

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S454.138	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	<p>Due to its linear nature and the requirement to connect new electricity generation to the National Grid, regardless of where the new generation facilities are located, transmission lines may need to traverse any zone within the Far North District.</p> <p>None of the Special Purpose zones have objectives, policies or rules that provide for critical infrastructure such as transmission facilities that may be located, or need to be located, within these zones to support the activities that occur there.</p>	Amend the provisions in the Ngawha Innovation and Enterprise Park Special Purpose zone to ensure that critical infrastructure, such as transmission facilities, is provided for.		Reject
FS114.10	Far North Holdings Limited		Oppose	<p>FNHL supports the protection of Critical Infrastructure but seeks that the Critical Electricity overlay not apply to the Ngawha Innovation Park. The Park property includes both 110kV and 33kV lines and development to date has had some flexibility in both development and retention of electricity supply.</p> <p>The proposed protection measures make many of the approved and future development areas unable to be developed and remove potential alternative options to enable both development and the protection of the Critical Electricity Lines. FNHL would be looking at securing an MOU with Top Energy Limited for sites where the Critical Electricity Lines are located. This would be outside the district plan process.</p>	Disallow		Accept
FS369.020	Top Energy		Support	Top Energy support the provision of critical infrastructure (including electricity) within the Ngāwhā Innovation and Enterprise Park Special Purpose Zone	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S375.001	Far North Holdings Limited	NIEP-O1	Support in part	The additional components referenced support the ability of individuals to operate businesses and take up employment, training and educational options available within the Park. The view of the Park is that the less impediment to enabling people to reach their potential - the better and this needs to be reflected within the intent of the zone.	<p>Amend NIEP-O1 as follows:</p> <p>The NIEP zone enables compatible development and activities that provide for primary production innovation, including manufacturing, further processing of raw materials, research and fostering technological advancements, and directly related education and training opportunities., education support such as childcare facilities, employment and business development initiatives offered within the Park.</p>		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation	
S331.112	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	NIEP-O1	Support	The submitter supports objective NIEP-O1, to enable compatible activities, such as educational facilities, that provide for primary production innovation, including manufacturing, further processing of raw materials, research and fostering technological advancements, and directly related education and training opportunities.	Retain objective NIEP-O1	Accept in part	
S354.025	The BOI Watchdogs	NIEP-O2	Oppose	We have noted in this consultation process that there are animal ownership and pet limits in this zone and this needs to be reviewed for legality and sanity.	Amend the objective and policy framework that would restrict pet ownership (inferred)	Reject	
FS570.1034	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
FS566.1048	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
FS569.1070	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
S375.002	Far North Holdings Limited	NIEP-P1	Support in part	Education opportunities provided within the Park's aim to ensure that there are appropriate transitions between secondary, alternative education and tertiary education pathways into work. The offerings are therefore not solely at tertiary level and would be more appropriate to simply state education. The inclusion of "employment" re-emphasises that employment opportunities which exist for the primary production elements. The inclusion of by-products and waste stream product development represents the closed loop philosophy of the Park which is a key environmental outcome sought from Park operators.	Amend NIEP-P1 as follows: Provide for activities directly related to primary production where these are of an appropriate scale, nature and design for the NIEP zone, including: a. farming activities; b. conservation activities; c. rural industry; d. primary production innovation, tertiary education and 'research and development' activities education, employment, and 'research and development' activities; and e. manufacturing of primary production raw materials into a range of products, including by-product waste materials and its by-products or waste streams into a range of products.	Accept	
S331.113	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	NIEP-P2	Support in part	The submitter supports in part policy NIEP-P2, to enable activities, such educational facilities, which are ancillary to permitted or existing primary production activities and are consistent with the outcomes sought for the NIEP zone. However, the Ministry request that the term 'education activities' is	Amend policy NIEP-P2 as follows: Enable the establishment of retail, office and educational facilities activities (including temporary course related accommodation for students and trainees) where these are ancillary to permitted or existing primary production activities and are consistent with the outcomes sought	Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				updated to 'educational facilities' to align with the proposed definition in the Far North Proposed District Plan and the National Planning Standards.	for the NIEP zone.	
S375.003	Far North Holdings Limited	NIEP-P3	Support in part	<p>There is a need for accommodation for employees or business owners who need to be located within the site. This could include residential units for security, or other employees relied upon for onsite activities such as visiting crown research and agency employees, visiting lecturers, and bespoke education or skills-based training courses where staff and students may need short term accommodation.</p> <p>The range of education facilities is wide and this needs to reflect the "closed loop" approach within the Park's key objectives. Adding value to primary production is a key element of the training programs to be offered within the Park. This intent goes beyond the narrow scope of primary production. Adding value to primary products is a key economic driver and will enable greater resilience and skill sets for individuals moving forward.</p>	<p>Amend NIEP-P3 as follows:</p> <p>Avoid land use and development that would compromise the function of the NIEP zone or detract from the function and well-being of Kaikohe and Ngawha, including but not limited to avoiding:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> commercial activities (excluding an ancillary office); industrial activities (excluding activities which incorporate manufacturing and processes relating to primary production and its by-products/ waste materials streams); retail (excluding small scale rural produce and ancillary retail related to on-site activity); trade; residential activities (excluding temporary student, trainee, and visiting staff and/or onsite employee accommodation as provided for in the zone); community facilities; education facilities not directly related to primary production activities, trade and added value trade and manufacturing education programs, or education services which are not provided for currently in Kaikohe or which forms extension to existing providers; hospitality and restaurants (excluding small-scale cafes and takeaway food outlets); keeping of domestic animals, including boarding and breeding kennels; and development and buildings located outside of the identified development areas (platforms 1-36). 	Accept in part
S375.004	Far North Holdings Limited	NIEP-P6	Support in part	While the intent is to use the consented and available existing wastewater infrastructure, there may be instances due to remoteness or alternative reasons for onsite wastewater treatment and disposal. In the event of onsite alternatives being used, the system would likely be a minimum of	<p>Amend NIEP-P6 as follows:</p> <p>Ensure adequate infrastructure is provided to service development and activities within the zone, through connections to the NIEP reticulated infrastructure or by</p>	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				secondary treatment and would be subject to any regional or district planning requirements.	suitable onsite infrastructure (except wastewater)	
S375.005	Far North Holdings Limited	NIEP-P7	Support in part	<p>The NIEP plan within the 'Ngawha Innovation and Enterprise Park Design Guidelines' needs a minor amendment as some of the development areas approved are not colored - areas 5 & 19, and the lizard relocation reserve is indicated in the key for Swamp Maire planting. In addition, the main horticultural area is unlabeled which will cause some confusion over number references within rules. This may lead to consequential amendments to the relevant rules.</p> <p>In addition, the eastern portion of the NIEP zone identifies various development areas 20-36 which are all separate from each other. There could be future proposals which may look to contiguously develop the respective sites. This needs to be allowed within the rules. The development areas are indicative only in these instances.</p> <p>A plan reflective of these changes sought can be prepared.</p>	<p>Amend NIEP-P7 as follows:</p> <p>Manage land use and subdivision to address the effects of the activity requiring resource consent, including (but not limited to) consideration of the following matters where relevant to the application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. historic heritage, cultural values, indigenous biodiversity, landscape, and natural value; b. the bulk and scale of buildings, structures, outdoor storage; c. effects on amenity within the NIEP zone and surrounding environment, including effects from number of employees on site, noise, hours of operation, lighting, and signage; d. parking and loading requirements; e. traffic generation, and the standard of roading and access; including limiting the type, volume and circulation of traffic within the NIEP zone and surrounding traffic network, particularly on Wallis Road; f. stormwater effects, including impacts on the NIEP zone's reticulated network, flooding hazards, overland flow paths and surrounding catchments; g. provision of any easements required for electricity, communications, media, access and any covenanted areas required to be protected based on the NIEP Design Guidelines; h. stormwater management (including provision for low impact design principles), wastewater management, and water supply management (including firefighting supply); i. the stability of land, buildings and infrastructure; j. erosion, dust, sediment and contaminant controls; k. the management of trade waste; l. public health and safety; m. risks from natural hazards; 	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> n. potential reverse sensitivity effects between activities within the NIEP zone and at the zone interface; and o. the temporary or permanent nature of any adverse effects. 	
S512.069	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Rules	Not Stated	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p>	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
S515.005	Ngāti Rangī ki Ngawha	Rules	Oppose	<p>Jane Drader's property is 42 Wallis Road, Kaikohe and they were not approached prior to consent being granted. Council should not administer the rules on their own land. There were issues of non-compliance with the consent (inferred). NIEP should not be excluded from rules for intensive indoor primary production (RPROZ-R23, RDIS-1) which the landowner feels the NIEP activities fall under.</p> <p>Jane Drader has had to endure adverse dust, noise and privacy effects with no compensation and has concerns for the level of development and activities enabled by the NIEP (inferred). There are concerns</p>	<p>Amend NIEP (inferred by requests) to include independent monitoring which includes mana whenua via hapū hui and mandated involvement. Include regular compliance of spray contents and amounts used and provide reports in layman's terms for affected households.</p> <p>NIEP should be responsible for monitoring neighbouring property's water quality. Access from employees should be off Wallis Road, which should be sealed and speed limit reduced to 50km/hr.</p> <p>Incorporate hapū objectives and engage with hapū. When an RFS is responded to, sent a report advising of</p>	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>for the health and safety effects of the spray and how this is monitored and how affected neighbours are informed. Concerns raised for the road quality, maintenance, and monitoring of traffic. Effects from spring diversion affecting water flows and erosion on submitters site and concern with the process for managing the RFS raised relating to this.</p> <p>The NIEP guidelines should be provided in hard copy and be easily accessible. The variations are hard to follow and be presented to mana whenua.</p>	actions taken and remediation completed to the person who lodged RFS and keep public records.	
S515.011	Ngāti Rangi ki Ngawha	Rules	Support in part	<p>Consultation and Compliance with reference and regard to the Ngāti Rangi Hapu Cultural Impact Assessment report and the cultural and Hapu Tikanga and Kawa need to be a lot more inclusive and improved. Hapu-mandated representatives in regard to Environmental Management and monitoring need to be consulted and included.</p>	<p>Amend to ensure consultation and Compliance with reference and regard to the Ngāti Rangi Hapu Cultural Impact Assessment report and the cultural and Hapu Tikanga and Kawa need to be a lot more inclusive and improved.</p> <p>Hapu-mandated representatives in regard to Environmental Management and monitoring need to be consulted and included. These representatives have been nominated and mandated through Hapu Hui, not appointed by or working for FNHL or other subsidiaries of Councils.</p> <p>Liliana Clarke and Josephine Clarke are both mandated hapu representatives for NIEP. This needs to be addressed and reestablished immediately in regard to true tangata whenua relationships and partnerships.</p>	Accept in part
S304.006	Ngāti Rangi ki Ngawha Hapu	Rules	Support in part	<p>Consultation and Compliance with reference and regard to the Ngāti Rangi Hapu Cultural Impact Assessment report and the cultural and Hapu Tikanga and Kawa need to be a lot more inclusive and improved. Hapu-mandated representatives regarding Environmental Management and monitoring need to be consulted and included.</p>	<p>Amend to ensure consultation and Compliance with reference and regard to the Ngāti Rangi Hapu Cultural Impact Assessment report and the cultural and Hapu Tikanga and Kawa need to be a lot more inclusive and improved.</p> <p>Hapu-mandated representatives in regard to Environmental Management and monitoring need to be consulted and included. These representatives have been nominated and mandated through Hapu Hui, not appointed by or working for FNHL or other subsidiaries of Councils.</p> <p>Liliana Clarke and Josephine Clarke are both mandated hapu representatives for NIEP. This needs to be addressed and reestablished immediately in regard to true tangata whenua relationships and partnerships.</p>	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS114.14	Far North Holdings Limited		Oppose	<p>NIEP continues to work with Ngāti Rangī for development proposals within the Park. FNHL does, however, oppose personalised provisions with reference to individuals.</p> <p>FNHL continues to support working with hapu representatives nominated by the Ngāti Rangī NIEP governance group. To this extent the Ngāti Rangī NIEP governance team and FNHL governance are currently drafting a memorandum of understanding.</p> <p>This is the most appropriate means meet all parties' expectations and enable changes as required to occur without proceeding through a plan change process.</p>	Disallow in part	Accept in part
S375.006	Far North Holdings Limited	NIEP-R1	Support in part	<p>- This requested change reflects the greater intensity generally allowed within the Innovation and Enterprise precinct, platforms 1-18, where detailed landscape assessments have been completed and a more built form has been accepted as permissible based on the infrastructure installed, and funded by MBIE.</p> <p>- Platforms 19-36 were envisaged for further glasshouse or horticultural structures which have a higher site coverage, albeit it is acknowledged there would be a need for an accompanying detailed landscape assessment. The 20% coverage is considered to be a minimum requirement.</p>	Amend NIEP-R1 as follows: 2. The accessory building or structure does not exceed 10-50% for consented areas 1-18 located within the Innovation and Enterprise precinct and 20% of the total area of the identified development areas (platforms 1-19-36) shown in the ' <i>Ngawha Innovation and Enterprise Park Design Guidelines</i> ', dated March 2022.	Accept in part
S512.116	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	NIEP-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
S481.018	Puketotara Lodge Ltd	NIEP-S4	Not Stated	<p>The submitter seeks to ensure that the PDP adequately controls effects from stormwater discharge, particularly between sites or adjacent sites.</p> <p>The Operative Far North Plan contains a stormwater management rule in each zone, along with matters</p>	<p>Insert the following as additional matters of discretion (inferred):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the extent to which landscaping or vegetation may reduce adverse effects of run-off; 	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>of discretion which Council can consider where the impermeable surface area exceeds what is allowed under the permitted activity rule.</p> <p>There is no specific "stormwater management" rule in the Rural Production zone in the PDP, however there is a rule relating to impermeable surface coverage.</p> <p>It is submitted that additional matters should be added to the list of relevant matters for discretion in the impermeable coverage rule in all zones, in order to better control effects between sites or adjacent sites,</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the effectiveness of the proposed method for controlling stormwater on site; • the availability of land for disposal of effluent and stormwater on the site without adverse effects on adjoining waterbodies (including groundwater and aquifers) or on adjoining sites; • whether low impact design methods and use of green spaces can be used; • any cumulative effects on total catchment impermeability; • natural hazard mitigation and site constraints; • extent of potential adverse effects on cultural, spiritual, heritage and/or amenity values of any affected waterbodies; • 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; and • the extent to which the diversion and discharge mimics natural run-off patterns. 	
<p>S482.019</p>	<p>House Movers Section of New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc</p>	<p>NIEP-R1</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>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".</p> <p>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</p>	<p>Amend NIEP-R1 to provide for relocated building as a permitted activity when relocated buildings meet performance standards and criteria (see schedule 1).</p> <p>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</p>	<p>Accept</p>

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS23.166	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	It is important that provision is made in all zones for relocatable buildings to enable choice, reuse of existing housing, and to make it clear what the activity status is for such buildings. This is particularly the case in urban zones.	Allow Allow the relief sought	Accept
S375.007	Far North Holdings Limited	NIEP-R4	Support in part	<p>The restriction of a retail area to only 100m2 of GBA is considered to be overly restrictive. This conclusion is reached as a result of GBA being used as the key definition used for this purpose. Retail will only ever be ancillary to the primary production and the processing of the product. The current GBA definition and the range of inclusions, leaves insufficient area for storage of the finished product. Some items produced are large and bulky. With each activity detailing parking and traffic requirements the potential concerns are alleviated. A percentage of the GBA is a more appropriate scaling mechanism.</p> <p>The title for this section could be simply referenced as "retail" because there will be some processing undertaken within the various processes which could fall outside of a strict "primary production" definition.</p>	<p>Amend NIEP-R4 PER-1 as follows:</p> <p>The retail area for any development platform area shown in the 'Ngawha Innovation and Enterprise Park Design Guidelines', dated March 2022, has a maximum GBA of 100m2-20% and is set back at least 30m from any zone boundary.</p>	Accept in part
S375.008	Far North Holdings Limited	NIEP-R5	Support in part	<p>That the limitation under PER-1 above should apply only to the platform areas noted as 19-36 rather than those which are "unlabeled" and front onto Wallis Road. - A significant concern relates to PER-3 which is contrary to likely operational components and conflicts with consented development within the Park. Many raw products cannot be stored outside, and many activities associated with the various processes are unable to be contained indoors.</p> <p>It is unclear as to the purpose of this rule (PER-3) given the relatively insular nature of the site and that similar rural activities on Rural Production sites do not contain this level of restriction. The scale of the requirements if required, would result in significant additional built form which would be detrimental to the remaining rural character of the site.</p>	<p>Amend NIEP-R5 as follows:</p> <p>PER-1 The rural industry or the rural industry building(s) do not exceed a GFA of 2,000m2 within development platform areas 19-36 each development platform area shown in the 'Ngawha Innovation and Enterprise Park Design Guidelines', dated March 2022.</p> <p>PER-2 The number of rural industry operations per development platform area shown in the 'Ngawha Innovation and Enterprise Park Design Guidelines', dated March 2022, does not exceed one.</p> <p>PER-3 All manufacturing, altering, repairing, dismantling</p>	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					or processing of any materials or articles is carried out within a building.	
S375.009	Far North Holdings Limited	NIEP-R5	Support in part	<p>There will be instances where more than one small-scale business may operate within a development platform. It is far more important that the building is used for the intended use than be restricted to one user only. As a facility for innovation and research smaller operators are expected. If a number is to be used, then one is far too little and could severely restrict smaller operators. The preference would be that the limitation in numbers requirement be removed entirely.</p> <p>The Park is to there to help incubate local and start-up businesses that generally cluster together to get economies of scale and share IP. This is a key function of the Park in supporting and growing our local economy.</p> <p>A significant concern relates to PER-3 which is contrary to likely operational components and conflicts with consented development within the Park. Many raw products cannot be stored outside, and many activities associated with the various processes are unable to be contained indoors.</p> <p>It is unclear as to the purpose of this rule given the relatively insular nature of the site and that similar rural activities on Rural Production sites do not contain this level of restriction. The scale of the requirements, if required would result in significant additional built form which would be detrimental to the remaining rural character of the site.</p>	<p>Amend IEP-R5 as follows: NIEP zone: Innovation and Enterprise precinct</p> <p>PER-1 The rural industry or the rural industry building(s) do not exceed a GFA of 1,000m2 within each development platform area shown in the 'Ngawha Innovation and Enterprise Park Design Guidelines', dated March 2022.</p> <p>PER-2 The number of rural industry operations per development platform area shown in the 'Ngawha Innovation and Enterprise Park Design Guidelines', dated March 2022, does not exceed one, unless explicitly provided for in the NIEP Concept Master Plan.</p> <p>PER-3 All manufacturing, altering, repairing, dismantling or processing of any materials or articles is carried out within a building.</p>	Accept in part
S375.010	Far North Holdings Limited	NIEP-R6	Support in part	<p>The scope of training needs to be broadened as noted to reflect consented activities on site. The whole intention of the Park is to offer education and training on-site and on-the-job that is relevant to the operations of the individual businesses.</p> <p>There needs to be provision for co-location of more than one provider within the approved development platforms.</p> <p>There would appear to be no specific reason for the suggested GFA of any facility noting that existing</p>	<p>Amend NIEP-R6</p> <p>PER-1 The office directly supports primary production activities- trades, and pathways-to employment programmes.</p> <p>PER-2 The tertiary education activity directly supports primary production activities- trades, and pathways-to-employment programmes.</p>	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				facilities are well above the size suggested within the rule.	<p>PER-3 The office or tertiary education activity is ancillary to a lawfully established activity on the same development platform area shown in the 'Ngawha Innovation and Enterprise Park Design Guidelines', dated March 2022. Note 1: lawfully established means an activity consented or operating under permitted activity rules when this Plan was notified. Note 2: there could be more than one education provider located within each development area as co-location and on-the-job training and education programs are likely to be delivered by a number of different providers with specialist expertise</p> <p>PER-4 The number of office or tertiary educational facilities per development platform area shown in the 'Ngawha Innovation and Enterprise Park Design Guidelines', dated March 2022, does not exceed one.</p> <p>PER-5 The GFA of the office or tertiary educational facility does not exceed 300m².</p>	
S375.011	Far North Holdings Limited	NIEP-R7	Support in part	<p>The Park offers wide-ranging facilities in research and development and should not be restricted or limited to primary production.</p> <p>The research and development of efficient use of waste and by products is equally important in minimising effects on the environment</p>	<p>Amend NIEP-R7 as follows:</p> <p>PER-1 The research and development activity directly relates to primary production- , manufacturing of primary production and its by-products/ waste streams, trades, and employment programmes.</p>	Accept
S375.012	Far North Holdings Limited	NIEP-R8	Support in part	While the intent of the provision is to use the consented and available existing wastewater infrastructure, there may be instances due to remoteness or alternative reasons for onsite wastewater treatment and disposal. In the event of onsite alternatives being used, the system would likely be minimum of secondary treatment and would	<p>Amend NIEP-R8 as follows:</p> <p>CON-1 New buildings or structures, and extensions or alterations to existing buildings and structures not otherwise provided for by NIEP-R1 New accessory buildings or structures, and extensions or alterations to existing accessory buildings and structures are located</p>	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				be subject to any regional or district planning requirements.	<p>and designed in accordance with the development platform areas shown in the '<i>Ngawha Innovation and Enterprise Park Design Guidelines</i>', dated March 2022.</p> <p>CON-2</p> <p>The development platform and buildings are connected to the NIEP internal reticulated 3 waters systems or sufficient onsite provision within the development platform can be demonstrated by a suitably qualified person (except wastewater).</p> <p>Matters of control are limited to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. the extent to which the building and development is consistent with the '<i>Ngawha Innovation and Enterprise Park Design Guidelines</i>', dated March 2022; b. the materials used, including consideration of colour, finishing, reflectivity, and permeability; c. the effect of buildings, structures and signage design (including facades and roofs) on the character and amenity of the zone and surrounding rural environment; d. the siting and separation of buildings; e. provisions of infrastructure services and the ability of stormwater, water and wastewater to be managed adequacy; and f. access and onsite manoeuvrability. 	
S512.045	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	NIEP-R8	Support in part	Fire and Emergency request reference to firefighting water supply	<p>Amend NIEP-R8 as follows:</p> <p>CON-2</p> <p>The development platform and buildings are connected to the NIEP internal reticulated 3 waters systems or sufficient onsite provision within the development platform can be demonstrated by a suitably qualified person (except wastewater).</p> <p>Matters of control are limited to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. the extent to which the building and development is consistent with the '<i>Ngawha Innovation and Enterprise Park Design Guidelines</i>', dated March 2022. b. the materials used, including consideration of colour, finishing, reflectivity, and permeability; 	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> c. the effect of buildings, structures and signage design (including facades and roofs) on the character and amenity of the zone and surrounding rural environment; d. the siting and separation of buildings; e. provisions of infrastructure services and the ability of stormwater, water (as per the SNZ PAS 4509:2008 New Zealand Fire Service Water Supplies Code of Practice) and wastewater to be managed adequately adequately; and f. access and onsite manoeuvrability. 	
FS114.11	Far North Holdings Limited		Oppose	FNHL opposes the inclusion within provision NIEP - R8, CON-2 the following wording "as per the SNZ PAS 4509:2008 New Zealand Fire Service Water Supplies Code of Practice". This standard is currently referenced correctly within Council's Engineering Standards in multiple locations and a requirement for development proposals. This is the most appropriate location for this standard to be located. Future changes to this standard can be made without significant cost if not referenced within the district plan.	Disallow	Accept
S375.013	Far North Holdings Limited	NIEP-R9	Support in part	The change reflects the wide scope of training and trades training consented within existing approved facilities and which will continue to be provided within the Park.	<p>Amend NIEP-R9 as follows:</p> <p>RDA-1</p> <p>The tertiary education facility provides tertiary education services, including trade training, that directly relates to primary production. education facility provides education services, including trade training, alternative education and secondary education pathways to employment and education that primarily relates to the manufacturing and production of primary products.</p> <p>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the effects on town centers; 2. the location and scale of buildings; 3. hours of operation; 4. servicing and infrastructure requirements; 	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. ability of the roading network to cater for the additional vehicular traffic; 6. number of people on site; 7. disturbance and loss of privacy surrounding sites; 8. reverse sensitivity; and 9. the matters of discretion of any infringed standard. 	
S375.014	Far North Holdings Limited	NIEP-R10	Support in part	People making use of the café will likely wish to eat there and requires additional space beyond the 50m2 suggestion. The kitchen, preparation area, storage, and waste area will exceed this limitation.	<p>Amend NIEP-R10 as follows:</p> <p>RDA-1 The café and takeaway food outlet does not exceed a GFA of 50m2. 150m2 plus a customer area not exceeding 200m2.</p> <p>RDA-2 The number of café and takeaway food outlets within the Innovation Precinct does not exceed five.</p> <p>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the effects on town centers; 2. the location and scale of buildings; 3. hours of operation; 4. servicing and infrastructure requirements; 5. ability of the roading network to cater for the additional vehicular traffic; 6. number of people on site; 7. disturbance and loss of privacy of surrounding sites; 8. reverse sensitivity; and 9. the matters of discretion of any infringed standard. N 	Accept in part
S375.015	Far North Holdings Limited	NIEP-R11	Support in part	<p>People will from time to time need for work purposes to reside on the site. This could be related to security or where experts for a particular activity may need to be accommodated.</p> <p>The Discretionary activity status is considered to be appropriate for this rare occurrence.</p>	<p>Amend rule heading NIEP-R11 to: Residential accommodation ancillary to educational facility - accommodation</p>	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation	
S512.090	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	NIEP-S3	Support in part	Setbacks play a role in reducing the 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	
S283.026	Trent Simpkin	NIEP-S4	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 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 stormwater management onsite and shouldn't require FNDC to look at it and tick the box to say it is 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	
FS570.840	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
FS566.854	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
FS569.876	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
S375.016	Far North Holdings Limited	NIEP-S7	Support in part	The replacement wording removes the confusion around the rule and its components	Amend NIEP-S7 as follows: A traffic management plan is prepared by a suitably qualified person which outlines traffic generation and movements from the activity and how access, parking, onsite manoeuvrability, and traffic generation will be appropriately managed. Until Wallis Road is sealed, this shall include restricting the use of Wallis Road to	Reject	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					<p>heavy vehicles (trucks, including provision for emergency vehicles) associated with the activity on Lot 1 DP 1872355 and Lot 1 DP 172355.</p> <p>Traffic movements do not exceed the following thresholds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 541 afternoon weekday peak hour vehicle movements (equivalent to approximately 1379 FTE) across the NIEP zone; and 2. a maximum of 30 peak hour vehicle movements via Wallis Road. <p>Following confirmation being provided by Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency that the Wallis Road/State Highway 12 intersection has been upgraded, the related traffic movements across the NIEP zone do not exceed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 620 afternoon weekday peak hour vehicle movements (equivalent to approximately 1599 FTE) across the NIEP zone; and 2. a maximum of 95 peak hour vehicle movements via Wallis Road. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prior to reaching 80% of the traffic movement thresholds set out below an annual traffic movement survey of the NIEP zone and Wallis Road entrance shall be undertaken to confirm movements are within the stated limits. Until Wallis Road is sealed, this shall include restricting the use of Wallis Road to heavy vehicles (trucks, including provision for emergency vehicles). 2. Exceeding 80% of the movement thresholds a traffic management assessment shall be prepared by a suitably qualified person which outlines traffic generation and movements from the activity. 3. Traffic movements do not exceed the following thresholds: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. 541 afternoon weekday peak hour vehicle movements (equivalent to approximately 1379 FTE) across the NIEP zone; and 	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii. a maximum of 30 peak hour vehicle movements via Wallis Road. <p>4. Following confirmation being provided by Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency that the Wallis Road/State Highway 12 intersection has been upgraded, the related traffic movements across the NIEP zone do not exceed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. 620 afternoon weekday peak hour vehicle movements (equivalent to approximately 1599 FTE) across the NIEP zone; and ii. a maximum of 95 peak hour vehicle movements via Wallis Road. 	
S307.001	Roxanne Drader	Rules	Oppose	<p>The submitter's property is 42 Wallis Road, Kaikohe and were not approached prior to consent being granted. Council should not administer the rules on their own land. There were issues of non-compliance with the consent (inferred). NIEP should not be excluded from rules for intensive indoor primary production (RPROZ-R23, RDIS-1) which the submitter feels the NIEP activities fall under.</p> <p>The submitter has had to endure adverse dust, noise and privacy effects with no compensation and has concerns for the level of development and activities enabled by the NIEP (inferred). There are concerns for the health and safety effects of the spray and how this is monitored and how affected neighbours are informed. Concerns raised for the road quality, maintenance, and monitoring of traffic.</p> <p>Effects from spring diversion affecting water flows and erosion on submitters site and concern with the process for managing the RFS raised relating to this. The NIEP guidelines should be provided in hard copy and be easily accessible. The variations are hard to follow and be presented to mana whenua.</p>	<p>Amend NIEP (inferred by requests) to include independent monitoring which includes mana whenua via hapū hui and mandated involvement. Include regular compliance of spray contents and amounts used and provide reports in layman's terms for affected households.</p> <p>NIEP should be responsible for monitoring neighbouring property's water quality. Access from employees should be off Wallis Road, which should be sealed and speed limit reduced to 50km/hr.</p> <p>Incorporate hapū objectives and engage with hapū. When an RFS is responded to, sent a report advising of actions taken and remediation completed to the person who lodged RFS and keep public records.</p>	Allow in part
FS114.19	Far North Holdings Limited		Support in part	<p>There is no relief sought which can be included in the district plan and its provisions, but it is important that effects within and outside of the site are accurately assessed. Past applications have been processed by independent consultants (planning and engineering) and application decisions determined by an Independent Planning Commissioner.</p>	Allow in part	Allow in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>With respect to monitoring conditions, most of the ongoing monitoring is completed by Northland Regional Council. How Council (FNDC) determines compliance is for them to determine. This aspect does not need to be part of the district plan. The applicant will however comply with conditions of consent as imposed within any resource consent decisions.</p>			
<p>FS93.41</p>	<p>Leonie M Exel</p>		<p>Support</p>	<p>I support this submission. I further recommend that in order for Far North Holdings to better understand the importance of honest consultation with hapu and iwi, that all staff and board undertake ongoing training, and that FNDC review the ethnic composition of the FNH staff and board to better reflect tangata whenua. More than half our district is Maori - why is that not the case at FNH? And in senior positions, too!</p>	<p>Allow</p>		<p>Allow in part</p>