



Kaipara te Orangahui • Two Oceans Two Harbours

Submission on Proposed Kaipara District Plan

Form 5 Submission on publically notified proposal for policy statement or plan, change or variation

Clause 6 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991

To: Kaipara District Council - District Plan Review

Date received: 30/06/2025

Submission Reference Number #:105

This is a submission on the following proposed plan (the **proposal**): Proposed Kaipara District Plan

Submitter:

Joanne Floyd

Contact person and address for service:

Joanne Floyd
Dargaville Residents and Ratepayers Association
175 Victoria Street Dargaville Dargaville 0310
New Zealand

Electronic address for service: jo.floyd@xtra.co.nz

I wish to be heard: Yes

I am willing to present a joint case: Yes

Could you gain an advantage in trade competition in making this submission?

- **No**

If you have answered yes to the above question, are you directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:

(a) adversely affects the environment; and

(b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition

- **No**

Submission points

Point 105.1

Section: Infrastructure

Sub-section: Three waters infrastructure

Provision:

- INF-P17** Where the level of service of the [reticulated](#) water supply, [reticulated wastewater](#) and [stormwater](#) management networks is insufficient to service the development proposed, only allow use and development when it can be demonstrated that:
1. It incorporates measures that appropriately mitigate any adverse [effects](#) on [Council's water](#), [wastewater](#) and [stormwater](#) network; and
 2. The additional demand generated can be accommodated by the [Council's water](#), [wastewater](#) and [stormwater](#) network, without resulting in increased flood risk, increased [wastewater](#) overflows or reduced pressure in the [reticulated water](#) network.

Support / Amend / Oppose: Amend

Submission:

Point 2 should include additional demand generated can be accommodated within consent compliance limits with regional consents.

Where the level of service of the [reticulated](#) water supply, [reticulatedwastewater](#) and [stormwater](#) management networks is insufficient to service the development proposed, only allow use and development when it can be demonstrated that:

- INF-P17**
1. It incorporates measures that appropriately mitigate any adverse [effects](#) on [Council'swater](#), [wastewater](#) and [stormwater](#) network; and
 2. The additional demand generated can be accommodated by the [Council'swater](#), [wastewater](#) and [stormwater](#) network, without resulting in increased flood risk, increased [wastewater](#) overflows or reduced pressure in the [reticulatedwater](#) network. A

Where the level of service of the [reticulated](#) water supply, [reticulatedwastewater](#) and [stormwater](#) management networks is insufficient to service the development proposed, only allow use and development when it can be demonstrated that:

- INF-P17**
1. It incorporates measures that appropriately mitigate any adverse [effects](#) on [Council'swater](#), [wastewater](#) and [stormwater](#) network; and
 2. The additional demand generated can be accommodated by the [Council'swater](#), [wastewater](#) and [stormwater](#) network, without resulting in increased flood risk, increased [wastewater](#) overflows or reduced pressure in the [reticulatedwater](#) network.

Where the level of service of the [reticulated](#) water supply, [reticulatedwastewater](#) and [stormwater](#) management networks is insufficient to service the development proposed, only allow use and development when it can be demonstrated that:

- INF-P17**
1. It incorporates measures that appropriately mitigate any adverse [effects](#) on [Council'swater](#), [wastewater](#) and [stormwater](#) network; and
 2. The additional demand generated can be accommodated by the [Council'swater](#), [wastewater](#) and [stormwater](#) network, without resulting in increased flood risk, increased [wastewater](#) overflows or reduced pressure in the [reticulatedwater](#) network.

Relief sought

Point 2 should include additional demand generated can be accommodated within consent compliance limits with regional consents.

Point 105.2

Section: Subdivision

Sub-section: Rules

Provision:

SUB-R3	Subdivision to create new allotments
---------------	---

Support / Amend / Oppose: Amend

Submission:

SUB-R3 Subdivision to create new allotments

Relief sought

In my view, this rule is not restrictive enough as it does not deal with capacity of infrastructure sufficiently – i.e. if there is no capacity, then the subdivision cannot be declined.

I note that there is provision under the contributions policies to require contribution towards upgrading, however this may be impractical to achieve.

The development could trigger effects that result in non-compliance with regional consents and have actual adverse effects.

Point 105.3

Section: Transport

Sub-section: Rules

Provision:

TRAN-R2	Construction of new transport network
----------------	--

Support / Amend / Oppose: Amend

Submission:

Council is leaning heavily on the 2011 engineering standard. Why is Council restricting the engineering standard to a 2011 standard? Doesn't this mean that Council is stuck with a standard that doesn't allow for improvement?

For TRAN-R4 Vehicle Access – there is no mention of a vehicle crossing permit being required when the status of the activity is permitted.

Relief sought

Council is leaning heavily on the 2011 engineering standard. Why is Council restricting the engineering standard to a 2011 standard? Doesn't this mean that Council is stuck with a standard that doesn't allow for improvement?

For TRAN-R4 Vehicle Access – there is no mention of a vehicle crossing permit being required when the status of the activity is permitted.