

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S44.003	Des and Lorraine Morrison	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	At present there is no provision made within either the Kororāreka Russell Township zone or the Rural Production zone for papakāinga. The plan appears to assume that all such activities will be located within the Māori purpose zone. However, as the definition of papakāinga recognises, papakāinga also applies to general land owned by Māori where it can be demonstrated that there is an ancestral link to the land. Both the Shortlands and the Morrisons have whakapapa to the area and consider it is important that provision is made to enable papakāinga to occur outside of Māori purpose zones. Accordingly, this submission seeks such amendments as may be necessary to enable papakāinga housing to be provided for on their Land through the Kororāreka Russell Township zone (if that zoning is accepted for the Land) or in the alternative in the Rural Production zone (if contrary to this submission that zoning is to remain).	Amend the rules applying to 19 and 24 James Street, and 34 and 36 Pukematu Lane, Russell, to enable the provision of papakāinga on the land as well as any consequential and further or other relief which may be necessary to give effect to the changes sought in this submission.		Reject
S431.001	John Andrew Riddell	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	A bespoke zone, rather than the General Residential zone proposed in earlier drafts of the proposed Plan reflects the importance of the town as an early contact town, the character of the town, and the limitations on the capacity of wastewater infrastructure. The bespoke zoning is further supported by Environment Court decisions. This decision has been departed from in the proposed Plan, resulting in more onerous provisions in the proposed Plan than are necessary to protect the character and values.	Retain Kororāreka Russell Township Zone subject to amendments as sought in submission		Accept in part
FS51.231	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support in part	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework notified for the protection of the Kororareka Russell Township zone (Special Purposed Zone).	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS332.001	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 in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S431.048	John Andrew Riddell	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	In general the heritage area provisions in the operative Plan comprehensively address the protection of historic heritage and character and there are no sound resource management reasons why the provisions cannot be carried over into the proposed Plan largely without alteration. The provisions in the proposed Plan are more onerous than is necessary to protect the heritage values and character of the Kororareka Russell Heritage Area Overlay Part D. This is inappropriate and contrary to policy 6.1.1 of the Regional Policy Statement.	Retain Kororāreka Russell Heritage Area Overlay provisions subject to amendments as sought in submission		Accept in part
FS51.236	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support in part	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework notified for the protection of the Kororareka Russell Heritage Are Overlay.	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS332.048	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 in part
S454.136	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	Due to its linear nature and the requirement to connect new electricity generation to the National Grid, regardless of where the new generation facilities are located, transmission lines may need to traverse any zone within the Far North District. None of the Special Purpose zones have objectives, policies or rules that provide for critical infrastructure such as transmission facilities that may be located, or need to be located, within these zones to support the activities that occur there.	Amend the provisions in the Kororareka Russell Township zone to ensure that critical infrastructure, suchas transmission facilities, is provided for.		Reject
FS369.018	Top Energy		Support	Top Energy supports the provision of critical infrastructure (including electricity) within the Kororareka Russell Township Zone.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
S6.001	Rodney and Anne Jess	SUB-S1	Oppose	The General Residential provisions for minimum allotment sizes should apply to Russell with exception of Heritage and Strand areas. This will allow Russell to grow and provide further land for development. Further rates will allow amenities in Russell to improve.	Apply the General Residential provisions for minimum allotment sizes to Russell with exception of Heritage and Strand areas of Russell. 600m2 (compliant), 300m2 (discretionary)		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS51.223	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT does not support applying the General Residential zone minimum allotment sizes to Kororareka Russell. Changes to the intensification residential development will impact on the area's townscape and associated heritage values.	Disallow		Accept
FS372.018	John Andrew Riddell		Oppose	The Kororāreka Russell Township minimum lot sizes are larger than the General Residential zone minimum lot sizes because of the special character of Kororāreka and because of the limited capacity of the Russell wastewater scheme. Reducing the minimum lot sizes for the Kororāreka Russell Township zone is not sustainable management and is inconsistent with the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement, the National Policy Statement on Freshwater Management, the Regional Policy Statement for Northland and the Regional Plan for Northland, and relevant objectives and policies in the proposed Far North District Plan.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept
S431.002	John Andrew Riddell	Overview	Not Stated	There are requirements set out in the Act and in supporting documents that the proposed Plan must meet, including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ achieving the sustainable management purpose of the Act; ◦ recognising and providing for the matters of national importance set out section 6 of the Act; ◦ having particular regard to the other matters set out in section 7 of the Act; ◦ taking into account the principles of Te Tiriti o Waitangi; ◦ addressing the functions of territorial authorities (section 31 of the Act) ◦ giving effect to national policy statements, including the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement ("Coastal Policy Statement"); and ◦ giving effect to the Regional Policy Statement for Northland ("Regional Policy Statement"). The provisions do not recognise and provide for the	Amend the Overview to include statements as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • that the community wastewater scheme has real, existing capacity limits • that the town has high indigenous biodiversity values includes the presence of kiwi and weka • that the relevant Council responsibilities are more than protection of historic heritage 	Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				natural and ecological values within Kororāreka/Russell and its environs, including the presence of North Island brown kiwi and North Island weka A bespoke zone, rather than the General Residential zone proposed in earlier drafts of the proposed Plan, reflects the importance of the town as an early contact town, the character of the town, and the limitations on the capacity of wastewater infrastructure.			
FS332.002	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 in part
S409.008	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Objectives	Support	The Proposed Plan is required to recognise and provide for the matters of national importance, in particular 6(f) "the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use and development" and s6(e) "the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga." HNZPT considers that the hybrid-plan format of the Proposed Plan, that includes: the identification of historic heritage; heritage area overlays; Kororareka Russell Township Zone and Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori issues (Overview), objectives, policies and rules each within a Section of the plan, is of assistance to the reader in understanding the background and reasons for the rules.	Retain the objectives of the Kororareka Russell Township		Accept in part
FS570.1183	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
FS400.038	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Oppose	The submission seeks additional sites / areas to be within the Heritage Overlay. The Further Submitter's original submission sought amendments to the overlay and reversion back to the Paihia Mission Heritage Area and associated provisions	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.1197	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
FS569.1219	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
S331.105	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	KRT-O1	Support	The submitter supports objective KRT-O1 as it provides for non-residential activities, such as educational facilities, with are appropriate for the township.	Retain objective KRT-O1, as proposed.		Accept
FS51.45	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support	HNZPT also supports the retention of Objective KRT-O1	Allow		Accept
S179.001	Russell Protection Society (INC)	KRT-O1	Support		Retain KRT - O1		Accept
FS51.104	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support in part	HNZPT is supportive of the planning framework notified for the Kororareka Russell Township	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS23.003	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support in part	Generally, support the objective and policy framework suggested as it will provide clear guidance to plan users and the regulator as to what is anticipated/desired for the township zone. However, the reference to encouraging the retention of existing vegetation is too broad as it does not distinguish between indigenous and nonindigenous vegetation, nor the quality or significance of that vegetation.	Allow in part	allow relief sought but clarify type of vegetation sought to be protected	Accept in part
S179.002	Russell Protection Society (INC)	KRT-O2	Support		Retain KRT -O2		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS51.105	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support in part	HNZPT is supportive of the planning framework notified for the Kororareka Russell Township	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS23.004	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support in part	Generally, support the objective and policy framework suggested as it will provide clear guidance to plan users and the regulator as to what is anticipated/desired for the township zone. However, the reference to encouraging the retention of existing vegetation is too broad as it does not distinguish between indigenous and nonindigenous vegetation, nor the quality or significance of that vegetation.	Allow in part	Allow relief sought but clarify type of vegetation sought to be protected.	Accept in part
S431.003	John Andrew Riddell	KRT-02	Not Stated	The provisions do not recognise and provide for the natural and ecological values within Kororāreka/Russell and its environs, including the presence of North Island brown kiwi and North Island weka	Amend Objective KRT-02 to insert indigenous biodiversity as a value to recognise and protect.		Accept
FS332.003	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
S331.106	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	KRT-03	Support	The submitter supports objective KRT-03 to enable activities, such as educational facilities, that contribute to the well-being of the community while complementing the character, scale and amenity of the Kororāreka Russell Township zone.	Retain objective KRT-03, as proposed.		Accept in part
FS51.46	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support	HNZPT also supports the retention of Objective KRT-03	Allow		Accept in part
S179.003	Russell Protection Society (INC)	KRT-03	Support		Retain KRT -03		Accept in part
FS51.106	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support in part	HNZPT is supportive of the planning framework notified for the Kororareka Russell Township	Allow in part		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS23.005	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support in part	Generally, support the objective and policy framework suggested as it will provide clear guidance to plan users and the regulator as to what is anticipated/desired for the township zone. However, the reference to encouraging the retention of existing vegetation is too broad as it does not distinguish between indigenous and nonindigenous vegetation, nor the quality or significance of that vegetation.	Allow in part	Allow relief sought but clarify type of vegetation sought to be protected.	Accept in part
S179.004	Russell Protection Society (INC)	KRT-O4	Support		Retain KRT-O4		Accept
FS51.107	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support in part	HNZPT is supportive of the planning framework notified for the Kororareka Russell Township	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS23.006	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support in part	Generally, support the objective and policy framework suggested as it will provide clear guidance to plan users and the regulator as to what is anticipated/desired for the township zone. However, the reference to encouraging the retention of existing vegetation is too broad as it does not distinguish between indigenous and nonindigenous vegetation, nor the quality or significance of that vegetation.	Allow in part	Allow relief sought but clarify type of vegetation sought to be protected.	Accept in part
S179.005	Russell Protection Society (INC)	KRT-O5	Support		Retain KRT-O5		Accept
FS51.108	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support in part	HNZPT is supportive of the planning framework notified for the Kororareka Russell Township	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS23.007	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support in part	Generally, support the objective and policy framework suggested as it will provide clear guidance to plan users and the regulator as to what is	Allow in part	Allow relief sought but clarify type of vegetation sought to be protected.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>anticipated/desired for the township zone. However, the reference to encouraging the retention of existing vegetation is too broad as it does not distinguish between indigenous and nonindigenous vegetation, nor the quality or significance of that vegetation.</p>		
<p>S431.009</p>	<p>John Andrew Riddell</p>	<p>Policies</p>	<p>Not Stated</p>	<p>The proposed Plan's objectives, policies, rules and standards do not ensure adequate recognition and protection of the historic heritage and character and amenity of Kororāreka/Russell. One of the policies in the operative Plan should be transferred to the proposed Plan because it provides sound and clear guidance over the special character of Kororāreka/Russell.</p>	<p>Insert a new policy as follows:That the special character of Russell be protected by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. providing additional controls in areas of Russell where groups of buildings, places or objects have significant historical associations or characteristics and protecting those buildings which are most important as examples of period styles; 2. retaining the visual dominance of natural landforms in the Kororareka Russell Heritage Area Overlay Part D area (as defined on Map ##); 3. ensuring development in the Gateway Area of Matauwhi Bay (as defined on Map ##) reflects its role as an entrance to Russell and that activities are of a scale and size that is consistent with that of Russell itself and appropriate to the character of the Bay; 4. maintaining as far as practicable the informal blending of land uses that have evolved to contribute to the village atmosphere of Russell; 5. protecting and fostering the small size and pedestrian scale of Russell; and 6. ensuring public works and the provision of utility services are carried out in a manner consistent with the special character of Russell. 	<p>Accept in part</p>

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS51.235	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support in part	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework for the protection of the Kororareka Russell Township zone (Special Purposed Zone).	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS332.009	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 in part
S409.009	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Policies	Support	The Proposed Plan is required to recognise and provide for the matters of national importance, in particular 6(f) "the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use and development" and s6(e) "the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga." HNZPT considers that the hybrid-plan format of the Proposed Plan, that includes: the identification of historic heritage; heritage area overlays; Kororareka Russell Township Zone and Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori issues (Overview), objectives, policies and rules each within a Section of the plan, is of assistance to the reader in understanding the background and reasons for the rules.	Retain the policies for Kororareka Russell Township zone		Accept in part
FS570.1184	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
FS400.039	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Oppose	The submission seeks additional sites / areas to be within the Heritage Overlay. The Further Submitter's original submission sought amendments to the overlay and reversion back to the Paihia Mission Heritage Area and associated provisions	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.1198	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS569.1220	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
S179.006	Russell Protection Society (INC)	KRT-P1	Support in part	we generally support the objectives and policies of the Kororareka Russell Township Zone, but consider that these can be strengthened by providing clarification of what is meant by "scale, character and amenity values".	Amend KRT-P1 by making specific reference to a FNDC document entitle " Russell Design Guidelines". Alternatively, the following provisions of the Operative plan could be modified for incorporation into the new plan: 11.21 Russell Township Basin and Gateway Area		Accept in part
FS51.109	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support in part	HNZPT is supportive of there being consideration of referencing the Kororareka Russell Design Guidance.	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS23.008	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally, support the objective and policy framework suggested as it will provide clear guidance to plan users and the regulator as to what is anticipated/desired for the township zone. However, the reference to encouraging the retention of existing vegetation is too broad as it does not distinguish between indigenous and nonindigenous vegetation, nor the quality or significance of that vegetation.	Allow in part	Allow relief sought but clarify type of vegetation sought to be protected.	Accept in part
S431.004	John Andrew Riddell	KRT-P1	Not Stated	The zoning has evolved over many years, based on archeological, historic and architectural studies in the 1970s, 1980s, 1990s and 2000s. Important components of these reports and studies and guidelines have not been adequately recognised and used to inform the zone's objectives, policies, rules and performance standards. The Council has a very useful Kororāreka/Russell Design Guideline that it does not refer to in the proposed Plan. The proposed Plan's objectives, policies, rules and	Amend Policy KRT-P1 to insert the following additional clauses: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> it is consistent with the Kororāreka/Russell design guidelines adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity are avoided 		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				standards do not ensure adequate recognition and protection of the historic heritage and character and amenity of Kororāreka/Russell. The provisions do not recognise and provide for the natural and ecological values within Kororāreka/Russell and its environs, including the presence of North Island brown kiwi and North Island weka.			
FS51.232	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support in part	HNZPT considers there is merit in reviewing and determining whether the Kororareka/Russell design guidelines remain relevant; how they could be applied.	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS23.109	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Oppose	It is inappropriate to: - require compliance with design guidelines in the plan, given it would stymie the ability to adopt future best practice methods. - require avoidance of effects on all indigenous biodiversity rather than just significant indigenous biodiversity as per the higher order policy documents. - constrain development to areas that are able to be serviced by infrastructure, given the constraints in Kororāreka in connecting to public services. The opportunity should remain to allow onsite servicing.	Disallow	Disallow the relief sought	Accept in part
FS332.004	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 in part
S368.022	Far North District Council	KRT-P2	Support in part	Minor grammatical error in reference to f.	Amend KRT-P2 Require all subdivision in the Kororareka Russell Township zone to provide the following reticulated services to the boundary of each lot: a. telecommunications; b. fibre where it is available; or c. copper where fibre is not available; d. local network power supply; e. wastewater; and		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					f. portable water and stormwater where they are it is available		
S368.115	Far North District Council	KRT-P2	Support in part	drafting error	Amend KRT-P2 require all subdivision in the Kororareka Russell Township zone to provide the following reticulated services to the boundary of each lot: a. telecommunications b. fibre where it is available ; or c. copper where fibre is not available; d. local network power supply; e. wastewater; and f. portable potable water and stormwater where it is available		Accept in part
S132.001	Lynley Newport	KRT-P2	Support in part	The policy is dictating how an urban dweller MUST receive their phone/telecommunications connectivity and power connectivity, and its wastewater, water and stormwater reticulation. There should be scope for alternatives. Telecommunications no longer must be in ground fibre or copper wire; power no longer must be conventional non- renewable means. Technology has moved on. If a site in this zone is large enough to sustainably cater for on-site wastewater then it should not be 'required' to connect up to a council service. If a property can sustainably provide for their own potable water supply, they should not be 'required' to connect and pay for a council service.	Amend KRTZ-P2 to read: Encourage all subdivision..... leave a-f unchanged (except'f' should read potable, not portable water); add sentence at the end; Andwhere it is proposed to rely on alternatives to the reticulated services outlined above, the alternative shall be capable of providing the same level of service as conventionalreticulated services.		Accept in part
FS172.212	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Accept in part
FS196.84	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko	Allow		Accept in part
FS23.001	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Would enable alternatives to be provided on-site where the site is large enough to address wastewater. This is important in the Russell context where there is limited availability to connect to the public waste-water system and requiring a connection would therefore constrain development.	Allow	Amend KRTZP2 to allow alternatives to public wastewater connection	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS372.0010	John Andrew Riddell		Oppose	The boundaries of the Kororāreka Russell Township zone are set by the extent of the wastewater scheme. There is a very limited reticulated water supply - mainly serving the part of Kororāreka that is zoned Mixed Use. The provisions of this zone reflect these realities. It is inappropriate to provide for on-site wastewater disposal within the zone. The policy appropriately recognises that a reticulated potable water supply is generally not available and provides for this. It is uncertain what "the same level of service as conventional reticulated services" means for on-site potable water systems. The changes sought are not appropriate or necessary in this zone.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept in part
S179.007	Russell Protection Society (INC)	KRT-P2	Support		Retain KRT - P2		Accept in part
FS51.110	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support in part	HNZPT is supportive of the planning framework notified for the Kororareka Russell Township	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS23.009	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support in part	Generally, support the objective and policy framework suggested as it will provide clear guidance to plan users and the regulator as to what is anticipated/desired for the township zone. However, the reference to encouraging the retention of existing vegetation is too broad as it does not distinguish between indigenous and nonindigenous vegetation, nor the quality or significance of that vegetation.	Allow in part	Allow relief sought but clarify type of vegetation sought to be protected.	Accept in part
S431.005	John Andrew Riddell	KRT-P2	Not Stated	Clause a. of Policy KRT-P2 may be redundant if telecommunications is intended to cover more than copper or fibre wiring	Delete clause a. of Policy KRT-P2		Accept in part
FS332.005	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	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.			
S179.008	Russell Protection Society (INC)	KRT-P3	Support		Retain KRT -P3		Accept in part
FS51.111	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support in part	HNZPT is supportive of the planning framework notified for the Kororareka Russell Township	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS23.0010	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support in part	Generally, support the objective and policy framework suggested as it will provide clear guidance to plan users and the regulator as to what is anticipated/desired for the township zone. However, the reference to encouraging the retention of existing vegetation is too broad as it does not distinguish between indigenous and nonindigenous vegetation, nor the quality or significance of that vegetation.	Allow in part	Allow relief sought but clarify type of vegetation sought to be protected.	Accept in part
S431.006	John Andrew Riddell	KRT-P3	Not Stated	The zoning has evolved over many years, based on archeological, historic and architectural studies in the 1970s, 1980s, 1990s and 2000s. Important components of these reports and studies and guidelines have not been adequately recognised and used to inform the zone's objectives, policies, rules and performance standards. The Council has a very useful Kororāreka/Russell Design Guideline that it does not refer to in the proposed Plan. The proposed Plan's objectives, policies, rules and standards do not ensure adequate recognition and protection of the historic heritage and character and amenity of Kororāreka/Russell. The provisions do not recognise and provide for the natural and ecological values within Kororāreka/Russell and its environs, including the presence of North Island brown kiwi and North Island weka.	Amend Policy KRT-P3 as follows: Provide for a variety of housing typologies within the Kororāreka Russell Township zone, where land is appropriate and adequately serviced by infrastructure and development is consistent with the Kororāreka Russell design guidelines and does not compromise historic heritage, natural and amenity values		Accept in part
FS51.233	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support in part	HNZPT considers there is merit in reviewing and determining whether the Kororareka/Russell design	Allow in part		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				guidelines remain relevant; how they could be applied			
FS23.110	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Oppose	It is inappropriate to: - require compliance with design guidelines in the plan, given it would stymie the ability to adopt future best practice methods. - require avoidance of effects on all indigenous biodiversity rather than just significant indigenous biodiversity as per the higher order policy documents. - constrain development to areas that are able to be serviced by infrastructure, given the constraints in Kororāreka in connecting to public services. The opportunity should remain to allow onsite servicing.	Disallow	Disallow the relief sought	Accept in part
FS332.006	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 in part
S331.107	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	KRT-P4	Support	The submitter supports policy KRT-P4 to enable activities, such as educational facilities, that support the social and economic well-being of the community.	Retain policy KRT-P4, as proposed.		Accept in part
S179.009	Russell Protection Society (INC)	KRT-P4	Support		Retain KRT- P4		Accept in part
FS51.112	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support in part	HNZPT is supportive of the planning framework notified for the Kororareka Russell Township	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS23.011	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support in part	Generally, support the objective and policy framework suggested as it will provide clear guidance to plan users and the regulator as to what is anticipated/desired for the township zone. However, the reference to encouraging	Allow in part	Allow relief sought but clarify type of vegetation sought to be protected.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				the retention of existing vegetation is too broad as it does not distinguish between indigenous and nonindigenous vegetation, nor the quality or significance of that vegetation.			
S179.010	Russell Protection Society (INC)	KRT-P5	Support		Retain KRT-P5		Accept in part
FS51.113	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support in part	HNZPT is supportive of the planning framework notified for the Kororareka Russell Township	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS23.012	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support in part	Generally, support the objective and policy framework suggested as it will provide clear guidance to plan users and the regulator as to what is anticipated/desired for the township zone. However, the reference to encouraging the retention of existing vegetation is too broad as it does not distinguish between indigenous and nonindigenous vegetation, nor the quality or significance of that vegetation.	Allow in part	Allow relief sought but clarify type of vegetation sought to be protected.	Accept in part
S431.007	John Andrew Riddell	KRT-P5	Not Stated	The proposed Plan's objectives, policies, rules and standards do not ensure adequate recognition and protection of the historic heritage and character and amenity of Kororāreka/Russell	Amend clause d. of policy KRT-P5 as follows: 1. address road safety and efficiency avoid as far as practicable adverse effects on the residential, natural and amenity values and functions of the Kororāreka Russell Township Zone.		Accept in part
FS332.007	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 in part
S179.011	Russell Protection Society (INC)	KRT-P6	Support in part	We generally support the Objectives and Policies of the Kororareka Russell Township zone but consider that these can be strengthened by providing	Amend KRT- P6 to include a statement acknowledging that there is a need to protect historical sight line corridors that provide views of Kororareka Bay. In addition, a policy from the		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				clarification of what is meant by "scale, character and amenity values"	Operative plan that reads..." That a reasonable level of privacy and peaceful enjoyment be provided for residents" could be incorporated into the plan		
FS51.114	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support in part	HNZPT is supportive of the planning framework for the Kororareka Russell Township	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS23.013	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Viewshafts are important to retain a connection within and between places	Allow	allow original submission	Accept in part
S431.008	John Andrew Riddell	KRT-P6	Not Stated	The proposed Plan's objectives, policies, rules and standards do not ensure adequate recognition and protection of the historic heritage and character and amenity of Kororāreka/Russell.	Amend Policy KRT-P6, changing the wording and inserting a new clause as follows: Manage land use and subdivision to address the effects of the activity requiring resource consent, including (but not limited to) consideration of the following matters where relevant to the application: a. the public benefit of the proposed activity; b. the siting and design of buildings, structures, outdoor storage areas, parking, internal roading and vegetation; c. any adverse effects on the character and amenity of adjacent zone; d. the temporary or permanent nature of any adverse effects; e. the need for and location of earthworks and vegetation clearance; f. the provision of low impact design principles; and g. the likelihood of the activity creating or exacerbating a natural hazard. h. the protection of: i. historic heritage; ii. Indigenous biodiversity; iii. the natural character of the coastal environment and margins of wetlands, lakes and rivers; iv. landforms; vi sites and areas of significance to Māori and cultural values; and v. identified and potential public access corridors and esplanade reserves;i. provision for areas of open space and outdoor living space;j.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					provision of landscaping, screening and planting; k. consistency with the design, character, scale and amenity of the surrounding residential environment; l. level of privacy, visual dominance and shading effects on adjoining sites; m. protection of pedestrian scale, layout and development within Kororāreka Russell; n. sunlight and daylight access; o. the adequacy of available or programmed development infrastructure and the certainty that any programmed future development of infrastructure occurs ; p. level of integration with other activities within the zone; q. hours of operation; r. provision for car parking; s. integration and connectivity within the surrounding road network; t. the ability of the site to address waste water, stormwater, soakage, water supply including fire fighting; u. community well-being, health and safety; v. number of planned or potential people on site; w. any site constraints or natural hazard mitigation; and x. any historical, spiritual, or cultural association held by tangata whenua, with regard to the matters set out in Policy TW-P6; andy. the preference for buildings that are small scale, and have simple shapes and a lack of ornamentation within the zone.		
FS51.234	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework notified for the protection of the Kororareka Russell Township zone (Special Purposed Zone).	Disallow		Accept in part
FS23.111	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Oppose	It is inappropriate to: - require compliance with design guidelines in the plan, given it would stymie the ability to adopt future best practice methods. - require avoidance of effects on all indigenous biodiversity rather than just significant indigenous biodiversity as per the higher order policy documents.	Disallow	Disallow the relief sought.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				- constrain development to areas that are able to be serviced by infrastructure, given the constraints in Kororāreka in connecting to public services. The opportunity should remain to allow onsite servicing.			
FS332.008	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 in part
S431.147	John Andrew Riddell	KRT-P6	Not Stated	The amendment is necessary in order to achieve the purpose of the Act.	Amend point h. of Policy KRT-P6 as follows: the adequacy of available or programmed development infrastructure and the certainty that any programmed future development of infrastructure will occur		Accept in part
FS23.145	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Oppose	The suggested amendments would be difficult to demonstrate compliance with given, the infrastructure is at the discretion of the Council. It is unclear what "certainty" means in this context.	Disallow	Disallow the relief sought.	Accept in part
FS332.147	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 in part
S179.108	Russell Protection Society (INC)	Rules	Not Stated		Insert rule for helicopter landing areas, except for emergency purposes should be a non complying activity		Reject
FS184.37	Richard Milner		Oppose	This submission does not allow for Non Air transport commercial aviation and should be added to R7 PER 2 as Item IV for the use of Helicopter Operations conducted for Utility, Maintenance, Inspection or Survey purposes such as but not limited to: lifting of equipment, water tanks, machinery, gravel, livestock etc. Removal of trees, maintaining or constructing infrastructure such as Powerlines, Cell towers etc, Maintaining or developing tracks, roads, slips. Survey operations, flight training and utility work	Disallow		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>like survey or agricultural activities or frost protection. All of these activities would require a helicopter landing site of a temporary nature and it should be Permitted Activity</p> <p>A Helicopter landing area should allow of fuelling of the aircraft especially if a temporary landing area</p> <p>Field Maintenance should also be allowed as a temporary operation may require some inspection and routine maintenance during operations - Transits to maintenance at larger airports is not practical in Northland with Whangerei and Auckland as closest airports with helicopter maintenance facilities</p> <p>Example would be for Powerlines assessment and maintenance - on site fuelling should be allowed as the dead leg to and from a fuelling station could be many miles adding unnecessary cost to the community and economy - Northland does not have many airports so the transit (dead leg) to and from fuel is possibly large</p> <p>Amend NOISE -S4 by adding NZS6807:1994 does not apply to agricultural aviation activities and non Air Transport Commercial Aviation Activities</p>		
S512.066	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Rules	Not Stated	<p>Fire and Emergency support an activity for emergency service facilities being listed as an activity in zones. Please see Table 1 of the submission for the location of existing fire stations. Note that these are found in a range of zones. New fire stations may be necessary in order to continue to achieve emergency response time commitments in situations where development occurs, and populations change. In this regard it is noted that Fire and Emergency is not a requiring authority under section 166 of the RMA, and therefore does not have the ability to designate land for the purposes of fire stations. Provisions within the rules of the district plan are therefore, the best way to facilitate the development of any new fire stations within the district as urban development progresses. Fire and Emergency request that emergency service facilities are included as a permitted activity in all zones. The draft Plan</p>	<p>Insertnew rule for Emergency service facilities included as a permitted activity Emergency service facilities are exempt from standards relating to setback distances, vehicle crossings</p>	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				currently only includes emergency services facilities as an activity in some zones and with varying activity status. In addition, fire stations have specific requirements with relation to setback distances and vehicle crossings. Fire and Emergency request that emergency service facilities are exempt from these standards.			
FS372.008	John Andrew Riddell		Support in part	It is appropriate to provide for specific setback and vehicle crossing provisions for emergency service facilities. However this should be by way of specific standards rather than a general exemption in order to provide certainty. For example the submission seeks exemption from setback distances. Setback distances apply to road, side and rear boundaries. It is unclear why an exemption is necessary from side and rear boundaries.	Allow in part	Accept the submission subject to the particular setbacks and vehicle crossings being specified in the standards.	Accept in part
S409.010	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Rules	Support	The Proposed Plan is required to recognise and provide for the matters of national importance, in particular 6(f) "the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use and development" and s6(e) "the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga." HNZPT considers that the hybrid-plan format of the Proposed Plan, that includes: the identification of historic heritage; heritage area overlays; Kororareka Russell Township Zone and Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori issues (Overview), objectives, policies and rules each within a Section of the plan, is of assistance to the reader in understanding the background and reasons for the rules.	Retain the rules for Kororareka Russell Township zone		Accept in part
FS570.1185	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
FS400.040	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Oppose	The submission seeks additional sites / areas to be within the Heritage Overlay. The Further Submitter's original submission sought amendments to the overlay and reversion back to the	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Paihia Mission Heritage Area and associated provisions			
FS566.1199	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
FS569.1221	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
S368.079	Far North District Council	KRT-R1	Support in part	The 'New buildings or structures, and extensions or alterations to existing buildings or structures' rule in each zone needs to be amended to include activities that are permitted, controlled and restricted discretionary, where applicable within the zone. As currently drafted a breach of this rule makes the activity 'discretionary', which was not the intent if the activity itself is permitted, controlled or restricted discretionary ... the standards in PER-2 should apply	Amend KRT-R1 " ... New buildings or structures, and extensions or alterations to existing buildings or structures Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The new building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure, will accommodate a permitted (where applicable, words to the effect...'or controlled, or restricted discretionary') activity ... "		Accept in part
S512.114	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	KRT-R1	Support in part	Many zones hold objectives and policies related to servicing developments with appropriate infrastructure. Noting that NH-R5 requires adequate firefighting water supply for vulnerable activities (including residential), Fire and Emergency consider that inclusion of an additional standard on infrastructure servicing within individual zone chapters may be beneficial.	Insert new standard and/or matter of discretion across zones on infrastructure servicing (including emergency response transport/access and adequate water supply for firefighting)		Reject
S427.037	Kapiro Residents Association	KRT-R1	Support in part	We agree that multi-unit developments such as terraced housing and low rise apartment blocks can contribute to the greater vibrancy of Kerikeri, and allow for the construction of a greater variety of housing types and sizes. However, one of our concerns is that the rules around outdoor space are inadequate, and there is a danger that in the drive for higher density, the planning rules will not achieve the overall goal of protecting what is valued by the community. We believe that intensification in urban zones should be encouraged in the form of well-	Amend the PDP provisions for multi-unit developments to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> include requirements for outdoor space beyond the area needed to move and park vehicles private, including private and shared outdoor space on the north, east or west side of a building where multi-unit developments take place alongside each other, the rules 		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>designed two or three storey buildings (e.g. apartment blocks) with permeable areas including garden/landscaped ground.</p> <p>In too many multi-unit developments in other districts, the only outdoor space is the concrete used to move and park cars. Especially where these developments take place alongside each other the importance of outdoor space increases. Outdoor spaces provide the opportunity for people to connect, to create a sense of community. When designed well, working within well designed rules, multi-unit developments could enhance the sense of community with Kerikeri and become a real asset.</p>	<p>for shared 'greenspace' reflects the greater density and the need for places for people to share and connect, pedestrian walkways and access to community facilities and amenities.</p>		
S431.010	John Andrew Riddell	KRT-R1	Not Stated	<p>A bespoke zone, rather than the General Residential zone proposed in earlier drafts of the proposed Plan, reflects the importance of the town as an early contact town, the character of the town, and the limitations on the capacity of wastewater infrastructure.</p> <p>This bespoke zoning has evolved over many years, based on archeological, historic and architectural studies in the 1970s, 1980s, 1990s and 2000s. Important components of these reports and studies and guidelines have not been adequately recognised and used to inform the zone's objectives, policies, rules and performance standards. The Council has a very useful Kororāreka/Russell Design Guideline that it does not refer to in the proposed Plan.</p> <p>The bespoke zoning is further supported by Environment Court decisions, including a decision on an appeal that introduced what is called 'The Russell Township Basin and Gateway Area' in the operative Far North District Plan ("the operative Plan"). This decision has been departed from in the proposed Plan, resulting in more onerous provisions in the proposed Plan than are necessary to protect the character and values.</p>	<p>Insert two further matters of discretion EITHER:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> to restricted discretionary rules KRT-R1 new buildings or structures and extensions to existing buildings or structures, KRT-R2 impermeable surface coverage, KRT-R3, residential activity and KRT-R8 minor residential unit; OR to standards KRT-S1 maximum height, KRT-S2 height in relation to boundary, KRT-S3 setback, KRT-S4 setback from MHWS, KRTS5 building or structure coverage, KRT-S6 outdoor living space, KRT-S7 fencing and boundary walls, KRT-S8 outdoor storage <p>as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the extent of building area and the scale of the building and the extent to which they are compatible with both the built and natural environments in the vicinity; consistency with the Kororāreka/Russell Design Guidelines 		Accept in part
FS23.112	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Oppose	<p>It is inappropriate to: - require compliance with design guidelines in the plan, given it would</p>	Disallow	Disallow the relief sought.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>stymie the ability to adopt future best practice methods.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - require avoidance of effects on all indigenous biodiversity rather than just significant indigenous biodiversity as per the higher order policy documents. - constrain development to areas that are able to be serviced by infrastructure, given the constraints in Kororāreka in connecting to public services. The opportunity should remain to allow onsite servicing. 			
FS332.0010	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 in part
S482.016	House Movers Section of New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc	KRT-R1	Support in part	The Proposed Plan definition of "building" does not clearly include relocated buildings, and the existence of a separate definition of relocate buildings in the Proposed Plan appears to create a distinction between "buildings" and "relocated buildings". It is not clear that the permitted activity status applied in most zones to "new buildings and structures" also applies to the relocation of buildings. It is submitted that relocated buildings should have the same status as new buildings, and subject to the same performance standards unless there is any specific overlay or control which applies e.g. historic heritage	<p>amend KRT-R1 to:</p> <p>provide for relocated building as a permitted activity whenrelocated buildings meet performance standards and criteria (see schedule 1).</p> <p>insert a performance standard for use of a pre inspection report(schedule 2)</p> <p>restricted discretionary activity status for relocated buildings that do not meet the permitted activity status standards</p>		Accept in part
FS23.163	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	It is important that provision is made in all zones for relocatable buildings to enable choice, reuse of existing housing, and to make it clear what the activity status is for such buildings. This is particularly the case in urban zones.	Allow	allow the relief sought	Accept in part
S338.027	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	KRT-R1	Not Stated	We agree that multi-unit developments such as terraced housing and low rise apartment blocks can contribute to the greater vibrancy of Kerikeri, and allow for the construction of a greater variety of housing types and sizes. However, one of our	Amend the PDP provisions for multi-unit developments to:		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>concerns is that the rules around outdoor space are inadequate, and there is a danger that in the drive for higher density, the planning rules will not achieve the overall goal of protecting what is valued by the community. We believe that intensification in urban zones should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings (e.g. apartment blocks) with permeable areas including garden/landscaped ground.</p> <p>In too many multi-unit developments in other districts, the only outdoor space is the concrete used to move and park cars. Especially where these developments take place alongside each other the importance of outdoor space increases. Outdoor spaces provide the opportunity for people to connect, to create a sense of community. When designed well, working within well designed rules, multi-unit developments could enhance the sense of community with Kerikeri and become a real asset.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> include requirements for outdoor space beyond the area needed to move and park vehicles private, including private and shared outdoor space on the north, east or west side of a building where multi-unit developments take place alongside each other, the rules for shared 'greenspace' reflects the greater density and the need for places for people to share and connect, pedestrian walkways and access to community facilities and amenities. 		
FS570.968	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.982	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.1004	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S529.195	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	KRT-R1	Support in part	<p>We agree that multi-unit developments such as terraced housing and low rise apartment blocks can contribute to the greater vibrancy of Kerikeri, and allow for the construction of a greater variety of housing types and sizes. However, one of our concerns is that the rules around outdoor space are inadequate, and there is a danger that in the drive for higher density, the planning rules will not achieve the overall goal of protecting what is valued by the community. We believe that intensification in urban zones should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings (e.g. apartment blocks) with permeable areas including garden/landscaped ground.</p> <p>In too many multi-unit developments in other districts, the only outdoor space is the concrete used to move</p>	<p>Amend the PDP provisions for multi-unit developments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> include requirements for outdoor space beyond the area needed to move and park vehicles private, including private and shared outdoor space on the north, east or west side of a building where multi-unit developments take place alongside each other, the rules for shared 'greenspace' reflects the greater density and the need for places for people to share and connect, pedestrian walkways and 		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				and park cars. Especially where these developments take place alongside each other the importance of outdoor space increases. Outdoor spaces provide the opportunity for people to connect, to create a sense of community. When designed well, working within well designed rules, multi-unit developments could enhance the sense of community with Kerikeri and become a real asset.	access to community facilities and amenities.		
FS570.2082	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.2096	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.2118	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S522.051	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	KRT-R1	Support in part	<p>We agree that multi-unit developments such as terraced housing and low rise apartment blocks can contribute to the greater vibrancy of Kerikeri, and allow for the construction of a greater variety of housing types and sizes. However, one of our concerns is that the rules around outdoor space are inadequate, and there is a danger that in the drive for higher density, the planning rules will not achieve the overall goal of protecting what is valued by the community. We believe that intensification in urban zones should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings (e.g. apartment blocks) with permeable areas including garden/landscaped ground.</p> <p>In too many multi-unit developments in other districts, the only outdoor space is the concrete used to move and park cars. Especially where these developments take place alongside each other the importance of outdoor space increases. Outdoor spaces provide the opportunity for people to connect, to create a sense of community. When designed well, working within well designed rules, multi-unit developments could enhance the sense of community with Kerikeri and become a real asset.</p>	<p>Amend the PDP provisions for multi-unit developments to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> include requirements for outdoor space beyond the area needed to move and park vehicles private, including private and shared outdoor space on the north, east or west side of a building where multi-unit developments take place alongside each other, the rules for shared 'greenspace' reflects the greater density and the need for places for people to share and connect, pedestrian walkways and access to community facilities and amenities. 		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.1790	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S481.015	Puketotara Lodge Ltd	KRT-R2	Not Stated	<p>The submitter seeks to ensure that the PDP adequately controls effects from stormwater discharge, particularly between sites or adjacent sites.</p> <p>The Operative Far North Plan contains a stormwater management rule in each zone, along with matters of discretion which Council can consider where the impermeable surface area exceeds what is allowed under the permitted activity rule.</p> <p>There is no specific "stormwater management" rule in the Rural Production zone in the PDP, however there is a rule relating to impermeable surface coverage. It is submitted that additional matters should be added to the list of relevant matters for discretion in the impermeable coverage rule in all zones, in order to better control effects between sites or adjacent sites,</p>	Amend point c of the matters of discretion as follows: c. the availability of land for disposal of effluent and stormwater on the site without adverse effects on adjoining adjacent waterbodies (including groundwater and aquifers) or on adjoining adjacent sites; Insert the following as additional matters of discretion:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoiding nuisance or damage to adjacent or downstream properties; • The extent to which the diversion and discharge maintains pre-development stormwater run-off flows and volumes; • The extent to which the diversion and discharge mimics natural run-off patterns. 	Accept in part
S179.012	Russell Protection Society (INC)	KRT-R2	Support in part	The impermeable surface coverage control for this zone of 35% is supported, however no specific indication is given as to what level of coverage is considered appropriate as a restricted discretionary activity	Amend KPT -R2 to specify 40% as a restricted discretionary activity		Reject
FS23.014	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	It is important to appropriately control impermeable surface coverage to avoid adverse impacts arising from stormwater.	Allow	allow original submission	Reject
S431.011	John Andrew Riddell	KRT-R2	Not Stated	<p>A bespoke zone, rather than the General Residential zone proposed in earlier drafts of the proposed Plan, reflects the importance of the town as an early contact town, the character of the town, and the limitations on the capacity of wastewater infrastructure.</p> <p>This bespoke zoning has evolved over many years, based on archeological, historic and architectural studies in the 1970s, 1980s, 1990s and 2000s. Important components of these reports and studies</p>	Insert two further matters of discretion EITHER:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to restricted discretionary rules KRT-R1 new buildings or structures and extensions to existing buildings or structures, KRT-R2 impermeable surface coverage, KRT-R3, residential activity and KRT-R8 minor residential unit; OR 	Accept in part.

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>and guidelines have not been adequately recognised and used to inform the zone's objectives, policies, rules and performance standards. The Council has a very useful Kororāreka/Russell Design Guideline that it does not refer to in the proposed Plan. The bespoke zoning is further supported by Environment Court decisions, including a decision on an appeal that introduced what is called 'The Russell Township Basin and Gateway Area' in the operative Far North District Plan ("the operative Plan"). This decision has been departed from in the proposed Plan, resulting in more onerous provisions in the proposed Plan than are necessary to protect the character and values.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> to standards KRT-S1 maximum height, KRT-S2 height in relation to boundary, KRT-S3 setback, KRT-S4 setback from MHWS, KRTS5 building or structure coverage, KRT-S6 outdoor living space, KRT-S7 fencing and boundary walls, KRT-S8 outdoor storage <p>as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the extent of building area and the scale of the building and the extent to which they are compatible with both the built and natural environments in the vicinity; consistency with the Kororāreka/Russell Design Guidelines 		
FS23.113	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Oppose	<p>It is inappropriate to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - require compliance with design guidelines in the plan, given it would stymie the ability to adopt future best practice methods. - require avoidance of effects on all indigenous biodiversity rather than just significant indigenous biodiversity as per the higher order policy documents. - constrain development to areas that are able to be serviced by infrastructure, given the constraints in Kororāreka in connecting to public services. The opportunity should remain to allow onsite servicing. 	Disallow	Disallow the relief sought.	Accept in part.
FS332.011	Russell Protection Society		Support	<p>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.</p>	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part.
S283.024	Trent Simpkin	KRT-R2	Oppose	<p>The impermeable surfaces rule is one of the most common rules breached when designing homes. The low thresholds means therefore means many homes</p>	Amend to increase impermeable surface coverage maximum to be realistic based on the site of lots allowed for the zone and/or insert a		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				will still require a resource consent for Impermeable surfaces. all RC's breaching impermeable surfaces require a TP10/Stormwater report from an engineer (already). This is a detailed design of the stormwater management onsite and shouldn't require FNDC to look at it and tick the box to say its acceptable. Why don't we have a PER-2 which says that if a TP10 report is provided by an engineer, it's permitted? (one solution to reduce the number of RC's for Council to process, and assist with getting back to realistic processing times). This submission point applies to all zones.	PER-2 which says if a TP10 report is provided by an engineer, the activity is permitted (inferred)		
FS372.036	John Andrew Riddell		Oppose	Stormwater management is an increasing issue in Kororareka. Ensuring there are adequate permeable areas on lots is important to the sustainable management of stormwater within the town. It is inappropriate and does not accord with sound decision making to define the status of impermeable surface provision dependent on whether a third party writes a report about stormwater management. This is aggravated by there being no standard or particular outcome that this report needs to address.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept
FS570.838	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS566.852	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS569.874	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
S179.013	Russell Protection Society (INC)	KRT-R3	Support in part	provides a clear understanding of the anticipated scale or intensity of development considered appropriate for this zone	Amend KRT-R3 to include restricted discretionary control of 800m2		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS23.015	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	The relief sought would provide a useful clarification of the site size anticipated for restricted activity consents.	Allow	allow original submission.	Reject
S431.012	John Andrew Riddell	KRT-R3	Not Stated	<p>A bespoke zone, rather than the General Residential zone proposed in earlier drafts of the proposed Plan, reflects the importance of the town as an early contact town, the character of the town, and the limitations on the capacity of wastewater infrastructure.</p> <p>This bespoke zoning has evolved over many years, based on archeological, historic and architectural studies in the 1970s, 1980s, 1990s and 2000s. Important components of these reports and studies and guidelines have not been adequately recognised and used to inform the zone's objectives, policies, rules and performance standards. The Council has a very useful Kororāreka/Russell Design Guideline that it does not refer to in the proposed Plan.</p> <p>The bespoke zoning is further supported by Environment Court decisions, including a decision on an appeal that introduced what is called 'The Russell Township Basin and Gateway Area' in the operative Far North District Plan ("the operative Plan"). This decision has been departed from in the proposed Plan, resulting in more onerous provisions in the proposed Plan than are necessary to protect the character and values.</p>	<p>Insert two further matters of discretion EITHER:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to restricted discretionary rules KRT-R1 new buildings or structures and extensions to existing buildings or structures, KRT-R2 impermeable surface coverage, KRT-R3, residential activity and KRT-R8 minor residential unit; OR • to standards KRT-S1 maximum height, KRT-S2 height in relation to boundary, KRT-S3 setback, KRT-S4 setback from MHWS, KRTS5 building or structure coverage, KRT-S6 outdoor living space, KRT-S7 fencing and boundary walls, KRT-S8 outdoor storage <p>as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the extent of building area and the scale of the building and the extent to which they are compatible with both the built and natural environments in the vicinity; • consistency with the Kororāreka/Russell Design Guidelines 	Accept in part.	
FS23.114	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Oppose	<p>It is inappropriate to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - require compliance with design guidelines in the plan, given it would stymie the ability to adopt future best practice methods. - require avoidance of effects on all indigenous biodiversity rather than just significant indigenous biodiversity as per the higher order policy documents. - constrain development to areas that are able to be serviced by infrastructure, given the constraints 	Disallow	Disallow the relief sought.	Accept in part.

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				in Kororāreka in connecting to public services. The opportunity should remain to allow onsite servicing			
FS332.012	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 in part.
S179.014	Russell Protection Society (INC)	KRT-R4	Support	supported because they reflect the nature and character of Russell where many people are either self-employed or working in small scale craft industries	Retain KRT-R4		Accept
FS23.016	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support in part	It is important to make provisions for these types of activity within the zone. Support provisions, subject to the clarification being made to the visitor accommodation provision suggested by Air BnB below.	Allow in part	allow in part original submission	Accept in part
S214.014	Airbnb	KRT-R4	Support in part	The proposed district plan allows for visitor accommodation as a permitted activity for less than or equal to 6-10 guests on site. If these conditions are not met, the activity is discretionary except in the settlement zone where it is restricted discretionary. Airbnb supports the overall approach to allow visitor accommodation to occur in all zones and commends the Council's leadership in this space. We would, however, recommend that restrictions around the number of guests be standardised to 10 across the district to account for the range of families that tend to stay in this type of accommodation and would also recommend that properties that do not meet permitted status default to restricted discretionary as opposed to discretionary. This would increase certainty for our Hosts and unlock the full potential of residential visitor accommodation in the district. Airbnb strongly believes that consistency for guests and hosts is important and that a national approach is the most effective way to address these concerns. Kiwis agree with 64% expressing support for national regulation. One example of this type of standardised approach across councils is the Code of Conduct approach as piloted in New South Wales (NSW),	Amend rules to standardise the guest limit cap for permitted visitor accommodation to 10 across all zones and make the default non-permitted status restricted discretionary (as opposed to Discretionary) across all zones.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Australia (with a robust compliance and enforcement mechanism, perating on a 'two strike' basis whereby bad actors are excluded from participating in the industry for a period of 5 years after repeated breaches of the Code).			
FS23.076	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Support standardizing the number applying to permitted visitor accommodation activities across all zones. Taking a consistent approach will make it easier for the plan provisions to be applied and understood. The effects are not likely to differ significantly in residential zones.	Allow	Allow relief sought.	Reject
S425.062	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust	KRT-R5	Support	PHTTCCT support the provision for home business in zones. It is considered that providing for this activity as a permitted activity, particularly throughout the zones that adjoin the Trail, will help activate the Trail and ensure that that the potential in terms of social and economic impact can be realised (noting the comments made in the Transport Chapter in regards to parking).	retain as notified		Accept in part
S283.036	Trent Simpkin	KRT-R5	Oppose	This submission applies to all Building Coverage rules within all zones. Amend to be larger, considering the size of allotments allowed for in the zone.	Amend the maximum building or structure coverage to be larger or offer an alternative pathway around this rule, by inserting a PER-2 which says if a building is above the maximum, it is permitted if a visual assessment and landscape plan is provided as part of the building consent.		Reject
FS372.037	John Andrew Riddell		Oppose	It is ultra vires and not sound resource management practice to provide for a different permitted activity building coverage standard based on the provision of a visual assessment and landscape plan that may or may not be adequate.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept
FS570.850	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.864	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS569.886	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
S431.022	John Andrew Riddell	KRT-R5	Not Stated	Not stated	Amend PER-5 of Rule KRT-R5, home business, so that hours of operation only apply to the hours open to the public		Accept
FS332.022	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
S431.145	John Andrew Riddell	KRT-R5	Not Stated	The amendment is necessary in order to achieve the purpose of the Act.	Amend PER-5 of Rule KRT-R5 so that the hours of operation apply to when the business is open to the public		Accept
FS332.145	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
S179.015	Russell Protection Society (INC)	KRT-R5	Support	supported because they reflect the nature and character of Russell where many people are either self-employed or working in small scale craft industries	Retain KRT-R5		Accept in part
FS23.398	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support in part	It is important to make provisions for these types of activity within the zone. Support provisions, subject to the clarification being made to the visitor accommodation provision suggested by Air BnB below.	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Accept in part
S331.108	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	KRT-R6	Support	The submitter supports rule KRT-R6 Educational facility, the permitted activity standards to provide for small scale educational facilities in the Kororāreka Russell Township zone. Due to the character, scale and amenity of this zone, the Ministry accept the	Retain rule KRT-R6 Educational facility, as proposed.		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				discretionary activity status if compliance with the permitted activity standards cannot be achieved.			
S179.016	Russell Protection Society (INC)	KRT-R6	Support	supported because they reflect the nature and character of Russell where many people are either self-employed or working in small scale craft industries	Retain KRT-R6		Accept
FS23.399	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support in part	It is important to make provisions for these types of activity within the zone. Support provisions, subject to the clarification being made to the visitor accommodation provision suggested by Air BnB below.	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Accept in part
S179.017	Russell Protection Society (INC)	KRT-R7	Support	supported because they reflect the nature and character of Russell where many people are either self-employed or working in small scale craft industries	Retain KRT-R7		Accept
FS23.400	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support in part	It is important to make provisions for these types of activity within the zone. Support provisions, subject to the clarification being made to the visitor accommodation provision suggested by Air BnB below.	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Accept in part
S133.001	Lynley Newport	KRT-R8	Support	I support the provision allowing a minor residential unit in the Kororareka Russell Township zone, and its category of activity	retain KRT-R8 (inferred)		Accept in part
FS23.002	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Enables intergenerational living on one site, which allows different types of households to provide for their wellbeing. Increases affordability of housing options for families. Also provides an option for rental income if it is not required to accommodate family.	Allow	insert provision for minor residential unit in the Kororāreka township zone (KTA-R8)	Accept in part
S179.018	Russell Protection Society (INC)	KRT-R8	Support in part	KRT-R* is supported, however these is an outstanding need to define what a minor residential unit is in terms of scale. it is suggested that 45m2 is an appropriate scale for a minor unit, provided that it satisfies that impermeable surface control for the site	Amend KRT-R8 to include 45m2 as an appropriate scale for a minor unit		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS23.017	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support in part	It is important to provide minor residential units to enable intergenerational living so provision for such units is supported. However, 45m2 is too small to accommodate more than one person. Provision for up to 65m2 is more appropriate and aligns with provision made in the Auckland Unitary Plan.	Allow in part	amend provision KRT-R8 to provide for minor residential units but increase the size to up to 65m2.	Accept
S431.013	John Andrew Riddell	KRT-R8	Not Stated	<p>A bespoke zone, rather than the General Residential zone proposed in earlier drafts of the proposed Plan, reflects the importance of the town as an early contact town, the character of the town, and the limitations on the capacity of wastewater infrastructure.</p> <p>This bespoke zoning has evolved over many years, based on archeological, historic and architectural studies in the 1970s, 1980s, 1990s and 2000s. Important components of these reports and studies and guidelines have not been adequately recognised and used to inform the zone's objectives, policies, rules and performance standards. The Council has a very useful Kororāreka/Russell Design Guideline that it does not refer to in the proposed Plan.</p> <p>The bespoke zoning is further supported by Environment Court decisions, including a decision on an appeal that introduced what is called 'The Russell Township Basin and Gateway Area' in the operative Far North District Plan ("the operative Plan"). This decision has been departed from in the proposed Plan, resulting in more onerous provisions in the proposed Plan than are necessary to protect the character and values.</p>	<p>Insert two further matters of discretion EITHER:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to restricted discretionary rules KRT-R1 new buildings or structures and extensions to existing buildings or structures, KRT-R2 impermeable surface coverage, KRT-R3, residential activity and KRT-R8 minor residential unit; OR • to standards KRT-S1 maximum height, KRT-S2 height in relation to boundary, KRT-S3 setback, KRT-S4 setback from MHWS, KRTS5 building or structure coverage, KRT-S6 outdoor living space, KRT-S7 fencing and boundary walls, KRT-S8 outdoor storage <p>as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the extent of building area and the scale of the building and the extent to which they are compatible with both the built and natural environments in the vicinity; • consistency with the Kororāreka/Russell Design Guidelines 		Accept in part.
FS23.115	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Oppose	<p>It is inappropriate to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - require compliance with design guidelines in the plan, given it would stymie the ability to adopt future best practice methods. - require avoidance of effects on all 	Disallow	Disallow the relief sought.	Accept in part.

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				indigenous biodiversity rather than just significant indigenous biodiversity as per the higher order policy documents. - constrain development to areas that are able to be serviced by infrastructure, given the constraints in Kororāreka in connecting to public services. The opportunity should remain to allow onsite servicing			
FS332.013	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 in part.
S179.019	Russell Protection Society (INC)	KRT-R9	Oppose	The Provision for KRT-R(in setting a limit of six occupants, may be unworkable given the usual size of such villages. This may be an activity more appropriately located in the Mixed Use zone or, alternatively the permitted capacity may have to be increased	Amend KRT-R9 to increase the permitted capacity (inferred)		Reject
FS23.018	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	It is important to provide standards to guide the layout and anticipated development on the site. Standards generally appear appropriate.	Allow	allow original submission	Reject
S179.020	Russell Protection Society (INC)	KRT-R10	Support		Retain KRT - R10		Accept
FS23.019	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	It is important to provide standards to guide the layout and anticipated development on the site. Standards generally appear appropriate.	Allow	allow original submission	Accept
S179.021	Russell Protection Society (INC)	KRT-R11	Support		Retain KRT-R11		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS23.020	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	It is important to provide standards to guide the layout and anticipated development on the site. Standards generally appear appropriate.	Allow	allow original submission	Accept
S179.022	Russell Protection Society (INC)	KRT-R12	Support		Retain KRT-R12		Accept
FS23.021	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	It is important to provide standards to guide the layout and anticipated development on the site. Standards generally appear appropriate.	Allow	allow original submission	Accept
S179.023	Russell Protection Society (INC)	KRT-R13	Support		Retain KRT-R13		Accept
FS23.022	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	It is important to provide standards to guide the layout and anticipated development on the site. Standards generally appear appropriate.	Allow	allow original submission	Accept
S179.024	Russell Protection Society (INC)	KRT-R14	Support		Retain KRT-R14		Accept
FS23.023	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	It is important to provide standards to guide the layout and anticipated development on the site. Standards generally appear appropriate.	Allow	allow original submission	Accept
S179.025	Russell Protection Society (INC)	KRT-R15	Support		Retain KRT-R15		Accept
FS23.024	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	It is important to provide standards to guide the layout and anticipated development on the site. Standards generally appear appropriate.	Allow	allow original submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S179.026	Russell Protection Society (INC)	KRT-R16	Support		Retain KRT-R16		Accept
FS23.025	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	It is important to provide standards to guide the layout and anticipated development on the site. Standards generally appear appropriate.	Allow	allow original submission	Accept
S179.027	Russell Protection Society (INC)	KRT-R17	Support		Retain KRT-R17		Accept
FS23.026	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	It is important to provide standards to guide the layout and anticipated development on the site. Standards generally appear appropriate.	Allow	allow original submission	Accept
S179.028	Russell Protection Society (INC)	KRT-R18	Support		Retain KRT-R18		Accept
FS23.027	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	It is important to provide standards to guide the layout and anticipated development on the site. Standards generally appear appropriate.	Allow	allow original submission	Accept
S179.029	Russell Protection Society (INC)	KRT-R19	Support		Retain KRT-R19		Accept
FS23.028	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	It is important to provide standards to guide the layout and anticipated development on the site. Standards generally appear appropriate.	Allow	allow original submission	Accept
S179.030	Russell Protection Society (INC)	KRT-R20	Support		Retain KRT-R20		Accept
FS23.029	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	It is important to provide standards to guide the layout and anticipated development on the site.	Allow	allow original submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Standards generally appear appropriate.		
S179.031	Russell Protection Society (INC)	KRT-S1	Support		Retain KRT-S1	Accept in part
S427.070	Kapiro Residents Association	KRT-S1	Support in part	<p>We agree that multi-unit developments such as terraced housing and low rise apartment blocks can contribute to the greater vibrancy of Kerikeri, and allow for the construction of a greater variety of housing types and sizes. However, one of our concerns is that the rules around outdoor space are inadequate, and there is a danger that in the drive for higher density, the planning rules will not achieve the overall goal of protecting what is valued by the community. We believe that intensification in urban zones should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings (e.g. apartment blocks) with permeable areas including garden/landscaped ground.</p> <p>In too many multi-unit developments in other districts, the only outdoor space is the concrete used to move and park cars. Especially where these developments take place alongside each other the importance of outdoor space increases. Outdoor spaces provide the opportunity for people to connect, to create a sense of community. When designed well, working within well designed rules, multi-unit developments could enhance the sense of community with Kerikeri and become a real asset.</p>	<p>Amend the PDP provisions for multi-unit developments to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> include requirements for outdoor space beyond the area needed to move and park vehicles private, including private and shared outdoor space on the north, east or west side of a building where multi-unit developments take place alongside each other, the rules for shared 'greenspace' reflects the greater density and the need for places for people to share and connect, pedestrian walkways and access to community facilities and amenities. 	Accept in part
S431.014	John Andrew Riddell	KRT-S1	Not Stated	<p>A bespoke zone, rather than the General Residential zone proposed in earlier drafts of the proposed Plan, reflects the importance of the town as an early contact town, the character of the town, and the limitations on the capacity of wastewater infrastructure.</p> <p>This bespoke zoning has evolved over many years, based on archeological, historic and architectural studies in the 1970s, 1980s, 1990s and 2000s. Important components of these reports and studies and guidelines have not been adequately recognised and used to inform the zone's objectives, policies, rules and performance standards. The Council has a</p>	<p>Insert two further matters of discretion EITHER:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> to restricted discretionary rules KRT-R1 new buildings or structures and extensions to existing buildings or structures, KRT-R2 impermeable surface coverage, KRT-R3, residential activity and KRT-R8 minor residential unit; OR to standards KRT-S1 maximum height, KRT-S2 height in relation to boundary, KRT-S3 setback, KRT-S4 setback from MHWS, KRTS5 building 	Accept in part.

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				very useful Kororāreka/Russell Design Guideline that it does not refer to in the proposed Plan. The bespoke zoning is further supported by Environment Court decisions, including a decision on an appeal that introduced what is called 'The Russell Township Basin and Gateway Area' in the operative Far North District Plan ("the operative Plan"). This decision has been departed from in the proposed Plan, resulting in more onerous provisions in the proposed Plan than are necessary to protect the character and values.	or structure coverage, KRT-S6 outdoor living space, KRT-S7 fencing and boundary walls, KRT-S8 outdoor storage as follows:		
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the extent of building area and the scale of the building and the extent to which they are compatible with both the built and natural environments in the vicinity; consistency with the Kororāreka/Russell Design Guidelines 		
FS23.116	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Oppose	It is inappropriate to: - require compliance with design guidelines in the plan, given it would stymie the ability to adopt future best practice methods. - require avoidance of effects on all indigenous biodiversity rather than just significant indigenous biodiversity as per the higher order policy documents. - constrain development to areas that are able to be serviced by infrastructure, given the constraints in Kororāreka in connecting to public services. The opportunity should remain to allow onsite servicing.	Disallow	Disallow the relief sought.	Accept in part.
FS332.014	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 in part.
S338.070	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	KRT-S1	Not Stated	We agree that multi-unit developments such as terraced housing and low rise apartment blocks can contribute to the greater vibrancy of Kerikeri, and allow for the construction of a greater variety of housing types and sizes. However, one of our concerns is that the rules around outdoor space are inadequate, and there is a danger that in the drive for	Amend the PDP provisions for multi-unit developments to:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> include requirements for outdoor space beyond the area needed to move and park vehicles private, including private and shared outdoor 	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>higher density, the planning rules will not achieve the overall goal of protecting what is valued by the community. We believe that intensification in urban zones should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings (e.g. apartment blocks) with permeable areas including garden/landscaped ground.</p> <p>In too many multi-unit developments in other districts, the only outdoor space is the concrete used to move and park cars. Especially where these developments take place alongside each other the importance of outdoor space increases. Outdoor spaces provide the opportunity for people to connect, to create a sense of community. When designed well, working within well designed rules, multi-unit developments could enhance the sense of community with Kerikeri and become a real asset.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> space on the north, east or west side of a building where multi-unit developments take place alongside each other, the rules for shared 'greenspace' reflects the greater density and the need for places for people to share and connect, pedestrian walkways and access to community facilities and amenities. 		
FS570.1007	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.1021	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.1043	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S529.194	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	KRT-S1	Support in part	<p>We agree that multi-unit developments such as terraced housing and low rise apartment blocks can contribute to the greater vibrancy of Kerikeri, and allow for the construction of a greater variety of housing types and sizes. However, one of our concerns is that the rules around outdoor space are inadequate, and there is a danger that in the drive for higher density, the planning rules will not achieve the overall goal of protecting what is valued by the community. We believe that intensification in urban zones should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings (e.g. apartment blocks) with permeable areas including garden/landscaped ground.</p> <p>In too many multi-unit developments in other districts, the only outdoor space is the concrete used to move and park cars. Especially where these developments take place alongside each other the importance of</p>	<p>Amend the PDP provisions for multi-unit developments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> include requirements for outdoor space beyond the area needed to move and park vehicles private, including private and shared outdoor space on the north, east or west side of a building where multi-unit developments take place alongside each other, the rules for shared 'greenspace' reflects the greater density and the need for places for people to share and connect, pedestrian walkways and access to community facilities and amenities. 		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				outdoor space increases. Outdoor spaces provide the opportunity for people to connect, to create a sense of community. When designed well, working within well designed rules, multi-unit developments could enhance the sense of community with Kerikeri and become a real asset.			
FS570.2081	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.2095	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.2117	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S522.054	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	KRT-S1	Support in part	<p>We agree that multi-unit developments such as terraced housing and low rise apartment blocks can contribute to the greater vibrancy of Kerikeri, and allow for the construction of a greater variety of housing types and sizes. However, one of our concerns is that the rules around outdoor space are inadequate, and there is a danger that in the drive for higher density, the planning rules will not achieve the overall goal of protecting what is valued by the community. We believe that intensification in urban zones should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings (e.g. apartment blocks) with permeable areas including garden/landscaped ground.</p> <p>In too many multi-unit developments in other districts, the only outdoor space is the concrete used to move and park cars. Especially where these developments take place alongside each other the importance of outdoor space increases. Outdoor spaces provide the opportunity for people to connect, to create a sense of community. When designed well, working within well designed rules, multi-unit developments could enhance the sense of community with Kerikeri and become a real asset.</p>	Amend the PDP provisions for multi-unit developments to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> include requirements for outdoor space beyond the area needed to move and park vehicles private, including private and shared outdoor space on the north, east or west side of a building where multi-unit developments take place alongside each other, the rules for shared 'greenspace' reflects the greater density and the need for places for people to share and connect, pedestrian walkways and access to community facilities and amenities. 		Reject
FS566.1793	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S179.032	Russell Protection Society (INC)	KRT-S2	Support		Retain KRT-S2		Accept
S431.196	John Andrew Riddell	KRT-S2	Not Stated	Not stated	Retain the approach varying the required height to boundary depending on the orientation of the relevant boundary.		Accept
S431.015	John Andrew Riddell	KRT-S2	Not Stated	<p>A bespoke zone, rather than the General Residential zone proposed in earlier drafts of the proposed Plan, reflects the importance of the town as an early contact town, the character of the town, and the limitations on the capacity of wastewater infrastructure.</p> <p>This bespoke zoning has evolved over many years, based on archeological, historic and architectural studies in the 1970s, 1980s, 1990s and 2000s. Important components of these reports and studies and guidelines have not been adequately recognised and used to inform the zone's objectives, policies, rules and performance standards. The Council has a very useful Kororāreka/Russell Design Guideline that it does not refer to in the proposed Plan.</p> <p>The bespoke zoning is further supported by Environment Court decisions, including a decision on an appeal that introduced what is called 'The Russell Township Basin and Gateway Area' in the operative Far North District Plan ("the operative Plan"). This decision has been departed from in the proposed Plan, resulting in more onerous provisions in the proposed Plan than are necessary to protect the character and values.</p>	<p>Insert two further matters of discretion EITHER:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> to restricted discretionary rules KRT-R1 new buildings or structures and extensions to existing buildings or structures, KRT-R2 impermeable surface coverage, KRT-R3, residential activity and KRT-R8 minor residential unit; OR to standards KRT-S1 maximum height, KRT-S2 height in relation to boundary, KRT-S3 setback, KRT-S4 setback from MHWS, KRTS5 building or structure coverage, KRT-S6 outdoor living space, KRT-S7 fencing and boundary walls, KRT-S8 outdoor storage <p>as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the extent of building area and the scale of the building and the extent to which they are compatible with both the built and natural environments in the vicinity; consistency with the Kororāreka/Russell Design Guidelines 	Accept in part.	
FS23.117	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Oppose	<p>It is inappropriate to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - require compliance with design guidelines in the plan, given it would stymie the ability to adopt future best practice methods. - require avoidance of effects on all indigenous biodiversity rather than just significant indigenous 	Disallow	Disallow the relief sought.	Accept in part.

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				biodiversity as per the higher order policy documents. - constrain development to areas that are able to be serviced by infrastructure, given the constraints in Kororāreka in connecting to public services. The opportunity should remain to allow onsite servicing.			
FS332.015	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 in part.
S179.033	Russell Protection Society (INC)	KRT-S3	Support		Retain KRT-S3		Accept
S512.088	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	KRT-S3	Support in part	Setbacks play a role in reducing spread of fire as well as ensuring Fire and Emergency personnel can get to a fire source or other emergency. An advice note is recommended to raise to plan users (e.g. developers) early on in the resource consent process that there is further control of building setbacks and firefighting access through the New Zealand Building Code (NZBC).	Insert advice noteto setback standard Building setback requirements are further controlled by the Building Code. This includes the provision for firefighter access to buildings and egress from buildings. Planusers should refer to the applicable controls within the Building Code to ensure compliance can be achieved at the building consent stage. Issuance of a resource consent does not imply that waivers of Building Code requirements will be considered/granted		Accept in part
S431.016	John Andrew Riddell	KRT-S3	Not Stated	A bespoke zone, rather than the General Residential zone proposed in earlier drafts of the proposed Plan, reflects the importance of the town as an early contact town, the character of the town, and the limitations on the capacity of wastewater infrastructure. This bespoke zoning has evolved over many years, based on archeological, historic and architectural studies in the 1970s, 1980s, 1990s and 2000s. Important components of these reports and studies and guidelines have not been adequately recognised and used to inform the zone's objectives, policies, rules and performance standards. The Council has a very useful Kororāreka/Russell Design Guideline that	Insert two further matters of discretion EITHER: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> to restricted discretionary rules KRT-R1 new buildings or structures and extensions to existing buildings or structures, KRT-R2 impermeable surface coverage, KRT-R3, residential activity and KRT-R8 minor residential unit; OR to standards KRT-S1 maximum height, KRT-S2 height in relation to boundary, KRT-S3 setback, KRT-S4 setback from MHWS, KRTS5 building 		Accept in part.

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>it does not refer to in the proposed Plan. The bespoke zoning is further supported by Environment Court decisions, including a decision on an appeal that introduced what is called 'The Russell Township Basin and Gateway Area' in the operative Far North District Plan ("the operative Plan"). This decision has been departed from in the proposed Plan, resulting in more onerous provisions in the proposed Plan than are necessary to protect the character and values.</p>	<p>or structure coverage, KRT-S6 outdoor living space, KRT-S7 fencing and boundary walls, KRT-S8 outdoor storage</p> <p>as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the extent of building area and the scale of the building and the extent to which they are compatible with both the built and natural environments in the vicinity; • consistency with the Kororāreka/Russell Design Guidelines 		
FS23.118	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Oppose	<p>It is inappropriate to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - require compliance with design guidelines in the plan, given it would stymie the ability to adopt future best practice methods. - require avoidance of effects on all indigenous biodiversity rather than just significant indigenous biodiversity as per the higher order policy documents. - constrain development to areas that are able to be serviced by infrastructure, given the constraints in Kororāreka in connecting to public services. The opportunity should remain to allow onsite servicing 	Disallow	Disallow the relief sought.	Accept in part.
FS332.016	Russell Protection Society		Support	<p>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.</p>	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part.
S179.035	Russell Protection Society (INC)	KRT-S5	Support		Retain KRT-S5		Accept in part
S431.018	John Andrew Riddell	KRT-S5	Not Stated	<p>A bespoke zone, rather than the General Residential zone proposed in earlier drafts of the proposed Plan, reflects the importance of the town as an early contact town, the character of the town, and the</p>	<p>Insert two further matters of discretion EITHER:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to restricted discretionary rules KRT-R1 new buildings or structures and 		Accept in part.

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>limitations on the capacity of wastewater infrastructure.</p> <p>This bespoke zoning has evolved over many years, based on archeological, historic and architectural studies in the 1970s, 1980s, 1990s and 2000s. Important components of these reports and studies and guidelines have not been adequately recognised and used to inform the zone's objectives, policies, rules and performance standards. The Council has a very useful Kororāreka/Russell Design Guideline that it does not refer to in the proposed Plan.</p> <p>The bespoke zoning is further supported by Environment Court decisions, including a decision on an appeal that introduced what is called 'The Russell Township Basin and Gateway Area' in the operative Far North District Plan ("the operative Plan").</p> <p>This decision has been departed from in the proposed Plan, resulting in more onerous provisions in the proposed Plan than are necessary to protect the character and values.</p>	<p>extensions to existing buildings or structures, KRT-R2 impermeable surface coverage, KRT-R3, residential activity and KRT-R8 minor residential unit; OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to standards KRT-S1 maximum height, KRT-S2 height in relation to boundary, KRT-S3 setback, KRT-S4 setback from MHWS, KRTS5 building or structure coverage, KRT-S6 outdoor living space, KRT-S7 fencing and boundary walls, KRT-S8 outdoor storage <p>as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the extent of building area and the scale of the building and the extent to which they are compatible with both the built and natural environments in the vicinity; • consistency with the Kororāreka/Russell Design Guidelines 		
<p>FS23.120</p>	<p>Des and Lorraine Morrison</p>		<p>Oppose</p>	<p>It is inappropriate to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - require compliance with design guidelines in the plan, given it would stymie the ability to adopt future best practice methods. - require avoidance of effects on all indigenous biodiversity rather than just significant indigenous biodiversity as per the higher order policy documents. - constrain development to areas that are able to be serviced by infrastructure, given the constraints in Kororāreka in connecting to public services. The opportunity should remain to allow onsite servicing. 	<p>Disallow</p>	<p>Disallow the relief sought.</p>	<p>Accept in part.</p>
<p>FS332.018</p>	<p>Russell Protection Society</p>		<p>Support</p>	<p>The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that</p>	<p>Allow</p>	<p>Allow the original submission.</p>	<p>Accept in part.</p>

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.			
S431.024	John Andrew Riddell	KRT-S5	Not Stated	The proposed Plan's objectives, policies, rules and standards do not ensure adequate recognition and protection of the historic heritage and character and amenity of Kororāreka/Russell.	Amend standard KRT-S5, building or structure coverage by limiting the restriction to net ground floor area, amending the standard as follows: The maximum combined net ground floor area of all buildings or structures on the site is no more than 20% of the net site area.		Accept in part
FS332.024	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 in part
S179.036	Russell Protection Society (INC)	KRT-S6	Support		Retain KRT-S6		Accept
S431.019	John Andrew Riddell	KRT-S6	Not Stated	<p>A bespoke zone, rather than the General Residential zone proposed in earlier drafts of the proposed Plan, reflects the importance of the town as an early contact town, the character of the town, and the limitations on the capacity of wastewater infrastructure.</p> <p>This bespoke zoning has evolved over many years, based on archeological, historic and architectural studies in the 1970s, 1980s, 1990s and 2000s. Important components of these reports and studies and guidelines have not been adequately recognised and used to inform the zone's objectives, policies, rules and performance standards. The Council has a very useful Kororāreka/Russell Design Guideline that it does not refer to in the proposed Plan.</p> <p>The bespoke zoning is further supported by Environment Court decisions, including a decision on an appeal that introduced what is called 'The Russell Township Basin and Gateway Area' in the operative Far North District Plan ("the operative Plan"). This decision has been departed from in the proposed Plan, resulting in more onerous provisions in the proposed Plan than are necessary to protect the character and values.</p>	<p>Insert two further matters of discretion EITHER:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> to restricted discretionary rules KRT-R1 new buildings or structures and extensions to existing buildings or structures, KRT-R2 impermeable surface coverage, KRT-R3, residential activity and KRT-R8 minor residential unit; OR to standards KRT-S1 maximum height, KRT-S2 height in relation to boundary, KRT-S3 setback, KRT-S4 setback from MHWS, KRTS5 building or structure coverage, KRT-S6 outdoor living space, KRT-S7 fencing and boundary walls, KRT-S8 outdoor storage <p>as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the extent of building area and the scale of the building and the extent to which they are compatible with both the built and natural environments in the vicinity; 		Accept in part.

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> consistency with the Kororāreka/Russell Design Guidelines 		
FS23.121	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Oppose	<p>It is inappropriate to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> require compliance with design guidelines in the plan, given it would stymie the ability to adopt future best practice methods. require avoidance of effects on all indigenous biodiversity rather than just significant indigenous biodiversity as per the higher order policy documents. constrain development to areas that are able to be serviced by infrastructure, given the constraints in Kororāreka in connecting to public services. The opportunity should remain to allow onsite servicing. 	Disallow	Disallow the relief sought.	Accept in part.
FS332.019	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 in part.
S179.037	Russell Protection Society (INC)	KRT-S7	Support		Retain KRT-S7		Accept
S431.020	John Andrew Riddell	KRT-S7	Not Stated	<p>A bespoke zone, rather than the General Residential zone proposed in earlier drafts of the proposed Plan, reflects the importance of the town as an early contact town, the character of the town, and the limitations on the capacity of wastewater infrastructure.</p> <p>This bespoke zoning has evolved over many years, based on archeological, historic and architectural studies in the 1970s, 1980s, 1990s and 2000s. Important components of these reports and studies and guidelines have not been adequately recognised and used to inform the zone's objectives, policies, rules and performance standards. The Council has a very useful Kororāreka/Russell Design Guideline that it does not refer to in the proposed Plan.</p>	Insert two further matters of discretion EITHER: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> to restricted discretionary rules KRT-R1 new buildings or structures and extensions to existing buildings or structures, KRT-R2 impermeable surface coverage, KRT-R3, residential activity and KRT-R8 minor residential unit; OR to standards KRT-S1 maximum height, KRT-S2 height in relation to boundary, KRT-S3 setback, KRT-S4 setback from MHWS, KRTS5 building or structure coverage, KRT-S6 outdoor living space, KRT-S7 fencing 		Accept in part.

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				The bespoke zoning is further supported by Environment Court decisions, including a decision on an appeal that introduced what is called 'The Russell Township Basin and Gateway Area' in the operative Far North District Plan ("the operative Plan"). This decision has been departed from in the proposed Plan, resulting in more onerous provisions in the proposed Plan than are necessary to protect the character and values.	and boundary walls, KRT-S8 outdoor storage as follows:		
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the extent of building area and the scale of the building and the extent to which they are compatible with both the built and natural environments in the vicinity; consistency with the Kororāreka/Russell Design Guidelines 		
FS23.122	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Oppose	It is inappropriate to: - require compliance with design guidelines in the plan, given it would stymie the ability to adopt future best practice methods. - require avoidance of effects on all indigenous biodiversity rather than just significant indigenous biodiversity as per the higher order policy documents. - constrain development to areas that are able to be serviced by infrastructure, given the constraints in Kororāreka in connecting to public services. The opportunity should remain to allow onsite servicing.	Disallow	Disallow the relief sought.	Accept in part.
FS332.020	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 in part.
S179.038	Russell Protection Society (INC)	KRT-S8	Support		Retain KRT-S8		Accept
S431.021	John Andrew Riddell	KRT-S8	Not Stated	A bespoke zone, rather than the General Residential zone proposed in earlier drafts of the proposed Plan, reflects the importance of the town as an early contact town, the character of the town, and the limitations on the capacity of wastewater infrastructure.	Insert two further matters of discretion EITHER:		Accept in part.
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> to restricted discretionary rules KRT-R1 new buildings or structures and extensions to existing buildings or structures, KRT-R2 impermeable 		

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>This bespoke zoning has evolved over many years, based on archeological, historic and architectural studies in the 1970s, 1980s, 1990s and 2000s. Important components of these reports and studies and guidelines have not been adequately recognised and used to inform the zone's objectives, policies, rules and performance standards. The Council has a very useful Kororāreka/Russell Design Guideline that it does not refer to in the proposed Plan. The bespoke zoning is further supported by Environment Court decisions, including a decision on an appeal that introduced what is called 'The Russell Township Basin and Gateway Area' in the operative Far North District Plan ("the operative Plan"). This decision has been departed from in the proposed Plan, resulting in more onerous provisions in the proposed Plan than are necessary to protect the character and values.</p>	<p>surface coverage, KRT-R3, residential activity and KRT-R8 minor residential unit; OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> to standards KRT-S1 maximum height, KRT-S2 height in relation to boundary, KRT-S3 setback, KRT-S4 setback from MHWS, KRTS5 building or structure coverage, KRT-S6 outdoor living space, KRT-S7 fencing and boundary walls, KRT-S8 outdoor storage <p>as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the extent of building area and the scale of the building and the extent to which they are compatible with both the built and natural environments in the vicinity; consistency with the Kororāreka/Russell Design Guidelines 		
<p>FS23.123</p>	<p>Des and Lorraine Morrison</p>		<p>Oppose</p>	<p>It is inappropriate to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - require compliance with design guidelines in the plan, given it would stymie the ability to adopt future best practice methods. - require avoidance of effects on all indigenous biodiversity rather than just significant indigenous biodiversity as per the higher order policy documents. - constrain development to areas that are able to be serviced by infrastructure, given the constraints in Kororāreka in connecting to public services. The opportunity should remain to allow onsite servicing 	<p>Disallow</p>	<p>Disallow the relief sought.</p>	<p>Accept in part.</p>
<p>FS332.021</p>	<p>Russell Protection Society</p>		<p>Support</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>Allow</p>	<p>Allow the original submission.</p>	<p>Accept in part.</p>

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S179.039	Russell Protection Society (INC)	KRT-S9	Support		Retain KRT-S9		Accept
S409.017	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Kororāreka Russell Township Zone	Support	The Proposed Plan is required to recognise and provide for the matters of national importance, in particular 6(f) "the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use and development" and s6(e) "the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga." HNZPT considers that the hybrid-plan format of the Proposed Plan, that includes: the identification of historic heritage; heritage area overlays; Kororareka Russell Township Zone and Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori issues (Overview), objectives, policies and rules each within a Section of the plan, is of assistance to the reader in understanding the background and reasons for the rules.	Retain the spatial map layers for Kororareka Russell Township Marae		Accept
FS570.1192	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
FS400.047	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Oppose	The submission seeks additional sites / areas to be within the Heritage Overlay. The Further Submitter's original submission sought amendments to the overlay and reversion back to the Paihia Mission Heritage Area and associated provisions	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Reject
FS566.1206	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
FS569.1228	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