

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S559.035	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rēhia	General / Process	Support in part	N/A	Amend to ensure there is no unnecessary restriction to any current use, or intended use of the land in the future in the Māori Purpose Zone.		Reject
FS151.343	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject
FS243.022	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Support	Kainga Ora seeks to enable Māori-led projects on whenua Māori land, particularly where it addresses the severe housing shortage in Te Tai Tokerau and supports the realisation of papakāinga. Kāinga Ora note that as Māori make up 40% of the district's population and 17% of the district's land is Māori land, enabling development will support the wellbeing of Tangata Whenua now and into the future.	Allow	Amend	Reject
FS570.2225	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
FS348.062	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Reject
FS566.2239	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
FS569.2261	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
S379.002	Kahukuraariki Trust	General / Process	Oppose	The overall make up and intent of the District Plan attempts to pull numerous strands of strategic direction together. These strategic directions are important to note and are important for the District. However, the zoning and provisions which follow through, in particular with respect to what tangata whenua can do on their own whenua fail is extremely limiting. Many objectives and policies seek to enable treaty settlement land and maori land, but this intent is quickly limited by overlays, rules and regulations which highlight that the existing Operative District Plan is far more favourable than that proposed. The new rules and provisions occur District Wide. They do not factor or provide for anything of significance or of importance to Kahukuraariki. They	Amend the District Plan to be more enabling for Treaty Settlement land and Maori land (inferred) as outlined in submission.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				are not site specific or rohe specific. The rules that apply at Te Rerenga Wairua, apply at Towai. This lack of specificity impacts everyone. For a district plan there is a lack of specificity for many provisions. It is not clear why Council needs to control papakainga density, or exclusive use areas, why there are activity specific controls, bulk and location controls. The land is Treaty Settlement Land, and the right to consider what activities will go where is the right of Kahukuraariki Trust. The land is important to Kahukuraariki and it forms one of the key pillars for intergenerational transformation for future generations. The PDP takes an approach to Treaty Settlement Land that does not appreciate the significance of the land, or its potential contribution to realising the dreams and aspirations of an entire iwi. To this end the PDP does not appropriately support Kahukuraariki's section 6(e) requirements outlined in the RMA 1991 or the purpose of the RMA 1991. Kahukuraariki, in general oppose the contents of the PDP.			
FS243.006	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Support in part	Kāinga Ora seeks to enable Māori-led projects on whenua Māori land, particularly where it addresses the severe housing shortage in Te Tai Tokerau and supports the realisation of papakāinga. Kāinga Ora supports working with Tangata Whenua, enabling the development of Māori land, and removing restriction on realising commercial, education light industry activities.	Allow	Amend the District Plan to be more enabling for Treaty Settlement land and Maori land (inferred) as outlined in submission	Reject
S452.002	Opononi Area School	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support	There is no public cemetery in the Opononi area. The Pakanae cemetery, known as Ro Iho is the only cemetery in the area from Koutu to Waiwhatawhata. Both Māori and Europeans are buried in Ro Iho, so works like a public cemetery, but unlike a public cemetery this urupa is on Māori land. The headstones tell the story of past and are being threatened by rising sea levels. The urupa is nearly full, how do we preserve what is there and where does the next one go.	Provide support and resourcing to maori people of the area in developing a Maori cemetery in their local area.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S486.017	Te Rūnanga o Whaingaroa	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	Te Rūnanga o Whaingaroa is mindful that the Māori Purpose Zone seeks to provide for the use and development of Māori land which can support the social, cultural and economic aspirations of tāngata whenua and enable a range of activities to be undertaken. Similar to the Treaty Settlement Land Overlay, Te Rūnanga o Whaingaroa 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 Zone. Te Rūnanga o Whaingaroa supports the development of a Māori Purpose Zone to give effect to the development aspirations of tāngata whenua.		Accept
S486.089	Te Rūnanga o Whaingaroa	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support	Te Rūnanga o Whaingaroa supports the principle of a Māori Purpose Zone.	Retain the Māori Purpose Zone.		Accept
S559.009	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rēhia	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	Although council does not need to consider greenhouse gas emissions currently, our whenua should be enabled to utilise our native and exotic forestry (that we have left on our property) to offset any emissions or trade them.	Amend to enable Ngāti Rēhia whenua are able to utilise native and exotic forestry on their properties to offset any emissions or trade them.		Reject
FS155.15	Fiona King		Support in part	make sure that this includes all land owners , not just one culture	Allow in part		Reject
FS151.142	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject
FS570.2199	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
FS348.036	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Reject
FS566.2213	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
FS569.2235	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
S559.036	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rēhia	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	Traffic management reports should not be required for marae development as they are the same as they	Insert rule which exempts marae development from providing a traffic management report (inferred).		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				always have been and will continue to be into the future.			
FS155.16	Fiona King		Oppose	allow as long as it is for all people not just one race	Allow in part		Accept
FS151.344	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept
FS36.006	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency		Oppose	Submitter is concerned about the potential removal of the requirement for traffic management reports. Marae can be high trip/traffic generators and should there be an increase/ change in land use there needs to be some sort of requirement in the District Plan to consider the effects of the proposal on the safety of the land transport system.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept
FS570.2226	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
FS348.063	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept
FS566.2240	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
FS569.2262	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
S498.004	Te Rūnanga Ā Iwi O Ngāpuhi	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	The submitter considers that the PDP should provide for Māori land which straddles territorial authority boundaries to avoid undue costs and delays in deciding applications.	Insert provisions in the PDP in relation to Māori land parcels (inferred) that straddle Council boundaries to harmonise with district plans of neighbouring authorities by creating special zones or precincts across boundaries or delegations of powers by Councils.		Reject
FS151.42	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject
FS23.172	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	It is important that provisions are consistent with Treaty principles and recognise and provide for Māori interests, including (but not limited to) appropriate economic development of their land	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S339.056	Te Aupōuri Commercial Development Ltd	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support	TACDL are generally supportive of the intentions of this of this chapter, particular the recognition of whenua Māori as a unique and limited resource requiring its own management approach to address section 6 (e), 7(a) and section 8 of the RMA.	Amend the Māori Purpose zone to: • Enable the occupation, use and development of whenua Māori; • Provide for the relationship of Māori to the lands, water, sites, taonga and wāhi tapu; • Ensures tangata whenua can occupy, use and develop their land in accordance with tikanga and mātauranga Māori.	Accept in part
FS243.028	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Support	Kainga Ora seeks to enable Māori-led projects on whenua Māori land, particularly where it addresses the severe housing shortage in Te Tai Tokerau and supports the realisation of papakāinga. Kainga Ora note that as Māori make up 40% of the district's population and 17% of the district's land is Māori land, enabling development will support the wellbeing of Tangata Whenua now and into the future.	Allow Amend	Accept
S407.003	Tapuaetahi Incorporation	Overview	Support in part	The site [illustrated in the submission] under consideration is unique in that it contains numerous operative zones that includes zoning that is urban (Coastal Residential) through to rural (General Coastal). The blanket zoning proposed does not appropriately cater for existing development which is partially residential in nature along parts of the coastline. The categorisation of Māori land into rural and urban in this instance is somewhat confusing. The existing Coastal Living Zone part of the site adjoins the existing coastal residential landholding. This part of the landholding would arguably meet neither of the tests provided in the Overview section.	Amend Māori Purpose Zone overview: The Far North District contains a significant number of parcels of Māori freehold land, Māori customary land and general land owned by Māori, as defined in Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993 (TTWMA). It is recognised that this legal and governance framework for Māori land provides for a unique situation for tangata whenua. The Māori Purpose zone provides for the use and development of Māori land which can support the social, cultural and economic aspirations of tangata whenua and enable a range of activities to be undertaken, such as marae, papakāinga, and economic activities which reflect Māori customs and values, while enabling tangata whenua to exercise kaitiakitanga. Māori land is categorised into either: • Māori Purpose Zone - Urban, where the land adjoins the General Residential Zone and is residential in character. • Māori Purpose Zone - Rural, where the land adjoins Rural Zones, is rural in character and / or surrounded by a working rural environment with a wide range of productive activities.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					The Council has responsibilities under the Treaty, the RMA, Te Ture Whenua Māori Act and the Northland Regional Policy Statement to provide for the on-going use and development of Māori land.		
561.097	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Overview	Support in part	Clarification is sought as to whether the Māori Purpose zone applies to all Māori owned land. If it is not intended to, we recommend it should be otherwise there is risk that Māori land that isn't captured within this zone will not be able to utilise the provisions of this zone.	Amend the Overview section as follows: Overview The Far North District contains a significant number of parcels of Māori freehold land, Māori customary land and general land owned by Māori, as defined in Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993 (TTWMA). It is recognised that this legal and governance framework for Māori land provides for a unique situation for tangata whenua. It is important to note that this Overlay applies to all Māori land. The Māori Purpose zone provides for the use and development of Māori land which can support the social, cultural and economic aspirations of tangata whenua and enable a range of activities to be undertaken, such as marae, papakāinga, and economic activities which reflect Māori customs and values, while enabling tangata whenua to exercise kaitiakitanga. Māori land is categorised into either: Māori Purpose Zone - Urban, where the land adjoins the General Residential Zone and is residential in character. Māori Purpose Zone - Rural, where the land adjoins Rural Zones, is rural in character and surrounded by a working rural environment with a wide range of productive activities. The Council has responsibilities under the Treaty, the RMA, Te Ture Whenua Māori Act and the Northland Regional Policy Statement to provide for the on-going use and development of Māori land.		Reject
FS32.151	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts. The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.			
FS23.369	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Reject
FS47.111	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Accept
FS348.184	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept
S396.001	Matauri X Incorporation	Overview	Support in part	Minor changes are proposed in the Overview section associated with the delineation between Maori Purpose Zone Urban and Maori Purpose Zone Rural. The addition of the 'or' enables a more nuanced consideration of areas, such as Matauri X) which,	amend overview Māori land is categorised into either: Māori Purpose Zone - Urban, where the land adjoins the General Residential Zone and / or is residential in character		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				under the Operative Plan, included a Coastal Residential Zone.	Māori Purpose Zone - Rural, where the land adjoins Rural Zones, is rural in character and surrounded by a working rural environment with a wide range of productive activities.....		
FS449.031	The Proprietors of Tapuaetahi Incorporation		Support in part	Minor changes are proposed in the Overview section associated with the delineation between Maori Purpose Zone Urban and Maori Purpose Zone Rural. The addition of the 'or' enables a more nuanced consideration of areas, such as Matauri X) which, under the Operative Plan, included a Coastal Residential Zone.	Allow in part	amend overview	Reject
S170.007	Alec Brian Cox	Overview	Oppose	The Plan framework considers matters as being either District-wide or relating to specific identified areas with common features. Unfortunately the detail below these headings fails to follow that idea. Some District wide items like subdivision are broken down into zone specific rulings which should be in the area section. Conversely provisions for Maori customary purposes which fit the overlay structure are classed as an area matter, fragmenting natural area groups purely on the basis of ownership structure. A number of Special Purpose zones are only separated as they have existing resource consents.	Delete the Māori Purpose zone and replace with an overlay that includes rules permitting Māori customary purposes, reclassify according to the underlying activity (inferred).		Reject
FS566.496	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
S561.098	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Objectives	Support in part	The objectives set out the outcomes to be achieved for the Māori Purpose Zone. Tikanga Māori (Māori customary practices) and mātauranga Māori (Māori knowledge) are integral to achieving the housing and development outcomes for tangata whenua on Māori land. Kāinga Ora seek changes to the objectives to explicitly include tikanga Māori and mātauranga Māori.	Retain MPZ-O1, MPZ-O2 and MPZ-O3 as drafted. Insert new objective MPZ-O4 as follows: Tangata Whenua have maximum flexibility to occupy, develop and use ancestral Māori land, exercising their role as kaitiaki by: 3. Incorporating mātauranga and tikanga Māori; 4. While ensuring the health, safety and wellbeing of people and communities is maintained.		Reject
FS32.152	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes. The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts. The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.			
FS23.370	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Reject
FS47.112	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Accept
FS348.185	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S454.128	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	Objectives	Not Stated	Critical infrastructure such as the National Grid sometimes has a functional or operational need to locate in the Māori Purpose Zone and needs to be provided for. Due to its linear nature and the requirement to connect new electricity generation to the National Grid, regardless of where the new generation facilities are located, transmission lines may need to traverse any zone within the Far North District. A new objective is required to address this.	Insert new objective MPZ-Ox as follows: The Māori Purpose zone is used by compatible activities and infrastructure, that have a functional or operational need to locate in the zone.		Reject
FS304.004	Radio New Zealand		Support	Support in so far as it relates to the Rural Production Zone. The submitter's facilities are located in this zone and the submitter made a submission in support of RPOZ-O2 (which refers to the use by compatible activities that have a functional need to be in a rural environment), but would support the recognition of functional and operational requirements.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject
FS243.165	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, as it is inconsistent with its primary submission. The amendment is unnecessary	Disallow	(similar relief sought to above submission - numerous points)	Accept
FS369.519	Top Energy		Support	Top Energy supports the objective to provide for infrastructure that has a functional or operational need to locate in the zone.	Allow		Reject
S331.109	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	MPZ-O2	Support	The submitter supports objective MPZ-O2 to enable range of social, cultural and economic development opportunities, such as educational facilities, that support the occupation, use, development and ongoing relationship with ancestral land.	Retain objective MPZ-O2, as proposed.		Accept
S489.033	Radio New Zealand	MPZ-O3	Support	RNZ support the use and development of Māori purpose land in a manner that takes into account the surrounding environment. Consideration of the surrounding environment will reduce the potential for activities to be established that conflict with existing land use and infrastructure such as RNZ's Facilities at Ōhaewai that are located in close proximity to Māori Purpose zone land.	Retain Objective MPZ-O3 (inferred)		Accept
S486.090	Te Rūnanga o Whaingaroa	MPZ-O3	Oppose	Te Rūnanga o Whaingaroa believes the term "sustainable carrying capacity" is uncertain and contestable. It could be interpreted as placing an additional constraint on development in this zone. The amendment submitted is to make clear that the	Amend objective MPZ-O3 as follows: Use and development in the Māori Purpose zone which fully utilises and reflects the sustainable carrying capacity of the land and surrounding environment. Otherwise amend		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				objective is to enable development up to the sustainable carrying capacity of the land and surrounding environment. This is consistent with the enabling approach of related objectives. A separate submission seeks a definition for "sustainable carrying capacity." In the absence of a definition, the objective should be further clarified, by adding references to capacity criteria including the usable or developable area of a site, nature of the locality (urban, rural, coastal or overlay), access and infrastructure, and services available.	MPZ-O3 to provide context and clarity.		
S390.077	Te Runanga o Ngai Takoto Trust	MPZ-O3	Oppose	The submitter opposes objective MPZ-J3 as the term "sustainable carrying capacity" is uncertain and contestable. It could be interpreted as placing an additional constraint on development in this zone. The amendment submitted is to make clear that the objective is to enable development up to the sustainable carrying capacity of the land and surrounding environment. This is consistent with the enabling approach of related objectives. A separate submission seeks a definition for "sustainable carrying capacity." In the absence of a definition, the objective should be further clarified, by adding	Amend objective MPZ-O3 to read as follows: Use and development in the Māori Purpose zone which fully utilises and reflects the sustainable carrying capacity of the land and surrounding environment." AND Otherwise amend MPZ-O3 to provide context and clarity.		Accept in part
S498.078	Te Rūnanga Ā Iwi O Ngapuhi	MPZ-O3	Oppose	The submitter opposes objective MPZ-J3 as the term "sustainable carrying capacity" is uncertain and contestable. It could be interpreted as placing an additional constraint on development in this zone. The amendment submitted is to make clear that the objective is to enable development up to the sustainable carrying capacity of the land and surrounding environment. This is consistent with the enabling approach of related objectives. A separate submission seeks a definition for "sustainable carrying capacity." In the absence of a definition, the objective should be further clarified, by adding	Amend objective MPZ-O3 to read as follows: Use and development in the Māori Purpose zone which fully utilises and reflects the sustainable carrying capacity of the land and surrounding environment." AND Otherwise amend MPZ-O3 to provide context and clarity.		Accept in part
FS151.125	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept
FS23.246	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	It is important that provisions are consistent with Treaty principles and recognise and provide for Māori interests, including (but not limited to) appropriate economic development of their land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission.	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S454.129	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	Policies	Not Stated	Due to its linear nature and the requirement to connect new electricity generation to the National Grid, regardless of where the new generation facilities are located, transmission lines may need to traverse any zone within the Far North District. A new policy is required to make it explicit that infrastructure such as the National Grid is enabled in the Māori Purpose zone.	Insert new policy MPZ-Px as follows: Enable compatible activities and infrastructure, that have a functional or operational need to locate in the Māori Purpose zone.		Reject
FS304.006	Radio New Zealand		Support	Support in so far as it relates to the Rural Production Zone. The submitter's facilities are located in this zone and the submitter made a submission in support of RPOZ-O2 (which refers to the use by compatible activities that have a functional need to be in a rural environment), but would support the recognition of functional and operational requirements in the relevant policy framework.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject
FS243.176	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, as it is inconsistent with its primary submission. The amendment is unnecessary.	Disallow	(similar relief sought to above submission - numerous points)	Accept
FS369.520	Top Energy		Support	Top Energy supports the objective to provide for infrastructure that has a functional or operational need to locate in the zone.	Allow		Reject
S529.160	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	Policies	Not Stated	We consider that all zones, except urban zones, need to be covered by firm PDP policies and rules to protect a key natural resource - productive land - now and for future generations. This means preventing fragmentation and loss of productive land from productive use, especially LUC Class 1-3 land and productive types of soil/land suitable for horticulture. It is not necessary to wait until the regional council has implemented the NPS-HPL.	Amend policies to protect a key natural resource - productive land - now and for future generations.		Reject
FS570.2048	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.2062	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.2084	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S561.101	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	MPZ-P1	Support in part	not stated	Amend MPZ-P1 as follows: Provide for the use and development of ancestral		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					Māori land administered under Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993.		
FS36.077	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency		Support in part	Supports the use and development of Maori land and alternative infrastructure where appropriate. However, Waka Kotahi is concerned that the requested relief in proposed MPZ-P5 does not require consideration of necessary transport infrastructure and safety of the transport system and its community.	Allow in part	Amend MPZ-P1 to include the requirement for consideration and provision of appropriate crossing place, associated transport infrastructure and safety of the transport system (inferred).	Reject
FS32.155	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes. The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts. The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept
FS23.373	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Reject
FS47.115	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document			
FS348.188	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept
S489.034	Radio New Zealand	MPZ-P2	Support	RNZ are generally supportive of enabling activities in the Māori Purpose zone provided adverse effects, are avoided, remedied or mitigated. RNZ consider that the policy ought to explicitly recognise adverse effects on regionally significant infrastructure which is important for the entire District.	Amend Policy MPZ-P2 as follows: Enable a range of activities on Māori land in the Māori Purpose zone including papakāinga, customary use, cultural and small-scale commercial activities where the adverse effects, including on regionally significant infrastructure , can be avoided, remedied or mitigated.		Reject
S396.002	Matauri X Incorporation	MPZ-P2	Support in part	In terms of MPS-P2, the PDP requirement for small scale commercial activities, is considered as disabling. Provided effects can be avoided, remedied, or mitigated, as the rest of the Policy requires, there is considered to be no need for the need for such activities to be exclusively small scale. This supports the changes proposed to the Home Occupation activities considered above.	amend MPZ-P2 Enable a range of activities on Māori land in the Māori Purpose zone including marae, papakāinga, customary use, cultural and small-scale commercial activities where the adverse effects can be avoided, remedied or mitigated.		Accept in part
FS449.032	The Proprietors of Tapuaetahi Incorporation		Support in part	In terms of MPS-P2, the PDP requirement for small scale commercial activities, is considered as disabling. Provided effects can be avoided, remedied, or mitigated, as the rest of the Policy requires, there is considered to be no need for the need for such activities to be exclusively small scale. This supports the changes proposed to the Home Occupation activities considered above.	Allow in part	Amend MPZ-P2 Enable a range of activities on Māori land in the Māori Purpose zone including marae, papakāinga, customary use, cultural and smallscale commercial activities where the adverse effects can be avoided, remedied or mitigated.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S331.110	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	MPZ-P2	Support in part	The submitter supports policy MPZ-P2, to enable a range of activities Māori land in the Māori Purpose zone. However, the Ministry consider additional infrastructure including social infrastructure such as educational activities to have an operational need to locate in the Māori Purpose zone to service the education needs of the community.	Amend policy MPZ-P2 as follows: Enable a range of activities on Māori land in the Māori Purpose zone including marae, papakāinga, customary use, additional infrastructure , cultural and small-scale commercial activities where the adverse effects can be avoided, remedied or mitigated.		Reject
FS243.204	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Support	Kainga Ora seeks to enable Māori-led projects on whenua Māori land, particularly where it addresses the severe housing shortage in Te Tai Tokerau and supports the realisation of papakāinga. Kainga Ora supports working with Tangata Whenua, enabling the development of Māori land, and removing restriction on realising commercial, education and light industry activities.	Allow	Amend policy MPZ-P2 as follows:	Reject
S489.035	Radio New Zealand	MPZ-P3	Support	RNZ support compatible development on Maori land. However, RNZ consider that the policy ought to specifically recognise the impact that development can have on regionally significant infrastructure.	Amend Policy MPZ-P3 as follows: Provide for development on Māori land where it is demonstrated: ... that any adverse effects, including on regionally significant infrastructure , can be avoided, remedied or mitigated.		Reject
S561.099	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	MPZ-P3	Support in part	The amendments proposed to this policy are to ensure the policy remains supportive of use and development of Māori land to achieve Objective MPZQ4.	~~Amend MPZ-P3 as follows: Provide for development on Māori land where it is demonstrated: h. it is compatible with surrounding activities; i. it will not compromise occupation, development and use of Māori land; j. it will not compromise use of adjacent land or other zones to be efficiently and effectively used for their intended purpose; k. it maintains character and amenity of surrounding area; l. it provides for community wellbeing, health and safety; m. it can be serviced by onsite infrastructure or reticulated infrastructure where this is available; and n. that any adverse effects can be avoided, remedied or mitigated.~~ Recognise and provide for mātauranga Māori, tikanga Māori and kaitiakitanga when determining the scale, intensity and compatibility of activities in the Māori purpose zone, including when considering measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS32.153	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes. The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts. The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept
FS23.371	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Reject
FS47.113	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document			
FS348.186	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept
S489.036	Radio New Zealand	MPZ-P4	Support	RNZ support a policy to manage the effects of land use and subdivision. However, RNZ consider that the policy should include reference to regionally significant infrastructure to recognise its importance to the District.	Insert a new matter within Policy MPZ-P4 as follows: k.the potential for reverse sensitivity effects on regionally significant infrastructure.		Reject
FS129.13	Waste Management New Zealand Limited		Support		Allow		Reject
S561.100	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	MPZ-P4	Support in part	This policy as it is written is more appropriate as matters of discretion required to be complied with for a Restricted Discretionary activity. New policies should be provided that outline how the objectives are to be achieved taking into consideration the need to enable the development of Māori land. In addition, there should be no distinction between Māori land in Te Ture Whenua and general land owned by Māori. Proposed to remove "small-scale" as adverse effects from any commercial activity needs to be avoided, remedied or mitigated.	Amend MPZ-P4 to include new policies and amendments as follows:Manage land use and subdivision to address the effects of the activity requiring resource consent, including (but not limited to) consideration of the following matters where relevant to the application:k. consistency with the scale, density, design and character of the environment and purpose of the zone;l. the location, scale and design of buildings and structures;m. the positive effects resulting from the economic, social and cultural wellbeing provided by the proposed activity.n. at zone interfaces:i. any setbacks, fencing, screening or landscaping required to address potential conflicts;ii. managing reverse sensitivity effects on adjacent land uses, including the ability of surrounding properties to undertake primary production activities in a rural environment;o. the adequacy and capacity of available or programmed development infrastructure to accommodate the proposed activity; or the capacity of the site to cater for on-site infrastructure associated with the proposed activity;p. the adequacy of roading infrastructure to service the proposed activity;q. managing natural hazards;r. any loss of highly productive land;s. adverse effects on areas with historic heritage and cultural values, natural features and landscapes, natural character or indigenous biodiversity values; andt. any historical, spiritual, or cultural association held by tangata whenua, with regard to the matters set out in Policy TW-		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					P6. Enable the occupation, use and development of Māori land where any resource consent is required by considering: b. the need to enable development, occupation and use of Māori land in accordance with mātauranga and tikanga to support the social, cultural and economic wellbeing of Mana Whenua; and d. that there may be no or limited alternative locations for whanau, hapū or iwi to occupy, manage and use their ancestral lands.		
FS36.076	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency		Support in part	Supports the use and development of Maori land and alternative infrastructure where appropriate. However, Waka Kotahi is concerned that the requested relief in proposed MPZ-P5 does not require consideration of necessary transport infrastructure and safety of the transport system and its community.	Allow in part	Amend MPZ-P4 to include the requirement for consideration and provision of appropriate crossing place, associated transport infrastructure and safety of the transport system (inferred).	Reject
FS32.154	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	The original submission seeks to amend the FNDP in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes. The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts. The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept
FS23.372	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.			
FS47.114	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Accept
FS348.187	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept
S416.056	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	MPZ-P4	Support in part	Policies in each zone provide for managing land use and subdivision to address the effects of the activity at zone interfaces by requiring the provision of 'setbacks, fencing, screening or landscaping required to address potential conflicts'. KiwiRail seeks an amendment to provide for the consideration of setbacks to the railway corridor or transport network, thus supporting safety and the railway setback rule sought	Insert additional matter as follows: the location and design of buildings adjacent to the railway corridor		Reject
FS243.142	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the requested 5m setback; a considerably reduced set back would provide adequate space for maintenance activities within sites adjacent to the rail network. In doing so, it will continue to protect the safe, efficient, and effective operation of the rail infrastructure while balancing the cost on landowners. The amendments are unnecessary.	Disallow	Insert additional matter as follows: the location and design of buildings adjacent to the railway corridor	Accept
S259.025	Nicole Wooster	Rules	Support in part	The submitter's property adjoins land that would qualify as 'Māori Land'. Although not Māori freehold title, it is ancestral land and benefits from the same framework. A scale of development not anticipated in the rural area could occur. The submitter is not	Amend rules so that development of Māori land must be compatible with, and does not unduly constrain, existing farm activities. If there is the potential for adverse effects, then the development on submitter's neighbouring property should have to offset these		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				opposed to a different framework being applies to Māori owned land due to multiple ownership issue but is concerned with how effects would be managed on the boundary to avoid constraints on existing rural land uses and future land uses.	effects against the cost and issue having to be dealt with by the submitter. It is unclear how 10 dwellings within 10m of boundary will not result in a potential conflict.	
S512.067	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Rules	Not Stated	Fire and Emergency support an activity for emergency service facilities being listed as an activity in zones. Please see Table 1 of the submission for the location of existing fire stations. Note that these are found in a range of zones. New fire stations may be necessary in order to continue to achieve emergency response time commitments in situations where development occurs, and populations change. In this regard it is noted that Fire and Emergency is not a requiring authority under section 166 of the RMA, and therefore does not have the ability to designate land for the purposes of fire stations. Provisions within the rules of the district plan are therefore, the best way to facilitate the development of any new fire stations within the district as urban development progresses. Fire and Emergency request that emergency service facilities are included as a permitted activity in all zones. The draft Plan currently only includes emergency services facilities as an activity in some zones and with varying activity status. In addition, fire stations have specific requirements with relation to setback distances and vehicle crossings. Fire and Emergency request that emergency service facilities are exempt from these standards.	Insert new rule for Emergency service facilities included as a permitted activity Emergency service facilities are exempt from standards relating to setback distances, vehicle crossings	Reject
S486.091	Te Rūnanga o Whaingaroa	Rules	Support	Te Rūnanga o Whaingaroa believes rural produce retailing should be permitted in the MPZ, as an economic development opportunity and to help alleviate food poverty within the zone. Rural produce retail is already permitted in the Rural Production Zone (RPROZ-R10, 1 per site, max 100m2) and in the Rural lifestyle and Rural residential zone (RLZ-R9, RRZ-R9, 1 per site, max 50m2.) The same opportunities should be available in the MPZ, in areas of corresponding character. This is consistent with MPZ objectives and policies	Amend the rules in the Māori Purpose Zone, to permit rural produce retail, the same as Rules RPROZ-R10, (rural) and RRZ-R9 (urban).	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S486.092	Te Rūnanga o Whaingaroa	Rules	Support	Te Rūnanga o Whaingaroa believes rural produce manufacturing should be permitted in the MPZ rural areas, as an economic development opportunity and to help alleviate food poverty within the zone. Rural produce manufacturing is already permitted in the Rural Production Zone (RPROZ-R11, 1 per site, max 100m2.) The same opportunity should be available in the MPZ, in rural areas. This is consistent with MPZ objectives and policies.	Insert a rule to the Māori Purpose Zone (rural), to permit rural produce manufacturing, the same as Rule RPROZ-R11.		Accept
S390.078	Te Runanga o Ngai Takoto Trust	Rules	Support	The submitter considers that a new rule providing for rural produce retailing should be included in the MPZ, as an economic development opportunity and to help alleviate food poverty within the zone. Rural produce retail is already permitted in the Rural Production Zone (RPROZ-R10, 1 per site, max 100m2) and in the Rural lifestyle and Rural residential zone (RLZ-R9, RRZ-R9, 1 per site, max 50m2.) The same opportunities should be available in the MPZ, in areas of corresponding character. This is consistent with MPZ objectives and policies	Insert a new rule to the Māori Purpose Zone, to provide for rural produce retail, the same as rule RPROZ-R10 (rural) and RRZ-R9 (urban).		Accept
S390.079	Te Runanga o Ngai Takoto Trust	Rules	Support	The submitter considers that a new rule should be included providing for rural produce manufacturing in the MPZ rural areas, as an economic development opportunity and to help alleviate food poverty within the zone. Rural produce manufacturing is already permitted in the Rural Production Zone (RPROZ-R11, 1 per site, max 100m2.) The same opportunity should be available in the MPZ, in rural areas. This is consistent with MPZ objectives and policies.	Insert a new rule in the Māori Purpose - Rural Zone to provide for rural produce manufacturing, the same as rule RPROZ-R11.		Accept
S498.079	Te Rūnanga Ā Iwi O Ngapuhi	Rules	Support	The submitter considers that a new rule providing for rural produce retailing should be included in the MPZ, as an economic development opportunity and to help alleviate food poverty within the zone. Rural produce retail is already permitted in the Rural Production Zone (RPROZ-R10, 1 per site, max 100m2) and in the Rural lifestyle and Rural residential zone (RLZ-R9, RRZ-R9, 1 per site, max 50m2.) The same opportunities should be available in the MPZ, in areas of corresponding character. This is consistent with MPZ objectives and policies	Insert a new rule to the Māori Purpose Zone, to provide for rural produce retail, the same as rule RPROZ-R10 (rural) and RRZ-R9 (urban).		Accept
FS151.126	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS23.247	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	It is important that provisions are consistent with Treaty principles and recognise and provide for Māori interests, including (but not limited to) appropriate economic development of their land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission.	Accept
S498.080	Te Rūnanga Ā Iwi O Ngāpuhi	Rules	Support	The submitter considers that a new rule should be included providing for rural produce manufacturing in the MPZ rural areas, as an economic development opportunity and to help alleviate food poverty within the zone. Rural produce manufacturing is already permitted in the Rural Production Zone (RPROZ-R11, 1 per site, max 100m2.) The same opportunity should be available in the MPZ, in rural areas. This is consistent with MPZ objectives and policies.	Insert a new rule in the Māori Purpose - Rural Zone to provide for rural produce manufacturing, the same as rule RPROZ-R11.		Accept
FS151.127	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept
FS23.248	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	It is important that provisions are consistent with Treaty principles and recognise and provide for Māori interests, including (but not limited to) appropriate economic development of their land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission.	Accept
S359.023	Northland Regional Council	Rules	Support in part	Fully support the identification of and specific zoning for Māori land (under Te Ture Whenua Act) and land returned through Treaty Settlement as cultural or commercial redress. However, we recommend that the provisions relating to the use and subdivision of these zones (eg. Policy NFL-P5) be reviewed to ensure that they do not unnecessarily restrict the intent for the use of such land (for example land returned as commercial redress should not be limited to 'ancestral' use where it is in an ONL or ONF) especially as there is no definition of what constitutes 'ancestral' use.	Amend the provisions in the Maori Purpose zone to ensure they do not unnecessarily restrict the intent for the use of such land (for example land returned as commercial redress should not be limited to 'ancestral' use where it is in an ONL or ONF) especially as there is no definition of what constitutes 'ancestral' use.		Reject
FS23.102	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	It is important that specific provision is made for Māori land and that these provisions do not inappropriately constrain the use to be made of this land - given the need to provide for positive economic usage by Māori not just preservation and conservation	Allow	Allow the relief and make changes to ensure that economic relief can continue to be made of Māori land	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS570.1059	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
FS346.484	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS and Part 2 of the RMA and the NPS IB.Forest & Bird supports the full submission other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.1073	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
FS569.1095	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
S529.167	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	Rules	Not Stated	We consider that all zones, except urban zones, need to be covered by firm PDP policies and rules to protect a key natural resource - productive land - now and for future generations. This means preventing fragmentation and loss of productive land from productive use, especially LUC Class 1-3 land and productive types of soil/land suitable for horticulture. It is not necessary to wait until the regional council has implemented the NPS-HPL.	Amend rules to protect a key natural resource - productive land - now and for future generations.		Reject
FS570.2055	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.2069	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.2091	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S148.052	Summit Forests New Zealand Limited	Rules	Not Stated	While farming is recognised and provided for as a permitted activity within this zone, other primary production activities are not. This both inequitable and contrary to the objectives and policies of this and other sections of the Plan that address Māori owned lands.	Amend MPZ-R3 to refer to "Primary Production activity" instead of "farming activity" or, in the alternative; provide for other primary production activities, including plantation forestry, as permitted activities within the Māori Purpose zone.		Reject
FS346.558	Royal Forest and Bird Protection		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Society of New Zealand Inc.			not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS. Loss of natural character, coastal environment values and the values of outstanding landscapes could also result.			
FS566.164	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
S368.076	Far North District Council	MPZ-R1	Support in part	The 'New buildings or structures, and extensions or alterations to existing buildings or structures' rule in each zone needs to be amended to include activities that are permitted, controlled and restricted discretionary, where applicable within the zone. As currently drafted a breach of this rule makes the activity 'discretionary', which was not the intent if the activity itself is permitted, controlled or restricted discretionary ... the standards in PER-2 should apply.	Amend MPZ-R1 " ... New buildings or structures, and extensions or alterations to existing buildings or structures Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The new building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure, will accommodate a permitted (where applicable, words to the effect...'or controlled, or restricted discretionary') activity ... "		Accept
S368.010	Far North District Council	MPZ-R1	Support in part	Provision needs to be made for the pedestrian frontage shown on the maps. This is an omission that was in the operative DP Commercial zone and not brought across in the Maori Purpose Urban PDP zone.	Amend to Include reference to a standard in the 'New buildings or structures, and extensions or alterations to existing buildings or structures' rule, and include the standard for pedestrian frontage as seen in the Mixed Use zone.		Reject
S512.115	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	MPZ-R1	Support in part	Many zones hold objectives and policies related to servicing developments with appropriate infrastructure. Noting that NH-R5 requires adequate firefighting water supply for vulnerable activities (including residential), Fire and Emergency consider that inclusion of an additional standard on infrastructure servicing within individual zone chapters may be beneficial.	Insert new standard and/or matter of discretion across zones on infrastructure servicing (including emergency response transport/access and adequate water supply for firefighting)		Reject
S489.037	Radio New Zealand	MPZ-R1	Support	RNZ support a permitted activity status for structures that comply with standards and a restricted discretionary status for activities that do not. As RNZ has the technical expertise and operational ability to assist applicants in ensuring the risk of EMR coupling is addressed, RNZ seeks the following note is added (similar to the note applying to subdivision applications noting the importance of considering effects on the airport operator). Notification to RNZ of any applications for tall structures within 1,000m will ensure safety risks to the applicant, and reverse	Insert a note to Rule MPZ-R1 as follows: NOTE: If a resource consent application is made under this rule on land that is within 1,000m of Radio New Zealand's Facilities at Waipapakauri or Ōhaeawai, and the proposed building does not comply with MPZ-R1, Radio New Zealand will be considered an affected person for the activity.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				sensitivity effects on RNZ can be considered collaboratively.			
S482.017	House Movers Section of New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc	MPZ-R1	Support in part	The Proposed Plan definition of "building" does not clearly include relocated buildings, and the existence of a separate definition of relocate buildings in the Proposed Plan appears to create a distinction between "buildings" and "relocated buildings". It is not clear that the permitted activity status applied in most zones to "new buildings and structures" also applies to the relocation of buildings. It is submitted that relocated buildings should have the same status as new buildings, and subject to the same performance standards unless there is any specific overlay or control which applies e.g. historic heritage	amend MPZ-R1 to: provide for relocated building as a permitted activity whenrelocated buildings meet performance standards and criteria (see schedule 1). insert a performance standard for use of a pre inspection report(schedule 2) restricted discretionary activity status for relocated buildings that do not meet the permitted activity status standards		Accept
FS23.164	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	It is important that provision is made in all zones for relocatable buildings to enable choice, reuse of existing housing, and to make it clear what the activity status is for such buildings. This is particularly the case in urban zones.	Allow	allow relief sought	Accept
S561.102	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	MPZ-R1	Support in part	PER-1 determines that a new building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure that will accommodate a permitted activity is a permitted activity, and where compliance is not achieved with PER-1 it becomes a Discretionary activity. PER-2 lists the Standards that must be complied with included (but not limited to) maximum height, height in relation to boundary, and setback. The Rule (activity) intended for new buildings or structures, and extensions or alterations to existing buildings or structures will be assessed under that particular Rule (activity). Therefore, PER-1 is not relevant.	Delete PER-1 from Rule MPZ-P1; Insert new standard MPZ-R8 - Impermeable surfaces; and Delete activity status related to PER-1, as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: ~~PER-1The new building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure, will accommodate a permitted activity.~~ PER-2 The building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure complies with standards: MPZ-S1 - Maximum height; MPZ-S2 - Height in relation to boundary; MPZ-S3 - Setback (excluding from MHWS or wetland, lake and river margins); MPZ-S4 - Setback from MHWS; MPZ-S5 - Building or structure coverage; MPZ-S6 - On-site services; and MPZ-S7 Sensitive activities setback from boundaries of a Mineral Extraction overlay MPZ-S8 - Impermeable surfaces		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-21: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion are restricted to: a. the matters of discretion of any infringed standard ~~Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER 1: Discretionary~~		
FS32.156	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes. The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts. The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept
FS23.374	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Reject
FS47.116	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan.	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document			
FS348.189	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept
S431.137	John Andrew Riddell	MPZ-R1	Not Stated	The amendment is necessary in order to achieve the purpose of the Act.	Amend the rule so that any proposal to set a building or structure less than 20 metres back from the coastal marine area, or from rivers and banks is a non-complying activity		Accept
FS332.137	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject
S529.207	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	MPZ-R1	Support in part	The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.	Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows - - In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour. - Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish.		
FS570.2094	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.2108	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.2130	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S355.033	Wakaiti Dalton	MPZ-R2	Support	We support increased impermeable surface thresholds, as in our view it recognises the nature of whenua Māori, particularly the innate nature that it is often in common and shared ownership. This often results in the land be used and occupied by multiple whanau.	retain MPZ-R2		Accept
S396.003	Matauri X Incorporation	MPZ-R2	Support	The PDP provides enabling provisions for a number of activities which are generally supported. This includes a generous impermeable surface coverage, provision for farming, visitor accommodation, Marae, community facilities, customary activities, Urupa, Educational Facilities and rural tourism.	retain Maori purpose zone - urban MPZ-R2		Accept
S396.004	Matauri X Incorporation	MPZ-R2	Support	The PDP provides enabling provisions for a number of activities which are generally supported. This includes a generous impermeable surface coverage, provision for farming, visitor accommodation, Marae, community facilities, customary activities, Urupa, Educational Facilities and rural tourism.	retain MPZ-R2 maori purpose zone - rural		Accept
S269.005	Brad Hedger	MPZ-R2	Support in part	Unable to determine how effects from climate change has been considered for maintaining this level of impermeable surface coverage. The changes in regards to rainfall are significant currently designers are adding an additional 20% to intensities for climate change, this will increase stormwater run off from entire catchments and the effects will increase especially in regards to ground water recharge and overland flow paths. This is also supported from the work that NRC has done on river/stream catchments which show the effects from flooding increasing due to development and effects from climate change. The NRC assessment is limited to stream flows and flooding, the effects from development and overland flow paths to streams and rivers does not seem to be	- Amend both PER1 of MPZ-R2 in urban and rural environments: Māori Purpose zone - Urban The impermeable surface coverage of any site is no more than 50% or 300m², which ever is the lesser. Māori Purpose Zone - Rural The impermeable surface coverage of any site is no more than 25% or 600m², which ever is the lesser. - Retain exception in Māori Purpose zone - Rural that "on sites containing marae, the impermeable surface is no more than 50%" as this would be considered in development as they will ultimately		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				considered. In my opinion properties downstream of development will be receiving between 5-10% more stormwater flows over the next 10 years and 20% over the next 30 years. Currently impermeable surfaces coverage is linked to % of area, so on smaller sites it triggers management basically as soon as a house is built i.e., 300m2 lot 150m2 is threshold, where as a 4ha site is triggered once 20,000m2 of area is covered and this may be located right on a boundary discharging to a downstream property or stream, obviously the runoff volume from the 4h property will have a much larger effect that 300m2 property that will effectively have mitigation. I note also the current residential zone controlled activity has a more restrictive requirement than the permitted zone as it has m2 limit.	engage with people and manaaki the land in the rohe.	
S481.016	Puketotara Lodge Ltd	MPZ-R2	Not Stated	The submitter seeks to ensure that the PDP adequately controls effects from stormwater discharge, particularly between sites or adjacent sites. The Operative Far North Plan contains a stormwater management rule in each zone, along with matters of discretion which Council can consider where the impermeable surface area exceeds what is allowed under the permitted activity rule. There is no specific "stormwater management" rule in the Rural Production zone in the PDP, however there is a rule relating to impermeable surface coverage. It is submitted that additional matters should be added to the list of relevant matters for discretion in the impermeable coverage rule in all zones, in order to better control effects between sites or adjacent sites,	Amend point c of the matters of discretion as follows: c. the availability of land for disposal of effluent and stormwater on site without adverse effects on adjoining adjacent waterbodies (including groundwater and aquifers) or on adjoining adjacent sites; Insert the following as additional matters of discretion: • Avoiding nuisance or damage to adjacent or downstream properties; • The extent to which the diversion and discharge maintains pre-development stormwater run-off flows and volumes; • The extent to which the diversion and discharge mimics natural run-off patterns.	Accept in part
S479.028	Tracy and Kenneth Dalton	MPZ-R2	Support	We support increased impermeable surface thresholds, as in our view it recognises the nature of whenua Māori, particularly the innate nature that it is often in common and shared ownership. This often results in the land be used and occupied by multiple whanau.	Retain as notified.	Accept
FS196.181	Joe Carr		Support		Allow	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S561.103	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	MPZ-R2	Support in part	Kāinga Ora considers that impermeable surface coverage is a development control that fits with other Standards rather than as a Rule in the activity status table. Rules which rely on compliance with bulk and location Standards for that Rule should include the Impermeable surfaces Standard.	Delete MPZ-R2 Impermeable surfaces in its entirety from the Rules section and create a new Standard for Impermeable surfaces.		Reject
FS32.157	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes. The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts. The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept
FS23.375	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Reject
FS47.117	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan.	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document			
FS348.190	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept
S283.025	Trent Simpkin	MPZ-R2	Oppose	The impermeable surfaces rule is one of the most common rules breached when designing homes. The low thresholds means therefore means many homes will still require a resource consent for Impermeable surfaces. all RC's breaching impermeable surfaces require a TP10/Stormwater report from an engineer (already). This is a detailed design of the stormwater management onsite and shouldn't require FNDC to look at it and tick the box to say its acceptable. Why don't we have a PER-2 which says that if a TP10 report is provided by an engineer, it's permitted? (one solution to reduce the number of RC's for Council to process, and assist with getting back to realistic processing times). This submission point applies to all zones.	Amend to increase impermeable surface coverage maximum to be realistic based on the site of lots allowed for the zone and/or insert a PER-2 which says if a TP10 report is provided by an engineer, the activity is permitted (inferred)		Reject
FS570.839	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS566.853	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS569.875	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
S355.034	Wakaiti Dalton	MPZ-R3	Support in part	It is unclear why farming is constrained by PER-1. In our view, the management of offensive trade is best managed as a separate activity. The RPROZ does not restrict farming in this way. For consistency across the PDP, we seek PER-1 is deleted.	Amend MPZ-R3 to delete PER-1.		Accept
S396.005	Matauri X Incorporation	MPZ-R3	Support	The PDP provides enabling provisions for a number of activities which are generally supported. This	retain MPZ-R3		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				includes a generous impermeable surface coverage, provision for farming, visitor accommodation, Marae, community facilities, customary activities, Urupa, Educational Facilities and rural tourism.		
S479.029	Tracy and Kenneth Dalton	MPZ-R3	Oppose	It is unclear why farming is constrained by PER-1. In our view, the management of offensive trade is best managed as a separate activity. The RPROZ does not restrict farming in this way. For consistency across the PDP, we seek PER-1 is deleted.	Amend MPZ-R3 to delete PER-1.	Accept
S407.004	Tapuaetahi Incorporation	MPZ-R4	Support in part	The number of dwellings allowable on a Maori Purpose Zone site should be determined by the carrying capacity of the site, determined through MPZ-P3 and MPZ-P4 (not PER-1-PER3) of Rule MPZ-R4 [inferred].	Amend MPZ-R4 (Māori Purpose zone - Rural): Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-2 The site area per standalone residential unit is at least 40ha. PER-3 The number of residential units on any site does not exceed six. Note: PER-2 and PER-3 do not apply to: - a single residential unit located on any site less than the minimum site area; and - papakāinga provided for in Rule MPZ-R5. The landholdings owner by the Taupaetahi Incorporation at Te Tii (Insert Lot and DP as required).	Reject
S355.035	Wakaiti Dalton	MPZ-R4	Support in part	For the reasons detailed in submission point 14, we consider that the 40ha density control to be inappropriate. It is noted that there appears to be a numbering error in this rule as it does not contain a PER-1.	Amend MPZ-R4-PER-2 to allow for at a minimum, one residential unit per 20ha.	Reject
S396.006	Matauri X Incorporation	MPZ-R4	Support in part	Notwithstanding this support for the above provision, changes are also proposed to MPZ-R4 Residential activity (except for papakainga housing) to reflect that tangata whenua should also have a mixture of housing options and choices, and to reflect the previous coastal residential overlay which applied to the Landholdings. Papakainga housing is but one technique available, but there may be other techniques available which Matauri X should have the right to pursue.	amend MPZ-R4 Maori purpose zone - Rural to include the following note PER-1 - PER-3 does not apply to the land identified by the following legal description: Lot 186-188, 190, 193 DP 393664 being part Matauri X Residue.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S479.030	Tracy and Kenneth Dalton	MPZ-R4	Support in part	For the reasons detailed in an earlier submission, we consider that the 40ha density control to be inappropriate. It is noted that there appears to be a numbering error in this rule as it does not contain a PER-1.	Amend MPZ-R4-PER-2 to allow for at a minimum, one residential unit per 20ha.		Reject
S427.039	Kapiro Residents Association	MPZ-R4	Support in part	We agree that multi-unit developments such as terraced housing and low rise apartment blocks can contribute to the greater vibrancy of Kerikeri, and allow for the construction of a greater variety of housing types and sizes. However, one of our concerns is that the rules around outdoor space are inadequate, and there is a danger that in the drive for higher density, the planning rules will not achieve the overall goal of protecting what is valued by the community. We believe that intensification in urban zones should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings (e.g. apartment blocks) with permeable areas including garden/landscaped ground. In too many multi-unit developments in other districts, the only outdoor space is the concrete used to move and park cars. Especially where these developments take place alongside each other the importance of outdoor space increases. Outdoor spaces provide the opportunity for people to connect, to create a sense of community. When designed well, working within well designed rules, multi-unit developments could enhance the sense of community with Kerikeri and become a real asset.	Amend the PDP provisions for multi-unit developments to: - include requirements for outdoor space beyond the area needed to move and park vehicles private, including private and shared outdoor space on the north, east or west side of a building - where multi-unit developments take place alongside each other, the rules for shared 'greenspace' reflects the greater density and the need for places for people to share and connect, pedestrian walkways and access to community facilities and amenities.		Reject
S561.105	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	MPZ-R4	Oppose	The definition of papakāinga includes residential activities, therefore this activity is captured under MPZ-R5 and the Rule MPZ-R4 Residential Activity is not required.	Delete Rule MPZ-R4 Residential Activity in its entirety, and re-number all the Rules that follow.		Reject
FS32.159	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts. The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.			
FS23.377	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Reject
FS47.119	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Accept
FS348.192	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept
S338.069	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	MPZ-R4	Not Stated	We agree that multi-unit developments such as terraced housing and low rise apartment blocks can contribute to the greater vibrancy of Kerikeri, and allow for the construction of a greater variety of housing types and sizes. However, one of our	Amend the PDP provisions for multi-unit developments to: include requirements for outdoor space beyond the area needed to move and park		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				concerns is that the rules around outdoor space are inadequate, and there is a danger that in the drive for higher density, the planning rules will not achieve the overall goal of protecting what is valued by the community. We believe that intensification in urban zones should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings (e.g. apartment blocks) with permeable areas including garden/landscaped ground. In too many multi-unit developments in other districts, the only outdoor space is the concrete used to move and park cars. Especially where these developments take place alongside each other the importance of outdoor space increases. Outdoor spaces provide the opportunity for people to connect, to create a sense of community. When designed well, working within well designed rules, multi-unit developments could enhance the sense of community with Kerikeri and become a real asset.	vehicles private, including private and shared outdoor space on the north, east or west side of a building where multi-unit developments take place alongside each other, the rules for shared 'greenspace' reflects the greater density and the need for places for people to share and connect, pedestrian walkways and access to community facilities and amenities.		
FS570.1006	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.1020	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.1042	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S529.197	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	MPZ-R4	Support in part	We agree that multi-unit developments such as terraced housing and low rise apartment blocks can contribute to the greater vibrancy of Kerikeri, and allow for the construction of a greater variety of housing types and sizes. However, one of our concerns is that the rules around outdoor space are inadequate, and there is a danger that in the drive for higher density, the planning rules will not achieve the overall goal of protecting what is valued by the community. We believe that intensification in urban zones should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings (e.g. apartment blocks) with permeable areas including garden/landscaped ground. In too many multi-unit developments in other districts, the only outdoor space is the concrete used to move and park cars. Especially where these developments take place alongside each other the importance of	Amend the PDP provisions for multi-unit developments: - include requirements for outdoor space beyond the area needed to move and park vehicles private, including private and shared outdoor space on the north, east or west side of a building - where multi-unit developments take place alongside each other, the rules for shared 'greenspace' reflects the greater density and the need for places for people to share and connect, pedestrian walkways and access to community facilities and amenities.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				outdoor space increases. Outdoor spaces provide the opportunity for people to connect, to create a sense of community. When designed well, working within well designed rules, multi-unit developments could enhance the sense of community with Kerikeri and become a real asset.			
FS570.2084	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.2098	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.2120	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S522.053	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	MPZ-R4	Support in part	We agree that multi-unit developments such as terraced housing and low rise apartment blocks can contribute to the greater vibrancy of Kerikeri, and allow for the construction of a greater variety of housing types and sizes. However, one of our concerns is that the rules around outdoor space are inadequate, and there is a danger that in the drive for higher density, the planning rules will not achieve the overall goal of protecting what is valued by the community. We believe that intensification in urban zones should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings (e.g. apartment blocks) with permeable areas including garden/landscaped ground. In too many multi-unit developments in other districts, the only outdoor space is the concrete used to move and park cars. Especially where these developments take place alongside each other the importance of outdoor space increases. Outdoor spaces provide the opportunity for people to connect, to create a sense of community. When designed well, working within well designed rules, multi-unit developments could enhance the sense of community with Kerikeri and become a real asset.	Amend the PDP provisions for multi-unit developments to: - include requirements for outdoor space beyond the area needed to move and park vehicles private, including private and shared outdoor space on the north, east or west side of a building - where multi-unit developments take place alongside each other, the rules for shared 'greenspace' reflects the greater density and the need for places for people to share and connect, pedestrian walkways and access to community facilities and amenities.		Reject
FS566.1792	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S407.005	Tapuaetahi Incorporation	MPZ-R5	Support in part	The exemption provided within MPZ-R5 which applies to landholdings within Matauri Bay is similarly	Amend Māori Purpose Zone - Rural MPZ-R5 to: Activity Status: Permitted Where:		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				proposed to be provided for the land under this submission.	PER-2 The number of residential units does not exceed the greater of: one residential unit per 40ha of site area; or 10 residential units per site. PER-3 Any commercial activity associated with the papakāinga does not exceed a GBA of 250m2. Note: PER-2 does not apply to the land identified by the following legal description: - Lot 186-188, 190, 193 DP 393664 being part Matauri X Residue. The landholding owner by the Taupaetahi Incorporation at Te Tii (insert Lot and DP as required).	
S396.007	Matauri X Incorporation	MPZ-R5	Support	The enabling intent of MPZ-R5 which excludes the density requirements for papakainga housing on the Landholdings is supported wholeheartedly, as this reflects the development aspirations previously provided to FNDC in relation to the site, and the development opportunity cost lost in terms of the proposed re-zoning and provisions of the then Draft PDP.	retain MPZ-R5 specifically Note:	Accept
S486.093	Te Rūnanga o Whaingaroa	MPZ-R5	Oppose	The rule as drafted permits limited numbers of houses, reflecting a cautious approach. Many sites could sustain more houses than these numbers. The option of obtaining resource consent for additional houses is largely impracticable for tāngata whenua in need of social housing. The amendment seeks permitted status for greater numbers of houses. This would better implement Objective MPZ-O3, which calls for use and development to reflect sustainable carrying capacity. The criteria to quantify carrying capacity should include the developable area of a site, nature of the locality (urban, rural, coastal or in an overlay) access and the services provided.	Amend Rule MPZ-R5, to permit residential units on sites in addition to the numbers permitted in the notified rule. Quantify additional units by reference to the sustainable carrying capacity of the site, referencing the developable site area, nature of the locality (urban, rural, coastal or overlay) access and the available services.	Reject
S498.081	Te Rūnanga Ā Iwi O Ngāpuhi	MPZ-R5	Oppose	The submitter opposes rule MPZ-R5 as it permits limited numbers of houses, reflecting a cautious approach. Many sites could sustain more houses than these numbers. The option of obtaining resource consent for additional houses is largely impracticable for tāngata whenua in need of social housing. The amendment seeks permitted status for	Amend Rule MPZ-R5, to permit residential units on sites in addition to the numbers permitted in the notified rule. Quantify additional units by reference to the sustainable carrying capacity of the site, referencing the developable site area, nature of the	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				greater numbers of houses. This would better implement Objective MPZ-O3, which calls for use and development to reflect sustainable carrying capacity. The criteria to quantify carrying capacity should include the developable area of a site, nature of the locality (urban, rural, coastal or in an overlay) access and the services provided.	locality (urban, rural, coastal or overlay) access and the available services.		
FS151.128	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject
FS23.249	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	It is important that provisions are consistent with Treaty principles and recognise and provide for Māori interests, including (but not limited to) appropriate economic development of their land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission.	Reject
FS243.206	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Support	Kainga Ora seeks to enable Māori-led projects on whenua Māori land, particularly where it addresses the severe housing shortage in Te Tai Tokerau and supports the realisation of papakāinga	Allow	Amend Rule MPZ-R5, to permit residential units on sites in addition to the numbers permitted in the notified rule. Quantify additional units by reference to the sustainable carrying capacity of the site, referencing the developable site area, nature of the locality (urban, rural, coastal or overlay) access and the available services	Reject
S559.037	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rēhia	MPZ-R5	Support in part	If the amendment is not provided then the plan is not meeting the objectives in SD-CP-O1.	Amend MPZ-R5 note as follows: 'PER-2 does not apply to the land identified by the following legal description Lot 186-188, 190, 193 DP 393664 being part Matauri X Residue. The landholdings owner by the Taupetahi Incorporation at Te Tii (Insert Lot and DP as required). ' (inferred).		Reject
FS151.345	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject
FS570.2227	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
FS348.064	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.2241	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
FS569.2263	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
S561.106	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	MPZ-R5	Support in part	To provide for the objectives and policies, Kāinga Ora seek that the minimum site area required for papakāinga be removed from the Māori Purpose Zone - Urban. Kāinga Ora recommends this be replaced with requiring use and development under this Rule to be adequately serviced in terms of infrastructure, reducing the restriction on papakāinga in this zone. Matters of discretion have been adopted from the proposed Policy MPZ-P4 with amendments.	Delete the minimum site area requirement under PER-1, replace with a requirement for infrastructure servicing. Amend where compliance with PER-1, PER-2 or PER-3 is not achieved, this activity becomes Restricted Discretionary with specific matters of discretion as follows: Māori Purpose Zone - Urban Activity Status: Permitted Where: PER-11. The site area is at least 600m2; and 2. The number of residential units on a site does not exceed three. 3. Use and development can be adequately serviced in terms of stormwater, wastewater and potable water infrastructure. Māori Purpose Zone - Rural Activity Status: Permitted Where: PER-2 The number of residential units does not exceed the greater of: e. one residential unit per 40ha of site area; or d. 10 residential units per site. PER-32 Any commercial activity associated with the papakāinga does not exceed a GBA of 250m2. Note: PER-2 does not apply to the land identified by the following legal description: - Lot 186-188, 190, 193 DP 393664 being part Matauri X Residue. Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-1 or PER-2: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion are restricted to: a. consistency with the scale, density, design and character of the planned environment and purpose of the zone; b. the location, scale and design of buildings and structures; c. at zone interfaces: i. any setbacks, fencing, screening or landscaping required to address potential conflicts; ii. managing reverse sensitivity effects		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					on adjacent land uses, including the ability of surrounding properties to undertake primary production activities in a rural environment;d. the adequacy and capacity of available or programmed development infrastructure to accommodate the proposed activity; or the capacity of the site to cater for onsite infrastructure associated with the proposed activity;e. the adequacy of roading infrastructure to service the proposed activity;f. any loss of highly productive land;g. effects on areas with historic heritage and cultural values, natural features and landscapes, natural character or indigenous biodiversity values; andh. any historical, spiritual, or cultural association held by tangata whenua, with regard to the matters set out in Policy TW-P6.		
FS36.078	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency		Support in part	Supports the use and development of Maori land and alternative infrastructure where appropriate. However, has concerns that the proposed relief is does not require specific consideration of provision of a safe crossing place and access to the transport network.	Allow in part	Amend MPZ-R5 to require specific consideration of provision of a safe crossing place and access to the transport network (inferred)..	Reject
FS32.160	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes. The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts. The original submission heralds the application for a	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.			
FS23.378	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Reject
FS47.120	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Accept
FS348.193	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept
S390.080	Te Runanga o Ngai Takoto Trust	MPZ-R5	Oppose	The submitter opposes rule MPZ-R5 as it permits limited numbers of houses, reflecting a cautious approach. Many sites could sustain more houses than these numbers. The option of obtaining resource consent for additional houses is largely impracticable for tāngata whenua in need of social housing. The amendment seeks permitted status for greater numbers of houses. This would better implement Objective MPZ-O3, which calls for use and development to reflect sustainable carrying capacity. The criteria to quantify carrying capacity should include the developable area of a site, nature of the locality (urban, rural, coastal or in an overlay) access and the services provided.	Amend Rule MPZ-R5, to permit residential units on sites in addition to the numbers permitted in the notified rule. Quantify additional units by reference to the sustainable carrying capacity of the site, referencing the developable site area, nature of the locality (urban, rural, coastal or overlay) access and the available services.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS243.205	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Support	Kainga Ora seeks to enable Māori-led projects on whenua Māori land, particularly where it addresses the severe housing shortage in Te Tai Tokerau and supports the realisation of papakāinga.	Allow	Amend Rule MPZ-R5, to permit residential units on sites in addition to the numbers permitted in the notified rule. Quantify additional units by reference to the sustainable carrying capacity of the site, referencing the developable site area, nature of the locality (urban, rural, coastal or overlay) access and the available services	Reject
S283.037	Trent Simpkin	MPZ-S5	Oppose	This submission applies to all Building Coverage rules within all zones. Amend to be larger, considering the size of allotments allowed for in the zone.	Amend the maximum building or structure coverage to be larger or offer an alternative pathway around this rule, by inserting a PER-2 which says if a building is above the maximum, it is permitted if a visual assessment and landscape plan is provided as part of the building consent.		Awaiting recommendation
FS570.851	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Awaiting recommendation
FS566.865	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Awaiting recommendation
FS569.887	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Awaiting recommendation
S396.008	Matauri X Incorporation	MPZ-R6	Support	The PDP provides enabling provisions for a number of activities which are generally supported. This includes a generous impermeable surface coverage, provision for farming, visitor accommodation, Marae, community facilities, customary activities, Urupa, Educational Facilities and rural tourism.	retain MPZ-R6 specifically Note:		Accept
S561.107	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	MPZ-R6	Support in part	The activity status where compliance is not achieved with PER-1 is a Discretionary activity. The proposed Discretionary Activity status for noncompliance with PER-1 is not in line with the objectives and policies for the zone. Kāinga Ora considers that a more appropriate activity status for infringements to PER-1 is a Restricted Discretionary activity.	Amend where compliance with PER-1 is not achieved, this activity becomes Restricted Discretionary with specific matters of discretion as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1The occupancy does not exceed six guests		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					per night. Use and development can be adequately serviced in terms of stormwater, wastewater and potable water infrastructure. Note: PER-1 does not apply to marae provided for under MPZ-R7 Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-1: Discretionary Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion are restricted to: i. consistency with the scale, density, design and character of the planned environment and purpose of the zone; j. the location, scale and design of buildings and structures; k. at zone interfaces: i. any setbacks, fencing, screening or landscaping required to address potential conflicts; ii. managing reverse sensitivity effects on adjacent land uses, including the ability of surrounding properties to undertake primary production activities in a rural environment; l. the adequacy and capacity of available or programmed development infrastructure to accommodate the proposed activity; or the capacity of the site to cater for onsite infrastructure associated with the proposed activity; m. the adequacy of roading infrastructure to service the proposed activity; n. any loss of highly productive land; o. effects on areas with historic heritage and cultural values, natural features and landscapes, natural character or indigenous biodiversity values; and p. any historical, spiritual, or cultural association held by tangata whenua, with regard to the matters set out in Policy TW-P6.		
FS36.072	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency		Support in part	Supports the use and development of Treaty Settlement land and alternative infrastructure where appropriate. However, Waka Kotahi is concerned that the removal of PER-1 triggers and proposed relief does not require consideration of necessary transport infrastructure and safety of the transport system and its community.	Allow in part	Amend MPZ-R6 to include the requirement for consideration and provision of appropriate crossing place, associated transport infrastructure and safety of the transport system (inferred).	Reject
FS32.161	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes. The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts. The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.			
FS23.379	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Reject
FS47.121	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Accept
FS348.194	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S214.015	Airbnb	MPZ-R6	Support in part	The proposed district plan allows for visitor accommodation as a permitted activity for less than or equal to 6-10 guests on site. If these conditions are not met, the activity is discretionary except in the settlement zone where it is restricted discretionary. Airbnb supports the overall approach to allow visitor accommodation to occur in all zones and commends the Council's leadership in this space. We would, however, recommend that restrictions around the number of guests be standardised to 10 across the district to account for the range of families that tend to stay in this type of accommodation and would also recommend that properties that do not meet permitted status default to restricted discretionary as opposed to discretionary. This would increase certainty for our Hosts and unlock the full potential of residential visitor accommodation in the district. Airbnb strongly believes that consistency for guests and hosts is important and that a national approach is the most effective way to address these concerns. Kiwis agree with 64% expressing support for national regulation. One example of this type of standardised approach across councils is the Code of Conduct approach as piloted in New South Wales (NSW), Australia (with a robust compliance and enforcement mechanism, operating on a 'two strike' basis whereby bad actors are excluded from participating in the industry for a period of 5 years after repeated breaches of the Code).	Amend rules to standardise the guest limit cap for permitted visitor accommodation to 10 across all zones and make the default non-permitted status restricted discretionary (as opposed to Discretionary) across all zones.		Reject
FS23.077	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Support standardizing the number applying to permitted visitor accommodation activities across all zones. Taking a consistent approach will make it easier for the plan provisions to be applied and understood. The effects are not likely to differ significantly in residential zones.	Allow	Allow relief sought.	Reject
S396.009	Matauri X Incorporation	MPZ-R7	Support	The PDP provides enabling provisions for a number of activities which are generally supported. This includes a generous impermeable surface coverage, provision for farming, visitor accommodation, Marae, community facilities, customary activities, Urupa, Educational Facilities and rural tourism.	retain MPZ-R7		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S396.010	Matauri X Incorporation	MPZ-R8	Support	The PDP provides enabling provisions for a number of activities which are generally supported. This includes a generous impermeable surface coverage, provision for farming, visitor accommodation, Marae, community facilities, customary activities, Urupa, Educational Facilities and rural tourism.	retain MPZ-R8	Accept
S396.011	Matauri X Incorporation	MPZ-R9	Support	The PDP provides enabling provisions for a number of activities which are generally supported. This includes a generous impermeable surface coverage, provision for farming, visitor accommodation, Marae, community facilities, customary activities, Urupa, Educational Facilities and rural tourism.	retain MPZ-R9	Accept
S396.012	Matauri X Incorporation	MPZ-R10	Support	The PDP provides enabling provisions for a number of activities which are generally supported. This includes a generous impermeable surface coverage, provision for farming, visitor accommodation, Marae, community facilities, customary activities, Urupa, Educational Facilities and rural tourism.	retain MPZ-R10	Accept
S396.013	Matauri X Incorporation	MPZ-R11	Support in part	However, in order to promote papakainga and housing developments on Maori Land, provisions associated with Home Business activities are sought to be increased in scale, recognising the need to provide for economic development for whanau. The changes proposed are sought to increase the scale of the building where the home occupation occurs, and the number of staff.	amend MPZ-R11 PER-1: The home business is undertaken within: 1. a residential unit; or 2. an accessory building that does not exceed GFA of 4100 m ² GFA; or 3. a minor residential unit. PER -2: There is no more than ~~two~~ four full-time equivalent persons engaged in the home business who reside offsite.	Reject
S425.063	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust	MPZ-R11	Support	PHTTCCT support the provision for home business in zones. It is considered that providing for this activity as a permitted activity, particularly throughout the zones that adjoin the Trail, will help activate the Trail and ensure that that the potential in terms of social and economic impact can be realised (noting the comments made in the Transport Chapter in regards to parking).	retain as notified	Accept
S561.108	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	MPZ-R11	Support in part	PER-2 limits the number of fulltime persons engaged in the home business who reside offsite to two persons. Kāinga Ora seek that PER-2 is deleted to enable more employment opportunities. The scale	Delete PER-2, re-number the subsequent clauses. Where compliance with PER-1, PER-2 or PER-3 is not achieved, this activity becomes Restricted Discretionary with specific matters of discretion as	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				and intensity of the home business activity will be controlled by the remaining activity status to ensure the primary use of the site remains residential in nature. Where compliance is not achieved with PER-1, PER-2, PER-3 or PER-4, it is currently proposed to be a Discretionary activity. Kāinga Ora seek that the activity status where compliance is not achieved with PER-1, PER-2, PER-3 or PER-4 becomes a Restricted Discretionary activity with specific matters of discretion. In the General Residential Zone where compliance with the Permitted activity standards under Rule GRZ-R5 Home Business is not achieved, the activity becomes a Restricted Discretionary activity. This demonstrates that effects from non-compliance with the Permitted activity standards can be managed under specific matters of discretion for this Rule.	follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The home business is undertaken within:1. a residential unit; or2. an accessory building that does not exceed GFA of 40m² GFA; or3. a minor residential unit. PER-2There is no more than two full-time equivalent persons engaged in the home business who reside off-site.Use and development can be adequately serviced in terms of stormwater, wastewater and potable water infrastructure. PER-3 All manufacturing, altering, repairing, dismantling or processing of any material or articles associated with an activity is carried out within a building or screened from residential units on adjoining sites. PER-4 Hours of operation are between: 1. 7am-8pm Monday to Friday. 2. 8am-8pm Weekends and public holidays. Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-1, PER-2, or PER-3: or PER-4: Discretionary Restricted DiscretionaryMatters of discretion are restricted to:a. scale, intensity and character of the business;b. traffic generation, safety and access;c. provision of parking;d. noise, odour and dust;e. disturbance and loss of privacy for surrounding sites; andf. hours of operation.		
FS36.073	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency		Support in part	Supports the use and development of Treaty Settlement land and alternative infrastructure where appropriate. However, Waka Kotahi is concerned that the removal of PER-1 triggers and proposed relief does not require consideration of necessary transport infrastructure and safety of the transport system and its community.	Allow in part	Amend TSL-R11 to include the requirement for consideration and provision of appropriate crossing place , associated transport infrastructure and safety of the transport system.	Reject
FS32.162	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes. The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts. The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.			
FS23.380	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Reject
FS47.122	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Accept
FS348.195	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S431.146	John Andrew Riddell	MPZ-R11	Not Stated	The amendment is necessary in order to achieve the purpose of the Act.	Amend PER-4 of Rule MPZ-R11 so that the hours of operation apply to when the business is open to the public		Accept
FS332.146	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept
S396.014	Matauri X Incorporation	MPZ-R14	Support	The PDP provides enabling provisions for a number of activities which are generally supported. This includes a generous impermeable surface coverage, provision for farming, visitor accommodation, Marae, community facilities, customary activities, Urupa, Educational Facilities and rural tourism.	retain MPZ-R14 specifically These standards do not apply to: Kohanga reo activities		Accept
S331.111	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	MPZ-R14	Support	The submitter supports rule MPZ-R14 Educational facility, the permitted activity standards to provide for small scale educational facilities in the Kororāreka Russell Township zone. Due to the scale of this zone, the Ministry accept the discretionary activity status if compliance with the permitted activity standards cannot be achieved.	Retain rule MPZ-R14 Educational facility, as proposed.		Accept
S486.094	Te Rūnanga o Whaingaroa	MPZ-R14	Oppose	Rule TSL-R11 permits kōhanga reo without restriction but requires resource consent for occupational and outdoor training. Training activities have the potential to make an important contribution to the economic wellbeing of tāngata whenua. Training in outdoor occupations such as farming and forestry in rural areas is unlikely to generate adverse effects more than minor.	Amend the last sentence of Rule MPZ-R14 as follows: These standards do not apply to: Kōhanga reo, or to occupational and outdoor training activities.		Reject
S390.081	Te Runanga o Ngai Takoto Trust	MPZ-R14	Oppose	The submitter opposes rule MPZ-R14 (inferred) as it permits kōhanga reo without restriction but requires resource consent for occupational and outdoor training. Training activities have the potential to make an important contribution to the economic wellbeing of tāngata whenua. Training in outdoor occupations such as farming and forestry in rural areas is unlikely to generate adverse effects more than minor.	Amend rule MPZ-R14 as follows: These standards do not apply to: Kōhanga reo, or to occupational and outdoor training activities.		Reject
S498.082	Te Rūnanga Ā Iwi O Ngapuhi	MPZ-R14	Oppose	The submitter opposes rule MPZ-R14 (inferred) as it permits kōhanga reo without restriction but requires resource consent for occupational and outdoor training. Training activities have the potential to	Amend rule MPZ-R14 as follows: These standards do not apply to: Kōhanga reo, or to occupational and outdoor training activities.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				make an important contribution to the economic wellbeing of tāngata whenua. Training in outdoor occupations such as farming and forestry in rural areas is unlikely to generate adverse effects more than minor.			
FS151.129	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject
FS23.250	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	It is important that provisions are consistent with Treaty principles and recognise and provide for Māori interests, including (but not limited to) appropriate economic development of their land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission.	Reject
S561.109	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	MPZ-R14	Support in part	The activity status where compliance is not achieved with PER-1 or PER-2 is a Discretionary activity. The proposed Discretionary activity status for non-compliance with PER-1 is not in line with the objectives and policies for the zone. In addition, Kāinga Ora seeks that PER-2 restricting the number of persons engaged in this activity residing off-site is deleted.	Delete PER-2. Amend where compliance with PER-1 is not achieved, this activity becomes Restricted Discretionary with specific matters of discretion as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 ~~The educational facility is within a residential unit or accessory building.~~ Use and development can be adequately serviced in terms of stormwater, wastewater and potable water infrastructure. PER-2 ~~The number of persons attending at any one time does not exceed four, excluding those who reside on site.~~ These standards do not apply to: Kōhanga reo activities. Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-1 or PER-2: Discretionary Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion are restricted to: i. consistency with the scale, density, design and character of the planned environment and purpose of the zone; j. the location, scale and design of buildings and structures; k. at zone interfaces: i. any setbacks, fencing, screening or landscaping required to address potential conflicts; ii. managing reverse sensitivity effects on adjacent land uses, including the ability of surrounding properties to undertake primary production activities in a rural environment; l. the adequacy and capacity of available or		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					programmed development infrastructure to accommodate the proposed activity; or the capacity of the site to cater for onsite infrastructure associated with the proposed activity;m. the adequacy of roading infrastructure to service the proposed activity;n. any loss of highly productive land;o. effects on areas with historic heritage and cultural values, natural features and landscapes, natural character or indigenous biodiversity values; andp. any historical, spiritual, or cultural association held by tangata whenua, with regard to the matters set out in Policy TW-P6.		
FS36.074	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency		Support in part	Supports the use and development of Treaty Settlement land and alternative infrastructure where appropriate. However, Waka Kotahi is concerned that the removal of PER-1 triggers and proposed relief does not require consideration of necessary transport infrastructure and safety of the transport system and its community.	Allow in part	Amend TSL-R14 to include the requirement for consideration and provision of appropriate crossing place, associated transport infrastructure and safety of the transport system.	Reject
FS32.163	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes. The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts. The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS375.004	Ministry of Education		Support in part	The Ministry is in support of the activity status of educational facilities in the Māori Purpose Zone. In the Ministry's original submission, the Ministry supported the permitted activity standards to provide for small scale educational facilities in the Kororāreka Russell Township zone and accepted the Discretionary activity status if compliance with the permitted activity standards cannot be achieved. However, the Ministry would like to support Kāinga Ora for the development of schools in the Māori Purpose Zone to be a Restricted Discretionary activity if compliance with permitted activity standards cannot be achieved. This will better allow educational facilities to be enabled in zones where they are considered to be essential social infrastructure. The Ministry considers that the permitted activity standard proposed by Kāinga Ora (that the development can be adequately serviced by infrastructure) is not appropriate as activities not compliant with the standard would only become a Restricted Discretionary activity subject to matters of discretion. The Ministry considers the provision of adequate waste and stormwater infrastructure to be essential and would require all educational facilities (initiated by the Minister) to be adequately serviced by this infrastructure. To be consistent with the matters of discretion requested in other zones, the Ministry request the adoption of the following matters of discretion: a) Design and layout. b) Transport safety and efficiency. c) Scale of activity and hours of operation. d) Infrastructure servicing. e) Potential reverse sensitivity effects on rural production operations. The Ministry seek that this submission point be allowed, but that the Permitted Activity standards are revised.	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Reject
FS23.381	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.			
FS47.123	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Accept
FS348.196	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept
S355.036	Wakaiti Dalton	MPZ-R15	Support in part	We support the intention of this rule, however, we concerned with the thresholds proposed in PER-1. In the absence of section 32 analysis of the thresholds, it is unclear whether these are the most practical in achieving the purpose of the RMA.	delete PER-1		Reject
S396.015	Matauri X Incorporation	MPZ-R15	Support	The PDP provides enabling provisions for a number of activities which are generally supported. This includes a generous impermeable surface coverage, provision for farming, visitor accommodation, Marae, community facilities, customary activities, Urupa, Educational Facilities and rural tourism.	retain MPZ-R15 specifically PER-1 The commercial activity does not exceed a GBA of 250m2		Accept
S425.065	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust	MPZ-R15	Support	PHTTCCT support commercial activities of an appropriate scale in the Māori Purpose Zone.	retain as notified		Accept
S479.031	Tracy and Kenneth Dalton	MPZ-R15	Oppose	We support the intention of this rule, however, we concerned with the thresholds proposed in PER-1. In the absence of section 32 analysis of the thresholds, it is unclear whether these are the most practical in achieving the purpose of the RMA.	Delete PER-1.		Reject
S486.095	Te Rūnanga o Whaingaroa	MPZ-R15	Oppose	Papakāinga - limits commercial activities that enable the long-term sustainability of facilities and activities.	Amend Rule MPZ-R15 so that commercial activities within papakāinga are more enabling.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Rule MPZ-R5 and MPZ-R15 are inconsistent and should be harmonised: MPZ-5 appears to permit commercial activity in papakāinga without restriction (economic activity being within the definition of papakāinga) only for this to be cut down by MPZ-15.			
S390.082	Te Runanga o Ngai Takoto Trust	MPZ-R15	Oppose	The submitter opposes rule MPZ-R15 as papakāinga limits commercial activities that enable the long-term sustainability of facilities and activities. Rule MPZ-R5 and MPZ-R15 are inconsistent and should be harmonised: MPZ-5 appears to permit commercial activity in papakāinga without restriction (economic activity being within the definition of papakāinga) only for this to be cut down by MPZ-15.	Amend rule MPZ-R15 to provide for commercial activities within papakāinga that are more enabling.		Accept in part
S498.083	Te Rūnanga Ā Iwi O Ngapuhi	MPZ-R15	Oppose	The submitter opposes rule MPZ-R15 as papakāinga limits commercial activities that enable the long-term sustainability of facilities and activities. Rule MPZ-R5 and MPZ-R15 are inconsistent and should be harmonised: MPZ-5 appears to permit commercial activity in papakāinga without restriction (economic activity being within the definition of papakāinga) only for this to be cut down by MPZ-15.	Amend rule MPZ-R15 to provide for commercial activities within papakāinga that are more enabling.		Accept in part
FS151.130	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept
FS23.251	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	It is important that provisions are consistent with Treaty principles and recognise and provide for Māori interests, including (but not limited to) appropriate economic development of their land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission.	Accept
S396.016	Matauri X Incorporation	MPZ-R16	Support	The PDP provides enabling provisions for a number of activities which are generally supported. This includes a generous impermeable surface coverage, provision for farming, visitor accommodation, Marae, community facilities, customary activities, Urupa, Educational Facilities and rural tourism.	retain MPZ-R16 specifically Activity status: Permitted		Accept
S561.104	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Standards	Support in part	Kāinga Ora considers that impermeable surface coverage is a development control that fits with other Standards rather than as a Rule in the activity status table. Rules which rely on compliance with bulk and location. Standards for that Rule should include the Impermeable surfaces Standard.	Insert new Standard MPZ-S8 Impermeable surfaces Māori Purpose Zone - Urban The impermeable surface coverage of any site is no more than 60%. Māori Purpose Zone - Rural The impermeable surface coverage of any site no more than 25%. Except that: On sites containing marae, the impermeable surface is no more than		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					50%.Where the standard is not met, matters of discretion are restricted to:g. the extent to which landscaping or vegetation may reduce adverse effects of runoff;h. the effectiveness of the proposed method for controlling stormwater on site;i. the availability of land for disposal of effluent and stormwater on site without adverse effects on adjoining waterbodies (including groundwater and aquifers) or on adjoining sites;j. whether low impact design methods and green spaces can be used;k. any cumulative effects on total catchment impermeability; andl. natural hazard mitigation and site constraints.		
FS32.158	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes. The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts. The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept
FS23.376	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS47.118	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Accept
FS348.191	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept
S396.017	Matauri X Incorporation	MPZ-S1	Support		retain MPZ-S1 Specifically Māori purpose zone - rural The maximum height of the building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure is 12m above ground level.		Accept
S489.038	Radio New Zealand	MPZ-S1	Support	RNZ is concerned that elevated structures near RNZ's facilities could experience EMR coupling which can present a safety risk to people on or near the structures. RNZ notes that the height limit proposed in the proposed district plan has been adopted as a trigger for considering EMR coupling, to allow for simpler administration of the standard. However, RNZ is open to higher trigger heights of 21m (within 1,000m of the Waipapakauri transmitter) and 16m (within 1,000m of the Ōhaeawai transmitter) being imposed in the District Plan if this would lead to better outcomes.	Insert a new matter within Policy MPZ-P4 as follows: g. for structures within1,000m of Radio NewZealand's Facilities atWaipapakauri or Ōhaeawai, whether the safety risks of electro magnetic coupling have been considered and addressed effectively.		Accept
S368.017	Far North District Council	MPZ-S1	Support in part	Submission: The proposed maximum height standard for Maori Purpose Zone - urban is currently 11 m above ground level, which is inconsistent with the 8m maximum height limit for the General Residential Zone, and	Amend MPZ-S1 Maximum height The maximum height of the building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure is 44 8m above ground level 416		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				could lead to potential adverse effects on character and amenity for surrounding residential sites. Key reasons for the requested change are: - Council's intention was that the maximum height for the Maori Purpose zone - Urban would be consistent with the maximum height for the General Residential Zone (as inferred by Section 5.3.3 of the S32 report - Tangata Whenua). - A large portion of MPZ - Urban zoned sites are residential in size and nature. Initial GIS analysis indicates that there are only approximately 16 sites zoned Maori Purpose - Urban Zone across the District that directly adjoin the Mixed Use, Light or Heavy Industrial Zones. - The amendment would achieve greater consistency in character and amenity between the MPZ-Urban and General Residential or Settlement Zones.			
FS243.203	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose	Kāinga Ora supports a maximum height of 8m in the GRZ only if the Medium Density Residential Zone is accepted as part of the notified District Plan. Otherwise, a maximum building height of 11m is requested in the General Residential Zone to provide for three-storey typologies including apartments, across the district. Therefore, Kāinga Ora opposes the amendment sought, consistent with the changes sought in original submission.	Disallow	Amend MPZ-S1 Maximum height	Reject
S431.197	John Andrew Riddell	MPZ-S2	Not Stated	Not stated	Retain the approach varying the required height to boundary depending on the orientation of the relevant boundary.		Accept
S512.089	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	MPZ-S3	Support in part	Setbacks play a role in reducing spread of fire as well as ensuring Fire and Emergency personnel can get to a fire source or other emergency. An advice note is recommended to raise to plan users (e.g. developers) early on in the resource consent process that there is further control of building setbacks and firefighting access through the New Zealand Building Code (NZBC).	Insert advice note to setback standard Building setback requirements are further controlled by the Building Code. This includes the provision for firefighter access to buildings and egress from buildings. Plan users should refer to the applicable controls within the Building Code to ensure compliance can be achieved at the building consent stage. Issuance of a resource consent does not imply that waivers of Building Code requirements will be considered/granted		Reject
S416.068	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	MPZ-S3	Support in part	For health and safety reasons, KiwiRail seek a setback for structures from the rail corridor boundary. While KiwiRail do not oppose development on	Insert a railway setback (refer to submission for examples) Insert the following matters of discretion into the		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				adjacent sites, ensuring the ability to access and maintain structures without requiring access to rail land is important. Parts of the KiwiRail network adjoin commercial, mixed use, industrial and open space zones. These zone chapters do not currently include provision for boundary setbacks for buildings and structures. KiwiRail seek a boundary setback of 5m from the rail corridor for all buildings and structures. KiwiRail considers that a matter of discretion directing consideration of impacts on the safety and efficiency of the rail corridor is appropriate in situations where the 5m setback standard is not complied with in all zones adjacent to the railway corridor. Building setbacks are essential to address significant safety hazards associated with the operational rail corridor. The Proposed Plan enables a 1m setback from side and rear boundaries shared with the rail corridor, increasing the risk that poles, ladders, or even ropes for abseiling equipment, could protrude into the rail corridor and increasing the risk of collision with a train or electrified overhead lines. Further, there is a 600mm eave allowance within side and rear yards which restricts potential access to roofs from of buildings even further and results in an effective yard setback of 400mm. KiwiRail consider that a 5m setback is appropriate in providing for vehicular access to the rear of buildings (e.g. a cherry picker) and allowing for scaffolding to be erected safely. This setback provides for the unhindered operation of buildings, including higher rise structures and for the safer use of outdoor deck areas at height. This in turn fosters visual amenity, as lineside properties can be regularly maintained. One option is a cross-reference between the standards of each zone to avoid repetition, or to create a standard rail corridor setback rule and replicate it in each zone. The provision of a setback can ensure that all buildings on a site can be accessed and maintained for the life of that structure, without the requirement to gain access to rail land, including by aspects such as ladders, poles or abseil ropes. This ensures that a safe amenity is provided on the adjacent sites for the occupants, in line with delivery policy direction such as GRZ-O2, clause 4 whereby safety is a specific	standard: - the location and design of the building as it relates to the ability to safely use, access and maintain buildings without requiring access on, above or over the rail corridor - the safe and efficient operation of the rail network	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				objective for achieving zone appropriate character and amenity values. It is noted that some zones (Heavy Industrial, Rural production)) have wider yards than sought by KiwiRail. This is supported, but the yard purpose is not linked to safety matters relating to a site's proximity to the railway and therefore any applications for reductions may not consider this requirement.			
FS243.154	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the requested 5m setback; a considerably reduced set back would provide adequate space for maintenance activities within sites adjacent to the rail network. In doing so, it will continue to protect the safe, efficient, and effective operation of the rail infrastructure while balancing the cost on landowners. The amendments are unnecessary.	Disallow	Insert a railway setback (refer to submission for examples) Insert the following matters of discretion into the standard:	Accept
S407.006	Tapuaetahi Incorporation	MPZ-S5	Support in part	An exemption is also proposed in terms of MPZ-S4 which allows for a balance lot, reserve or road to negate the need for the setback from MHWS provisions to be applied. This approach is similar in nature to those found in the existing rule 12.7.6.1.1(vii) of the Operative District Plan.	Amend MPZ-S4 to: The maximum height of the building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure, must be set back at least 26m from MHWS. Exemption: Where there is a legally formed and maintained road, reserve or allotment between the property and the coastal marine area.		Reject
S396.018	Matauri X Incorporation	MPZ-S5	Support		retain MPZ-S5 Specifically, The combined building or structure coverage of the site is no more than 50%.		Accept
S396.019	Matauri X Incorporation	MPZ-S6	Support in part	Linked to the above is MPZ-S6 On-site services. The continued requirements for exclusive use areas for wastewater are considered to duplicate the requirements already considered under TP58 and the Northland Regional Council rules, and they promote an inefficient use of a physical resource (land). Many development on Maori Land favour collective systems which require a balance area for development, but enable Maori Landowners to achieve scale, pitch for government funding, and more appropriately use the very limited amount of land they have. This approach is considered to more	amend MPZ-S6 onsite services Wastewater 1. Where a connection to Council's reticulated wastewater systems is not available: ~~a. any residential unit has a minimum exclusive use area surrounding the unit, for on-site wastewater treatment and disposal, of 2,000m².~~ ~~b. all wastewater treatment and disposal systems must be contained within the site that the system serves, and be connected to a septic tank or soakage field or an approved alternative means to dispose of sewage in a sanitary manner in~~		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				appropriately meet the provisions of higher order documents and Part 2 of the RMA.	accordance with Far North District Council Engineering Standards April 2022. ~~c. where sewage is to be disposed to ground, the receiving area must not be:~~ land susceptible to instability; or an area identified in the District Plan as subject to inundation; or used for the disposal of stormwater. d. A site suitability report for on-site wastewater disposal, prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced person, to demonstrate compliance with ~~the above~~ Far North District Council Engineering Standards April 2022. TP58, and the Northland Regional Plan ~~ve~~ standards, shall be submitted to Council for approval at time of building consent.	
S512.043	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	MPZ-S6	Support	Support inclusion of firefighting water supply as well as potable (or drinking) water supply. Fire and Emergency request this framing is copied throughout the District Plan.	amend MPZ-S6 Water 2. Where a connection to Council's reticulated water systems is not available, all residential units shall have access to potable (drinkable) water and access to water supplies for firefighting in accordance with the alternative firefighting water source provisions of SNZ PAS 4509:2008. ~~from a community water scheme or private water bore or shall be able to store 45,000 litres of potable water from another source.~~	Reject
S390.011	Te Runanga o Ngai Takoto Trust	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.	Accept
S390.075	Te Runanga o Ngai Takoto Trust	Māori Purpose - Rural Zone	Support	The submitter supports the principle of a Māori Purpose - Rural Zone (inferred).	Retain the Māori Purpose - Rural Zone.	Accept
S498.012	Te Rūnanga Ā Iwi O Ngāpuhi	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	Retain the Māori Purpose - Rural Zone.	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				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.			
FS151.52	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept
FS23.180	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	It is important that provisions are consistent with Treaty principles and recognise and provide for Māori interests, including (but not limited to) appropriate economic development of their land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission.	Accept
S498.076	Te Rūnanga Ā Iwi O Ngāpuhi	Māori Purpose - Rural Zone	Support	The submitter supports the principle of a Māori Purpose - Rural Zone (inferred).	Retain the Māori Purpose - Rural Zone.		Accept
FS151.123	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept
FS23.244	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	It is important that provisions are consistent with Treaty principles and recognise and provide for Māori interests, including (but not limited to) appropriate economic development of their land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Accept
S390.012	Te Runanga o Ngai Takoto Trust	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.		Accept
S390.076	Te Runanga o Ngai Takoto Trust	Māori Purpose - Urban Zone	Support	The submitter supports the principle of a Māori Purpose - Urban Zone (inferred).	Retain the Māori Purpose - Urban Zone.		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S498.013	Te Rūnanga Ā Iwi O Ngāpuhi	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.		Accept
FS151.53	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept
FS23.181	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	It is important that provisions are consistent with Treaty principles and recognise and provide for Māori interests, including (but not limited to) appropriate economic development of their land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Accept
S498.077	Te Rūnanga Ā Iwi O Ngāpuhi	Māori Purpose - Urban Zone	Support	The submitter supports the principle of a Māori Purpose - Urban Zone (inferred).	Retain the Māori Purpose - Urban Zone.		Accept
FS151.124	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept
FS23.245	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	It is important that provisions are consistent with Treaty principles and recognise and provide for Māori interests, including (but not limited to) appropriate economic development of their land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission.	Accept