil type is too poor for farming and only suitable for lifestyle purposes. The land is surrounded by subdivision, close to Rangitane community town and has spectacular views.	Delete the Rural Production zoning of Lot 12 DP 431913 (Rangitane Road) and zone the land Rural Lifestyle
<b>Alistair Kenneth Lambie (S332)</b>	S332.001	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Support in part	The Rural Production zoning in the PDP does not reflect the changing character of rural developing village Treaty settlement land, low to non-rural productive use, and smaller style living lots. The site/s is / are more suitable for considered spot or strip Zoning to Rural Residential.	amend zone of 211 Creamery Road, Kohukohu and lots in the vicinity from Rural Production to Rural residential

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
<p><b>P S Yates Family Trust (S333)</b></p>	<p>S333.109</p>	<p>Planning maps</p>	<p>Rural Production Zone</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>The Proposed Plan describes the Rural Lifestyle Zone as being characterised by open space and vegetated landscapes, interspersed by farm buildings, structures and residential units. It states that areas suitable for rural lifestyle living have been identified because they are already fragmented with residential land uses, are on low value soils or where consent has already been granted to undertake more dense living than anticipated in the Rural Production Zone. These circumstances equally apply to The PS Yates Family Trust properties at 1 and 23 Kokinga Point Road. The specific objectives of the Rural Lifestyle Zone are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA in respect of these properties and are more appropriate because (with reference to these objectives): Objective RLZ-O1 The Rural Lifestyle Zone is used predominantly for low density residential activities and small scale farming activities that are compatible with the rural character and amenity of the zone. The density is already established through the comparatively small lot sizes of 4.36ha and 7.99ha. Development opportunities are very constrained on the sites given their steep sided peninsula topography, and vegetated areas with buildings and cleared areas already established. Objective RLZ-O2 The predominant character and amenity of the Rural Lifestyle Zone is characterised by: a. low density residential activities; b. small scale farming activities with limited buildings and structures; c. smaller lot sizes than anticipated in the Rural Production Zone; d. a general absence of urban infrastructure; e. rural roads with low traffic volumes; f. areas of vegetation, natural features and open space. The properties align with each of these features. Objective RLZ-O3 The role, function and predominant character and amenity of the Rural Lifestyle Zone is not compromised by incompatible activities. There is no risk of incompatible activities within the properties, or</p>	<p>Rezone from Rural Production to Rural Lifestyle the properties at 1 and 23 Kokinga Point Road, Rawhiti, legally described as Lot 3 DP 71896 and Part Te Kokinga Block.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					externally (noting in particular that rural production activities are distant from the properties). Objective RLZ-O4 Land use and subdivision in the Rural Lifestyle Zone does not compromise the effective and efficient operation of primary production activities in the adjacent Rural Production Zones. As noted above, there are no rural production activities in close proximity to the properties. In contrast, for the reasons set out in this submission, the Rural Production Zone (as currently drafted in the Proposed Plan) fails to recognise existing and potentially future rural residential opportunities, on properties that by their nature, will not compromise rural production activities.	
<b>Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust (S338)</b>	S338.003	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Not Stated	The area between Waipapa and the golf course (Brownlie property) currently under consideration offers a more appropriate location for future growth than the areas to the north or south of Kerikeri indicated in the PDP zone map. The area between Waipapa and the golf course has the potential to provide connectivity between SH10 and the CBD, and between SH10 and Waipapa Road, and safe connectivity between the new FNDC Sports Hub on SH10 and local schools. Integrated planning is generally easier on a greenfield site. Importantly, growth in this area would eventually provide a relatively compact footprint for Kerikeri/Waipapa. No other site offers this advantage. The current lack of infrastructure could be addressed by requiring the developer to provide roading, water supply, on-site wastewater system and other needs.	Delete Rural Production zoning of the land commonly referred to as the 'Brownlee' property, being 1878 State Highway 10, Waipapa (Lot 2 DP 89875, Part Section 13 Block X Kerikeri Survey District and Part Lot 6 Deposited Plan 6704). Rezone this land area for future development (primarily as a mix of residential, mixed use and natural open space zones).
<b>Waipapa Pine Limited and Adrian Broughton Trust (S342)</b>	S342.002	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose		rezone land from rural production to heavy industrial zone Lot 1 DP 146372, lot 3 DP 321759, Lot 2 DP 321759, Lot 1 DP 321759
<b>Carrington Estate Jade LP and</b>	S351.004	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Support in part	The submitter supports in part the General Residential Zone as it applies to the land adjoining the Carrington Estate Jade LP and Carrington	Amend zoning of a portion of the land owned by Carrington Estate Jade LP and Carrington Farms Jade

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>Carrington Farms Jade LP (S351)</b>					Farms Jade LP land at Whatuwhiwi, however requests that the General Residential Zone be extended to include a portion of the land identified as Lot 1 DP 413387 (as shown in Appendix A of submission 351).	LP land at Whatuwhiwi, identified as Lot 1 DP 413387 (as shown in Appendix A of submission 351) from Rural Production Zone to the General Residential Zone.
<b>Carrington Estate Jade LP and Carrington Farms Jade LP (S351)</b>	S351.005	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Not Stated	The submitter requests that the Carrington Estate Jade LP and Carrington Farms Jade LP land at Whatuwhiwi, identified as Pt Lot 1 DP 82178, and zoned Rural Production have the Mineral Extraction Overlay applied (as shown in Appendix A of submission 351), as the submitters own and operate the site as a quarry.	Amend Rural Production Zone of the land owned by Carrington Estate Jade LP and Carrington Farms Jade LP land at Whatuwhiwi, identified as Pt Lot 1 DP 82178 (as shown in Appendix A of submission 351), to have the Mineral Extraction Overlay applied
<b>Carrington Estate Jade LP and Carrington Farms Jade LP (S351)</b>	S351.006	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Not Stated	The submitter requests that a suitable but as yet unspecified area of the Carrington Estate Jade LP and Carrington Farms Jade LP land at Whatuwhiwi, be zoned Light Industrial with the extent and scale to be presented with associated evidence, prior to any hearing.	Amend the zoning of an as yet unspecified area of the Carrington Estate Jade LP and Carrington Farms Jade LP land at Whatuwhiwi, to the Light Industrial Zone.
<b>Amanda Kennedy, Julia Kennedy Till and Simon Till (S353)</b>	S353.003	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Support	The reasons why it is believed that the proposed changes are more appropriate for this site are: - it better aligns with existing development, size of landholdings and underlying characteristics and qualities of the land; - the approach proposed is more consistent with high order Resource Management Act 1991 ('RMA') policies and plans; and - the approach proposed is more consistent with the purpose and principles of the RMA.	Retain NA125B/204 (Lot 1 DP 197131) and NA119C/48 (Lot 1 DP 189675) as Rural Production Zone. If the primary relief above is not proposed, the submitters further seek that: the Management Plan approach be retained in the PDP, with further measures that enable sites (such as the Landholdings under consideration) to be appropriately developed.
<b>Wakaiti Dalton (S355)</b>	S355.037	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	The MPZ recognises and provides for Māori freehold land, Māori customary land and general land owned by Māori, as defined in Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993. While all of our land is held in general title, we have resided on this whenua for at least seven generations, living in a dwelling that was constructed in the 1890's. This whenua has been held in our whanau for all of this time. In our view our sites of interest is General	rezone our sites from Rural Production to Maori purpose zone NA19C/722, Whirinaki 5K6D1 Block; - NA19C/1001, Whirinaki 5K6D2 Block; - NA21A/197, Whirinaki 5K 6O Block; - NA21C/1080, Whirinaki 5K6P

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					Land Owned by Māori, and while it is not MFL, there is no intention to sell, alienate or dispose of this land. We are the kaitiaki and ahi kā of this whenua, for the purpose for maintaining the ancestral relationship for all whanau members. For this reasons, we seek the land be rezoned MPZ in line with our values, the nature of the tenure and recognise our relationship with our land in accordance with section 6(e) of the RMA.	Block; - NA26B/1140 (Freehold), Whirinaki No 5K No 6L Block and Section 1 Survey Office Plan 60502; - NA19C/1351, Whirinaki 5K6N Block and Section 1 Survey Office Plan 60501; - NA19C/929, Whirinaki 5K6A2 Block.
<b>Sean Frieling (S357)</b>	S357.025	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	The Planning Maps show the Rural Production Zone in some areas e.g. Wireless road Kaitaia/ Awanui from the sports field to Spains road and around the Awanui school that are serviced by sewerage, footpaths, refuse collection etc. If this zoning continues, it will severely constrain future urban development, and this should be corrected by amending the planning maps to a more appropriate urban zoning. This will make efficient use of existing infrastructure, as per the regional policy statement for northland, and will also better reflect the existing consented and established built environment and use, specifically a large bus depot, a childcare centre, and now a new school. The road location is also adjacent to the existing industrial area, being the Kaitaia mill, and and Whangatane drive, and has existing Council reticulated infrastructure, and already has a change to the character of the area due to the existing consented industrial and commercial activities in that locality.	Amend the Planning Maps by removing the Rural Production Zone from areas developed with infrastructure for urban development and substitute an appropriate urban zone; and re-zone the portion of wireless road that has Council reticulated sewage and water to be re-zoned to be industrial or commercial zoning.
<b>Sean Frieling (S357)</b>	S357.042	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Support	The Planning Maps show the Rural Production Zone in some areas e.g. Wireless road Kaitaia/ Awanui from the sports field to Spains road and around the Awanui school that are serviced by sewerage, footpaths, refuse collection etc. If this zoning continues, it will severely constrain future urban development, and this should be corrected by amending the planning maps to a more appropriate urban zoning. This will make efficient use of existing infrastructure, as per the regional	Re-zone the portion of wireless road that has Council reticulated sewage and water to be re-zoned to be industrial or commercial zoning and Amend the Planning Maps by removing the Rural Production Zone from areas developed with infrastructure for urban development and substitute an appropriate urban zone; and

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					policy statement for northland, and will also better reflect the existing consented and established built environment and use, specifically a large bus depot, a childcare centre, and now a new school. The road location is also adjacent to the existing industrial area, being the Kaitaia mill, and and Whangatane drive, and has existing Council reticulated infrastructure, and already has a change to the character of the area due to the existing consented industrial and commercial activities in that locality.	
<b>Leah Frieling (S358)</b>	S358.028	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	The Planning Maps show the Rural Production zone in some areas that are serviced by sewerage, footpaths, refuse collection etc. If this zoning continues, it will severely constrain future urban development, and this should be corrected by amending the planning maps to a more appropriate urban zoning. This will make efficient use of existing infrastructure, as per the regional policy statement for northland.	Amend the Planning Maps by removing the Rural Production zone from areas developed with infrastructure for urban development and substitute an appropriate urban zone; OR amend Rural Production Zone objectives, policies and rules as separately submitted and allow smaller blocks of land i.e. 2,000m2
<b>Leah Frieling (S358)</b>	S358.032	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	Rezone the portion of Wireless Road, Kaitaia, that has Council reticulated sewage and water to an industrial or commercial zoning. This will make efficient use of existing infrastructure, as per the regional policy statement for northland, and will also better reflect the existing consented and established built environment and use, specifically a large bus depot, a childcare centre, and now a new school.	Delete the Rural Production zoning of Wireless Road, Kaitaia, where it has Council reticulated sewage and water, zone for industrial or commercial purposes instead.
<b>Northland Regional Council (S359)</b>	S359.016	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Support in part	There has been significant expansion of horticulture on the Aupōuri Peninsula and in the Awanui area, primarily for avocado growing - supported in a large part by groundwater resources. There could be justification for including these areas in the Horticultural Zone	Amend the planning maps to rezone avocado orchards in the Aupōuri Peninsula and in the Awanui area from Rural Production to Horticulture (inferred)
<b>Northland Regional Council (S359)</b>	S359.017	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Support in part	Given geography and water supply, the service catchment of the mid-north water storage project near Kaikohe should be zoned for horticulture. The Matawii dam is currently under construction and will supply reliable water to support a shift to	Amend the planning maps to rezone the service catchment of the mid-north water storage project near Kaikohe from Rural Production to

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					horticultural/arable use - strongly recommend rezoning to manage potential for reverse sensitivity and to support land use change which is likely to have economic, employment and greenhouse gas emissions reduction benefits.	Horticulture (inferred)
<b>Far North District Council (S368)</b>	S368.099	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	Error in mapping whereby operative Conservation zoning has not carried through into the PDP as Natural Open Space zone for parcel 4861315. This is one site Council is aware of, there are potentially others.	Amend the zoning of parcel 4861315 (Mataka Station) from Rural Production to Natural Open Space. Make any further changes to the PDP where and if the same issue arises.
<b>Nigel Ross Surveyor Ltd (S380)</b>	S380.001	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	The Rural Production zoning of 15 to 49 Kokohuia Road, Omapere, is inappropriate as they are small residential sites on the opposite side of the road to other sites zoned General Residential.	Amend the zoning of 15 to 49 Kokohuia Road, Omapere (being Lots 5 to 8 DP130479, and Lots 1 and 2 of DP 75761), from Rural Production to General Residential
<b>Nigel Ross Surveyor Ltd (S381)</b>	S381.001	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	Cannot see any reason for complete or partial zoning of 98A to 110, and 109 to 115 State Highway 12, Opononi/Pakanae, as Rural Production. The properties should be fully zoned Rural Lifestyle (inferred)	Delete the Rural Poduction zoning of 98A to 110, and 109 to 115 State Highway 12, Opononi/Pakanae (being Lots 1 to 5, 8, and 10 to 13 of DP 32412, Lot 2 DP 92721, and Part Lot 1 DP 84442), zone Rural Lifestyle
<b>Roman Catholic Bishop of the Diocese of Auckland (S382)</b>	S382.001	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	The Moerewa Catholic Church premises comprise 2 properties at 17A and 17B Snowdon Avenue in Moerewa as shown in the attached map. The legal descriptions of these sites are Lot 10 DP 53299 and Lot 1 DP 533343 respectively. According to the Far North District Operative District Plan, No 17A is zoned 'Residential' while No 17B is located within the 'Rural Production' zone. The north-eastern part of Lot 1 DP 533343 contains an existing development comprising St Therese Church, a caretaker's residential unit, other associated buildings, a driveway, parking and on-site services. Lot 10 DP 53299 contains the majority of the parking area and landscaping. In May 2021, the submitter obtained a resource consent under RC 2300437 to subdivide these two	Amend the zoning of the existing Lot 1 DP 53343 to the Settlement Zone, as shown on the attached map to ensure that the entire area of proposed Lot 1 LT 583834 (that includes existing Lot 10 DP 53299) is consistent with the proposed zoning of the adjacent areas as being a 'Settlement Zone'.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>properties by way of boundary adjustment. The purpose of the subdivision is to include all existing church-related activities into a separate title and to create the other title for the balance vacant lot with access from Otiria Road for rural lifestyle purposes. At the time of making this submission, the Title Plan (LT 583834) of the proposed subdivision has been prepared and submitted to the Council for s223 approval. A copy of the Title Plan is attached in Appendix 1. According to the zone maps of the Proposed District Plan, the existing Lot 10 DP 53299 and Lot 1 DP 53343 are zoned 'Settlement' and 'Rural Production' respectively. This means the proposed Lot 1 of LT 583834, which contains all existing church-related activities within an area of 5510m<sup>2</sup>, will be subject to a 'split zone' boundary between the 'Settlement Zone' and 'Rural Production Zone'. Proposed Lot 1 area has been part of the residential settlement along Snowdon Avenue in Moerewa. This area is connected to Council's reticulated water supply and stormwater networks. Therefore, it is considered most appropriate and rational to demarcate the surveyed area of Lot 1 LT 583834 within the 'Settlement Zone'. This developed area is consistent with the objectives and policies of the Settlement Zone compared to those of the Rural Production Zone.</p>	
<p><b>Braedon &amp; Cook Limited (S401)</b></p>	<p>S401.001</p>	<p>Planning maps</p>	<p>Rural Production Zone</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>121 Redcliffs Road, Kerikeri, does not contain soils that are suitable for productive purposes. The site contains only a thin layer of topsoil that is underlaid by heavy clay and some brown rock. Much of the site is also encumbered by volcanic rocks, which inhibits the site for productive use. There is already subdivision approved for the neighbouring site to the south (referenced 2220308-RMASUB). Therefore, rural residential development will be present immediately adjacent to the southern boundary of the site. The land is close to Kerikeri Centre (6ks), has good road access to town and Marina. School Bus service etc The neighbouring land (across Redcliffs Rd) is</p>	<p>Delete the Rural Production zoning of 121 Redcliffs Road, Kerikeri (Lot 3 DP 108139), zone Rural Lifestyle</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					rezoned in PDP. Neighbouring land (ex-horticultural land) across the river is used for residential To fertilise the poor clay soil means inevitable run off into Rangitane River that borders land.	
<b>Meridian Farm Ltd (S403)</b>	S403.001	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	1. The site does not contain soils that are suitable for productive purposes. The site contains only a thin layer of topsoil that is underlaid by heavy clay and some brown rock. Much of the site is also encumbered by volcanic rocks, which inhibits the site for productive use. 2. There is already subdivision approved for the subject site (referenced 2220308-RMASUB). An additional subdivision consent is currently in the process of being processed by FNDC. Therefore, the proposed rezoning will reflect the existing/approved uses of the site. 3. The land is close to Kerikeri Centre (6ks), has good road access to town and Marina. School Bus service etc. 4. The neighbouring land (across Redcliffs Rd) is rezoned in PDP. Neighbouring land (ex-horticultural land) across the Rangitane River is used for residential. 5. To fertilise the poor clay soil means inevitable run off into Rangitane River that borders land.	Amend the zoning of 119 Redcliffs Road, Kerikeri (Lot 1 DP 94462 and Lot 2 DP 376997) as shown in the attached Figure 1 to Rural Lifestyle from Rural Production.
<b>Antoinette Pot (S405)</b>	S405.001	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Not Stated	Henderson Bay previously came under the General Coastal Zone which was best suited to preserving the natural character and conservation of the coastline. It is disappointing that this zone is no longer available. Henderson Bay has now been assigned to the Rural Production Zone. I believe the uncontrolled permissible activities of the Rural Production Zone will have adverse effects on the natural character of Henderson Bay. What occurs on the land at Henderson Bay has an effect on the coastline due to the contour of the land and streams that run off onto the beach. I would like to see Henderson Bay have exclusions that restrict and limit any primary production to what doesnt have adverse effects on those living in the Bay and the natural character of the Bay. I do support the low density development of Rural	Amend zoning For Henderson Bay from rural production to have its own unique zone that restricts further subdivision below the current 4ha and maintains the current allowable activities or for Henderson Bay to remain in Rural Production and have tight restrictions on any primary production that will have adverse effects on the natural character of the coastline and those living in the Bay.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					Production. This therefore protects Henderson Bay from further subdivision. Further subdivision would also cause adverse effects on the conservation of the area	
<b>Murray and Sandra Wilson (S406)</b>	S406.001	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	We have lived at Rangiputa since 1991. In this time the land west of rangiputa rd from approximately 300 rangiputa rd to south of the recreation reserve at 699 rangiputa rd has been subdivided from 10 titles into 30 titles. These properties range in size from 6500 sq metres to 14ha with most in the 3ha to 4 ha range. These properties now fit best into the rural lifestyle zone as this zone best matches the current size of the properties now.	amend zoning from Rural production zone to rural lifestyle zone for all the properties west of rangiputa rd from Approximately 300 Rangiputa rd to south of the recreation reserve at 699 rangiputa rd. Approx. 30 properties.
<b>Waitomo Papakainga (S418)</b>	S418.001	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	The subject site is immediately adjacent to the Te Rarawa marae which is zoned Māori Purpose Zone - Rural and is subject to the 'Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori' overlay and is surrounded by a mix of rural and rural-residential activities which form an established community centre which provides for more than just productive land. Given the surrounding context, the proposed zoning does not include any enabling objectives, policies or standards for residential activities that would encompass Waitomo Papakainga residences or allow for Te Warawa to achieve the social, cultural and economic aspirations for the whenua.	Amend zoning of land at 684 Kaitaia-Awaroa Road, Pukepoto from Rural Production Zone to Māori Purpose Zone - Rural.
<b>Muriwhenua Incorporated (S420)</b>	S420.002	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Not Stated	Muriwhenua strongly supports the concept embodied within the Proposed District Plan of providing specialist zones for Māori purposes. The Proposed Plan currently provides for a Māori Purposes Urban zone and a Māori Purposes Rural zone.	Delete the Rural Production zoning of Lot 1 DP 84931 (title identifier 5202813, affecting land at State Highway 1F, Te Hapua) and zone Maori Purpose - Rural (or such alternative zone or precinct to achieve the equivalent relief sought in submission)
<b>J L Hayes and Sons Ltd (S441)</b>	S441.002	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	Volume 1 planning map 27 not adequate for planning purposes. Department of Conservation areas shown as Natural Open Space. Nothing shown as Summit Plantations or NZ Carbon Farming.	Delete Rural Production zoning of carbon farming and identify specific use of land (inferred)

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					The regional and district councils are involved in regulations for plantation forestry to ensure that infrastructure for future harvesting is not a burden on the ratepayers. Carbon farming is new and should not be shown within Rural Production zone. We have Significant Natural Areas and Outstanding Natural Areas at Mangapa which, referring to map 27 would not describe as significant.	
<b>Kapiro Conservation Trust (S449)</b>	S449.005	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	The area between Waipapa and the golf course (Brownlee property) currently under consideration offers a more appropriate location for future growth than the areas to the north or south of Kerikeri indicated in the PDP zone map. The area between Waipapa and the golf course has the potential to provide connectivity between SH10 and the CBD, and between SH10 and Waipapa Road, and safe connectivity between the new FNDC Sports Hub on SH10 and local schools. Integrated planning is generally easier on a greenfield site. Importantly, growth in this area would eventually provide a relatively compact footprint for Kerikeri/Waipapa. No other site offers this advantage. The current lack of infrastructure could be addressed by requiring the developer to provide roading, water supply, on-site wastewater system and other needs.	Delete Rural Production zoning of the land commonly referred to as the 'Brownlee' property, being 1878 State Highway 10, Waipapa (Lot 2 DP 89875, Part Section 13 Block X Kerikeri Survey District and Part Lot 6 Deposited Plan 6704). Rezone this land area for future development (primarily as a mix of residential, mixed use and natural open space zones).
<b>Kingheim Limited (S461)</b>	S461.001	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	The site's ability to be used for productive purposes is restricted by many factors, including its size, the existing buildings on the property, its non-productive soils and its proximity to the coast. The proposed RPZ zoning is therefore not an effective and efficient use of resources.	rezone 44 Gillies Road, Karikari Peninsula Lot 1 DP 149495 from rural production zone to settlement zone
<b>LJ King Ltd (S464)</b>	S464.033	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	There is already development on Wireless Road, Kaitaia from SH1 to the Bell Road intersection including a bus depot, Kura School and other businesses. Along SH1 from the Kaitaia boundary to Brott Road there is already housing and businesses all serviced by town sewerage. From the Awanui rugby field to Spains Road and around Awanui School is serviced by sewerage, footpaths, refuse collection etc. If this zoning	Amend planning maps to remove Rural Production zoning from areas such as Awanui and Wireless Road, Kaitaia are other areas which are serviced by infrastructure for urban development and rezone with a more appropriate urban zone or amend Rural Production Zone objectives, policies and rules as

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					continues, it will severely constrain future urban development, and this should be corrected by amending the planning maps to a more appropriate urban zoning.	separately submitted to allow for smaller blocks of land such as 2,000m2.
<b>Michael Foy (S472)</b>	S472.029	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	The Planning Maps show the Rural Production Zone in some areas e.g. Wireless road Kaitaia/ Awanui from the sports field to Spains road and around the Awanui school that are serviced by sewerage, footpaths, refuse collection etc. If this zoning continues, it will severely constrain future urban development, and this should be corrected by amending the planning maps to a more appropriate urban zoning. It is formally requested to re-zone the portion of wireless road that has Council reticulated sewage and water to be re-zoned to be industrial or commercial zoning. This will make efficient use of existing infrastructure, as per the regional policy statement for northland, and will also better reflect the existing consented and established built environment and use, specifically a large bus depot, a childcare centre, and now a new school. The road location is also adjacent to the existing industrial area, being the Kaitaia mill, and and Whangatane drive, and has existing Council reticulated infrastructure, and already has a change to the character of the area due to the existing consented industrial and commercial activities in that locality.	Amend the Planning Maps by removing the Rural Production Zone from areas developed with infrastructure for urban development and substitute an appropriate urban zone; OR amend Rural Production Zone objectives, policies and rules as separately submitted and allow smaller blocks of land ie.2000 sq mtrs
<b>Michael Foy (S472)</b>	S472.033	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Support in part	It is formally requested to re-zone the portion of wireless road that has Council reticulated sewage and water to be re-zoned to be industrial or commercial zoning. This will make efficient use of existing infrastructure, as per the regional policy statement for northland, and will also better reflect the existing consented and established built environment and use, specifically a large bus depot, a childcare centre, and now a new school. The road location is also adjacent to the existing industrial area, being the Kaitaia mill, and and Whangatane drive, and has existing Council reticulated infrastructure, and already has a change to the character of the area due to the	Re-zone the portion of wireless road that has Council reticulated sewage and water to be re-zoned from Rural Production to be industrial or commercial zoning.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					existing consented industrial and commercial activities in that locality	
<b>Tracy and Kenneth Dalton (S479)</b>	S479.032	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	The Māori Purpose Zone recognises and provides for Māori freehold land, Māori customary land and general land owned by Māori, as defined in Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993. The land identified as '1' and '2' in Figure 1 above shows our sites of interest which meet the definition of General Land Owned by Māori. Our whanau have been the kaitiaki of this whenua ("owners") since the early 1900s, when titles were established. The history and whakapapa of this whenua is sensitive and is not something we want to share through this public process. Despite the land being in general title, we consider ourselves the kaitiaki and ahi kā of the land with responsibilities to care for the whenua and be a place where family can return. In our view, the land is a papakāinga for the wider whanau and will not be sold or disposed of now and into the future. For this reasons, we seek the land be rezoned MPZ in line with our values, the nature of the tenure and recognise our relationship with our land in accordance with section 6(e) of the RMA.	Amend the zoning of the sites shown in Figure 1 as "1" and "2" (NA31B/253 and NA31B/253) to Māori Purpose Zone from Rural Production located at 4749 State Highway 12, Kaikohe
<b>Elbury Holdings (S485)</b>	S485.033	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	There is already development on Wireless Road, Kaitaia from SH1 to the Bell Road intersection including a bus depot, Kura School and other businesses. Along SH1 from the Kaitaia boundary to Brott Road there is already housing and businesses all serviced by town sewerage. From the Awanui rugby field to Spains Road and around Awanui School is serviced by sewerage, footpaths, refuse collection etc. If this zoning continues, it will severely constrain future urban development, and this should be corrected by amending the planning maps to a more appropriate urban zoning.	Amend the Planning Maps by removing the Rural Production Zone from areas (Wireless Road, Kaitaia / Awanui) as described above developed with infrastructure for urban development and substitute an appropriate urban zone; OR amend Rural Production Zone objectives, policies and rules as separately submitted and allow smaller blocks of land ie.2000 sq mtrs.
<b>Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited (S502)</b>	S502.103	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	Sites are currently zoned Coastal residential. No Rural Production activity could be undertaken on these sites, and all development would trigger landuse consent for setback breaches. This would be a perverse outcome.	Amend the Rural Production zone for are areas identified in the submission along Wreck Bay Rd, Ahipara, and rezone General

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						Residential
<b>Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited (S502)</b>	S502.104	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	At the top end of Wharo Way sites which have been developed as General Residential sites are shown as being zoned Rural Production. This would be a perverse outcome with landuse consent being required for matters such as setback and stormwater coverage which have already been accounted for at time the site was subdivided.	Amend the Rural Production zone of the properties identified in the submission at Wharo Way and rezone General Residential: 11,13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 29, 31 Wharo Way, Ahipara
<b>Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited (S502)</b>	S502.105	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	They are a small group of General title sites ranging from 2200m2 - 1ha. These would be better zoned as a Rural Residential as the sites are already of this size, or Rural Lifestyle which achieves consistency with neighbouring allotments at the end of Panorama Lane. The same approach should be made with 320 - 334 Foreshore Road, 362 - 380 Foreshore Road and the section of land located off Gumfields Road shown in the submission.	Amend the Rural Production zone identified in the submission and rezone either Rural Residential or Rural Lifestyle. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>320, 322, 334, 336A, 336B, 359, 361, 371, 375, Lot 1, Lot 2, 362, 366, 370, 380 Foreshore Rd, Ahipara 73B2B4, Lot 1, Lot 2, Lot 3, Lot 4 DP114764, Pt Ahipara 72, 85 Gumfields Rd, Ahipara</li> </ul>
<b>Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited (S502)</b>	S502.106	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	Sites located to the Southwest of Okahu Road are zoned as Rural Production. The lot sizes range from 6347m2 to 1.4ha and as such they are not of a size where they could operate as a productive lot. Sites immediately to the North have been zoned Rural Residential and notably these allotments are larger than the agglomeration of sites in this space. Given that the sites are unable to be utilised for productive purposes, they have already been subdivided down to sizes akin with a Rural Residential zone and are located on soils which are not highly versatile. We seek relief that the sites be rezoned as Rural Residential.	Amend to rezone Rural Production sites southwest of Okahu Rd, Kaitaia identified in the submission to Rural Residential zone.
<b>Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited (S502)</b>	S502.108	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Not Stated	Given the high historical importance of Waitangi Estate is it has a number of overlays which apply to the site. If left with the underlying zone and general overlays, the rules assessment would be difficult to undertake as each overlay stipulates	Delete the zoning that applies to the Waitangi Treaty Grounds (including the Treaty House, Hobson Memorial, Whare Runanga and Flagpole, and regarded as including

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>that the more restrictive rule is applicable. This would result in very minor activities which are generally enabled being captured and requiring consent. The existing Rural Production zone may directly conflict with the Waitangi Trust Board Act's preamble which has set aside the site for a specific purpose. The multiple layers make any planning assessment difficult as in all cases the most stringent rules in any overlay apply. This means that more enabling rules imposed under certain overlays tailored for a particular activity cannot be utilized which results in almost all activities requiring consent as a Discretionary or Non-Complying activity. A more tailored approach will provide clarity as at present the Proposed District Plan makes everyday management and maintenance activities require consent. We have an opportunity to tailor make some rules which are specific to the Waitangi Estate and help give effect to the deed established in 1932. Given the fact that no other zones in the District Plan would be appropriate given the specific nature of this site, and moreover that the other spatial layers would cause undue confusion and perverse outcomes in terms of the activities they would capture, we consider that the use of a special purpose zone is most suitable to this site. We therefore seek that a Special Purpose Zone or Precinct be applied to the Estate.</p>	<p>Lots 1 - 3 of DP 326610, and Lots 1 and 2 of DP 152502) and insert/create a new Waitangi Grounds Special Purpose zone OR Insert a new Precinct over the Waitangi Treaty Grounds OR In the event the Waitangi Treaty Grounds is not set aside for special zoning and/or precinct: rezone Lots 2 and 3 DP 326610 Sport and Active Recreation (to accommodate the existing golf club). amend the rules applying to the Waitangi Treaty Ground to clarify when resource consent is required.</p>
<p><b>Waitangi Limited (S503)</b></p>	<p>S503.008</p>	<p>Planning maps</p>	<p>Rural Production Zone</p>	<p>Not Stated</p>	<p>Given the high historical importance of Waitangi Estate is it has a number of overlays which apply to the site. If left with the underlying zone and general overlays, the rules assessment would be difficult to undertake as each overlay stipulates that the more restrictive rule is applicable. This would result in very minor activities which are generally enabled being captured and requiring consent. The existing Rural Production zone may directly conflict with the Waitangi Trust Board Act's preamble which has set aside the site for a specific purpose. The multiple layers make any planning assessment difficult as in all cases the</p>	<p>Delete the zoning that applies to the Waitangi Treaty Grounds (including the Treaty House, Hobson Memorial, Whare Runanga and Flagpole, and regarded as including Lots 1 - 3 of DP 326610, and Lots 1 and 2 of DP 152502) and insert/create a new Waitangi Grounds Special Purpose zone OR Insert a new Precinct over the Waitangi Treaty Grounds OR</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>most stringent rules in any overlay apply. This means that more enabling rules imposed under certain overlays tailored for a particular activity cannot be utilized which results in almost all activities requiring consent as a Discretionary or Non-Complying activity. A more tailored approach will provide clarity as at present the Proposed District Plan makes everyday management and maintenance activities require consent. We have an opportunity to tailor make some rules which are specific to the Waitangi Estate and help give effect to the deed established in 1932. Given the fact that no other zones in the District Plan would be appropriate given the specific nature of this site, and moreover that the other spatial layers would cause undue confusion and perverse outcomes in terms of the activities they would capture, we consider that the use of a special purpose zone is most suitable to this site. We therefore seek that a Special Purpose Zone or Precinct be applied to the Estate.</p>	<p>In the event the Waitangi Treaty Grounds is not set aside for special zoning and/or precinct: rezone Lots 2 and 3 DP 326610 Sport and Active Recreation (to accommodate the existing golf club); amend the rules applying to the Waitangi Treaty Ground to clarify when resource consent is required.</p>
<p><b>James William Rogers and Sara Rogers (S504)</b></p>	<p>S504.001</p>	<p>Planning maps</p>	<p>Rural Production Zone</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>The changes will be in accordance with the purpose and principles of the Resource Management Act 1991 ("the Act") and will be appropriate in terms of section 32 of the Act. The potential adverse effects that might arise from activities allowed by the changes will have been addressed appropriately. The current proposed rural production zoning does not recognise that the subject area is currently comprised entirely of lots that are significantly smaller than that anticipated under the Subdivision Rule as a Controlled activity (some allotments being 100 times too small), and further significantly less than even that anticipated as a Discretionary Activity, is currently highly unsuitable for undertaking rural production activities, and therefore additional ability for residential purposes, which is the existing land use for almost all allotments, would not result in a loss of productive land as the productive capacity of the land is already absent. The proposed zoning is not forward looking in</p>	<p>Amend the zoning from Rural Production to Settlement zone for the following properties (see attachment 1 to the original submission): 2 x Lot 1 Arawhata Rd, 51, 53, 61, 71, 71A, 73, 81, 85, 87, 99, 101, 103, 113 Arawhata Rd, 28, 42, 58, 86, 100, 110, 120 Mangatete Heights, Lot 18 Mangatete Heights, Lot 26 Mangatete Heights, 6, 7, 20, 27, 31, 43 Bobs Way, 5, 22, 23, 24, 25 Ronas Place</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					regard to providing a supply of land for predicted future growth of the district over the short, medium or long term. Given the absolute minimum productive lot size being 4ha, with good access to water, and that 39 of the 44 lots within the subject area are below this size, have poor access to water, and contain poor soil, it is difficult to understand how rural production activities would be able to be carried out within the area, as per the expectations of the Rural production Zoning. The area meets all must have criteria for the Settlement zone, in that it is un-serviced, meets house cluster and may have zoning criteria. In regard to remaining 'may have' criteria, it is noted that there is both a school and community hall located within 2km of the subject area.	
<b>Dr Lynn Kincla (S505)</b>	S505.004	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Not Stated	The Henderson Bay area is quite unique and I believe that there should have been more thought into creating a special zone to protect the future of this area.	Amend to consider a special zone instead of Rural production for the Henderson Bay area
<b>The General Trust Board of the Diocese of Auckland (S514)</b>	S514.003	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	8145 Far North Road, Te Kao is zoned as Rural Production under the Operative Plan. The zoning remains as the Rural Production Zone under the Proposed Plan. The site is subject to both the Sites of Cultural Significance to Māori and, Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori. The site zoning is opposed and it is considered that the Māori Purpose - Rural Zone is more appropriate for this site.	Delete the Rural Production zoning of 8145 Far North Road, Te Kao, zone Maori Purpose - Rural
<b>Elbury Holdings (S519)</b>	S519.033	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	The Planning Maps show the Rural Production Zone in some areas e.g. Awanui/wireless road kaitaia that are serviced by sewerage, footpaths, refuse collection etc. If this zoning continues, it will severely constrain future urban development, and this should be corrected by amending RPROZ objectives, policies and rules zones to accommodate things other than rural production	Amend the Planning Maps by removing the Rural Production Zone from areas (Wireless Road, Kaitaia / Awanui) as described above developed with infrastructure for urban development and substitute an appropriate urban zone; OR amend Rural Production Zone objectives, policies and rules as separately submitted and allow smaller blocks of land ie.2000 sq mtrs

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK) (S522)</b>	S522.004	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	The area between Waipapa and the golf course (Brownlie property) currently under consideration offers a more appropriate location for future growth than the areas to the north or south of Kerikeri indicated in the PDP zone map. The area between Waipapa and the golf course has the potential to provide connectivity between SH10 and the CBD, and between SH10 and Waipapa Road, and safe connectivity between the new FNDC Sports Hub on SH10 and local schools. Integrated planning is generally easier on a greenfield site. Importantly, growth in this area would eventually provide a relatively compact footprint for Kerikeri/Waipapa. No other site offers this advantage. The current lack of infrastructure could be addressed by requiring the developer to provide roading, water supply, on-site wastewater system and other needs.	Delete Rural Production zoning of the land commonly referred to as the 'Brownlee' property, being 1878 State Highway 10, Waipapa (Lot 2 DP 89875, Part Section 13 Block X Kerikeri Survey District and Part Lot 6 Deposited Plan 6704). Rezone this land area for future development (primarily as a mix of residential, mixed use and natural open space zones).
<b>Carbon Neutral NZ Trust (S529)</b>	S529.046	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	The area between Waipapa and the golf course (Brownlie property) currently under consideration offers a more appropriate location for future growth than the areas to the north or south of Kerikeri indicated in the PDP zone map. The area between Waipapa and the golf course has the potential to provide connectivity between SH10 and the CBD, and between SH10 and Waipapa Road, and safe connectivity between the new FNDC Sports Hub on SH10 and local schools. Integrated planning is generally easier on a greenfield site. Importantly, growth in this area would eventually provide a relatively compact footprint for Kerikeri/Waipapa. No other site offers this advantage. The current lack of infrastructure could be addressed by requiring the developer to provide roading, water supply, on-site wastewater system and other needs.	Delete Rural Production zoning of the land commonly referred to as the 'Brownlee' property, being 1878 State Highway 10, Waipapa (Lot 2 DP 89875, Part Section 13 Block X Kerikeri Survey District and Part Lot 6 Deposited Plan 6704). Rezone this land area for future development (primarily as a mix of residential, mixed use and natural open space zones).
<b>Victoria Yorke and Andre Galvin (S530)</b>	S530.003	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Not Stated	The plot of land borders an existing residential area. As Haruru is predominantly a residential area, partial rezoning of the property for more intensive residential use would consolidate growth around the urban centre. It would also allow purchasers the opportunity for coastal living which	Delete Rural Production zoning of part (3.9ha) of Lot 1 DP 53506 (Puketona Road, Haruru Falls), zone the 3.9ha land area Residential.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					is something the Far North have asked for in the 'have your say' portion of the new district plan.	
<b>Elbury Holdings (S541)</b>	S541.030	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	The Planning Maps show the Rural Production Zone in some areas e.g. Awanui/wireless road kaitaia that are serviced by sewerage, footpaths, refuse collection etc. If this zoning continues, it will severely constrain future urban development, and this should be corrected by amending RPROZ objectives, policies and rules zones to accommodate things other than rural production	Amend the Planning Maps by removing the Rural Production Zone from areas (Wireless Road, Kaitaia / Awanui) as described above developed with infrastructure for urban development and substitute an appropriate urban zone; OR amend Rural Production Zone objectives, policies and rules as separately submitted and allow smaller blocks of land ie.2000 sq mtrs.
<b>LJ King Limited (S543)</b>	S543.031	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	The Planning Maps show the Rural Production Zone in some areas e.g. Awanui/wireless road kaitaia that are serviced by sewerage, footpaths, refuse collection etc. If this zoning continues, it will severely constrain future urban development, and this should be corrected by amending RPROZ objectives, policies and rules zones to accommodate things other than rural production	Amend the Planning Maps by removing the Rural Production Zone from areas (Wireless Road, Kaitaia / Awanui) as described above developed with infrastructure for urban development and substitute an appropriate urban zone; OR amend Rural Production Zone objectives, policies and rules as separately submitted and allow smaller blocks of land ie.2000 sq mtrs.
<b>LJ King Limited (S547)</b>	S547.031	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	The Planning Maps show the Rural Production Zone in some areas e.g. Awanui/wireless road kaitaia that are serviced by sewerage, footpaths, refuse collection etc. If this zoning continues, it will severely constrain future urban development, and this should be corrected by amending RPROZ objectives, policies and rules zones to accommodate things other than rural production	Amend the Planning Maps by removing the Rural Production Zone from areas (Wireless Road, Kaitaia / Awanui) as described above developed with infrastructure for urban development and substitute an appropriate urban zone; OR amend Rural Production Zone objectives, policies and rules as separately submitted and allow smaller blocks of land ie.2000 sq mtrs
<b>Omata Estate (S548)</b>	S548.001	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	the Omata Estate land is predominantly used as a vineyard with an associated café/restaurant. These activities operate over approximately five	rezone The Omata Estate land at 212 and 212B Aucks Road (legally described as Lot 1 DP 391936 and

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>hectares of the landholding, and the balance of the sites comprises of established native vegetation. The sizes of the allotments, existing land use, large areas of native vegetation and the undulating topography of the Omata Estate land limits the ability for the land to be practically utilised for rural productive activities. Furthermore, the surrounding properties predominantly contain rural residential development. Rural production activities are not commonplace within the site's locality. Applying a Rural Production zoning to the Omata Estate land does not accurately represent the use of the land nor the localised character of the sites which is inherently rural lifestyle living. The Manaaki Whenua Landcare Research Land Use Capacity (LUC) Maps indicate that the Omata Estate land contains Class 6 (non-arable) soils. A copy of the LUC maps is provided as Attachment 3 to this submission. The Class 6 soils indicate that the land has slight to moderate limitations to pastoral use and that the land is suitable for pasture, tree crops and forestry and in some case vineyards. Erosion is generally the dominant limiting factor to the productive potential of this soil type. The Class 6 soils do not fall within the PDP definition of versatile soils nor does the soil type trigger the site to meet the PDP definition of highly productive land.</p>	Lot 2 DP 391936) from Rural Production to Rural Lifestyle
<b>Omata Estate (S548)</b>	S548.002	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	<p>Omata Estate seeks that the Far North District Council also considers rezoning the Rural Production zoned land between Okiato and Te Wahapu to the Rural Lifestyle Zone to provide a more succinct zoning pattern that better aligns with the predominant rural lifestyle use of this area.</p>	rezone the land between the settlements of Okiato and Te Wahapu should be rezoned from Rural Production to rural lifestyle
<b>Lucklaw Farm Ltd (S551)</b>	S551.001	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Support in part	<p>The re-zoning proposed for Part A will allow for further urban growth and development around the existing Rangiputa Settlement, in accordance with SD-UFD-O2. The expansion of the existing Rangiputa settlement would likely allow for better funding and eventual replacement of the wastewater ponds (FN160). It is envisaged that</p>	<p>rezone 690 Rangiputa road, Karikari peninsula from Rural Production to 3 different zones see map for part A/B/C                      part A - mixed us / residential                      part B - rural lifestyle</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					engagement would occur with adjacent landowners in relation to the proposed re-zoning	part C - remain rural production
<b>Trustees of the Taranaki Trust (S552)</b>	S552.001	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	The land use for this 52 ha property is currently Lifestyle - Multiuse (see Schedule 1 attached FNDC rating info). The property is owned by a family trust and has two modern dwellings, 4 older style batches and 2 sheds. The FNDC PDP now proposes that this property is zoned Rural Production. This submission is that this use of this land which is adjacent to a residential area (Rangiputa settlement) and is used for residential purposes such as accommodation is not compatible with the purpose, character and amenity of a Rural Production zone. Rezoning of land adjacent to the Rangiputa settlement as Rural lifestyle / Mixed Use / Residential, with the balance as Rural Production will allow for the planned expansion of the existing Rangiputa settlement in accordance with the strategic direction objectives for urban form and development, while allowing for a mix of housing typologies	Rezone 700 Rangiputa Road, Karikari from Rural Production to different zones based on location see map Part A - Mixed use/ Residential Part B- Rural Lifestyle Part C - Rural Production Alternatively, Rural Lifestyle or Rural Settlement zoning is sought for the property at 700 Rangiputa Road, Karikari Peninsula.
<b>Grace Anne Sturgess (S553)</b>	S553.001	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	The land identified is adjacent or in proximity to a residential area (Rangiputa settlement) and its use is not compatible with the purpose, character and amenity of a Rural Production zone. Rezoning of land adjacent to the Rangiputa settlement as a mix of Rural Lifestyle/Mixed Use /Residential, with the balance as Rural Production will allow for the planned expansion of the existing Rangiputa settlement in accordance with the strategic direction objectives for urban form and development, while allowing for a mix of housing typologies.	Delete the Rural Production zoning of the following land shown as land area A in schedule 2 to the submission, and zone the identified land area as Mixed Use and Residential with the respective zone's objectives, policies and provisions applying to the land - - Part of 700 Rangiputa Road, Karikari Peninsula (being Lot 2 DP 446414) - Part of land on Rangiputa Road, Karikari Peninsula (being Lot 1 DP 446414) - 2B Motutara Drive, Karikari Peninsula (being Lot 2 DP 350584) - 2C Motutara Drive, Karikari Peninsula (being Lot 1 DP 350584)Delete the Rural Production zoning of the following land shown as land area B in schedule 2 to the submission,

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						and zone the identified land area as Rural Lifestyle with the respective zone's objectives, policies and provisions applying to the land - - Part of land on Rangiputa Road, Karikari Peninsula (being Lot 1 DP 446414) - 2D Motutara Drive, Karikari Peninsula (being Lot 2 DP 446414)OR ALTERNATIVELY Delete the Rural Production zoning of 2B Motutara Drive, Karikari Peninsula (being Lot 2 DP 350584), and zone as Rural Residential
<b>Grace Anne Sturgess (S553)</b>	S553.002	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Support	The land use is compatible with the purpose, character and amenity of a Rural Production zone.	Retain the Rural Production zoning of the following land shown as land area C in schedule 2 to the submission - Part of 700 Rangiputa Road, Karikari Peninsula (being Lot 2 DP 446414). Land on Puheke Road, Karikari Peninsula (being Sec 4 Blk III Karikari SD)
<b>Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited (S554)</b>	S554.002	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	The reasons supporting KFO's submission are explained in the Section 32 Report - Brownlie Land prepared by the Planning Collective. That report contains both the reasons for the submission and an evaluation of the submission under the statutory tests in section 32 of the RMA. The Submission Area lies between the Kerikeri and Waipapa townships. Given anticipated growth in the area (see below), KFO considers the Submission Area the logical place for urban development that cannot be provided by infill development alone, while bridging a gap and integrating with the two urban areas of Kerikeri and Waipapa. The proposal's mix of General Residential, Mixed Use and Natural Open Space is to accommodate the various needs of urban growth whilst recognising and avoiding development of significant ecological features of the landscape. In support of its submission and the Section 32 Report - Brownlie Land, KFO has	Amend the zoning for the site, known locally as Brownlie development (Title references 137884, NA46D/1149, NA33B/689 & NA1126/159) for urban development as requested in the submission (General Residential, Mixed Use, Natural Open Space) from Rural Production.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>commissioned independent expert reports that:</p> <p>(a) Provide an independent economic assessment of projected growth within Kerikeri-Waipapa and consider whether it is, or is intended to be, an urban environment under the NPS-UD.</p> <p>(b) Consider infrastructure and servicing restraints on development of the Submission Area and assess the feasibility of solutions. (c) Model flood risks and propose conceptual designs for flood management. (d) Assess the existing traffic environment and anticipated changes to the receiving environment from development of the Submission Area and propose and consider roading design options. (e) Assess the proposed structure plan and transport options against potential landscape considerations. (f) Identify high-level ecological constraints that require management through planning controls, such as Natural Open Space zoning. Identify soil types within the Submission Area for the purpose of engaging with the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL). The proposed zoning seeks approx. 152ha General Residential, 22ha Mixed Use and 23ha Natural Open Space.</p>	
<b>Andr� Galvin (S567)</b>	S567.001	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Not Stated	<p>The Rural Production zone is inconsistent with the location of the subject site adjacent to and contiguous with the Residential zone imposed over the urban settlement of Haruru Falls. The subject site has 14 residentially zoned neighbours. It is acknowledged that the site contributes to the high natural character of the coastal setting which is acknowledged through the imposition of overlay HNC409. The submitter has, relying on the operative General Coastal zoning of the site, taken significant steps in the preparation of a development plan in keeping with the management plan opportunities under the operative zone. The submitter wishes to continue this environmental development opportunity which has a high public benefit through the provision of access to the coastal edge in an enhanced</p>	Delete Rural Production zoning of Lot 1 DP 53506 (Puketona Road, Haruru Falls), and rezone Settlement

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					vegetated coastal setting at this upper reach of the Waitangi River estuary.	
<b>Andr� Galvin (S567)</b>	S567.004	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Not Stated	The plot of land borders an existing residential area. As Haruru is predominantly a residential area, partial rezoning of the property for more intensive residential use would consolidate growth around the urban centre. It would also allow purchasers the opportunity for coastal living which is something the Far North have asked for in the 'have your say' portion of the new district plan.	Delete Rural Production zoning of part (3.9ha) of Lot 1 DP 53506 (Puketona Road, Haruru Falls), zone the 3.9ha land area Residential.
<b>Dave and Nisha Clark (S572)</b>	S572.001	Planning maps	Rural Production Zone	Not Stated	Our section is part of an approved residential subdivision located in Wharo Way, Ahipara. Although DP 381292 is an approved residential subdivision, it retained a mixed zoning status with many lots retaining a General Coastal zoning while the balance was zoned Residential. Oddly enough, the lots closest to Foreshore Road and the beach were zoned Residential and those further away General Coastal In reviewing the FNDC zone maps (Operative District Plan Map #75), the anomaly of the zoning, in comparison to the rest of Ahipara south, is quite visible. The Residential zone for Ahipara includes all residential sections except that of Wharo Way. We believe the designated zoning of this subdivision to Rural Production is an oversight. FNDC has assigned what was previously a General Coastal zone into Rural Production, just allowing for minor tweaks to avoid split zoning Lot 16 DP 381292 was subdivided with residential sizing in mind, it has no productive potential, and is not located within a rural environment We do not represent all owners, and this submission relates specifically to Lot 16 DP 381292, however common sense would lead to the complete subdivision being rezoned as Residential	Delete the Rural Production zoning of 14 Wharo Way (Lot 16 DP 381292), zone the lot Residential. Note: submission suggests Council consider similar zoning for all lots on Wharo Way
<b>Ken Lewis Limited (S9)</b>	S9.001	Planning maps	Rural Residential Zone	Oppose	Summary of Reasons: Rezoning from Rural Residential to General Residential is appropriate because the property: -Adjoins the General Residential Zone along its western and northern boundaries and has direct	Amend zoning of 64 ha of land which has frontage to Donald Road and Allen Bell Drive, Kaitaia (legally described as ROT NA105B/60 (Lot 1 DP 173052)) from Rural

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>access to main traffic routes onto Allen Bell Drive and Donald Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Residential subdivision approvals have been granted to enable the creation of seven residential sites as Non-Complying activities.</li> <li>-The elevation of the property enables efficient use of gravity to allow connection to the Councils three waters services.</li> <li>-The land is not identified as containing any high class soils or being defined as highly productive</li> <li>-The inclusion of the land within the General Residential Zone is a coherent extension of the residential area which creates the urban area of the Kaitaia town centre.</li> <li>-The submitters property is located on elevated land and presents a bona fide future residential opportunity for the township that is located away from the current flooding hazard that covers the large majority of the Kaitaia township.</li> <li>-There is no widespread evidence that Kaitaia is ready for apartment type - or above town centre living in the mixed use zone.</li> </ul>	Residential to General Residential (refer to Figure 1 of submission)
<b>Richard Dunsheath (S10)</b>	S10.001	Planning maps	Rural Residential Zone	Support	<p>Waipapa is a growing area with a strong economy and appeal - sustainable progress is critical to maintaining positive communities. As the Waipapa economy continues to create employment and training opportunities, family wellbeing needs to remain a top priority.</p> <p>Increasing the number of residents within close proximity and walking distance of Waipapa retail and businesses is positive for the community as it will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Reduce council infrastructure expenses (creating better economies of scale)</li> <li>· Support the community to buy locally</li> <li>· Reduce carbon emissions with less cars and shorter travel distances</li> <li>· Reduce traffic congestion and parking problems</li> <li>· Enable people to work and live in the same area</li> </ul>	Retain the proposed Rural Residential Zone surrounding Waipapa (especially on the north side of Waipapa between State Highway 10 and Waipapa Stream (near Pungaere Road)).

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support healthy physical and mental health by promoting exercise.</li> </ul>	
<b>Smartlife Trust (S15)</b>	S15.001	Planning maps	Rural Residential Zone	Not Stated	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.	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
<b>Alan and Pat Strang (S20)</b>	S20.001	Planning maps	Rural Residential Zone	Oppose	Our property and other along this side of Kerikeri road are still zoned Rural living. This makes compliance for any development very costly and difficult. We are only 300m from the town centre and kilometers away from rural land. A rezoning is long overdue. Our neighbour on Kerikeri road has recently been rezoned to mixed use. We would like the same zoning for us. We have submitted an application to subdivide our section into 3 sections. This aligns with government and Council policy to better utilise fully serviced in town land	Delete Rural Residential zoning of 316A Kerikeri Road, Kerikeri, zone Mixed Use
<b>Seeka Limited (S34)</b>	S34.001	Planning maps	Rural Residential Zone	Oppose	The Seeka Limited property at 153 Waipapa Road, Kerikeri is currently located within the Horticulture Processing Zone and partly within the Rural Residential Zone. The proposed District Plan maps appear to show the whole site being within the Rural Residential Zone. Seeka oppose the site being fully rezoned to Rural Residential, however this may simply be a mapping error. Seeka therefore seek that at least the existing	Amend the zoning of the property at 153 Waipapa Road, Kerikeri (Lot 3 DP 196433) from Rural Residential Zone to Horticulture Processing Zone (so that the entire property is within the Horticulture Processing Zone). Ensure the planning maps correctly identify the Horticulture

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					portion of the site zoned Horticulture Processing is retained as such, but would prefer that the whole site (that being the entirety of Lot 3 DP 196433) be rezoned to Horticulture Processing.	Processing Zone.
<b>Elizabeth Irvine (S39)</b>	S39.001	Planning maps	Rural Residential Zone	Support	Ms Irvine supports the Land being zoned Rural Residential (RRZ) under the Proposed Plan. Thus, recognising that this land may be up zoned over time to an urban zone as required to cater growth.	Retain the Rural Residential zone for the land at 70 Shepherds Road, Kerikeri (Lots 4 and 5 DP 335593)
<b>BOI Enterprises Limited (S139)</b>	S139.001	Planning maps	Rural Residential Zone	Oppose	Lots 1 and 2 DP 561725 (2 and 4 The Lakes Drive, Kerikeri) should be zoned Mixed Use. This zoning is more appropriate for these sites: a) It better aligns with existing development, size of landholdings and proposed development for the site. b) Existing and proposed activities are not consistent with the Rural Residential zone. c) The landholdings are consistent with the Mixed Use zone. d) The approach proposed is more consistent with the purpose and principles of the Resource Management Act 1991.	Amend the zoning of Lots 1 and 2 DP 561725 (2 and 4 The Lakes Drive, Kerikeri), from Rural Residential to Mixed Use
<b>Arvida Group Limited (S165)</b>	S165.002	Planning maps	Rural Residential Zone	Oppose	The site legally described as Lot 2 DP 321732 is owned by Arvida Group Limited and forms part of the Te Puna Waiora retirement village complex. This irregular parcel of land has been given a split zoning based on the simple extrapolation of "straight line" which has no regard to the site's single land ownership and the ability for integrated management of resources to be achieved based on land tenure arrangements	Re-zone that part of Lot 2 DP 321732 shown as Rural Residential on the PDP planning maps to General Residential zone (see attachment 1 to the submission)
<b>Reuben Wright (S178)</b>	S178.001	Planning maps	Rural Residential Zone	Support in part	The provisions identified above as they relate to the proposed Rural Residential Zoning of the specified properties and the wider area of the same Zone enclosed within Okahu and Pukepoto Roads, Kaitaia, is supported.	Retain the Rural Residential Zone as it applies to Section 1 SO 65376 and Lot 9 DP554104, and to the wider area enclosed within Okahu and Pukepoto Roads, Kaitaias.
<b>Northland Transportation Alliance (S184)</b>	S184.026	Planning maps	Rural Residential Zone	Oppose	Not supportive of the small lot, rural development adjacent to urban centres. Supportive of development which encourages active and public transportation systems. Large urban lot and small rural lot zoning are not economical to provide	Amend Rural Residential zoning adjacent to urban centres

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					active and public transport to as we require a certain level of density in order to create those networks.	
<b>Audrey Campbell-Frear (S209)</b>	S209.005	Planning maps	Rural Residential Zone	Oppose	<p>Rural Residential Zone (RRZ) is the most appropriate zoning in the mapped location (refer to the 2nd of the two appendices titled Appendix 1) because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The properties located within this area are consistent with the intended purpose of the RRZ</li> <li>- PDP mapped extent the RRZ does not follow a logical and defensible boundary</li> <li>- The character and amenity of this area is consistent with the PDP zoned land RRZ, enhancing a coherent per-urban pattern and character to Kerikeri</li> <li>- These properties do not fit with the proposed zone criteria of the Horticulture Zone</li> <li>- The proposed Horticulture Zone fails to enable sustainable use and development of the properties within this area.</li> </ul>	Amend by reviewing the Rural Residential Zone on the edge of Kerikeri and rezone land in accordance with the Map in Appendix 1 (note this is the 2nd of the two appendices titled Appendix 1).
<b>Jim Longhurst (S224)</b>	S224.001	Planning maps	Rural Residential Zone	Support	I am in support for the zoning of the property (184 Kerikeri Inlet Road, Kerikeri) remaining Rural Residential Zone.	[Retain proposed zoning of 184 Kerikeri Inlet Road, Kerikeri as Rural Residential Zone].
<b>JL and AR Matthewson Partnership (S245)</b>	S245.001	Planning maps	Rural Residential Zone	Support	To keep The Ridge Rd, Kerikeri as a semi-rural environment with plenty of open space for people to enjoy a spacious, per-urban living environment located close to a settlement.	[Retain] proposed Rural Residential Zone for The Ridge Rd, Kerikeri.
<b>Paul Wright (S280)</b>	S280.002	Planning maps	Rural Residential Zone	Oppose	Mixed Use Zone reflects the reality of these sites current and future use. The Rural Residential Zone no longer reflects the reality of the infrastructure (reticulated wastewater, stormwater and potable water), location (within urban area, with footpath to central Kerikeri) and current commercial use of these properties. The sites are comparable to neighbouring properties proposed zoning (all of which are mixed use both adjacent or directly across Kerikeri Road). There seems to be no validity in zoning these sites as Rural Residential and therefore it is proposed these subject sites are Zoned to reflect reality as Mixed Use. These sites are already Mixed Use sites.	Amend zoning of land at 316 - 342 Kerikeri Road, Kerikeri from Rural Residential Zone to Mixed Use Zone.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>Trent Simpkin (S284)</b>	S284.010	Planning maps	Rural Residential Zone	Oppose	It is clear from the zone maps that no thought has been given to Ahipara's future growth plans. Just because the projected population growth stats may not show growth in some areas around the Far North doesn't mean that land shouldn't be rezoned to allow development - because development drives increased population, more rates for FNDC and a better lifestyle for the local people with access to better services. The land is already subdivided and is Rural Residential in nature.	Amend zoning of land at 1-45 Kokopu Street, Ahipara and 6-25 Karawaka Street (informally known as "Kokopu subdivision") from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential Zone.
<b>Trent Simpkin (S284)</b>	S284.016	Planning maps	Rural Residential Zone	Oppose	Residential areas which are serviced should be zoned General Residential, not other zones. There should be an overlay map completed showing the serviced areas with infrastructure and the new zones proposed. All areas with sewer infrastructure should be rezoned to General Residential to allow further development and sites to be created. Pekama Drive, Mangonui is an example.	Amend zoning of all land at Pekama Drive, Mangonui with access to sewer services from Rural Residential Zone to General Residential Zone. This includes land at 1-3 Pekama Drive (inferred) (see map attached to original submission).
<b>Tristan Simpkin (S288)</b>	S288.010	Planning maps	Rural Residential Zone	Oppose	It is clear from the zone maps that no thought has been given to Ahipara's future growth plans. Just because the projected population growth stats may not show growth in some areas around the Far North doesn't mean that land shouldn't be rezoned to allow development - because development drives increased population, more rates for FNDC and a better lifestyle for the local people with access to better services. The land is already subdivided and is Rural Residential in nature.	Amend zoning of land at 1-45 Kokopu Street, Ahipara and 6-25 Karawaka Street (informally known as "Kokopu subdivision") from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential Zone.
<b>Tristan Simpkin (S288)</b>	S288.016	Planning maps	Rural Residential Zone	Oppose	Residential areas which are serviced should be zoned General Residential, not other zones. There should be an overlay map completed showing the serviced areas with infrastructure and the new zones proposed. All areas with sewer infrastructure should be rezoned to General Residential to allow further development and sites to be created. Pekama Drive, Mangonui is an example.	Amend zoning of all land at Pekama Drive, Mangonui with access to sewer services from Rural Residential Zone to General Residential Zone. This includes land at 1-3 Pekama Drive (inferred) (see map attached to original submission).

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>Kathleen Courtenay (S298)</b>	S298.001	Planning maps	Rural Residential Zone	Oppose	Specific concern is the proposed ability to divide sections into lots less than 4000m <sup>2</sup> . Submitter bought land because of its rural nature and does not wish for the land to be intensified in an urban direction. Submitter feels that neighbours and surrounding community share this view.	Amend the proposed zoning of land at Lot 1, Cable Bay Block Road (Deposited Plan 361189) from Rural Residential to Rural Production (inferred as the submission states a preference for Rural Living zoning (i.e. retaining Operative District Plan zoning)).
<b>Paul Wright (S301)</b>	S301.001	Planning maps	Rural Residential Zone	Oppose	These properties are almost all currently used for commercial purposes, are connected to reticulated wastewater, stormwater and potable water and mostly pay commercial based rates. The proposed zoning does not reflect the current use, future use or current infrastructure. The sites are a few hundred metres from central Kerikeri and are serviced by a FNDC footpath and properties adjacent or across the road have mixed use zoning.	Amend zoning of 316-342 Kerikeri Road, Kerikeri from Rural Residential to Mixed use.
<b>Selwyn Garton (S306)</b>	S306.001	Planning maps	Rural Residential Zone	Support	There are limited sections available in Kaitaia for high value/quality homes. There is a need for providing opportunity to live close to work, schools, hospitals etc. The land proposed for rezoning is practically no longer rural production and already moving to residential.	Retain proposed zoning of rural residential land adjacent to existing residential zoned land of Kaitaia (rezoned from rural production to rural residential), in particular within the Okahu Loop Road.
<b>Mangonui Haulage (S318)</b>	S318.001	Planning maps	Rural Residential Zone	Oppose	The submitter considers that the proposed Rural Residential Zone as it applies to Lot 2 DP 437473, located in Waipapa, does not reflect the existing activities on the site. The submitter acknowledges that a district plan cannot create site specific zones in every instance however there is merit in changing this property to a zone which reflects the activities being undertaken.	Amend the Rural Residential zoning of Lot 2 DP 437473 to Light Industrial Zone.
<b>Per Lugnet (S322)</b>	S322.001	Planning maps	Rural Residential Zone	Oppose	The residential area south of Freyja Crescent and the end of Torsby Road in Coopers Beach should be zoned Residential. This would be consistent with the Strategic Direction, and would contribute to meeting growth demands for Retirement Housing by utilising existing infrastructure, Objectives GRZ-O1, GRZ-O2.	Rezone the area south of Freyja Crescent and the end of Torsby Road in Coopers Beach to Residential so existing residential infrastructure can be utilised for Retirement Housing.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>Adrian and Sue Knight (S325)</b>	S325.004	Planning maps	Rural Residential Zone	Oppose	<p>Rural Residential Zone is the most appropriate zoning in the mapped location because:</p> <p>a. The properties located within this area are consistent with the intended purpose of the Rural Residential Zone.</p> <p>b. The PDP mapped extent the Rural Residential Zone does not follow a logical and defensible boundary.</p> <p>c. The character and amenity of this area is consistent with the PDP zoned land Rural Residential Zone, establishing a coherent peri-urban pattern and character to Kerikeri.</p> <p>d. These properties do not fit with the proposed zone criteria of the Horticulture Zone.</p> <p>e. The proposed Horticulture Zone fails to enable sustainable use and development of the properties within this area.</p>	Review the Rural Residential zone on the edge of Kerikeri and rezone land in accordance with the Map in Appendix 1 of the submission.
<b>Davies Kerikeri Family Trust, MR Davies, and BR &amp; R Davies (S329)</b>	S329.001	Planning maps	Rural Residential Zone	Not Stated	<p>Rezone part of the site fronting Kerikeri Inlet Road to General Residential as opposed to Rural Residential for a number of reasons, including:</p> <p>difficulties to comply with air emission requirements for the orchard operations on this area;</p> <p>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;</p> <p>the site has direct access to reticulated Council infrastructure;</p> <p>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;</p> <p>economic benefits - relative increase in residential density;</p> <p>social benefits - buffer between proposed General Residential zone and horticultural activities - assist in minimising potential reverse sensitivity effects;</p> <p>environmental benefits include a potential esplanade reserve, and improvement to the site frontage with Kerikeri Inlet Road;</p> <p>the General Residential zone is a more efficient</p>	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.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					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>Kerikeri Heights Limited (S362)</b>	S362.001	Planning maps	Rural Residential Zone	Oppose	Refer to full submissions for specific reasons for decisions sought which include, but not limited to, the following: immediately across the road are properties proposed to be zoned General Residential Zone - a large general residential subdivision is currently being developed at 373 Kerikeri Road with lot sizes of approximately 300m2 and 700m2; the property already has available development infrastructure; and the property is within an easy walking distance to town.	Amend to rezone 372 Kerikeri Road, Kerikeri from Rural Residential Zone to General Residential Zone.
<b>Nigel Ross Surveyor Ltd (S367)</b>	S367.001	Planning maps	Rural Residential Zone	Oppose	Area referenced in the submission. A considerable number of properties, around 0.5 to 2ha in the area have not been rural production in nature for many years. The current and future land uses identified in the submission are consistent with the objectives of the Rural Residential zone. The current rural production zoning is inappropriate.	Amend the zoning of the properties identified in the submission to Rural Residential
<b>Brady Wild (S369)</b>	S369.001	Planning maps	Rural Residential Zone	Support	Supports the proposed rezoning of a property on Okahu Road, Kaitaia, legally described as Lot 10 DP 554104 and Pt Lot 8 DP 135828 (held within one CT, ref. 962760) to Rural Residential. Being on the fringe of the Kaitaia Township in an area where medium-density residential development is already emerging, it is considered that the Rural Residential zoning of the site is far more appropriate than the current Rural Production zoning. The proposed zoning represents a largely positive change for the site and the wider Kaitaia area as it recognises the need for housing development where there is currently a severe housing shortage	Retain the Rural Residential zoning of a property on Okahu Road, Kaitaia, legally described as Lot 10 DP 554104 and Pt Lot 8 DP 135828 (held within one CT, ref. 962760).
<b>Linda Gigger (S370)</b>	S370.001	Planning maps	Rural Residential Zone	Oppose	166 Waipapa Road, Kerikeri, being Lot 18 DP 357357, includes an existing and operating concrete product manufacturing plant producing wastewater treatment system components and	Delete the Rural Residential zoning of 166 Waipapa Road, Kerikeri, being Lot 18 DP 357357, zone Light

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>pastoral water containment components, which has operated under planning approval.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	Industrial
<b>Grant Alan Billington and Georgina McGarry (S372)</b>	S372.001	Planning maps	Rural Residential Zone	Oppose	<p>Refer to the full submission for reasons for decision requested which include, but not limited to, the following: the size of the site can appropriately provide infrastructure on the site; the underlying consent approval (RC2030759) confirms that light industrial activities can be appropriately undertaken on the site (subject to conditions); and the Light Industrial Zones provides for unserviced allotments, therefore, provision of infrastructure does not seem like a key determinant for zoning.</p>	Amend to rezone 8 Waterfront Drive, Mangonui from Rural Residential Zone to Light Industrial Zone.
<b>Birta Kortner and Jonas Kortner (S387)</b>	S387.001	Planning maps	Rural Residential Zone	Not Stated	<p>The current zone does not reflect the objectives and policies laid out for the rural production zone. The lot size is too small to carry out rural production activities on a commercially feasible scale.</p> <p>Considering the current use as well as past use there is no functional need to be in a production zone and the property would be more appropriately located in a residential zone.</p> <p>Many properties along SH12 are zoned residential, and within a stretch of residential zone adjacent to 4 Wallis Rd, are of similar size or even much larger.</p> <p>The property is located near NIEP and is connected to town water and broadband.</p>	Amend the zoning on 4 Wallis Rd from Rural Production to Rural Residential
<b>Kaizen Management</b>	S392.001	Planning maps	Rural Residential Zone	Oppose	<p>The site is relatively large and is uniquely positioned on the corner of State Highway 10 and Waterfront Drive with access to the site being off</p>	Amend to rezone 6 Waterfront Drive, Mangonui (Lot 1 DP 174109 NA106D/655) from Rural

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Limited (S392)					<p>Waterfront Drive, and is situated close to an environment of light industrial activities with ITM Building Supplies being just two properties to the west, and Mangonui Haulage across from it. It therefore is more appropriate location for Light Industrial development.</p> <p>A number of Resource Consents that relate to light industrial activity have been granted for this site in the past, including a marine and general engineering workshop, and a yard for transportable home construction with show buildings and office.</p> <p>Light industrial activities such as the above and other light industrial use activities seems more appropriate for the site.</p>	Residential Zone to Light Industrial Zone.
Pukanui Investments Ltd & The Ridge Childcare Ltd (S408)	S408.001	Planning maps	Rural Residential Zone	Oppose	<p>RRZ-01 Rural should be changed in parts of Kerikeri Road. Residential Zone is said to provide for a fringe transitional area surrounding Rural production, Rural Lifestyle and Horticultural zones. This is not the case with 322 Kerikeri Road where the nearest rural activity is an estimated km away to the North/West and some 2-3km down Kerikeri Road. Kerikeri Road has 1000 traffic movements per day and is the busiest road in the Far North. The impermeable coverage of 12.5% is very restrictive and should be increased.</p>	Amend the Planning Maps to make the zoning to Kerikeri Road frontage properties between Aranga Road and Greenway Drive from Rural Residential Zone to Mixed Use Zone.
Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited (S502)	S502.107	Planning maps	Rural Residential Zone	Oppose	<p>Sites located from 192 - 238 Pukepoto Road range in size from 809m2 to 3050m2 and are connected to Council's Reticulated Network. Other sites from 85-129 Pukepoto Road, most of which are 1017m2 are zoned as General Residential. Given the fact that these sites are serviced by Council's reticulated wastewater and stormwater networks and the area is urban in character we seek relief that the sites from 192-238 Pukepoto Road be rezoned as General Residential</p>	Amend to rezone Rural Residential land at 192 - 238 Pukepoto Rd to General Residential zone
Ngā Kaingamaha o Ngāti Hine	S555.001	Planning maps	Rural Residential Zone	Oppose	<p>The Rural Residential zone limits development density due to implied onsite servicing requirements of each new dwelling. Having regard to the context of the area, the site is</p>	Amend the zoning of the rear of 11 Greenacres Drive (Section 22 SBRS of Kawakawa) and the adjoining site to the south Section

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>Charitable Trust (S555)</b>					<p>part of the Bay of Islands Hospital land holdings which is considered to form a portion of the urban area of Kawakawa, however we do acknowledge that the site would be the hypothetical urban rural boundary for the area. There is clear demand from Iwi to provide urban growth on the site where the submitter is seeking to secure a 100 year lease to accommodate housing (both assisted and independent, and private) as well as community facilities that benefit the wider area.</p> <p>The site can accommodate a residential development without servicing constraints subject to some infrastructure upgrades. Therefore, General Residential zoning is considered appropriate for the site.</p> <p>Further high level assessments are currently being undertaken with regard to geotechnical stability, and potential contamination (a detailed site investigation) of the site which will be provided to Council as part of further submissions. At this stage, there are no indications that suggest that the site cannot accommodate buildings.</p>	25 SBRS OF Kawakawa) from Rural Residential to General Residential
<b>Lynley Newport (S100)</b>	S100.002	Planning maps	Settlement Zone	Support in part	there may be some areas that have been missed out that should have been zoned Settlement	amend / review where it might be additionally applied in the district
<b>Ian Ray (Joe) Carr (S397)</b>	S397.006	Planning maps	Settlement Zone	Support in part	<p>Lot 2 DP336924 split zoning has remained unchanged in the notified PDP. I am essentially requesting for Settlement Zoning over most of this property.</p> <p>Taking into account contour, aspect, amenity and existing services 9.5910 ha property on Horeke Road Okaihau, with the legal description of Lot 2 Deposited Plan 336924 has the best capacity of any land adjoining the Okaihau Residential Zone (ODP) for the provision of future housing lots.</p> <p>Extending Map 97's settlement zone westward along Settlers Way (Horeke Road) will provide for the community's future housing needs for at least part of the life of the plan (10 years). The location of the property is within the submission.</p>	Delete the split zoning of Lot 2 DP 336924 and zone the entire lot area Settlement

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Ian Ray (Joe) Carr (S397)	S397.007	Planning maps	Settlement Zone	Not Stated	<p>Council has not provided sufficient residential land for the foreseeable housing requirements in the Okaihau Settlement Zone. I know of no available sections for house development.</p> <p>The PDP Overview records that Council has a responsibility under the RMA, the NPS-UD and the Northland Regional Policy Statement to ensure that there is sufficient land, integrated infrastructure networks, for housing and business to meet their expected demands.</p>	Amend the boundaries of the Okaihau Settlement zone, extending the area of the zone
Musson Family Trust (S404)	S404.001	Planning maps	Settlement Zone	Oppose	<p>Refer to full submissions for detailed reason(s) for decision sought which include, but not limited to, the following: Rural Lifestyle Zone will 'downzone' the site in terms of its development and subdivision potential; rezoning the land Settlement Zone will provide for the residential yield lost as a result of the development restriction posed by the wetlands on Lot 7 DP 204703; highly productive land will not be comprised by further subdivision; the subject land is already developed at a residential density and pattern of development that exceeds the density provisions of the proposed Rural Lifestyle Zone; there is high demand for housing in the area, particularly for works employed by the growing number of orchards throughout the region; and the Settlement Zone is the most efficient and effective means of achieving Part 2 of the RMA.</p>	Amend to rezone from Rural Lifestyle to Settlement Zone, 30 Houhora Heads Road, Pukenui and the surrounding properties (outlined in blue in Figure 4 in the full submission) to Settlement zone.
Scrumptious Fruit Trust (S568)	S568.004	Planning maps	Settlement Zone	Support in part	<p>The requirement of the NPS - indigenous biodiversity as that applies to coastal areas are best fulfilled by a targeting "coastal settlement" zone. Northland has precious coastal habitat and environment justifying more nuanced zoning controls.</p> <p>in coastal margins where settlements mix residential and holiday home developments, and have adjacent areas of natural significance (eg Taupo Bay) some greater controls should be placed on certain activities to ensure the natural environment is protected - for example stronger controls on outdoor lighting, security lights, reflective material.</p>	amend zoning of coastal settlements. Settlements that are within the coastal environment should be a separate "coastal settlement" zone

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>Jeff and Robby Kemp (S51)</b>	S51.001	Planning maps	Sport And Active Recreation Zone	Support	The land is the subject of an approved resource consent application which provides for a Sports Hub. The proposed zone facilitates the development of this facility.	Retain the Sport and Active Recreation Zone over the land described as Lot 18 DP 316057 as provided for on the PDP E-Maps.
<b>Ernie Cottle (S92)</b>	S92.001	Planning maps	Sport And Active Recreation Zone	Support	The land is the subject of an approved resource consent application which provides for a Sports Hub. The proposed zone facilitates the development of this facility.	Retain the Sport and Active Recreation Zone over the land described as Lot 18 DP 316057 as provided for on the PDPE-Maps.
<b>Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust (S274)</b>	S274.007	Planning maps	Sport And Active Recreation Zone	Not Stated	The benefits of rezoning 17 and 19 Harmony Lane for the community would be supporting the growth in Waipapa and demand for housing within proximity and access to community sports and recreational facilities, local amenities, and schools.	Delete 'Sport and Active Recreation' zoning of 17 and 19 Harmony Lane, rezone the land (with appropriate consultation) for general residential or mixed-use development.
<b>Nigel Ross Surveyor Ltd (S374)</b>	S374.001	Planning maps	Sport And Active Recreation Zone	Oppose	Number 9 and 7 Enterprise Street, Kaikohe are zoned Industrial in the Operative District Plan. These properties are now zoned Sport and Active Recreation, which i hope is a genuine mistake.	Amend the zoning of Lots 5 and 6 DP 73952 to the correct zoning.
<b>Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited (S502)</b>	S502.110	Planning maps	Sport And Active Recreation Zone	Not Stated	<p>Given the high historical importance of Waitangi Estate is it has a number of overlays which apply to the site. If left with the underlying zone and general overlays, the rules assessment would be difficult to undertake as each overlay stipulates that the more restrictive rule is applicable. This would result in very minor activities which are generally enabled being captured and requiring consent.</p> <p>The existing Rural Production zone may directly conflict with the Waitangi Trust Board Act's preamble which has set aside the site for a specific purpose.</p> <p>The multiple layers make any planning assessment difficult as in all cases the most stringent rules in any overlay apply. This means that more enabling rules imposed under certain overlays tailored for a particular activity cannot be utilized which results in almost all activities requiring consent as a Discretionary or Non-Complying activity.</p> <p>A more tailored approach will provide clarity as at</p>	<p>Delete the zoning that applies to the Waitangi Treaty Grounds (including the Treaty House, Hobson Memorial, Whare Runanga and Flagpole, and regarded as including Lots 1 - 3 of DP 326610, and Lots 1 and 2 of DP 152502) and insert/create a new Waitangi Grounds Special Purpose zone</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Insert a new Precinct over the Waitangi Treaty Grounds</p> <p>OR</p> <p>In the event the Waitangi Treaty Grounds is not set aside for special zoning and/or precinct:</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>present the Proposed District Plan makes everyday management and maintenance activities require consent.</p> <p>We have an opportunity to tailor make some rules which are specific to the Waitangi Estate and help give effect to the deed established in 1932. Given the fact that no other zones in the District Plan would be appropriate given the specific nature of this site, and moreover that the other spatial layers would cause undue confusion and perverse outcomes in terms of the activities they would capture, we consider that the use of a special purpose zone is most suitable to this site. We therefore seek that a Special Purpose Zone or Precinct be applied to the Estate.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>rezone Lots 2 and 3 DP 326610 Sport and Active Recreation (to accommodate the existing golf club)</li> <li>amend the rules applying to the Waitangi Treaty Ground to clarify when resource consent is required.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Waitangi Limited (S503)</b></p>	<p>S503.009</p>	<p>Planning maps</p>	<p>Sport And Active Recreation Zone</p>	<p>Not Stated</p>	<p>Given the high historical importance of Waitangi Estate is it has a number of overlays which apply to the site. If left with the underlying zone and general overlays, the rules assessment would be difficult to undertake as each overlay stipulates that the more restrictive rule is applicable. This would result in very minor activities which are generally enabled being captured and requiring consent.</p> <p>The existing Rural Production zone may directly conflict with the Waitangi Trust Board Act's preamble which has set aside the site for a specific purpose.</p> <p>The multiple layers make any planning assessment difficult as in all cases the most stringent rules in any overlay apply. This means that more enabling rules imposed under certain overlays tailored for a particular activity cannot be utilized which results in almost all activities requiring consent as a Discretionary or Non-Complying activity.</p> <p>A more tailored approach will provide clarity as at present the Proposed District Plan makes everyday management and maintenance activities require consent.</p> <p>We have an opportunity to tailor make some rules which are specific to the Waitangi Estate and help</p>	<p>Delete the zoning that applies to the Waitangi Treaty Grounds (including the Treaty House, Hobson Memorial, Whare Runanga and Flagpole, and regarded as including Lots 1 - 3 of DP 326610, and Lots 1 and 2 of DP 152502) and insert/create a new Waitangi Grounds Special Purpose zone</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Insert a new Precinct over the Waitangi Treaty Grounds</p> <p>OR</p> <p>In the event the Waitangi Treaty Grounds is not set aside for special zoning and/or precinct:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>rezone Lots 2 and 3 DP 326610 Sport and Active Recreation (to accommodate the existing golf club)</li> </ul>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					give effect to the deed established in 1932. Given the fact that no other zones in the District Plan would be appropriate given the specific nature of this site, and moreover that the other spatial layers would cause undue confusion and perverse outcomes in terms of the activities they would capture, we consider that the use of a special purpose zone is most suitable to this site. We therefore seek that a Special Purpose Zone or Precinct be applied to the Estate.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>amend the rules applying to the Waitangi Treaty Ground to clarify when resource consent is required.</li> </ul>
<b>Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK) (S528)</b>	S528.005	Planning maps	Sport And Active Recreation Zone	Oppose	The site LOT 17 & 19 Harmony Lane is zoned Sport and Recreation in the District Plan. Consider rezoning this site for any future consideration of relocating to the site 1936 State Highway 10, Kerikeri 0470 a Sport and Recreation site under development and repurposing (with appropriate consultation) the land for either general residential or mixed-use development. The benefits for the community would be supporting the growth in Waipapa and demand for housing within proximity and access to community sports and recreational facilities, local amenities, and schools - there is a new school development across the road. (Map attached). The benefit for sports would be cost efficiencies in being co-located and the provision of improved and sustainable facilities	rezone Lot 17 & 19 Harmony Lane from sport and active recreation to either general residential or mixed use
<b>Michelle Patricia Nilsson-Webby Family Trust (S5)</b>	S5.002	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Oppose	On the Historic Sites map there is reference of a Pa very near the boundary of DP 14043 Paua No2 BLK111. There is no such Pa. There are some earthworks which consist of an earth wall which are of historical significance but not part of a pa. Request that the description be corrected on the Historic Sites map as it is currently incorrect and misleading.	Amend NZAA ID N02/816 reference to reflect that the earth works are of early European origin and are not part of a pa site.
<b>Paul O'Connor (S49)</b>	S49.001	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Oppose	Removal of SNA maps from the PDP is unnecessary and puts the onus on landowners to prove bush on their property is not an SNA. This necessitates engaging an ecologist at their expense. It is not fair to assume all bush is under SNA unless proven otherwise.	Insert SNA maps back into the PDP

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>Lynley Newport (S121)</b>	S121.002	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Support in part	Whilst appreciating the decision to include a definition of "Limited Access Road" into the Plan, it would be more helpful for the Plan to include a map layer depicting which roads are Limited Access Road. That map layer could also distinguish between Access, Secondary Collector, Primary Collector, Arterial and Strategic Roads. This would be a useful addition to the Plan given that there are rules relating to various classifications of roads, yet nowhere to readily identify what category applies to the road on which the application site is located.	Insert a map layer in the District Plan showing road hierarchy classifications.
<b>Summit Forests New Zealand Limited (S148)</b>	S148.018	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	Not explicitly stated	Amend through working with the Forest Industry to map and schedule all SNA within the boundaries of plantation forests.
<b>Summit Forests New Zealand Limited (S148)</b>	S148.057	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	While there is still uncertainty over the final form of the NPS-IB, there is little doubt that it will require SNA's to be mapped. The framework that is established under the proposed plan is neither efficient nor effective and, as recognised in the section 32 report, will shift a significant cost impost for a public good from Council to landowners and at a significant scale. This will adversely affect primary production activity in the District.	Amend through working with the Forest Industry to map and schedule all SNA within the boundaries of plantation forests; and establish a process whereby the costs of an ecologist's report on a potential SNA area is fully funded by Council when associated with primary production activity and the voluntary scheduling of SNA areas.
<b>Kerikeri Peninsula Conservation Charitable Trust (S180)</b>	S180.002	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Not Stated		Insert new zone for SNAs and similar sites that are already protected through the Resource consenting process , and sites that will be added by future consenting. or given status similar to a Reserve on private property in order to protect high ecological areas
<b>Kerikeri Peninsula Conservation Charitable Trust (S180)</b>	S180.003	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	Insert SNA and similar sites that have been protected via the council consenting process must be clearly indicated on the district plan maps	Insert SNA and similar sites that have been protected via the council consenting process on the district plan maps

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>Thomson Survey Ltd (S192)</b>	S192.003	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	not stated	Include the 'proposed SNA map layer' as a non-statutory map layer, available to landowners and professionals to use as a guide to identifying SNA's when preparing applications.
<b>Willowridge Developments Limited (S250)</b>	S250.030	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Support	The definition proposed to identify and manage Land Susceptible to Land Instability is complex. It is considered that this risk would be more efficiently managed if it was mapped and clearly identified, ensuring consistent application of the definition and management of the hazard.	Insert map of land instability as a non statutory information layer showing areas of low, medium and high instability.
<b>Willowridge Developments Limited (S250)</b>	S250.031	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	The wider locality of Orongo Bay should be rezoned to Settlement Zone as there is a range of commercial, industrial, residential and recreational activities established within the locality that align with the purpose of the Settlement Zone, and applying a consistent and singular zoning pattern would provide an opportunity to achieve a more coherent and coordinated management approach for the areas.	Rezone the land identified in Figure 4 of the submission to Settlement Zone.
<b>Kerry Michael Lupi and Susan Charlotte Lupi (S270)</b>	S270.001	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Oppose	Rural Residential Zone better aligns with existing development, size of landholdings, surrounding land uses and proposed uses for the site. There is no existing horticultural use, and the land is not suitable for such usage. The land is not consistent with the Horticulture Zone provisions Rural Residential zoning is more consistent with higher order Resource Management Act 1991 ('RMA') policies and plans. Rural Residential zoning is more consistent with the purpose and principles of the RMA.	Rezone 156 Stanners Rd (Lot 2 DP539355) from Horticulture zone to Rural Residential zone
<b>Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust (S272)</b>	S272.010	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	Esplanade Priority areas in Kerikeri should continue to be included in DP maps, because this area is experiencing rapid growth and esplanade reserves play an important role in improving connectivity, active transport and green corridors.	Insert esplanade priority areas on planning maps in Kerikeri and any other communities in the district that wish to identify esplanade priority

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					Esplanade priority areas also help provide transparent, consolidated land use/planning information for Council staff, developers and others. Esplanade Priority area should also be included for any other communities in the district that wish to identify Esplanade Priority areas.	areas.
<b>Trent Simpkin (S284)</b>	S284.015	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Oppose	Residential areas which are serviced should be zoned General Residential, not other zones. There should be an overlay map completed showing the serviced areas with infrastructure and the new zones proposed. All areas with sewer infrastructure should be rezoned to General Residential to allow further development and sites to be created.	Amend zoning of all areas across the district with available connections to the sewer system to General Residential Zone.
<b>Tristan Simpkin (S288)</b>	S288.015	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Oppose	Residential areas which are serviced should be zoned General Residential, not other zones. There should be an overlay map completed showing the serviced areas with infrastructure and the new zones proposed. All areas with sewer infrastructure should be rezoned to General Residential to allow further development and sites to be created.	Amend zoning of all areas across the district with available connections to the sewer system to General Residential Zone.
<b>Far North Holdings Limited (S320)</b>	S320.004	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	The submitter considers that a Bay of Islands Marina Development Area overlay for all of the Far North Holdings Ltd (FNHL) landholdings, in the location identified as the Bay of Islands Marina, to be appropriate (s32 assessment provided with submission).	Amend the zoning of the sites owned by Far North Holdings Ltd(FNHL), in the location identified as the Bay of Islands Marina, to include a Bay of Islands Marina Development Area overlay.
<b>Far North Holdings Limited (S320)</b>	S320.005	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	The submitter considers that the appropriate to retain the Maritime Exemption Area of the Operative District Plan as it applies to the Bay of Islands Marina (s32 assessment provided with submission).	Insert the Maritime Exemption Area of the Operative District Plan as currently mapped, in relation to the Bay of Islands Marina.
<b>Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust (S338)</b>	S338.004	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	We support the zone changes on Kerikeri Road as this is accessible to some existing infrastructure needs for new dwellings. However, roading infrastructure is not fit for purpose and needs to be upgraded to cope with the increased traffic demands. This may be an upgrade to Kerikeri Road itself, or perhaps a new road to provide	Retain proposed zoning changes on Kerikeri Road to State Highway 10, with further consideration of upgrading roading infrastructure to cope with increased traffic.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					alternatives to travel out on to the State Highway. We do not however generally advocate for the construction of unnecessary roads that are created just for congestion/traffic alone, as this general induces demand for vehicle travel.	
<b>Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust (S338)</b>	S338.005	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	Land to the north of Landing Road and the southern part of Kerikeri Road are not suitable as future growth areas. They would create disjointed patches of urban area spread out over a wide area. Growth along the north and south sides of the Inlet would considerably alter the coastal and natural character of the Inlet. Growth within the traffic catchment area north of Landing Road is unsuitable because it will exacerbate significant traffic issues on Landing Road. The Kerikeri-Waipapa Structure Plan recognised the high ecological values of the land on the north and south sides of the Inlet, and identified these two areas as 'Enhanced environmental habitat and protection area' on the Structure Plan map.	Amend zoning to reflect that areas of land to the north of Landing Road and the southern part of Kerikeri Road are not suitable as future growth areas [inferred].
<b>Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust (S338)</b>	S338.043	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	Some areas of significant ecological value on private land have already been recognised and protected (by consent conditions, covenant, etc.) during a resource consenting process in recent years. However, the PDP map does not identify these sites and has applied entirely inappropriate zoning in some cases. This problem needs to be rectified promptly, so that existing protected sites are indicated on maps, protected by appropriate zoning and/or overlay, and are promptly included in Schedule 4 of the PDP.	Amend the planning maps to identify ecological areas already protected by resource consent conditions, consent notices, covenants etc and reconsider underlying zoning/overlays
<b>Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust (S338)</b>	S338.048	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	Within close distance to Kerikeri township, there are limited opportunities to develop greenfield land for future growth. We consider that the PDP zoning, at present, does not focus on greenfield sites that are more appropriate for future growth, taking into account potential for infrastructure, connectivity, traffic, and other issues.	Amend the zones to consider a focus on greenfield sites that are more appropriate for future growth, taking into account potential for infrastructure, connectivity, traffic, and other issues.
<b>Nicole Way and Christopher Hujich as</b>	S345.013	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Oppose	The Resource Consents at Mataka Station enable development, and completion of the Mataka Station development, notwithstanding the provisions of the Proposed District Plan.	Insert a new special purpose zone and/or structure plan for Mataka Station together with appropriate provisions (objectives, policies and

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>Trustees of the Trssh Birnie Settlement Trust (S345)</b>					<p>The Proposed District Plan fails to recognise, have regard to, or provide for the development and subdivision enabled by the Resource Consents. The Proposed District Plan provisions will restrict development of the Property, and Mataka Station more generally, in a manner that is inconsistent with the Resource Consents and the integrated and comprehensive development authorised by those. The Council's s32 analysis does not mention, or consider approved but unimplemented developments within the Property and Mataka Station more generally, nor elsewhere. The "low intensity" development controls and height limits proposed within the Coastal Environment are given very little analysis. The proposed provisions are inconsistent with the Act and relevant planning instruments.</p>	<p>rules) enabling the residential activity and development as authorised by resource consents as a permitted activity (where they are in general accordance with the resource consents) as well as appropriate activities within the Rural Production zone, regardless of the provisions of the Coastal Environment, Outstanding Natural Landscape or High Natural Character overlays.</p>
<b>Paradise Found Developments Limited (S346)</b>	S346.004	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Oppose	<p>Resource consents granted for Wiroa Station, 40 McKenzie Road, Purerua Peninsula, Kerikeri (being Lots 1-21 DP 497523) have been given effect to, and remain live, thus development of Wiroa Station, including vacant lots and the Property itself continue to be enabled by those consents. In other words, the Resource Consents enable development, and completion of the Wiroa Station development, notwithstanding the provisions of the Proposed District Plan. 8. However, the Proposed District Plan fails to recognise, have regard to, or provide for the development and subdivision enabled by the Resource Consents. The Proposed District Plan provisions will restrict development of the property in a manner that is inconsistent with the resource consents and the integrated and comprehensive development authorised by those. Especially the controls within the Coastal Environment overlay, which covers the entire property. Parts of the property are also identified as being subject to the Coastal Flood overlays. Insofar as these interfere with, or purport to restrict development authorised under the resource</p>	<p>Amend the Proposed District Plan to explicitly, and specifically provide for, and preserve the activities and land uses authorised under the resource consents approved for Wiroa Station, 40 McKenzie Road, Purerua Peninsula, Kerikeri (being Lots 1-21 DP 497523); and/or Insert a new special purpose zone and/or structure plan together with appropriate provisions (objectives, policies and rules) enabling the residential activity and development authorised by the resource consents approved for Wiroa Station as a permitted activity as well as appropriate activities within the Rural Production Zone, regardless of the provisions of the Coastal Environment and Coastal Flooding and/or</p> <p>Otherwise amend the provisions of the Proposed District Plan to preserve the activities and buildings</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>consents, these are inappropriate. Council's s32 analysis does not mention, or consider approved but unimplemented developments within the Property, nor elsewhere. The "low intensity" development controls and height limits proposed within the Coastal Environment are given very little analysis. The proposed provisions are inconsistent with the Act and relevant planning instruments</p>	<p>authorised by the resource consents approved for Wiroa Station Otherwise amend the provisions of the Proposed District Plan to provide for extensions and alterations to existing structures at Wiroa Station, in a manner consistent with the activities and buildings authorised by the resource consents approved for Wiroa Station.</p>
<p><b>Matthew Draper and Michaela Jannard (S347)</b></p>	<p>S347.005</p>	<p>Planning maps</p>	<p>General / Miscellaneous</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>Resource consents for Mataka Station have been given effect to, and remain live, thus development of Mataka Station, including vacant lots and Lot 19 DP 323083 continue to be enabled by those consents. In other words, the resource consents enable development, and completion of the Mataka Station development, notwithstanding the provisions of the Proposed District Plan. However, the Proposed District Plan fails to recognise, have regard to, or provide for the development and subdivision enabled by the resource consents. The Proposed District Plan provisions will restrict development of the property and Mataka Station more generally, in a manner that is inconsistent with the resource consents and the integrated and comprehensive development authorised by that. The Council's s32 analysis does not mention, or consider approved but unimplemented developments within the Property and Mataka Station more generally, nor elsewhere. The "low intensity" development controls and height limits proposed within the Coastal Environment are given very little analysis. The proposed provisions are inconsistent with the Act and relevant planning instruments</p>	<p>Amend the Proposed District Plan to explicitly, and specifically provide for, and preserve the activities and land uses authorised under the resource consents approved for Mataka Station, Purerua Peninsula Peninsula (including Lot 19 DP 323083); and/or Insert a new special purpose zone and/or structure plan together with appropriate provisions (objectives, policies and rules) enabling the residential activity and development authorised by the resource consents approved for Mataka Station as a permitted activity as well as appropriate activities within the Rural Production Zone, regardless of the provisions of the Coastal Environment, Outstanding Natural Landscape of High Natural Character and/or  Otherwise amend the provisions of the Proposed District Plan to preserve the activities and buildings authorised by the resource consents approved for Mataka Station</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>Sean Frieling (S357)</b>	S357.024	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Oppose	We seek some rules under the District Plan for the existing mapped drainage district drains, as the current bylaws are not being enforced for the drainage districts. Mapping of the drainage district drains and overland flow paths in urban areas should be included in the District Plan.	Amend the Infrastructure section, by adding objectives, policies and rules providing for existing mapped Council drainage district drains, to ensure the ability to clean, unblock access and service the drainage channels in the Kaitaia, Waiharara/Kaikino and Motutangi drainage areas, as defined in the Far North Land Drainage Bylaw 2019. And stop buildings being built within 10 mtrs of the drains as per the bylaws Amend to add to the Planning Maps, maps indicating location of drainage channels in the Kaitaia, Waiharara/Kaikino and Motutangi drainage areas, as defined in the Draft Management Plans and Far North Land Drainage Bylaw 2019. and include overland flow paths in urban areas.
<b>Leah Frieling (S358)</b>	S358.027	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Oppose	Mapping of the drainage district drains and overland flow paths in urban areas should be included in the District Plan.	Add to the Planning Maps, maps indicating location of drainage channels in the Kaitaia, Waiharara/Kaikino and Motutangi drainage areas, as defined in the Draft Management Plans and Far North Land Drainage Bylaw 2019. and include overland flow paths in urban areas.
<b>Northland Regional Council (S359)</b>	S359.013	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Support in part	Understand a constraints mapping approach has been undertaken to provide underlying guidance as to which are the most appropriate zonings across the district, by excluding those areas where more intensive development and subdivision should be restricted due to constraints such as highly versatile soils, flood and coastal hazards, ONLs and ONFs, historic/cultural heritage sites	Amend the planning maps to ensure that areas prone to natural hazards are not zoned for intensification.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>and areas.</p> <p>The proposed maps appear to rezone a number of areas to provide greater development intensity in areas at risk from natural hazards or that are unserved (e.g. lack three waters infrastructure). Do not support further intensification in flood plains given storm/flood events are predicted to intensify with climate change.</p> <p>Enabling further development in areas prone to flooding is at odds with direction in the RPS Policy 7.1.2 and Method 7.1.7</p> <p>It appears that some areas with potential flood hazards allow for intensive development.</p> <p>Applying a hazard overlay does not fully address this issue as the underlying zoning can create a development expectation. This is of particular concern for industrial zones with the potential for hazardous chemical storage, but is also relevant to sensitive activities such as residential development, education facilities, visitor accommodation etc.</p>	
<p><b>Northland Regional Council (S359)</b></p>	<p>S359.014</p>	<p>Planning maps</p>	<p>General / Miscellaneous</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>Any zoning without three waters infrastructure is an issue in the long term - retrofitting networks to service such sites can be problematic and more costly than establishment at the 'greenfield' stage. This is especially so where existing development has already established on-site services but would need to pay to connect to new network services. Without access to appropriate servicing there are major limitations on the density and type of urban development which can be accommodated in these zones.</p>	<p>Retain zoning for more intensive development where three waters infrastructure is provided (inferred)</p>
<p><b>Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation) (S364)</b></p>	<p>S364.006</p>	<p>Planning maps</p>	<p>General / Miscellaneous</p>	<p>Not Stated</p>	<p>Kiwi conservation is particularly important in the Far North District context. Although it is noted that the North Island Kiwi is "Not Threatened", it has only reached this improved conservation status after significant community conservation efforts. These efforts should not go to waste and specific kiwi conservation objectives, policies, and rules should therefore be incorporated into the Proposed District Plan.</p>	<p>Insert overlays that identify locations of 'kiwi present' or 'high-density kiwi areas', with a mechanism for updating these maps.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>Far North District Council (S368)</b>	S368.027	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Support in part	The special zone grey background requirement from the National Planning Standards needs further refinement to the symbology to enable plan users to better understand zoning in the ePlan. Clarity is also required within the Legend of the ePlan	Amend symbology of special zones, as well as legend scale, to enable easier differentiation of special zones in the PDP.
<b>Far North District Council (S368)</b>	S368.100	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Oppose	Error in mapping whereby operative Conservation zoning has not carried through into the PDP as Natural Open Space zone for parcel 4861315. This is one site Council is aware of, there are potentially others.	Amend to make any further changes to the PDP where and if the same issue arises.
<b>Te Hiku Iwi Development Trust (S399)</b>	S399.007	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	Te Rūnanga o te Rarawa's submission that the plan should provide a process which allows plan users to identify iwi/hapū management plans which might be relevant to them and obtain the plan(s) they require was accepted but does not appear to have been implemented in the proposed plan.	Insert a mapping layer which shows the areas of interest which relate to the 14 iwi/hapū management plans recognised by the plan. The current mapping shows the area of interest in Treaty Settlements (under the Non-District Plan Layers tab), but these are not the same thing.
<b>Bernard Sabrier (S423)</b>	S423.001	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Oppose	The Proposed Plan, if approved, will directly affect members of the [Mataka Residents'] Association by imposing undue restrictions on the construction of residential dwellings on the Site through the application of specified overlays and rules.	Insert a new Special Purpose Zone for "Mataka Station Precinct" (including Lots 3, 21, 23 and 35 Rangihoua Road, Kerikeri, and Lots 7, 8 and 29 Oihi Road, Kerikeri) under 'Part 3 - Area Specific Matters' of the Proposed Plan; and include appropriate objectives, policies and rules to enable residential activity and buildings as a permitted activity where they are in accordance with the Mataka Scheme and located on the consented House Site location as identified on Plan 5670/14 and to enable farming, conservation, recreation and common facilities where they are in accordance with the Mataka Scheme. The Precinct will also need to include other activities appropriate for this locality

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>including farming and other Rural Production activities.                      Insert appropriate permitted activity standards, including but not limited to the following:                      (i) The dwelling shall be located on the House Site location                      (ii) Maximum height = 12m above existing ground level                      (iii) Building or structure coverage = 12.5%</p> <p>Insert an overview, objectives and policies for the new Special Purpose zone that address the matters raised in this submission and any further standards and/or design criteria that are consistent with the resource consents granted to date.</p>
<p><b>Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (S425)</b></p>	<p>S425.009</p>	<p>Planning maps</p>	<p>General / Miscellaneous</p>	<p>Not Stated</p>	<p>As a primary submission, PHTTCCT continues to seek that the Trail be mapped in the plan and re-submits the Pou Herenga Tai Cycle Trail Overlay Chapter (see Attachment 2) which includes provisions that seek to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Recognise and provide for the Trail in acknowledgement of the social, economic and environmental benefits it provides to the District as acknowledged by its classification as regionally significant infrastructure;</li> <li>- Enable appropriate activities, including the maintenance, operation, and upgrade of the Trail; and</li> <li>- Manage reverse sensitivity effects.</li> </ul> <p>PHTTCCT considers that this request is appropriate for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Given the regionally significant economic, social, and environmental benefits associated with the Pou Herenga Tai Trail which are further set out in section 2.1.1 and 2.1.2, mapping it in the Plan with an associated suite of provisions (as provided in</li> </ul>	<p>insert Pou herenga Tai Trail in the district plan as an overlay</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>Attachment 2 or to same effect) would be the most efficient and effective way to ensure these benefits are protected, continued and enhanced;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The overlay and associated provisions promote the sustainable management of the physical resources;</li> <li>- The overlay and associated provisions are consistent with Part 2 of the RMA;</li> <li>- The overlay and associated provisions are appropriate in terms of section 32 of the RMA;</li> <li>- The overlay and associated provisions represent an efficient use and development of physical resources which have received significant investment;</li> <li>- The overlay and associated provision sought appropriately avoids, remedies or mitigates adverse effects on the environment; and</li> <li>- The overlay and associated provision are consistent with the balance of the PDP, in particular the Strategic Direction section of the Plan.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (S425)</b></p>	<p>S425.037</p>	<p>Planning maps</p>	<p>General / Miscellaneous</p>	<p>Not Stated</p>	<p>It is considered that Council should take all opportunities to gain access to waterbodies, as there is always future potential for contributing to connectivity.</p> <p>There no longer appears to be an esplanade priority mapped layer. It is considered that this layer can usefully inform applications for esplanade waivers to ensure that at an absolute minimum area that have been identified as part of future connections are not accidentally waived entirely or a limited width accepted.</p> <p>This layer can also usefully be used to encourage voluntary creation where lots a less than 4ha as a mitigation measure or off set.</p>	<p>Insert Council mapped esplanade priority layers as an information layer.</p>
<p><b>Kapiro Residents Association (S427)</b></p>	<p>S427.002</p>	<p>Planning maps</p>	<p>General / Miscellaneous</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>We support intensification of the urban area for the reasons outlined in our previous submissions and discussions with council. However, intensification needs to be carefully planned, with good design principles, appropriate infrastructure and adequate green open spaces for the community. Sub-zones or precincts (or whatever</p>	<p>Amend PDP zoning, at present, does not focus on greenfield sites that are more appropriate for future growth, taking into account potential for infrastructure, connectivity, traffic, and other issues [inferred].</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					terms are now required by the National Planning Standards) need to be identified to achieve good connectivity, good functionality and protect character and amenity values. Sub-zones are needed to ensure that building height and density are reduced in a graduated manner moving out from the central area to high density residential areas and then lower density residential areas. Policies/rules are also needed to avoid peppercorn multi-storied buildings in diverse locations in random fashion.	
<b>Kapiro Residents Association (S427)</b>	S427.003	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Support in part	Proximity to the CBD is a key issue.  Ideally [this area] should provide several green corridor walkways and cycleways (e.g. on the margins of the intermittent stream) to create links between the CBD, Kerikeri River margin and westwards to Fairway Drive. Adjacent to the river reserve there should include a large green public space with native trees, restful areas, and cafés and restaurant facilities (low impact facilities). This area should be designed in a sensitive manner to be in keeping with the conservation areas around the river, particularly the natural character and high ecological values of the river margins, large areas of native trees/vegetation and wildlife in the vicinity, and the historical and cultural areas downstream.	Amend zone of area currently owned by the Bing family (next to the CBD) as a combination of Mixed Use and Residential zones, with a lower height limit than the CBD, such as 7m or two stories.
<b>Kapiro Residents Association (S427)</b>	S427.004	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Support in part	The area between Waipapa and the golf course has the potential to provide connectivity between SH10 and the CBD, and between SH10 and Waipapa Road, and safe connectivity between the new FNDC Sports Hub on SH10 and local schools. Integrated planning is generally easier on a greenfield site. Importantly, growth in this area would eventually provide a relatively compact footprint for Kerikeri/Waipapa. No other site offers this advantage. The current lack of infrastructure could be addressed by requiring the developer to provide roading, water supply, on-site wastewater system and other needs.	Amend zoning of the Brownlie property (land between Waipapa and KK golf course) for future development (primarily as a mix of residential, mixed use and natural open space zones).

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>Kapiro Residents Association (S427)</b>	S427.005	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Support in part	Growth to the north of Landing Road or on the south side of the Inlet would create disjointed patches of urban area spread out over a wide area. Growth along the north and south sides of the Inlet would considerably alter the coastal and natural character of the Inlet. Growth within the traffic catchment area north of Landing Road is unsuitable because it will exacerbate significant traffic issues on Landing Road. The Kerikeri-Waipapa Structure Plan recognised the high ecological values of the land on the north and south sides of the Inlet, and identified these two areas as 'Enhanced environmental habitat and protection area' on the Structure Plan map.	Amend to reflect areas of land to the north of Landing Road and Inlet area southeast of Kerikeri as not suitable as future growth areas [inferred].
<b>Kapiro Residents Association (S427)</b>	S427.030	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Support in part	Some areas of significant ecological value on private land have already been recognised and protected (by consent conditions, covenant, etc.) during a resource consenting process in recent years. However, the PDP map does not identify these sites and has applied entirely inappropriate zoning in some cases.	Amend the planning maps to add areas of significant ecological value on private land which have already been recognised and protected (by consent conditions, covenant, etc.) [inferred].
<b>Kapiro Residents Association (S427)</b>	S427.031	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Support in part	The area around Waipapa Landing and Cherry Park house grounds should be recognised for its history, ecological, riparian and coastal values, and as an area for peaceful enjoyment of the natural environment.	Amend to rezone the grounds around Cherry Park house to Natural Open Space Zone.
<b>Kapiro Residents Association (S428)</b>	S428.006	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Support in part	A pop-out window in the PDP map, entitled News Feed - How to use the Eplan, points out that the coastal and flooding hazard maps in the draft plan are out of date, and asks users to check the updated NRC Natural Hazards Maps on NRC website. However, the sections of the PDP that refer to flooding and natural hazards do not provide the above warning to users. As a result, people may use out-of-date mapping information. The PDP section should refer specifically to the most recent NRC Natural Hazards maps, and PDP maps should be updated regularly, as soon as possible.	Amend PDP to apply the <i>precautionary approach</i> with regard to mapped inland flood and coastal hazards, areas to take account of longer-term changes expected from climate change, as well as the limitations in mapping.
<b>Kapiro Residents</b>	S430.002	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	SNAs and similar sites that have been protected via the council's consenting process must be clearly indicated on the district plan maps.	Amend the planning maps to identify significant natural areas and

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>Association (S430)</b>						similar sites protected through the resource consent process
<b>Kapiro Residents Association (S430)</b>	S430.004	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	We firmly oppose the proposed zoning of Lot 3 DP 415575 (Kurapari Road) in Rural Lifestyle zone or any other residential zone. As noted in submission, this block should be zoned in a special zoning for SNAs and similar ecological sites and/or given status similar to a Reserve on private property, in order to protect high ecological at the site	Amend the zoning of Lot 3 DP 415575 (at the end of Kuripari Road) from Rural Lifestyle to special zoning for SNAs and similar ecological sites and/or given status similar to a Reserve on private property
<b>Ngawha Generation Limited (S432)</b>	S432.005	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Oppose	As a general comment, the range of grey colours and symbols used to identify a number of zones (e.g. Horticulture, Rural Residential, Māori Purpose, and Hospital Zone) are difficult to differentiate between.	Amend to utilise different colours to assist with differentiating between the different zones.
<b>Francois Dotta (S434)</b>	S434.001	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Oppose	The Proposed Plan, if approved, will directly affect members of the [Mataka Residents'] Association by imposing undue restrictions on the construction of residential dwellings on the Site through the application of specified overlays and rules.	Insert a new Special Purpose Zone for "Mataka Station Precinct" (including Lots 3, 21, 23 and 35 Rangihoua Road, Kerikeri, and Lots 7, 8 and 29 Oihi Road, Kerikeri) under 'Part 3 - Area Specific Matters' of the Proposed Plan; and include appropriate objectives, policies and rules to enable residential activity and buildings as a permitted activity where they are in accordance with the Mataka Scheme and located on the consented House Site location as identified on Plan 5670/14 and to enable farming, conservation, recreation and common facilities where they are in accordance with the Mataka Scheme. The Precinct will also need to include other activities appropriate for this locality including farming and other Rural Production activities. Insert appropriate permitted activity standards, including but not limited to the following: (i) The dwelling shall be located on

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>the House Site location                      (ii) Maximum height = 12m above existing ground level                      (iii) Building or structure coverage = 12.5%</p> <p>Insert an overview, objectives and policies for the new Special Purpose zone that address the matters raised in this submission and any further standards and/or design criteria that are consistent with the resource consents granted to date.</p>
<b>Kapiro Conservation Trust (S443)</b>	S443.006	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Support in part	A pop-out window in the PDP map, entitled News Feed - How to use the Eplan, points out that the coastal and flooding hazard maps in the draft plan are out of date, and asks users to check the updated NRC Natural Hazards Maps on NRC website. However, the sections of the PDP that refer to flooding and natural hazards do not provide the above warning to users. As a result, people may use out-of-date mapping information. The PDP section should refer specifically to the most recent NRC Natural Hazards maps, and PDP maps should be updated regularly, as soon as possible.	Amend PDP to apply the <i>precautionary approach</i> with regard to mapped inland flood and coastal hazards, areas to take account of longer-term changes expected from climate change, as well as the limitations in mapping.
<b>Kapiro Conservation Trust (S445)</b>	S445.020	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	esplanade priority areas should continue to be included in DP maps, because this area is experiencing rapid growth and esplanade reserves play an important role in improving connectivity ,active transport and green corridors (items needed within the lifetime of the new district plan).Esplanade priority areas also help provide transparent, consolidated land use/planning information for Council staff, developers and others. By removing Esplanade Priority areas from the planning/zone maps, Council would fail to indicate to land owners, developers and others that Council has an interest in a stream boundary. Failure to indicate the Council's interest could result in the consenting planner (or those	Insert Esplanade Priority areas for Kerikeri in the PDP

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					undertaking monitoring), or a future landowner being unaware that there is Council interest, especially if there are frequent staff changes at Council.	
<b>Kapiro Conservation Trust (S445)</b>	S445.021	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	Failure to indicate the Council's interest could result in the consenting planner (or those undertaking monitoring), or a future landowner being unaware that there is Council interest, especially if there are frequent staff changes at Council.	Insert Esplanade Priority area for any other communities in the district that wish to identify Esplanade Priority areas.
<b>Kapiro Conservation Trust (S446)</b>	S446.018	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Oppose	It is considered that Council should take all opportunities to gain access to waterbodies, as there is always future potential for contributing to connectivity. There no longer appears to be an esplanade priority mapped layer. It is considered that this layer can usefully inform applications for esplanade waivers to ensure that at an absolute minimum area that have been identified as part of future connections are not accidentally waived entirely or a limited width accepted. This layer can also usefully be used to encourage voluntary creation where lots a less than 4ha as a mitigation measure or off set.	Insert Council mapped esplanade priority layers that identify key areas for future connectivity purposes and include as an information layer in the District Plan
<b>Kapiro Conservation Trust (S448)</b>	S448.002	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Oppose	A number of SNAs have already been protected via the resource consent process, but they are not shown on the PDP map. There is no justification for omitting existing protected SNAs from the maps and they should be added to the map.	Amend PDP maps to include SNA's and similar sites that have been protected via the Council's consenting process
<b>Kapiro Conservation Trust (S449)</b>	S449.002	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Support in part	We support intensification of the urban area. However, intensification needs to be carefully planned, with good design principles, appropriate infrastructure and adequate green open spaces for the community. Sub-zones or precincts (or whatever terms are now required by the National Planning Standards) need to be identified to achieve good connectivity, good functionality and protect character and amenity values. Sub-zones are needed to ensure that building height and density are reduced in a graduated manner moving out from the central area to high density residential areas and then lower density	Amend the zones to consider a focus on greenfield sites that are more appropriate for future growth, taking into account potential for infrastructure, connectivity, traffic, and other issues.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					residential areas. Policies/rules are also needed to avoid pepper-potting multi-storied buildings in diverse locations in random fashion. Within close distance to Kerikeri township, there are limited opportunities to develop greenfield land for future growth. We consider that the PDP zoning, at present, does not focus on greenfield sites that are more appropriate for future growth, taking into account potential for infrastructure, connectivity, traffic, and other issues.	
<b>Kapiro Conservation Trust (S449)</b>	S449.006	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Support in part	Land to the north of Landing Road and the southern part of Kerikeri Rd are not suitable as future growth areas. They would create disjointed patches of urban area spread out over a wide area. Growth along the north and south sides of the Inlet would considerably alter the coastal and natural character of the Inlet. Growth within the traffic catchment area north of Landing Road is unsuitable because it will exacerbate significant traffic issues on Landing Road. The Kerikeri-Waipapa Structure Plan recognised the high ecological values of the land on the north and south sides of the Inlet, and identified these two areas as 'Enhanced environmental habitat and protection area' on the Structure Plan map.	Amend zoning to recognise that areas of land to the north of Landing Road and Inlet area southeast of Kerikeri are not suitable as future growth areas [inferred].
<b>Kapiro Conservation Trust (S449)</b>	S449.042	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Oppose	Many of the coastal areas that were zoned in coastal zones in the ODP are proposed as rural zones in the PDP, and the Coastal Environment area now covers a rather narrow coastal fringe. These changes have a negative effect, removing many of the protections that exist for coastal areas under the RMA and NZCPS.	Amend planning maps to add coastal overlays, or similar mechanism, to all coastal areas visible from marine areas, so that coastal landscapes, coastal character and coastal environments will be protected appropriately.
<b>Kapiro Conservation Trust (S449)</b>	S449.043	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Support in part	Some areas of significant ecological value on private land have already been recognised and protected (by consent conditions, covenant, etc.) during a resource consenting process in recent years. However, the PDP map does not identify these sites and has applied entirely inappropriate zoning in some cases. This problem needs to be rectified promptly, so that existing protected sites are indicated on maps, protected by appropriate	Amend the planning maps to identify ecological areas already protected by resource consent conditions, consent notices, covenants etc and reconsider underlying zoning/overlays

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					zoning and/or overlay, and are promptly included in Schedule 4 of the PDP.	
<b>Waiaua Bay Farm Limited (S463)</b>	S463.123	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Oppose	WBF seeks amendment of the Proposed Plan maps for the reasons set out in this submission.	Amend the planning maps as set out in Annexure B to this submission with respect to: The RPROZ, Kauri Cliffs Zone and its constituent subzones The Piakoa wāhi tapu site. Delete the mapping of ONC80.
<b>LJ King Ltd (S464)</b>	S464.032	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Oppose	Mapping of the drainage district drains and overland flow paths in urban areas should be included in the District Plan.	Insert planning maps and maps indicating location of drainage channels in the Kaitaia, Waiharara/Kaikino and Motutangi drainage areas, as defined in the Draft Management Plans and Far North District Council Land Drainage Bylaw 2019 and the draft management plan 2017. Include overland flow paths in urban areas.
<b>Michael Foy (S472)</b>	S472.028	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	Mapping of the drainage district drains and overland flow paths in urban areas should be included in the District Plan.	insert to the Planning Maps, maps indicating location of drainage channels in the Kaitaia, Waiharara/Kaikino and Motutangi drainage areas, as defined in the Draft Management Plans and Far North Land Drainage Bylaw 2019. and include overland flow paths in urban areas.
<b>Top Energy Limited (S483)</b>	S483.184	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	As a general comment, the range of grey colours and symbols used to identify a number of zones (e.g., Horticulture, Rural Residential, Māori Purpose, and Hospital Zone) are difficult to differentiate between.	Insert different colours to assist with differentiating between the different zones.
<b>Elbury Holdings (S485)</b>	S485.031	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Oppose	Mapping of the drainage district drains should be included in the District Plan.	Amend planning maps to include the location of drainage channels in the Kaitaia, Waiharara/Kaikino and Motutangi drainage areas, as defined in the Draft Management Plans and Far North District Council Land Drainage Bylaw 2019 and the

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						draft management plan 2017.
<b>Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited (S502)</b>	S502.100	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Oppose	The horticultural zone and the Rural Residential zones look too similar. Given that they are generally located immediately adjacent to each other, it makes discerning the zone boundary difficult, and correct identification also challenging.	Amend the planning maps to better differentiate between the Horticulture and Rural Residential zones
<b>Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited (S502)</b>	S502.112	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	<p>Given the high historical importance of Waitangi Estate it has a number of overlays which apply to the site. If left with the underlying zone and general overlays, the rules assessment would be difficult to undertake as each overlay stipulates that the more restrictive rule is applicable. This would result in very minor activities which are generally enabled being captured and requiring consent.</p> <p>The existing Rural Production zone may directly conflict with the Waitangi Trust Board Act's preamble which has set aside the site for a specific purpose.</p> <p>The multiple layers make any planning assessment difficult as in all cases the most stringent rules in any overlay apply. This means that more enabling rules imposed under certain overlays tailored for a particular activity cannot be utilized which results in almost all activities requiring consent as a Discretionary or Non-Complying activity.</p> <p>A more tailored approach will provide clarity as at present the Proposed District Plan makes everyday management and maintenance activities require consent.</p> <p>We have an opportunity to tailor make some rules which are specific to the Waitangi Estate and help give effect to the deed established in 1932. Given the fact that no other zones in the District Plan would be appropriate given the specific nature of this site, and moreover that the other spatial layers would cause undue confusion and perverse outcomes in terms of the activities they would capture, we consider that the use of a special purpose zone is most suitable to this site. We</p>	<p>Delete the zoning that applies to the Waitangi Treaty Grounds (including the Treaty House, Hobson Memorial, Whare Runanga and Flaggpole, and regarded as including Lots 1 - 3 of DP 326610, and Lots 1 and 2 of DP 152502) and insert/create a new Waitangi Grounds Special Purpose zone</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Insert a new Precinct over the Waitangi Treaty Grounds</p> <p>OR</p> <p>In the event the Waitangi Treaty Grounds is not set aside for special zoning and/or precinct:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• rezone Lots 2 and 3 DP 326610 Sport and Active Recreation (to accommodate the existing golf club)</li> <li>• amend the rules applying to the Waitangi Treaty Ground to clarify when resource consent is required</li> </ul>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					therefore seek that a Special Purpose Zone or Precinct be applied to the Estate.	
<b>Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland (S516)</b>	S516.081	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	Ngā Tai Ora, consider that it is important to ensure provision of sustainable and safe water supply, wastewater and stormwater systems (three waters systems), which are essential for the health and wellbeing of the Far North population. In particular protection of water supply catchments, both agricultural and drinking water to prevent the degradation of both quality and quantity of water to for extraction. Protection of waste water treatment plant locations to prevent encroachment and provide sufficient area for future expansion.	Insert a Special Purpose Zone to provide for the identification and protection of critical infrastructure.
<b>Elbury Holdings (S519)</b>	S519.031	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Oppose	We seek some rules under the District Plan for the existing mapped drainage district drains, as the draft management plan 2017 and current bylaws are not being enforced for the drainage districts. And, rules within the bylaws should be included under drainage districts ie; 10 meter setback for buildings.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amend the Infrastructure section, by adding rules providing for existing mapped Council drainage district drains, to ensure the ability to clean, unblock access and service the drainage channels in the Kaitaia, Waiharara/Kaikino and Motutangi drainage areas, as defined in the Far North District Council Land Drainage Bylaw 2019 and the Draft Management Plan 2017.</li> <li>Amend to stop buildings being built within 10 mtrs of the drains as per the bylaws.</li> </ul>
<b>Elbury Holdings (S519)</b>	S519.032	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Oppose	Mapping of the drainage district drains and overland flow paths in urban areas should be included in the District Plan	Amend to add maps indicating location of drainage channels in the Kaitaia, Waiharara/Kaikino and Motutangi drainage areas, as defined in the Draft Management Plans and Far North District Council Land Drainage Bylaw 2019 and the

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						Draft Management Plan 2017 and include overland flow paths in urban areas..
<b>Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK) (S522)</b>	S522.005	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Support in part	Land to the north of Landing Road and the southern part of Kerikeri Rd are not suitable as future growth areas. They would create disjointed patches of urban area spread out over a wide area. Growth along the north and south sides of the Inlet would considerably alter the coastal and natural character of the Inlet. Growth within the traffic catchment area north of Landing Road is unsuitable because it will exacerbate significant traffic issues on Landing Road. The Kerikeri-Waipapa Structure Plan recognised the high ecological values of the land on the north and south sides of the Inlet, and identified these two areas as 'Enhanced environmental habitat and protection area' on the Structure Plan map.	Amend zoning to reflect areas of land to the north of Landing Road and the southern part of Kerikeri Rd as not suitable as future growth areas [inferred].
<b>Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK) (S522)</b>	S522.029	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Support in part	Some areas of significant ecological value on private land have already been recognised and protected (by consent conditions, covenant, etc.) during a resource consenting process in recent years. However, the PDP map does not identify these sites and has applied entirely inappropriate zoning in some cases. This problem needs to be rectified promptly, so that existing protected sites are indicated on maps, protected by appropriate zoning and/or overlay, and are promptly included in Schedule 4 of the PDP.	Amend the planning maps to identify ecological areas already protected by resource consent conditions, consent notices, covenants etc and reconsider underlying zoning/overlays
<b>Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK) (S522)</b>	S522.031	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Support in part	Within close distance to Kerikeri township, there are limited opportunities to develop greenfield land for future growth. We consider that the PDP zoning, at present, does not focus on greenfield sites that are more appropriate for future growth, taking into account potential for infrastructure, connectivity, traffic, and other issues.	Amend the zones to consider a focus on greenfield sites that are more appropriate for future growth, taking into account potential for infrastructure, connectivity, traffic, and other issues.
<b>Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK) (S522)</b>	S523.010	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	Esplanade Priority areas in Kerikeri should continue to be included in DP maps, because this area is experiencing rapid growth and esplanade reserves play an important role in improving connectivity, active transport and green corridors.	Insert esplanade priority areas on planning maps in Kerikeri and any other communities in the district that wish to identify esplanade priority

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>Environs, VKK) (S523)</b>					Esplanade priority areas also help provide transparent, consolidated land use/planning information for Council staff, developers and others. Esplanade Priority area should also be included for any other communities in the district that wish to identify Esplanade Priority areas.	areas.
<b>Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK) (S527)</b>	S527.031	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	We consider that it would be appropriate to add the NZ Land Resource Inventory maps (as updated) as overlays in the PDP map now to provide an essential guide until the regional council has completed its mapping of HPL. This would make sense because the regional council is very likely to adopt NZ LRI mapping as the recognised standard.	Insert new overlay for NZ Land Resource Inventory maps in the PDP
<b>Carbon Neutral NZ Trust (S529)</b>	S529.002	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Support in part	Within close distance to Kerikeri township, there are limited opportunities to develop greenfield land for future growth. We consider that the PDP zoning, at present, does not focus on greenfield sites that are more appropriate for future growth, taking into account potential for infrastructure, connectivity, traffic, and other issues.	Amend the zones to consider a focus on greenfield sites that are more appropriate for future growth, taking into account potential for infrastructure, connectivity, traffic, and other issues.
<b>Carbon Neutral NZ Trust (S529)</b>	S529.005	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Support in part	Land to the north of Landing Road and the southern part of Kerikeri Rd are not suitable as future growth areas. They would create disjointed patches of urban area spread out over a wide area. Growth along the north and south sides of the Inlet would considerably alter the coastal and natural character of the Inlet. Growth within the traffic catchment area north of Landing Road is unsuitable because it will exacerbate significant traffic issues on Landing Road. The Kerikeri-Waipapa Structure Plan recognised the high ecological values of the land on the north and south sides of the Inlet, and identified these two areas as 'Enhanced environmental habitat and protection area' on the Structure Plan map.	Amend zoning to reflect areas of land to the north of Landing Road and the southern part of Kerikeri Rd as not suitable as future growth areas [inferred].
<b>Carbon Neutral NZ Trust (S529)</b>	S529.042	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Support in part	Some areas of significant ecological value on private land have already been recognised and protected (by consent conditions, covenant, etc.) during a resource consenting process in recent years. However, the PDP map does not identify	Amend the planning maps to identify ecological areas already protected by resource consent conditions, consent notices, covenants etc and reconsider

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					these sites and has applied entirely inappropriate zoning in some cases. This problem needs to be rectified promptly, so that existing protected sites are indicated on maps, protected by appropriate zoning and/or overlay, and are promptly included in Schedule 4 of the PDP.	underlying zoning/overlays
<b>Carbon Neutral NZ Trust (S529)</b>	S529.065	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	Esplanade Priority areas in Kerikeri should continue to be included in DP maps, because this area is experiencing rapid growth and esplanade reserves play an important role in improving connectivity, active transport and green corridors. Esplanade priority areas also help provide transparent, consolidated land use/planning information for Council staff, developers and others. Esplanade Priority area should also be included for any other communities in the district that wish to identify Esplanade Priority areas	Insert esplanade priority areas on planning maps and for any other communities in the district that wish to identify Esplanade Priority areas.
<b>Carbon Neutral NZ Trust (S529)</b>	S529.084	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	Council should take all opportunities to gain access to waterbodies, as there is always future potential for contributing to connectivity. There no longer appears to be an esplanade priority mapped layer. This layer can also usefully be used to encourage voluntary creation where lots of less than 4ha as a mitigation measure or off set.	Amend the PDP to include mapped esplanade priority layers identifying key areas for future connectivity purposes and include as an information layer in the District Plan
<b>Carbon Neutral NZ Trust (S529)</b>	S529.168	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	We consider that it would be appropriate to add the NZ Land Resource Inventory maps (as updated) as overlays in the PDP map now to provide an essential guide until the regional council has completed its mapping of HPL. This would make sense because the regional council is very likely to adopt NZ LRI mapping as the recognised standard.	Insert NZ Land Resource Inventory maps into PDP
<b>Victoria Yorke and Andre Galvin (S530)</b>	S530.001	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	Not stated	Amend the boundary lines of the SNA mapped on Lot 1 DP 53506 ((Puketona Road, Haruru Falls) to reflect area mapped in submission
<b>Elbury Holdings (S541)</b>	S541.029	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Oppose	Mapping of the drainage district drains and overland flow paths in urban areas should be included in the District Plan.	Amend to add maps indicating location of drainage channels in the Kaitaia, Waiharara/Kaikino and Motutangi drainage areas, as

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						defined in the Draft Management Plans and Far North District Council Land Drainage Bylaw 2019 and the Draft Management Plan 2017 and include overland flow paths in urban areas.
<b>LJ King Limited (S543)</b>	S543.030	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Oppose	Mapping of the drainage district drains and overland flow paths in urban areas should be included in the District Plan.	Amend to add maps indicating location of drainage channels in the Kaitaia, Waiharara/Kaikino and Motutangi drainage areas, as defined in the Draft Management Plans and Far North District Council Land Drainage Bylaw 2019 and the Draft Management Plan 2017 and include overland flow paths in urban areas.
<b>LJ King Limited (S547)</b>	S547.030	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Oppose	Mapping of the drainage district drains and overland flow paths in urban areas should be included in the District Plan.	Amend to add maps indicating location of drainage channels in the Kaitaia, Waiharara/Kaikino and Motutangi drainage areas, as defined in the Draft Management Plans and Far North District Council Land Drainage Bylaw 2019 and the Draft Management Plan 2017 and include overland flow paths in urban areas.
<b>Lucklaw Farm Ltd (S551)</b>	S551.004	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	The PDP has mapped ONC, HNC, and Outstanding Natural Landscape (ONL) using the mapping methods and assessment criteria contained within the RPS. Lucklaw Farms have concerns with respect to the accuracy and spatial extent of the ONC,HNC areas mapped within the PDP, specifically those identified within the subject site and the adjoining Puwheke Beach.	Undertake onsite ground-truthing to ensure the District Plan maps accurately reflect the features onsite recognising policy 4.5.2 and method 4.5.4 (2) of the RPS.
<b>Andr� Galvin (S567)</b>	S567.003	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	Not stated	Amend the boundary lines of the SNA mapped on Lot 1 DP 53506 ((Puketona Road, Haruru Falls) to reflect area mapped in submission

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Te Rūnanga o Te Rarawa (S571)	S571.001	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	The Proposed Map Tools includes 14 layers. There is no spatial layers setting out the area of interest relevant to each iwi/hapū management plan.	<p>Insert a map layer which maps the area of interest for each of the iwi/hapū management plans lodged with Council.</p> <p>The interactive map currently includes Treaty Settlement Areas of Interest (under the 'Non-Council Layers' tab), but these are not the same thing.</p> <p>We suggest 'Iwi/hapū Management Plans' be a separate "top" layer (i.e. along with Zone, Non District Plan Layers, Historical and Cultural Values, Specific Controls etc) with the 14 areas sitting underneath it, and not included within the 'Historical and Cultural Values' layer so that it is easily accessible to plan users. Alternatively, it could be included under the 'Non-Council Layers' tab. The maps could also link to the documents.</p>