

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
<b>S559.006</b>	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rēhia	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	There are climate change mitigation and adaptation responses relevant to district planning that could be set out now. We support the greater use of mixed-use zones and enabling greater density in urban centres.	Retain the extent of the Mixed Use zoning subject to appropriate requirements for water resilience and minimising risk from natural hazards (inferred).		Accept in part
<b>FS151.139</b>	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part
<b>FS570.2196</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
<b>FS348.033</b>	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Reject
<b>FS566.2210</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
<b>FS569.2232</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
<b>S324.001</b>	Per Lugnet	GRZ-R10	Support in part	Lot 9, 9 Midgard Rd can currently be used for a 3 unit development with more than 50% impermeable surface and no setback from the stub of the road reserve. These rights must be preserved. Zoned Commercial in the operative district plan.	Issue a Landuse Consent that preserves the present property rights without adding additional costs when the property is developed.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
<b>S324.002</b>	Per Lugnet	GRZ-S3	Support in part	Lot 9, 9 Midgard Rd can currently be used for a 3 unit development with more than 50% impermeable surface and no setback from the stub of the road reserve. These rights must be preserved. Zoned Commercial in the operative district plan.	Issue a Landuse Consent that preserves the present property rights without adding additional costs when the property is developed	Reject
<b>S179.107</b>	Russell Protection Society (INC)	General Residential Zone	Oppose	anomaly - there is no indication given on the map as to why these properties are zoned General Residential, since these properties have similar characteristics to the surrounding Kororareka Russell Township zoned lands.	Delete General Residential zoning 16/26A/26B Gould Street and 24B/24C Florance Ave, zone Kororaeka Russell Township	Accept
<b>S223.001</b>	Stephen Manley	General Residential Zone	Oppose	<p>The zoning inconsistent with PDP, objectives and general residential, or if considered more appropriate Rural Residential, in order to provide a transition to the Rural Production areas.</p> <p>None of the (Rural Production) objectives are achieved with the site and adjoining sites and the current zone and land location / land parcel size are inconsistent with the objectives and current/potential use of the sites.</p> <p>Refer to submission for site specifications and relevant further reasons that Rural Production Zone is inappropriate or inconsistent with the PDP.</p>	Amend rezone of 72 Kokohuia Road, Omapere to [General] Residential Zone, or failing that, to be Rural Residential Zone.	Reject
<b>S413.002</b>	Roman Catholic Bishop of the Diocese of Auckland	General Residential Zone	Support	The existing sites are serviced and located within an area of residential development.	Proposed zoning of the sites Lot 2 & 3 DP 165788 and Lot 2 DP 343569 (Tawanui Road refer attachment 2) remain as General Residential.	Accept
<b>S251.016</b>	New Zealand Maritime Parks Ltd	General Residential Zone	Oppose	NZMPL opposes the application of the General Residential zone to their site of interest, being 14 Baffin Street, Opua. NZMPL note that the Opua/Pahia/Haruru are identified as requiring additional business land to meet the expected demand of the area. The Urban	Delete General Residential zoning of 14 Baffin Street, Opua (legally described as Section 9 Block XXII Town of Opua) and zone Mixed Use.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>Section 32 details a need to provide an additional 6ha of commercial land over in the next 20 years, with a minimum of 5ha required in the medium term. In addition to this, the same Statistical Area 2 (SA2) unit requires an additional 8ha of industrial land over the life of this District Plan, and 10ha overall in the long term. In NZMPL seek that FNDC apply the Mixed Use zone to the site of interest for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-The application of the GRZ is not the most appropriate for the site given the natural hazard constraints that apply;</li> <li>-The demand for business land in the Opuia is projected to grow in the short, medium and long term;</li> <li>-The site of interest is adjacent to and contiguous with land zoned for MUZ on the corner of Baffin and Kellet Street;</li> <li>-The site is in close adjacent to Opuia's industrial park and will enable the establishment of compatible commercial activities in proximity to Opuia's industrial and commercial area; and</li> <li>-The application of the MUZ will provide a transition and buffer to adjacent residential activities located in the GRZ.</li> </ul>			
<b>FS400.021</b>	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Support	<p>Submission 251 rightly notes that the underlying analyses related to the Coastal Environment provisions has not sufficiently considered the appropriate implementation of these provision in the urban environment. Specific provisions such a height limits and gross floor area restrictions (for example) require flexibility when considered against the urban environment values and existing environment.</p>	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS396.021	Ed and Inge Amsler		Support	Submission 251 rightly notes that the underlying analyses related to the Coastal Environment provisions has not sufficiently considered the appropriate implementation of these provision in the urban environment. Specific provisions such a height limits and gross floor area restrictions (for example) require flexibility when considered against the urban environment values and existing environment	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
S330.005	The Paihia Property Owners Group	General Residential Zone	Support	The submitter generally supports the enabling intent of the General Residential zone however, when considered alongside the other overlays which constrain development these must be appropriately considered and selected based on a higher degree of evidence and assessment, as they relate specifically to Paihia.	Retain the General Residential zone as they apply to Paihia township with minimal overlays and restrictions.		Accept
FS547.117	Heron Point Limited		Support	This decision sought is supported to the extent that the Proposed District Plan facilitates residential development within the Paihia settlement to facilitate the delivery of housing supply within Paihia. The overlays should be removed from all residential zoned land within the wider Paihia area including the land owned by Heron Point Limited.	Allow	Retain the General Residential zone as they apply to Paihia township with minimal overlays and restrictions	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
<b>S565.007</b>	The Paihia Property Owners Group	General Residential Zone	Support	The Submitters generally support the enabling intent of many of the urban zones proposed by the PDP. However, when considered alongside the myriad of other controls, believe that the PDP unnecessarily constrains and confuses their intent, aims and objectives. As outlined above, should additional provisions and overlays be warranted, these must be appropriately considered and selected based on a higher degree of evidence and assessment as they relate specifically to Paihia.	Retain the General Residential zone as it applies to Paihia and only apply overlays that are considered and selected based on a higher degree of evidence and assessment.		Accept in part
<b>FS547.120</b>	Heron Point Limited		Support	This decision sought is supported to the extent that the Proposed District Plan facilitates residential development within the Paihia settlement to facilitate the delivery of housing supply within Paihia. The overlays should be removed from all residential zoned land within the wider Paihia area including the land owned by Heron Point Limited.	Allow	Retain the General Residential zone as they apply to Paihia township with minimal overlays and restrictions	Accept in part
<b>FS348.223</b>	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Reject
<b>S431.025</b>	John Andrew Riddell	General Residential Zone	Not Stated	Not stated	Rezone 24B and 24C Florance Avenue and 16, 26A and 26B Gould Street from General Residential to Kororāreka Russell Township		Accept
<b>FS332.025</b>	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept
<b>S419.002</b>	LMD Planning Consultancy	General Residential Zone	Support	The existing sites are serviced and located within an area of residential development	Retain the zoning of 164 and 166 Broadway, Kaikohe, and 45 Tawanui Road, Kaikohe (Lots 2 and 3 DP 165788 and Lot 2 DP 343569) as General Residential		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.1241	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
S42.017	Te Whatu Ora - Health New Zealand, Te Tai Tokerau	Hospital Zone	Oppose	To be effective the Hospital zone must be applied to the correct landholdings.	Amend the planning maps as necessary and/or make such other amendments so as to achieve the intent of the submission so that the following landholdings are shown as Hospital Zone: CT NA807/182, Section 25 SBRS S OF Kawakawa Part Section 13 Block XVI Kawakawa SD Lot 1 DP 79488 Lot 1 DP 65762 BLK XIV MANGAMUKA SD PT LOT 1 DP 36075 SECS 75-78 PTS 79 82 83 RAWENE SUBS BLK XIV MANGAMUKA <del>SD Part Section 20 SBRS OF Kawakawa Lot 1 DP 63855 Lot 2 DP 63855 Part Section 20 SBRS OF Kawakawa</del>		Accept in part
FS307.1	Ngā Kaingamaha o Ngāti Hine Charitable Trust		Support	Agree that the Special Purpose Hospital Zone should apply to the correct landholdings.	Allow		Accept in part
FS570.034	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject
FS566.048	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject
FS569.070	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S336.023	Z Energy Limited	Light Industrial Zone	Support	Not stated	Retain the Light Industrial zoning of Caltex Awanui Truck Stop - State Highway 1, Awanui	Accept
S412.001	Glenn Alan Jerkovich	Light Industrial Zone	Oppose	This property (8 and 9 Enterprise Street, Kaikohe) is and has always being zoned Industrial for the 30 years I have owned it, as shown in the current operative District Plan, and wish to keep it the same as it is now.	Amend the zoning for 8 (Lot 4 DP 73952) and 9 (Lot 5 DP 73952) Enterprise Street, Kaikohe, from Sport and Active Recreation Zone to [Light] Industrial Zone.	Accept
S398.001	Warwick John Ross	Light Industrial Zone	Oppose	The property is currently zoned industrial in the ODP. Contact was made with FNDC 30 October 2022 regarding the rezoning to sport and active recreation and was informed it is a mapping error. This submission is needed to rezone back to industrial.	Amend the zone from 'sport and active recreation' to 'light industrial'	Accept
S432.001	Ngawha Generation Limited	Light Industrial Zone	Not Stated	<p>NGL considers that this zoning request is appropriate for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Given the consented and future operations intended for the site, Light Industrial Zoning OR a bespoke Special Purpose Zoning would most efficiently and effectively enable those operations and the regionally significant economic, social and environmental benefits associated with it;</li> <li>-The zoning sought promotes the sustainable management of natural and physical resources on the site;</li> <li>-The zoning sought is consistent with Part 2 of the RMA;</li> <li>-The zoning sought is appropriate in terms of section 32 of the RMA;</li> <li>- The zoning sought represents an efficient use and development of natural and physical resources;</li> <li>- The zoning sought appropriately avoids, remedies or mitigates adverse effects on the environment; and</li> </ul>	Amend the zoning at Ngāwha Springs to Light Industrial Zone or a Special Purpose Zone (similar to that applied to the Ngāwha Innovation Park to the north operated by Far North Holdings) to extend to Ngawha Generation Limited land holdings as per Attachment 2 to the submission.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>The zoning sought is consistent with the balance of the PDP, in particular the Strategic Direction section of the Plan.</p>			
<p><b>FS571.001</b></p>	<p>Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections</p>		<p>Oppose</p>	<p>Under the PDP the land subject to NGL's submission is zoned as Rural Production and Sport and Active Recreation. A change in the zoning to Light Industrial, or a Special Purpose zoning which is akin in nature to Light Industrial, would likely enable a range of activities to establish as of right which could impact Ara Poutama's ability to operate the NRCF in accordance with its designated purpose (as per designation MCO230 under the Operative District Plan and MCOR2 under the PDP).</p> <p>Effects typically associated with industrial activities, such as noise emissions, light emissions, odour and air discharges, have the potential to impact inmates and staff who reside and work at the NRCF site on a full time ('24/7') basis. Likewise, future development or expansion of facilities on the NRCF site could be affected by industrial activities being enabled and undertaken on the adjacent land.</p> <p>As such, any rezoning of the subject land must be subject to appropriate controls to manage effects on the NRCF site - recognising that NRCF is subject to a</p>	<p>Disallow</p>	<p>The rezoning proposals in their current form be rejected. b. If rezoning of the NGL land is to be implemented, that specific provisions be procured to recognise NRCF's designation and its status as "regionally significant infrastructure", and manage the potential effects associated with the activities enabled in the zone</p>	<p>Reject</p>

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>designation enabling full time accommodation activities (and a range of other activities associated with operating a major prison facility), as well as its status as "regionally significant infrastructure" under the Regional Policy Statement for Northland and the PDP.</p> <p>There is currently not enough detail in the relief sought by NGL to suggest that any mitigation of effects on the NRCF site would be provided for through the rezoning.</p>		
<b>FS369.521</b>	Top Energy		Support	Ngāwhā Generation Limited is a subsidiary of Top Energy. Top Energy supports all submission points made by Ngāwhā Generation Limited	Allow	Accept in part
<b>S432.029</b>	Ngawha Generation Limited	Light Industrial Zone	Not Stated	<p>NGL considers that this zoning request is appropriate for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Given the consented and future operations intended for the site, Light Industrial Zoning OR a bespoke Special Purpose Zoning would most efficiently and effectively enable those operations and the regionally significant economic, social and environmental benefits associated with it;</li> <li>-The zoning sought promotes the sustainable management of natural and physical resources on the site;</li> <li>-The zoning sought is consistent with Part 2 of the RMA;</li> <li>-The zoning sought is appropriate in terms of section 32 of the RMA;</li> <li>- The zoning sought represents an efficient use and development of natural and physical resources;</li> <li>- The zoning sought appropriately avoids, remedies or mitigates adverse effects on the environment; and</li> </ul>	Amend the zoning at Ngāwha Springs to Light Industrial Zone or a Special Purpose Zone (similar to that applied to the Ngāwha Innovation Park to the north operated by Far North Holdings) to extend to Ngawha Generation Limited land holdings as per Attachment 2 to the submission.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				The zoning sought is consistent with the balance of the PDP, in particular the Strategic Direction section of the Plan.		

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS571.002	Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections		Oppose	<p>Under the PDP the land subject to NGL's submission is zoned as Rural Production and Sport and Active Recreation. A change in the zoning to Light Industrial, or a Special Purpose zoning which is akin in nature to Light Industrial, would likely enable a range of activities to establish as of right which could impact Ara Poutama's ability to operate the NRCF in accordance with its designated purpose (as per designation MCO230 under the Operative District Plan and MCOR2 under the PDP).</p> <p>Effects typically associated with industrial activities, such as noise emissions, light emissions, odour and air discharges, have the potential to impact inmates and staff who reside and work at the NRCF site on a full time ("24/7") basis. Likewise, future development or expansion of facilities on the NRCF site could be affected by industrial activities being enabled and undertaken on the adjacent land.</p> <p>As such, any rezoning of the subject land must be subject to appropriate controls to manage effects on the NRCF site - recognising that NRCF is subject to a designation enabling full time accommodation activities (and a range of other activities associated with operating a major prison facility), as well as its status as "regionally significant infrastructure" under the Regional Policy Statement for Northland and the PDP.</p> <p>There is currently not enough detail in the relief sought by NGL to suggest that any mitigation of effects on the NRCF site would be provided for through the rezoning.</p>	Disallow	<p>The rezoning proposals in their current form be rejected. b. If rezoning of the NGL land is to be implemented, that specific provisions be procured to recognise NRCF's designation and its status as "regionally significant infrastructure", and manage the potential effects associated with the activities enabled in the zone</p>	Reject
FS369.549	Top Energy		Support	<p>Ngāwhā Generation Limited is a subsidiary of Top Energy. Top Energy supports all submission points made by Ngāwhā Generation Limited</p>	Allow		Accept in part

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				subdivided land at Matauri Bay under the provisions of the PDP is General Residential.		
<b>S86.001</b>	Nathaniel John Jull	Māori Purpose - Urban Zone	Oppose	The submitter opposes the zoning of 62 Albert Street Kawakawa (Legal Description-Section 126 Block XVI Kawakawa SD) as Māori Purpose Zone - Urban as the property is not Māori Freehold Land under Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993. The submitter has provided a copy of the certificate of title to verify this.	Amend the zone of 62 Albert Street Kawakawa (Legal Description-Section 126 Block XVI Kawakawa SD) from Māori Purpose Zone - Urban to General Residential zone.	Accept
<b>S21.002</b>	Doug's Opuā Boatyard	Mixed Use Zone	Support in part	Maritime Exemption Areas in Opuā that are zoned Industrial under the Operative District Plan have been zoned Light Industrial under the Proposed District Plan. 1 Richardson Street, Opuā, is no longer a commercial site and should not be zoned Mixed Use.	Amend the zoning of 1 Richardson Street, Opuā, from Mixed Use zone to the Light Industrial zone	Reject
<b>S74.001</b>	Brownie Family Trust	Mixed Use Zone	Oppose	The proposed zoning does not fit within existing development in the area. The existing residential developments are not compatible with the proposed provisions for the Mixed-Use zone.	Amend the zoning of 132 -150 Marsden Road, and the land extending from Davis Crescent to Marsden Road; from Mixed Use to General Residential, as illustrated on Attachment 1 to submission.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
<b>S74.002</b>	Brownie Family Trust	Mixed Use Zone	Oppose	152-154 Marsden Road (inferred) is a reserve and should be zoned as one of the Open Space and Recreation Zones to ensure appropriate protection and treatment.	Amend the zoning of 152 -154 Marsden Road from Mixed Use to Open Space and Recreation	Accept
<b>S336.008</b>	Z Energy Limited	Mixed Use Zone	Support	The mixed use zoning is considered appropriate in a wider sense but there is an inherent tension between service stations and zonings that are pedestrian and streetscape orientated. Service stations and truck stops are by nature vehicle orientated and whilst these developments can be attractive, they have functional requirements which mean that they do not conform to traditional "streetscape" standards (e.g.: provision of verandahs and building to the front boundary). This is reflected in the specific comments in relation to policies and standards below.	Retain the Mixed Use zoning of Z Kaikohe at 45 Broadway, Kaikohe; Z Kaikohe at 141-145 Commerce Street, Kaitaia; Z Taipa at 570 State Highway 10, Taipa; and the Caltex Kawakawa Truck Stop at 4 Station Road, Kawakawa	Accept
<b>S459.001</b>	Allan Bruce Thorpe	Mixed Use Zone	Oppose	The proposed Mixed Use zoning of the property on part of 1368 Kohukohu Road ("The Herald Building" site also known as 1366 Kohukohu Road) is of concern as it seems at odds with the Residential nature of the surroundings. My concerns are: the potential loss of the long-standing residential nature of this immediate area; the further disruption of traffic and particularly parking in this area; an overall concern with the traffic manoeuvres - turning, delivering, at a corner already involving a blind spot, a pub and post office on opposing sides, and a further blind entry to the town at 1350 Kohukohu Road (approx). Also of concern is the lack of consultation with long term residents, such as myself on the social problems associated with proposed changes.	Amend the zoning of the property on part of 1368 Kohukohu Road ("The Herald Building" site also known as 1366 Kohukohu Road) from Mixed Use to General Residential	Reject
<b>S478.001</b>	Alistair Kenneth Lambie	Mixed Use Zone	Support in part	The Mixed Use spot zoning for part of 1368 Kohukohu Road, Kohukohu, is isolated from the rest of the Mixed Use and Commercial zones in the Heritage Precinct of Kohukohu. The building sited on the land parcel fills the	Amend the zoning of the property on part of 1368 Kohukohu Road ("The Herald Building" site also known as 1366 Kohukohu Road) from Mixed Use to General Residential.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>entire site and there is no buffer between this and the Heritage Residence located immediately next door. All surrounding land is zoned General Residential. I am concerned that future use of the building under a Mixed Use zone will impact significantly on the quiet enjoyment of the neighbouring residence. Mixed Use zoning will impact unreasonably on the amenity values of all the surrounding residential land, by adversely affecting fire safety, traffic and parking and noise/hours of operation etc.</p> <p>The proposed Mixed Use spot zoning is contrary to sound resource management practice. The proposed zoning of this small site is clearly contrary to objective MUZ-O4, in that adverse environmental effects generated by activities within site cannot be effectively managed at the zone boundaries.</p> <p>Such a small site has little or no redevelopment potential for mixed uses, with no opportunity to create setbacks to protect neighbours' amenity.</p> <p>The site is most suitable for General Residential Zoning in all respects.</p>		

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
<b>S453.001</b>	Gone North Limited	Mixed Use Zone	Oppose	The Mixed Use spot zone for this property is isolated from the rest of the Mixed Use and Commercial Zones within the Heritage Precinct of Kohukohu. The building sited on the land parcel fills the entire site and there is no buffer between this and the scheduled Heritage Residence located immediately next door. All surrounding land is zoned General Residential. I am concerned that future use of the property and building under a Mixed Use Zone will impact significantly on the quiet enjoyment of the neighbouring residence. Mixed use zoning will impact unreasonably on the amenity values of all the surrounding residential land, by adversely affecting fire safety, traffic and parking and noise/hours of operation etc. The proposed Mixed Use spot zoning is contrary to sound resource management practice. The proposed zoning of this small site is clearly contrary to objective MUZ-O4, in that adverse environmental effects generated by activities within the site cannot be effectively managed at the zone boundaries. Such a small site has little or no redevelopment potential for mixed uses, with no opportunity to create setbacks to protect neighbours' amenity.	Amend the zoning on part of 1368 Kohukohu Rd, Kohukohu ("The Herald Building" site also known as 1366 Kohukohu Road) from Mixed Use to General Residential	Reject
<b>S561.124</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Mixed Use Zone	Oppose	14 Park Road, Kaikohe, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25 and 27 Mangakahia Road, Kaikohe, 2A, 3, 4A, 4B, 5, 8 and 10 Guerin Street, Kaikohe are all currently zoned Residential in the Operative Plan and in the FNPDP are zoned Mixed Use. As noted in the Kāinga Ora submission, amendments are sought to the Mixed Use zone provisions to ensure that residential buildings and activities are not restricted on the ground floor of properties (with the exception of sites with the pedestrian frontage identified on the planning maps). Should the Council not make the amendments to the Mixed Use zone as sought, then Kāinga Ora request the zoning of	Amend the zoning of 14 Park Road, Kaikohe, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25 and 27 Mangakahia Road, Kaikohe, 2A, 3, 4A, 4B, 5, 8 and 10 Guerin Street, Kaikohe from Mixed Use to General Residential unless Council makes the amendment sought to the Mixed Use zone provisions.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				these sites remain residential.			
FS32.178	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	<p>The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes.</p> <p>The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts.</p> <p>The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.</p>	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Reject
FS23.396	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	<p>Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kainga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.</p>	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS47.138	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	<p>The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan.</p> <p>Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications ..... etc see FS document</p>	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Reject
FS348.211	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
S565.006	The Paihia Property Owners Group	Mixed Use Zone	Support	<p>The Submitters generally support the enabling intent of many of the urban zones proposed by the PDP. However, when considered alongside the myriad of other controls, believe that the PDP unnecessarily constrains and confuses their intent, aims and objectives. As outlined above, should additional provisions and overlays be warranted, these must be appropriately considered and selected based on a higher degree of evidence and assessment as they relate specifically to Paihia.</p>	Retain the Mixed use zone as it applies to Paihia and only apply overlays that are considered and selected based on a higher degree of evidence and assessment.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS547.119	Heron Point Limited		Support	This decision sought is supported to the extent that the Proposed District Plan facilitates residential development within the Paihia settlement to facilitate the delivery of housing supply within Paihia. The overlays should be removed from all residential zoned land within the wider Paihia area including the land owned by Heron Point Limited.	Allow	Retain the General Residential zone as they apply to Paihia township with minimal overlays and restrictions	Accept in part
FS348.222	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
S248.001	Richard G A Palmer	Rural Lifestyle Zone	Oppose	the property is bordered by land which is zoned general residential and mixed use including houses, shops and the Heads Hotel. The current zoning is illogical, particularly given the residential land to the east		rezone 341 Hokianga Harbour Drive to general Residential or mixed use	Reject
S341.001	Ed and Inge Amsler	Rural Lifestyle Zone	Oppose	Refer to full submission for specific reasons for decision sought which include, but not limited to, the following: the General Residential Zone better aligns with topography and surrounding land uses; the availability and presence of existing infrastructure; there is no true rural lifestyle use present on the site, nor are there significant vegetated landscapes; the General Residential Zone is more consistent with higher order RMA policies and plans and the purpose and principles of the RMA; the site is not impacted by any designations or special overlays except for the Coastal Environment, which provides specific controls for development; rezoning the land as requested is not inconsistent with Regional Policy Statement for Northland and the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement; and the current and proposed Rural Lifestyle Zone of the site does not achieve the sustainable management of resources, and the General Residential Zone would be more consistent with the purpose and principles of the RMA		Amend to rezone across ROT NA68D/600 (6 Bedggood Close) from Rural Lifestyle Zone to General Residential Zone.	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S321.001	Per Lugnet	Rural Lifestyle Zone	Oppose	The residential area consisting of Albatross Alley, Poseidon Way and the end of Weka Street in Ahipara should be zoned Residential. This would be consistent with the Strategic Direction, and would contribute to meeting growth demands for housing by utilising existing infrastructure, Objectives GRZ-O1, O2.	Amend by rezoning the area consisting of Albatross Alley, Poseidon Way and the end of Weka Street in Ahipara to Residential so existing residential infrastructure can be utilised.	Reject
FS152.1	Brian Allan Jones		Oppose	<p>1.0 My submission relates to the land at the end of Weka St, opposite Poseidon Way. The legal description is Lot 1 DP 474635. I am a neighbour at 2 Poseidon Way.</p> <p>Mr Lugnet recently applied for a Resource Consent (number 2300507-RMACOM) to subdivide this land into small lots for housing. A hearing was held on 27 October 2022.</p> <p>The Resource Consent was refused for this land. A copy of the Decision is attached. The reasons stated in the Decision were the "unavailability of a wastewater service and incompatibility with the existing rural based activity adjacent to it."</p> <p>Mr Lugnet's current submission to have this land zoned residential is essentially the same proposal as his recent Resource Consent application. The decision made then should stand and this land should not be zoned residential.</p> <p>3.0 I oppose rezoning this land residential due to the effect on my visual amenity. My outlook would change from semi-rural to high intensity housing.</p> <p>2.0 I also oppose due to the effect on my amenity values. I would suffer loss of privacy and inferior living conditions. The increased traffic intensity would cause noise issues. Unsealed driveways and parking areas would cause a dust nuisance.</p>	Disallow	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS326.001	H Piripi & Associates		Support	<p>Follow up submission to support: Proposed District Plan Submission #321 Request to expand scope of submission, premise and application of decision on submission to include 231 Ahipara Road, Ahipara Mereraina Grbic - Director, H Piripi &amp; Associates Ltd 28/08/2023</p> <p>1Statements in support of District Plan submission #321 and further request to expand scope of application for consideration and final decision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission attached is a follow up submission to #321 LUGNET.</li> </ul> <p>1. Support change of zoning rules applied to Albatross Alley, Poseidon Way and Weka Street in Ahipara.</p> <p>a) We support the premise of submission #321 to re-zone areas in Ahipara residential area currently zoned rural productive.</p> <p>b) Agree with submission premise that identified characteristics of noted areas that are obviously better suited to Rural Residential or Residential zoning rules.</p> <p>2. Seek to expand application of decision on submission #321 by Lugnet to include 231 Ahipara Road. Request scope expanded to incorporate 231 Ahipara Road on the premise that this land lot has similar characteristics to areas noted in original submission.</p> <p>a) Agree inclusion of additional property details provided in follow up submission as necessary to inform submission process going forward on the basis of consistent premise, context and outcomes. And for efficient application of resource in due process.</p> <p>b) Make necessary considerations to expand application of decision/s made with regard to submission #321 -</p>	Not stated	reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>specifically consider and decide on re-zone of 231 Ahipara road from rural productive to rural residential. Alongside Albatross Alley, Poseidon Way and Weka Street Ahipara locations provided for specifically in submission #321. provided in this follow up submission in final decision.</p> <p>3. Shared premise - Current zoning applications are not fit for purpose. Land parcels in Ahipara require more specific strategic review of zoning provision based on unique characteristics of land &amp; location. With special consideration to strategic objective of FNDC to support growth in demand for housing. The proposed expanded application of the submission and decisions on the district plan is timely to support the critical needs of our community. It provides an obvious opportunity to support incremental growth in demand for housing in Ahipara, without putting additional pressure on existing infrastructure systems that are at capacity and/or require significant investment in upgrade.</p> <p>4. Shared situational context - The land at 231 Ahipara Road is located at the 'gateway' to Ahiparapara, where a pou was recently erected to signal Specific detail to support follow up request to submission #321 - to agree extended scope for consideration and decision making</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is our position, that continued categorisation of this property as rural production does little to achieve the intended outcomes of the principles and policies that apply in the district plan. And although we acknowledge the council has a responsibility under the RMA and the Northland Regional Policy Statement to 'manage the rural land resource to provide for the economic, social and cultural wellbeing</li> </ul>		

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>of people and communities, protect highly versatile soils, and avoid reverse sensitivity effects on primary production activities' I believe our reasoning above demonstrates that there is little relevance between this property and the requirements of the Act.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is also our view that the property is better suited to the zoning principles, policies and regulatory aspects of the Rural Residential zone. As an opportunity provide for residential living in a way that does not further fragment productive land and reverse sensitivity effects on the District's primary sector.</li> <li>• We believe that re-categorising this property to Rural Residential zone will provide an opportunity for people to enjoy a spacious, peri-urban living environment located close to a settlement. As it is located on the fringe of the District's settlements and provides a transition to the surrounding Rural Production zones.</li> <li>• 231 Ahipara road has had residential occupancy (by our family) since the early 1900's. Our family has owned the land for generations. The land has historically been used for agricultural activity, however scale of stock and productive activity from land has diminished to stock as supply for personal/family use. Up until 70's ownership interests and access to larger productive land for agriculture purposes relied on my great-great grandfather Kingi Phillips sole ownership of adjacent land blocks - the 21 acres at 231 Ahipara Road in this submission were once part of total 70+ acres. Ownership interests of adjacent land blocks have been fragmented over time. It is extremely unlikely that the land will provide opportunity for productive agri activity, now or in the future.</li> </ul>		

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
<b>FS355.001</b>	Lance Wakeman and Noeleen Masters		Oppose	the subdivision in question is right on my rural boundary as such i believe it would adversely affect my farming activities. Council sewerage infrastructure is not up to sufficient capacity standards	Disallow	disallow original submission point	accept
<b>S288.017</b>	Tristan Simpkin	Rural Lifestyle Zone	Oppose	Residential areas which are serviced should be zoned General Residential, not other zones. There should be an overlay map completed showing the serviced areas with infrastructure and the new zones proposed. All areas with sewer infrastructure should be rezoned to General Residential to allow further development and sites to be created. Stratford Drive, and Dudley Crescent in Cable Bay are examples.	Amend zoning of all land with access to sewer services at Stratford Drive and Dudley Crescent at Cable Bay from Rural Lifestyle Zone to General Residential Zone. This includes land at 66 to 177 Stratford Drive, 19 to 52 Dudley Crescent and 3 to 26 Sunrise Place (inferred) (refer to map attached to original submission).		Reject
<b>FS29.35</b>	Trent Simpkin		Support	I support this suggestion of the zone amendments as it makes the most sense for the said areas.	Allow		reject
<b>FS570.896</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
<b>FS566.910</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
<b>FS569.932</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
<b>S284.017</b>	Trent Simpkin	Rural Lifestyle Zone	Oppose	Residential areas which are serviced should be zoned General Residential, not other zones. There should be an overlay map completed showing the serviced areas with infrastructure and the new zones proposed. All areas with sewer infrastructure should be rezoned to General Residential to allow further development and sites to be created. Stratford Drive, and Dudley Crescent in Cable Bay are examples.	Amend zoning of all land with access to sewer services at Stratford Drive and Dudley Crescent at Cable Bay from Rural Lifestyle Zone to General Residential Zone. This includes land at 66 to 177 Stratford Drive, 19 to 52 Dudley Crescent and 3 to 26 Sunrise Place (inferred) (refer to map attached to original submission).		Reject
<b>FS36.088</b>	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency		Oppose	Opposes the proposed rezoning/intensification of the submitters land until there is a clearer understanding on how the proposal affects the safety, efficiency, and effectiveness of the land transport system. There needs to be clear documentation of what transport infrastructure/ upgrades/mitigation measures are needed to avoid, remedy or mitigate effects on the transport system, triggers for necessary infrastructure development and how the infrastructure will be funded. The proposed rezoning needs to ensure that it includes details as to how the proposed transport network will provide active modes and support the longer term development of public transport.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission until appropriate analysis and information has been provided for each of the proposed rezonings.	Accept
<b>FS570.871</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
<b>FS566.885</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
<b>FS569.907</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
<b>S21.001</b>	Doug's Opua Boatyard	Rural Production Zone	Support in part	1/5 Beechy Street, Opua, has a proposed zoning of Rural Production. The property is supported by pilings over the coastal marine area	Amend the zoning of 1/5 Beechy Street, Opua	Accept in part
<b>S22.001</b>	Trent Simpkin	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	The zoning of existing subdivided land should reflect the state that the land is now in. There is no point zoning a completed residential subdivision 'Rural Production' because it will never be used in a Rural Production manner in the future.	Amend the zoning for the 400-1600m <sup>2</sup> lots at 11 - 31 Wharo Way, Ahipara from Rural Production Zone to General Residential Zone. Retain coastal environment overlay (see map attached to original submission)	Reject
<b>S4.001</b>	Northland Proprietors Trust	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	Submitter wants the whole section to be zoned General Residential rather than split zoning of General Residential and Rural Production as notified. Existing sewer line runs through the rural production zoned area. Further rationale for the change was submitted in the IAF proposal.	Amend the zoning for 39 Harold Avenue, Kaikohe, from Rural Production to General Residential (so that the whole site is zoned General Residential)	Reject
<b>S52.001</b>	Rebecca Stilton	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	Lots 9 and 19 DP 381292 (Title 325706) are currently zoned General Coastal under the ODP. The General Coastal zoning was incorrect and does not align with all other lots within Ahipara. The PDP changes the zoning to Rural Production which is not appropriate given the underlying subdivision includes residentially zoned  lots and all residential zoning requirements have been met.	Delete the Rural Production zoning of two sections on Wharo Way, Ahipara (being Lots 9 and 19 DP 381292), zone General Residential.	Reject
<b>S54.001</b>	Jacqueline and Timothy Partington	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	Opposed to the re-zoning of 31 Wharo Way, Ahipara (Lot 15 DP 381292) from Coastal Living in the operative district plan to Rural Production with a Coastal Environment overlay in the proposed district plan.	Amend the zoning of 31 Wharo Way (Lot 15 DP 381292), Ahipara, to General Residential zone.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
<b>S85.001</b>	Riki and Sharon Waiariki	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	Approved residential subdivision creating 9 Wharo Way, Ahipara (being Lot 4 DP 381292, title 325701) is presently split between Residential and General Coastal. General Coastal zoning was incorrect and not aligned to all the other lots within Ahipara. All Residential zoning requirements have been met. Proposed District Plan erroneously changes the current zoning to Rural Production. Rural Production is not appropriate for the development lots on Wharo Way	Delete the Rural Production zoning of 9 Wharo Way, Ahipara (being Lot 4 DP 381292, title 325701), zone Residential.	Reject
<b>S85.002</b>	Riki and Sharon Waiariki	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	Approved residential subdivision creating 9 Wharo Way, Ahipara (being Lot 4 DP 381292, title 325701) is presently split between Residential and General Coastal. General Coastal zoning was incorrect and not aligned to all the other lots within Ahipara. All Residential zoning requirements have been met. Proposed District Plan erroneously changes the current zoning to Rural Production. Rural Production is not appropriate for the development lots on Wharo Way	Delete the Rural Production zoning of properties on Wharo Way within DP 381292, zone Residential.	Reject
<b>S299.001</b>	Stephen Manley	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	Proposed Rural Production zoning for 72 Kokohuia Road, Omapere, and adjoining properties is inconsistent with objectives of the zoning and a more appropriate zone would be General Residential or Rural Residential to provide for an appropriate transition to Rural Production zone. 72 Kokphuia Road is 6,756m <sup>2</sup> and the adjoining sites despite being zoned as part of the Rural Production zone are significantly smaller than 20ha. The land is not currently used for rural production and the size of land parcels are insufficient for rural production, there is no transition to rural production from the general residential sites, therefore, there is potential for nearby general residential premises to be negatively impacted if activities consistent with Rural	Delete Rural Production zoning of 72 Kokohuia Road, Omapere, and zone either General Residential or Rural Residential. Adjoining properties to be similarly considered.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>Production zoning were undertaken at these sites.</p> <p>Furthermore, 72 Kokohuia Road has on-site infrastructure, is connected to services including wastewater and stormwater, is within the rollout of Fibre internet and has power. Therefore, the size of land and use of land is more consistent with residential than rural production and its neighbouring residential/urban dwellings. The site is has access to the Kokohuia waterline, therefore, this will not impact on the town water supply. Permissible activities within Rural Production zone have the potential to impact on the livability and quiet expected of adjoining residential properties.</p> <p>Omapere and Opononi have infrastructure to support the town. it is reasonably foreseeable that the growth of the town will continue to move inland due to coastal erosion etc. For these reasons the proposed zoning does not seem appropriate or consistent with the proposed district plan</p>		
<b>S358.032</b>	Leah Frieling	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	<p>Rezone the portion of Wireless Road, Kaitaia, that has Council reticulated sewage and water to an industrial or commercial zoning. This will make efficient use of existing infrastructure, as per the regional policy statement for northland, and will also better reflect the existing consented and established built environment and use, specifically a large bus depot, a childcare centre, and now a new school.</p>	Delete the Rural Production zoning of Wireless Road, Kaitaia, where it has Council reticulated sewage and water, zone for industrial or commercial purposes instead.	Reject
<b>S380.001</b>	Nigel Ross Surveyor Ltd	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	<p>The Rural Production zoning of 15 to 49 Kokohuia Road, Omapere, is inappropriate as they are small residential sites on the opposite side of the road to other sites zoned General Residential.</p>	Amend the zoning of 15 to 49 Kokohuia Road, Omapere (being Lots 5 to 8 DP130479, and Lots 1 and 2 of DP 75761), from Rural Production to General Residential	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
<b>S319.001</b>	FNR Properties Limited	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	The submitter considers the Rural Production Zone as it applies to the properties legally described as Lots 2 & 3 DP 547587 as residential intensity and subdivision are significantly reduced which will severely restrict development opportunities in an area where expansion should be accommodated. It is considered that rezoning the sites to General Residential Zone (GRZ) would be more appropriate as this would recognize the immediate need for more housing in the district and assist to alleviate the current housing crisis. Rezoning the site to the GRZ is considered appropriate given the site adjoins the GRZ to the north and east.	Delete Rural Production Zone as it applies to all of the properties legally described as Lots 2 and 3 DP 547587 and apply the General Residential Zone. If not the entire site then rezone at least the eastern half of the site.	Reject
<b>S530.003</b>	Victoria Yorke and Andre Galvin	Rural Production Zone	Not Stated	The plot of land borders an existing residential area. As Haruru is predominantly a residential area, partial rezoning of the property for more intensive residential use would consolidate growth around the urban centre. It would also allow purchasers the opportunity for coastal living which is something the Far North have asked for in the 'have your say' portion of the new district plan.	Delete Rural Production zoning of part (3.9ha) of Lot 1 DP 53506 (Puketona Road, Haruru Falls), zone the 3.9ha land area Residential.	Accept in part
<b>S547.031</b>	LJ King Limited	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	The Planning Maps show the Rural Production Zone in some areas e.g. Awanui/wireless road kaitaia that are serviced by sewerage, footpaths, refuse collection etc. If this zoning continues, it will severely constrain future urban development, and this should be corrected by amending RPROZ objectives, policies and rules zones to accommodate things other than rural production	Amend the Planning Maps by removing the Rural Production Zone from areas (Wireless Road, Kaitaia / Awanui) as described above developed with infrastructure for urban development and substitute an appropriate urban zone; OR amend Rural Production Zone objectives, policies and rules as separately submitted and allow smaller blocks of land ie.2000 sq mtrs	Reject
<b>S502.103</b>	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	Sites are currently zoned Coastal residential. No Rural Production activity could be undertaken on these sites, and all development would trigger landuse consent for setback breaches. This would be a perverse outcome.	Amend the Rural Production zone for are areas identified in the submission along Wreck Bay Rd, Ahipara, and rezone General Residential	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S502.104	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	At the top end of Wharo Way sites which have been developed as General Residential sites are shown as being zoned Rural Production. This would be a perverse outcome with landuse consent being required for matters such as setback and stormwater coverage which have already been accounted for at time the site was subdivided.	Amend the Rural Production zone of the properties identified in the submission at Wharo Way and rezone General Residential: 11,13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 29, 31 Wharo Way, Ahipara	Reject
S572.001	Dave and Nisha Clark	Rural Production Zone	Not Stated	<p>Our section is part of an approved residential subdivision located in Wharo Way, Ahipara. Although DP 381292 is an approved residential subdivision, it retained a mixed zoning status with many lots retaining a General Coastal zoning while the balance was zoned Residential. Oddly enough, the lots closest to Foreshore Road and the beach were zoned Residential and those further away General Coastal</p> <p>In reviewing the FNDC zone maps (Operative District Plan Map #75), the anomaly of the zoning, in comparison to the rest of Ahipara south, is quite visible. The Residential zone for Ahipara includes all residential sections except that of Wharo Way.</p> <p>We believe the designated zoning of this subdivision to Rural Production is an oversight. FNDC has assigned what was previously a General Coastal zone into Rural Production, just allowing for minor tweaks to avoid split zoning</p> <p>Lot 16 DP 381292 was subdivided with residential sizing in mind, it has no productive potential, and is not located within a rural environment</p> <p>We do not represent all owners, and this submission relates specifically to Lot 16 DP 381292, however common sense would lead to the complete subdivision being rezoned as Residential</p>	Delete the Rural Production zoning of 14 Wharo Way (Lot 16 DP 381292), zone the lot Residential. Note: submission suggests Council consider similar zoning for all lots on Wharo Way	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
<b>S357.042</b>	Sean Frieling	Rural Production Zone	Support	The Planning Maps show the Rural Production Zone in some areas e.g. Wireless road Kaitaia/ Awanui from the sports field to Spains road and around the Awanui school that are serviced by sewerage, footpaths, refuse collection etc. If this zoning continues, it will severely constrain future urban development, and this should be corrected by amending the planning maps to a more appropriate urban zoning. This will make efficient use of existing infrastructure, as per the regional policy statement for northland, and will also better reflect the existing consented and established built environment and use, specifically a large bus depot, a childcare centre, and now a new school. The road location is also adjacent to the existing industrial area, being the Kaitaia mill, and and Whangatane drive, and has existing Council reticulated infrastructure, and already has a change to the character of the area due to the existing consented industrial and commercial activities in that locality.	Re-zone the portion of wireless road that has Council reticulated sewage and water to be re-zoned to be industrial or commercial zoning and  Amend the Planning Maps by removing the Rural Production Zone from areas developed with infrastructure for urban development and substitute an appropriate urban zone; and	Reject
<b>S485.033</b>	Elbury Holdings	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	There is already development on Wireless Road, Kaitaia from SH1 to the Bell Road intersection including a bus depot, Kura School and other businesses. Along SH1 from the Kaitaia boundary to Brott Road there is already housing and businesses all serviced by town sewerage. From the Awanui rugby field to Spains Road and around Awanui School is serviced by sewerage, footpaths, refuse collection etc. If this zoning continues, it will severely constrain future urban development, and this should be corrected by amending the planning maps to a more appropriate urban zoning.	Amend the Planning Maps by removing the Rural Production Zone from areas (Wireless Road, Kaitaia / Awanui) as described above developed with infrastructure for urban development and substitute an appropriate urban zone; OR amend Rural Production Zone objectives, policies and rules as separately submitted and allow smaller blocks of land ie.2000 sq mtrs.	Reject
<b>FS155.85</b>	Fiona King		Support	use some coomon sense. if FNDC can provide services of sewage, water then it is not rural production land. CHANGE THE ZONE	Allow	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
<b>S519.033</b>	Elbury Holdings	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	The Planning Maps show the Rural Production Zone in some areas e.g. Awanui/wireless road kaitaia that are serviced by sewerage, footpaths, refuse collection etc. If this zoning continues, it will severely constrain future urban development, and this should be corrected by amending RPROZ objectives, policies and rules zones to accommodate things other than rural production	Amend the Planning Maps by removing the Rural Production Zone from areas (Wireless Road, Kaitaia / Awanui) as described above developed with infrastructure for urban development and substitute an appropriate urban zone; OR amend Rural Production Zone objectives, policies and rules as separately submitted and allow smaller blocks of land ie.2000 sq mtrs	Reject
<b>FS155.86</b>	Fiona King		Support	see all comments in my above submissions. CHANGE THE ZONE	Allow	Reject
<b>S284.007</b>	Trent Simpkin	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	Kaitaia General Residential Zone Needs Expanding . There has been no new land zoned "General Residential" in and around the Kaitaia town. If we create the land to be developed, then new subdivisions will be created, drawing new people and an increased population to Kaitaia. Kaitaia has space and room to grow. The lack of developable land means that its rare for a section to come on the market. As the attached screenshot shows, nearly all of the residential zoned land has been cut down to Residential sizes. The only large blocks left are schools and the local cemetery. Population projections should not drive zoning - because if we create the property, people will come.	Amend zoning surrounding Kaitaia to expand the residential zones to allow more new subdivisions to be created.	Reject
<b>FS45.30</b>	Tristan Simpkin		Support	Support as per Reasons given in submission	Allow	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
<b>FS36.083</b>	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency		Oppose	Opposes the proposed rezoning/ intensification of the submitters land until there is a clearer understanding on how the proposal affects the safety, efficiency, and effectiveness of the land transport system. There needs to be clear documentation of what transport infrastructure/ upgrades/mitigation measures are needed to avoid, remedy or mitigate effects on the transport system, triggers for necessary infrastructure development and how the infrastructure will be funded. The proposed rezoning needs to ensure that it includes details as to how the proposed transport network will provide active modes and support the longer term development of public transport.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission until appropriate analysis and information has been provided for each of the proposed rezonings.	Accept
<b>FS570.861</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
<b>FS566.875</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
<b>FS569.897</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
<b>S472.033</b>	Michael Foy	Rural Production Zone	Support in part	It is formally requested to re-zone the portion of wireless road that has Council reticulated sewage and water to be re-zoned to be industrial or commercial zoning. This will make efficient use of existing infrastructure, as per the regional policy statement for northland, and will also better reflect the existing consented and established built environment and use, specifically a large bus depot, a childcare centre, and now a new school. The road location is also adjacent to the existing industrial area, being the Kaitaia mill, and and Whangatane drive, and has existing Council reticulated infrastructure, and already has a change to the character of the area due to the existing consented industrial and commercial activities in that locality	Re-zone the portion of wireless road that has Council reticulated sewage and water to be re-zoned from Rural Production to be industrial or commercial zoning.		Reject
<b>FS258.9</b>	logan king		Support	Some small blocks are classed under rural production and are not used as that. there needs to be other categories in rural zone. They are not productive and can not run enough stock .	Allow		Reject
<b>FS259.13</b>	Leah Frieling		Support	All the rural zoning needs to be addressed. the one size all fits is not working in the rural production zone. as is the case on our land at wireless road and State highway one	Allow		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
<b>S315.001</b>	Colwyn Shortland	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	The neighbouring properties are also seeking to be rezoned and the reasons for the submission are set out in the submission made by DS and LA Morrison (Sub# 44), including that 1) 1. Amending the zoning of the Land would redefine the urban boundary in a more logical way, 2) The Land is all able to be serviced via the existing Russell township infrastructure. 3) 3. None of the four blocks are currently used for a rural production purpose and nor, to the respective owners' knowledge, have they been previously used as such, and 4) Land is not consistent with rural production zone provisions.	Amend zoning of land at 34 Pukematu Lane, Russell from Rural Production zone to Kororareka Russell Township Zone.		Reject
<b>FS23.093</b>	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Submission seeks the same outcome as our primary submission. Rezoning to Kororāreka township zone is more appropriate for the reasons set out in our primary submission.	Allow	Allow rezoning of the land.	Reject
<b>FS332.270</b>	Russell Protection Society		Oppose	These parcels have already been subdivided from General Coastal and are important in defining the boundary between urban Russell and the natural coastal hinterland. These properties do not share the characteristics of the KRSZ and are not within the area serviced by the Russell Sewerage Scheme. This would serve to promote unwise development.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept

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

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>would also provide the potential for access to be opened to these areas, which could support the future marae development on the adjoining block (such as through providing access for mahinga kai purposes) as well as potentially public access if the land were later vested as reserve. The existing and proposed rural production zoning would make these outcomes unfeasible. (d) the presence of the overlays and the provisions of the zone will ensure that the Land is developed in a manner that maintains the special characteristics and amenity of the area. Subdivision is limited by the overlays and would be strategically executed to position residential and non-residential buildings, accessways, outside of the High natural character boundaries. (e) all four properties have areas of native bush on-site. Providing for a greater level of development on these properties would enable the cost and resource involved in maintaining and enhancing the significant bush areas to be spread among a greater number of owners. (f) the contours and existing natural bush on site provide opportunities for functional high amenity development which complements the character and amenity of the zone. (g) consolidating land use and subdivision around the existing township would avoid/mitigate future sprawl and sporadic patterns of development. (h) location of these properties in the Russell township basin puts them near required infrastructure - existing sealed roads, wastewater, stormwater systems and electricity, broadcasting, telecommunications as noted above.</p> <p>(i) development of these properties would function as a transition between urban and rural production land use activities. 7. The land will provide additional growth capacity. The Northland region has been growing at a rate higher (and in some years significantly higher) than the national average growth rate</p>		

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>since 2014.1 In 2018 and 2019 it had the highest growth rate in the country. It is important that the FNDP is future looking and makes sufficient land available to meet the needs of its growing population over the 10-year period of the plan. It is also important that this land is proximate to existing urban zoned land in towns to avoid urban sprawl. Rezoning the Land Kororāreka Township zone will provide additional capacity for Russell township, while ensuring that development remains proximate to the township, and urban sprawl is avoided.</p> <p>8. More consistent with higher order RMA policies and plans. Like the proposed district plan, the Regional Policy Statement for Northland and the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement both seek to consolidate urban development within or adjacent to existing coastal settlement and avoid sprawling or sporadic patterns of development. Rezoning the Land Kororāreka Russell Township zone is consistent with these policies for the reasons noted above. The National Environmental Standards for Freshwater are designed in part to protect existing inland wetlands. However, that protection is only triggered where a use is proposed on site to which the standards apply. As noted above, enabling a further level of development would provide a means to restore and protect the wetland area in a manner consistent with the standards.</p> <p>9. More consistent with the RMA. The current and proposed rural production zoning of the Land does not achieve the sustainable management of resources. As already noted, the current shape, size, contours and other characteristics of the Land make it unusable for a rural production purpose, and do not allow the owners to provide for their economic or social wellbeing. Nor does it ensure the protection and enhancement of those special characteristics of the Land, such as the wetland on 19 James Street, or the areas of</p>		

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation	
				high quality existing native bush. Kororāreka Russell Township zoning would be more consistent with the purpose and principles of the RMA as it would enable these matters to be provided for and it also offers opportunities to enhance cultural wellbeing (such as through the remediation of the wetland, restoration of the WWII track, and provision of public/marae access to the area).			
FS372.003	John Andrew Riddell		Oppose	<p>The submission to rezone 19 and 24 James Street and 34 and 39 Pukematu Lane from Rural Production to Kororāreka Russell Township is opposed.</p> <p>The Kororāreka Russell Township zone extent is limited by, among other things, the capacity of the wastewater treatment and disposal system. These lots are located outside the area served by the Russell wastewater scheme.</p> <p>The Kororāreka Russell Township zone is inappropriate for these lots. Rezoning this land to Kororāreka Russell Township zone is inconsistent with the sustainable management of natural and physical resources.</p> <p>The lots of similar size to the west of these four lots are zoned Rural Lifestyle. It may be that extending the Rural Lifestyle Zone across these lots may be appropriate</p>	Disallow	Reject the submission to rezone these four lots to Kororāreka Russell Township zone.	Accept
FS332.268	Russell Protection Society		Oppose	<p>These parcels have already been subdivided from General Coastal and are important in defining the boundary between urban Russell and the natural coastal hinterland. These properties do not share the characteristics of the KRSZ and are not within the area serviced by the Russell Sewerage Scheme. This would serve to promote unwise development.</p>	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
<b>FS345.040</b>	Ngawha Generation Limited		Support in part	NGL supports the general approach where all new buildings should be able to be accommodated within the Light Industrial Zone without resource consent, unless the proposal infringes specific standards, as identified.	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Reject
<b>S284.012</b>	Trent Simpkin	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	It is clear from the zone maps that no thought has been given to Ahipara's future growth plans. Just because the projected population growth stats may not show growth in some areas around the Far North doesn't mean that land shouldn't be rezoned to allow development - because development drives increased population, more rates for FNDC and a better lifestyle for the local people with access to better services. Wharo Way and the land on the hillside above Ahipara should be zoned General Residential.	Amend zoning at 11-31 Wharo Way, Ahipara and 18 Highfields, 29, 31D, 39, 59 Reef View Road and 41, 51, 63 Tasman Heights from Rural Production Zone to General Residential Zone.		<u>Accept in part</u>
<b>FS570.866</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
<b>FS566.880</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
<b>FS569.902</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
<b>S288.012</b>	Tristan Simpkin	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	It is clear from the zone maps that no thought has been given to Ahipara's future growth plans. Just because the projected population growth stats may not show growth in some areas around the Far North doesn't mean that land shouldn't be rezoned to allow development - because development drives increased population, more rates for FNDC and a better lifestyle for the local people with access to better services. Wharo Way and the land on the hillside above Ahipara should be zoned General Residential.	Amend zoning at 11-31 Wharo Way, Ahipara and 18 Highfields, 29, 31D, 39, 59 Reef View Road and 41, 51, 63 Tasman Heights from Rural Production Zone to General Residential Zone.		Accept in part
<b>FS570.891</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
<b>FS566.905</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
<b>FS569.927</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
<b>S567.004</b>	Andr� Galvin	Rural Production Zone	Not Stated	The plot of land borders an existing residential area. As Haruru is predominantly a residential area, partial rezoning of the property for more intensive residential use would consolidate growth around the urban centre. It would also allow purchasers the opportunity for coastal living which is something the Far North have asked for in the 'have your say' portion of the new district plan.	Delete Rural Production zoning of part (3.9ha) of Lot 1 DP 53506 (Puketona Road, Haruru Falls), zone the 3.9ha land area Residential.		Accept in part
<b>FS348.227</b>	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
<b>S464.033</b>	LJ King Ltd	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	There is already development on Wireless Road, Kaitaia from SH1 to the Bell Road intersection including a bus depot, Kura School and other businesses. Along SH1 from the Kaitaia boundary to Brott Road there is already housing and businesses all serviced by town sewerage. From the Awanui rugby field to Spains Road and around Awanui School is serviced by sewerage, footpaths, refuse collection etc. If this zoning continues, it will severely constrain future urban development, and this should be corrected by amending the planning maps to a more appropriate urban zoning.	Amend planning maps to remove Rural Production zoning from areas such as Awanui and Wireless Road, Kaitaia are other areas which are serviced by infrastructure for urban development and rezone with a more appropriate urban zone or amend Rural Production Zone objectives, policies and rules as separately submitted to allow for smaller blocks of land such as 2,000m2.		Reject
<b>FS566.1576</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
<b>S543.031</b>	LJ King Limited	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	The Planning Maps show the Rural Production Zone in some areas e.g. Awanui/wireless road kaitaia that are serviced by sewerage, footpaths, refuse collection etc. If this zoning continues, it will severely constrain future urban development, and this should be corrected by amending RPROZ objectives, policies and rules zones to accommodate things other than rural production	Amend the Planning Maps by removing the Rural Production Zone from areas (Wireless Road, Kaitaia / Awanui) as described above developed with infrastructure for urban development and substitute an appropriate urban zone; OR amend Rural Production Zone objectives, policies and rules as separately submitted and allow smaller blocks of land ie.2000 sq mtrs.		Reject
<b>FS566.2192</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S9.001	Ken Lewis Limited	Rural Residential Zone	Oppose	<p>Summary of Reasons: Rezoning from Rural Residential to General Residential is appropriate because the property:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Adjoins the General Residential Zone along its western and northern boundaries and has direct access to main traffic routes onto Allen Bell Drive and Donald Road</li> <li>-Residential subdivision approvals have been granted to enable the creation of seven residential sites as Non-Complying activities.</li> <li>-The elevation of the property enables efficient use of gravity to allow connection to the Councils three waters services.</li> <li>-The land is not identified as containing any high class soils or being defined as highly productive</li> <li>-The inclusion of the land within the General Residential Zone is a coherent extension of the residential area which creates the urban area of the Kaitaia town centre.</li> <li>-The submitters property is located on elevated land and presents a bona fide future residential opportunity for the township that is located away from the current flooding hazard that covers the large majority of the Kaitaia township.</li> <li>-There is no widespread evidence that Kaitaia is ready for apartment type - or above town centre living in the mixed use zone.</li> </ul>	Amend zoning of 64 ha of land which has frontage to Donald Road and Allen Bell Drive, Kaitaia (legally described as ROT NA105B/60 (Lot 1 DP 173052)) from Rural Residential to General Residential (refer to Figure 1 of submission)	Reject
S322.001	Per Lugnet	Rural Residential Zone	Oppose	<p>The residential area south of Freyja Crescent and the end of Torsby Road in Coopers Beach should be zoned Residential. This would be consistent with the Strategic Direction, and would contribute to meeting growth demands for Retirement Housing by utilising existing infrastructure, Objectives GRZ-O1, GRZ-O2.</p>	Rezoning the area south of Freyja Crescent and the end of Torsby Road in Coopers Beach to Residential so existing residential infrastructure can be utilised for Retirement Housing.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
<b>S502.107</b>	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	Rural Residential Zone	Oppose	Sites located from 192 - 238 Pukepoto Road range in size from 809m2 to 3050m2 and are connected to Council's Reticulated Network. Other sites from 85-129 Pukepoto Road, most of which are 1017m2 are zoned as General Residential. Given the fact that these sites are serviced by Council's reticulated wastewater and stormwater networks and the area is urban in character we seek relief that the sites from 192-238 Pukepoto Road be rezoned as General Residential	Amend to rezone Rural Residential land at 192 - 238 Pukepoto Rd to General Residential zone	Reject
<b>S372.001</b>	Grant Alan Billington and Georgina McGarry	Rural Residential Zone	Oppose	Refer to the full submission for reasons for decision requested which include, but not limited to, the following: the size of the site can appropriately provide infrastructure on the site; the underlying consent approval (RC2030759) confirms that light industrial activities can be appropriately undertaken on the site (subject to conditions); and the Light Industrial Zones provides for unserviced allotments, therefore, provision of infrastructure does not seem like a key determinant for zoning.	Amend to rezone 8 Waterfront Drive, Mangonui from Rural Residential Zone to Light Industrial Zone.	Reject
<b>FS264.1</b>	SJ & GM Jones Family Trust		Oppose	The site should not be re-zoned to Light Industrial as the property is adjacent to residential properties and should be zoned Rural Residential as noted within the proposed plan. There would be unacceptable reverse sensitivity concerns from noise, traffic, operating hours, and general amenity particularly if the likely uses are comparable to the resource consent application currently lodged for the site to which the submitter opposes.  A review of the zones by Council has retained the Rural Residential zoning which is the correct zoning for the property.  We would therefore ask that the submission for the rezoning of the land to Light Industrial be disallowed.	Disallow	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS217.2	Marie Lindsay		Oppose	<p>The site should not be re-zoned to Light Industrial as the property is adjacent to residential properties and should be zoned Rural Residential as originally proposed. There would be unacceptable reverse sensitivity concerns from noise, traffic, operating hours, and general amenity particularly if the likely uses are comparable to the resource consent application currently lodged for the site to which the submitter opposes.</p> <p>A review of the zones by Council has retained the Rural Residential zoning which is the correct zoning for the property.</p> <p>We would therefore ask that the submission for the rezoning of the land to Light Industrial be disallowed.</p>	Disallow	Accept
S392.001	Kaizen Management Limited	Rural Residential Zone	Oppose	<p>The site is relatively large and is uniquely positioned on the corner of State Highway 10 and Waterfront Drive with access to the site being off Waterfront Drive, and is situated close to an environment of light industrial activities with ITM Building Supplies being just two properties to the west, and Mangonui Haulage across from it. It therefore is more appropriate location for Light Industrial development.</p> <p>A number of Resource Consents that relate to light industrial activity have been granted for this site in the past, including a marine and general engineering workshop, and a yard for transportable home construction with show buildings and office.</p> <p>Light industrial activities such as the above and other light industrial use activities seems more appropriate for the site.</p>	Amend to rezone 6 Waterfront Drive, Mangonui (Lot 1 DP 174109 NA106D/655) from Rural Residential Zone to Light Industrial Zone.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS264.2	SJ & GM Jones Family Trust		Oppose	<p>The site should not be re-zoned to Light Industrial as the property is adjacent to residential properties and should be zoned Rural Residential. There would be unacceptable reverse sensitivity concerns from noise, traffic, operating hours, and general amenity particularly if the likely uses are comparable to the resource consent application currently lodged for the site to which the submitter opposes.</p> <p>A review of the zones by Council has retained the Rural Residential zoning which is the correct zoning for the property.</p> <p>We would therefore ask that the submission for the rezoning of the land to Light Industrial be disallowed.</p>	Disallow	Accept
FS217.1	Marie Lindsay		Oppose	<p>The site should not be re-zoned to Light Industrial as the property is adjacent to residential properties and should be zoned Rural Residential as originally proposed. There would be unacceptable reverse sensitivity concerns on residential properties adjacent to the site from noise, traffic, operating hours, and general amenity particularly if the likely uses are comparable to the resource consent application currently lodged for the site to which the submitter opposes.</p> <p>A review of the zones by Council has retained the Rural Residential zoning which is the correct zoning for the property.</p> <p>We would therefore ask that the submission for the rezoning of the land to Light Industrial be disallowed.</p>	Disallow	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
<b>S184.026</b>	Far North District Council	Rural Residential Zone	Oppose	Not supportive of the small lot, rural development adjacent to urban centres. Supportive of development which encourages active and public transportation systems. Large urban lot and small rural lot zoning are not economical to provide active and public transport to as we require a certain level of density in order to create those networks.	Amend Rural Residential zoning adjacent to urban centres		Reject
<b>FS289.2</b>	Reuben Wright		Oppose	The Rural Residential Zone is an appropriate response to demand for additional residential scale development as a transitional area from rural to residential. The provision of services including transport management can be addressed by suitable plan provisions and appropriate strategic planning by NTA. It is not considered appropriate to simply oppose the zoning for the reasons stated.	Disallow		Accept
<b>FS36.079</b>	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency		Support	The submitter considers that large amounts low density residential/rural residential development can result in an increase in private vehicle movements that impact the transport network and result in an increase in emissions. Waka Kotahi supports the development of well-functioning urban environment that enable more businesses and community services to be located in areas that are well-serviced by existing or planned public transport as per the National Policy Statement on Urban Development.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
<b>S284.016</b>	Trent Simpkin	Rural Residential Zone	Oppose	Residential areas which are serviced should be zoned General Residential, not other zones. There should be an overlay map completed showing the serviced areas with infrastructure and the new zones proposed. All areas with sewer infrastructure should be rezoned to General Residential to allow further development and sites to be created. Pekama Drive, Mangonui is an example.	Amend zoning of all land at Pekama Drive, Mangonui with access to sewer services from Rural Residential Zone to General Residential Zone. This includes land at 1-3 Pekama Drive (inferred) (see map attached to original submission).		Reject
<b>FS36.087</b>	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency		Oppose	Opposes the proposed rezoning/intensification of the submitters land until there is a clearer understanding on how the proposal affects the safety, efficiency, and effectiveness of the land transport system. There needs to be clear documentation of what transport infrastructure/ upgrades/mitigation measures are needed to avoid, remedy or mitigate effects on the transport system, triggers for necessary infrastructure development and how the infrastructure will be funded. The proposed rezoning needs to ensure that it includes details as to how the proposed transport network will provide active modes and support the longer term development of public transport.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission until appropriate analysis and information has been provided for each of the proposed rezonings.	Accept
<b>FS570.870</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
<b>FS566.884</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
<b>FS569.906</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
<b>S555.001</b>	Ngā Kaingamaha o Ngāti Hine Charitable Trust	Rural Residential Zone	Oppose	<p>The Rural Residential zone limits development density due to implied onsite servicing requirements of each new dwelling. Having regard to the context of the area, the site is part of the Bay of Islands Hospital land holdings which is considered to form a portion of the urban area of Kawakawa, however we do acknowledge that the site would be the hypothetical urban rural boundary for the area. There is clear demand from Iwi to provide urban growth on the site where the submitter is seeking to secure a 100 year lease to accommodate housing (both assisted and independent, and private) as well as community facilities that benefit the wider area.</p> <p>The site can accommodate a residential development without servicing constraints subject to some infrastructure upgrades. Therefore, General Residential zoning is considered appropriate for the site. Further high level assessments are currently being undertaken with regard to geotechnical stability, and potential contamination (a detailed site investigation) of the site which will be provided to Council as part of further submissions. At this stage, there are no indications that suggest that the site cannot accommodate buildings.</p>	Amend the zoning of the rear of 11 Greenacres Drive (Section 22 SBRS of Kawakawa) and the adjoining site to the south Section 25 SBRS OF Kawakawa) from Rural Residential to General Residential	Reject
<b>FS243.207</b>	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Support	<p>Kainga Ora support the urbanisation of the hospital land and consider the rezoning of the land should be sought more wider than just the hospital site alone.</p>	<p>Allow</p> <p>Amend the zoning of the rear of 11 Greenacres Drive (Section 22 SBRS of Kawakawa) and the adjoining site to the south Section 25 SBRS OF Kawakawa) from Rural Residential to General Residential</p>	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS402.025	Te Whatu Ora - Health New Zealand		Oppose	<p>Te Whatu Ora's original submission (S42.017) sought changes to the planning maps to seek that a number of its landholdings at Bay of Islands Hospital are shown as Hospital Zone. This submission point from Ngā Kaingamaha o Ngāti Hine Charitable Trust seeks that the rear of 11 Grenacres Drive (Section 22 SBRS of Kawakawa) and the adjoining site to the south Section 25 SBRS of Kawakawa are rezoned from rural residential to general residential zone.</p> <p>Te Whatu Ora are neutral on this submission point from Ngā Kaingamaha o Ngāti Hine Charitable Trust, but seek clarification to the extent of the rezoning sought. If this extends over the land sought to be rezoned Hospital Zone as per Te Whatu Ora's original submission, then Te Whatu Ora would oppose the extent that affected the Bay of Islands Hospital Zone / landholdings.</p>	Disallow in part Seek Provision detail as above.	Accept
S582.001	Gabriele Pfaender	Rural Residential Zone	Oppose	<p>Considering the proposed district plan, land-use and development in our district I am writing to you. I am thinking of future proof planning with the thoughts of natural hazard and climate change, I like to encourage you to move the zoning of my property 97 Okahu Road into residential zoning. At least the top areas of the block.</p> <p>The reasons are obvious - urged requirement of new housing on hillsides of Kaitaia and out of flood zone areas</p>	Delete Rural Residential zoning of 97 Okahu Road, Kaitaia (being Part Allotment 99 Parish of Ahipara); zone General Residential	Reject
S284.010	Trent Simpkin	Rural Residential Zone	Oppose	<p>It is clear from the zone maps that no thought has been given to Ahipara's future growth plans. Just because the projected population growth stats may not show growth in some areas around the Far North doesn't mean that land shouldn't be rezoned to allow development - because development drives increased population, more rates for FNDC and a better lifestyle for the local people with</p>	Amend zoning of land at 1-45 Kokopu Street, Ahipara and 6-25 Karawaka Street (informally known as "Kokopu subdivision") from Rural Residential to General Residential Zone	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				access to better services. The land is already subdivided and is Rural Residential in nature.			
<b>FS570.864</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
<b>FS566.878</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
<b>FS569.900</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
<b>S288.016</b>	Tristan Simpkin	Rural Residential Zone	Oppose	Residential areas which are serviced should be zoned General Residential, not other zones. There should be an overlay map completed showing the serviced areas with infrastructure and the new zones proposed. All areas with sewer infrastructure should be rezoned to General Residential to allow further development and sites to be created. Pekama Drive, Mangonui is an example.	Amend zoning of all land at Pekama Drive, Mangonui with access to sewer services from Rural Residential Zone to General Residential Zone. This includes land at 1-3 Pekama Drive (inferred) (see map attached to original submission).		Reject
<b>FS570.895</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
<b>FS566.909</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
<b>FS569.931</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
<b>S374.001</b>	Nigel Ross Surveyor Ltd	Sport And Active Recreation Zone	Oppose	Number 9 and 7 Enterprise Street, Kaikohe are zoned Industrial in the Operative District Plan. These properties are now zoned Sport and Active Recreation, which I hope is a genuine mistake.	Amend the zoning of Lots 5 and 6 DP 73952 to the correct zoning.		Accept
<b>S288.015</b>	Tristan Simpkin	General / Miscellaneous	Oppose	Residential areas which are serviced should be zoned General Residential, not other zones. There should be an overlay map completed showing the serviced areas with infrastructure and the new zones proposed. All areas with sewer infrastructure should be rezoned to General Residential to allow further development and sites to be created	Amend zoning of all areas across the district with available connections to the sewer system to General Residential Zone.		Reject
<b>FS29.38</b>	Trent Simpkin		Support	I agree fully with this submission point. Wherever there is already sewer services available, the zoning should be changed to General Residential to allow for further subdivision, development and lots to be created.	Allow		Reject
<b>FS570.894</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
<b>FS566.908</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
<b>FS569.930</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
<b>S284.015</b>	Trent Simpkin	General / Miscellaneous	Oppose	Residential areas which are serviced should be zoned General Residential, not other zones. There should be an overlay map completed showing the serviced areas with infrastructure and the new zones proposed. All areas with sewer infrastructure should be rezoned to General Residential to allow further development and sites to be created.	Amend zoning of all areas across the district with available connections to the sewer system to General Residential Zone.		Reject
<b>FS36.086</b>	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency		Oppose	Opposes the proposed rezoning/ intensification of the submitters land until there is a clearer understanding on how the proposal affects the safety, efficiency, and effectiveness of the land transport system. There needs to be clear documentation of what transport infrastructure/ upgrades/mitigation measures are needed to avoid, remedy or mitigate effects on the transport system, triggers for necessary infrastructure development and how the infrastructure will be funded. The proposed rezoning needs to ensure that it includes details as to how the proposed transport network will provide active modes and support the longer term development of public transport. or mitigate effects on the transport system, triggers for necessary infrastructure development and how the infrastructure will be funded. The proposed rezoning needs to ensure that it includes details as to how the proposed transport network will provide active modes and support the longer term development of public transport.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission until appropriate analysis and information has been provided for each of the proposed rezonings.	Accept
<b>FS570.869</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
<b>FS566.883</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS569.905	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