

## Further Submission on Proposed Kaipara District Plan

*Clauses 8 and 8A of First Schedule, Resource Management Act 1991*

**To:** Kaipara District Council  
**Address:** District Plan Team, Kaipara District Council  
Private Bag 1001  
Dargaville 0340  
**Email:** [districtplanreview@kaipara.govt.nz](mailto:districtplanreview@kaipara.govt.nz)

**Submitter:** New Zealand Defence Force  
**Contact Person:** Rebecca Davies, Principal Statutory Planner  
**Address for Service:** New Zealand Defence Force  
C/- Tonkin + Taylor  
PO Box 9544  
Hamilton 3204  
Attention: Alia Cederman

**Phone:** +64 21 445 482  
**Email:** [rebecca.davies@nzdf.mil.nz](mailto:rebecca.davies@nzdf.mil.nz) / [acederman@tonkintaylor.co.nz](mailto:acederman@tonkintaylor.co.nz)

The New Zealand Defence Force (NZDF) is a submitter on the Proposed Kaipara District Plan. This is a further submission by NZDF on the Proposed Kaipara District Plan. A detailed further submission is attached.

NZDF represents a relevant aspect of the public interest. Statutory Defence purposes under Section 5 of the Defence Act 1990 include the defence of New Zealand, the protection of the interests of New Zealand, the provision of assistance to the civil power either in New Zealand or elsewhere in times of emergency, and the provision of any public service. NZDF therefore has an interest in the Kaipara District Plan that is greater than the interest the general public has.

NZDF has military interests throughout New Zealand. While NZDF does not currently operate any facilities within Kaipara District, the Kaipara Air Weapons Range is located nearby. NZDF may undertake temporary military training activities (TMTA) in the district. NZDF undertakes TMTA across the country as an essential part of maintaining operational capability in order for it to continue to meet statutory Defence purposes, and to provide for the nation's security, and the well-being, health and safety of communities.

NZDF **does** wish to be heard in support of its further submission.

If others make a similar further submission, NZDF will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing.

A copy of this further submission has been sent to each person who made the original submission.

R Davies

Date 15/12/2025

Person authorised to sign on behalf of New Zealand Defence Force

## Further submission points

Deletions are marked with ~~strike through~~ and additions with underline

	Name of original submitter	Submission point	Support/ Oppose	Plan provision / Section	Summary of submission	Reasons for supporting or opposing	Decision sought by NZDF
FS84.1 to FS84.11	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated	149.37 – 149.47	Oppose	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter	The submitter's overarching submission points seek new objectives and related policies to be added to the Proposed District Plan in order to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity. The submitter also seeks a number of rule amendments and additions in this chapter to give effect to the key provisions of the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity.	NZDF does not oppose provisions that give effect to the key provisions of the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity. However, NZDF considers that these provisions should allow for activities to be permitted within limits and not include blanket restrictions on sites or overlays. Restrictions should be proportionate to effects.	Reject the submission point in full, or allow in part, by ensuring the provisions do not include broad blanket restrictions, but allow for necessary activities within limits.
FS84.12 to FS84.20	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated	149.87 – 149.95	Oppose	Earthworks chapter	The submitter seeks to amend or add clauses to include recognition that earthwork activities have the potential to adversely affect natural environment values including indigenous biodiversity.	NZDF does not oppose provisions recognising that earthwork activities have the potential to adversely affect natural environment values. However, NZDF does not consider it necessary or appropriate to have a blanket restriction on earthworks on sites and within overlays containing indigenous biodiversity, particularly when the activity may not have effects on indigenous biodiversity. Restrictions should be proportionate to effects.	Reject the submission point in full or allow in part by ensuring the provisions do not include broad blanket restrictions but allow for necessary activities within limits.

	<b>Name of original submitter</b>	<b>Submission point</b>	<b>Support/ Oppose</b>	<b>Plan provision / Section</b>	<b>Summary of submission</b>	<b>Reasons for supporting or opposing</b>	<b>Decision sought by NZDF</b>
<b>FS84.21</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated	149.104	Oppose	Temporary Activities chapter overview text	The submitter seeks to amend the overview text to include recognition that temporary activities have the potential to adversely affect natural environment values including indigenous biodiversity.	As per point 1 above the Rules table in the Temporary Activities chapter, other Part-2 District-wide matters apply to temporary activities. NZDF considers the appropriate place to include provisions addressing adverse effects on natural environment values and indigenous biodiversity is in the chapters contained in the Natural Environment Values subsection.	Reject the submission point in full or allow in part by acknowledging some temporary activities can have effects on the natural environment and that these effects are addressed through the application of other district-wide matters chapters.
<b>FS84.22</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated	149.105	Oppose	Objective TEMP-O2.1	The submitter seeks to amend TEMP-O2.1. to include natural environment values.	NZDF considers the appropriate place to include provisions addressing adverse effects on natural environment values and indigenous biodiversity is in the chapters contained in the Natural Environment Values subsection.	Reject the submission point in full.
<b>FS84.23</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated	149.106	Oppose	Rule TEMP-R2	The submitter is concerned the Temporary Activity provisions do not reflect the adverse effects temporary activities can have on natural environment values and indigenous biodiversity and seeks to delete the “enabling standard of ancillary building and structures” from TEMP-R2.	Rule TEMP-R2 relates to temporary military training activities. Standard TEMP-R2(b) requires that any ancillary building or structure is removed within seven days of the activity being completed. NZDF must undertake training in order to fulfil its statutory purposes under the Defence Act 1990. At times this can involve the construction of buildings and structures. NZDF therefore considers that these	Reject the submission point in full.

Name of original submitter	Submission point	Support/ Oppose	Plan provision / Section	Summary of submission	Reasons for supporting or opposing	Decision sought by NZDF
					<p>should be permitted as long as they are removed or are otherwise permitted or authorised. As noted above the other Part-2 District-wide matters apply to temporary activities. NZDF considers the appropriate place to include provisions addressing adverse effects on natural environment values and indigenous biodiversity is in the chapters contained in the Natural Environment Values subsection.</p>	
<p><b>FS84.24</b> Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated</p>	<p>149.107</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>Temporary Activities – matters for discretion and rules</p>	<p>The submitter seeks to include effects on natural values, the environment and indigenous biodiversity as matters of discretion, and to amend rules so temporary activities are not enabled on sites and within overlays containing indigenous biodiversity.</p>	<p>NZDF must be able to train in a variety of environments for diversity and realism in order to be ready and able to respond in a wide range of situations. At times, and for various reasons including logistical Restrictions should be proportionate to effects considerations, TMTA may need to occur on sites containing indigenous biodiversity. NZDF does not consider it necessary or appropriate to have a blanket restriction on TMTA on sites and within overlays containing indigenous biodiversity, particularly when the activity may not have effects on indigenous biodiversity. NZDF</p>	<p>Reject the submission point in full.</p>

	Name of original submitter	Submission point	Support/ Oppose	Plan provision / Section	Summary of submission	Reasons for supporting or opposing	Decision sought by NZDF
						considers provisions in the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter of the Proposed District Plan to be the most appropriate way to address effects on natural values, the environment and indigenous biodiversity.	
<b>FS84.25</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated	149.108	Oppose	Temporary Activities - standards	The submitter seeks to add standards for temporary activities in natural environments which protect them from adverse effects.	The submitter has not specified what standards are sought for temporary activities in natural environments. NZDF considers provisions in the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter of the Proposed District Plan to be the most appropriate way to address effects on natural values, the environment and indigenous biodiversity.	Reject the submission point in full.
<b>FS84.26</b>	New Zealand Helicopter Association	147.5	Support in part	Definitions – new definition of Heliport	The submitter seeks to clarify the difference between a temporary helicopter landing area used on an intermittent, infrequent or temporary basis, and a heliport used on a regular basis or as a permanent base, and is seeking the addition of a new definition for the term 'Heliport'.	As outlined in its original submission, NZDF agrees that greater clarity is required on the application of the rules to permanent versus temporary helicopter landings. NZDF considers this could be achieved through providing a definition of helicopter landing area (the term used in Rule NOISE-R6) and clarify that this term covers permanent helicopter landing areas, not temporary. If additional definitions are included,	Allow the submission point to the extent that the plan provisions are amended to provide clarity in the provisions and distinguish between a landing area used on an intermittent, infrequent or temporary basis versus a permanent heliport used on a regular basis or as a base. Ensure it is clear that helicopter landings associated with TMTA and Defence activities are excluded from the noise limits for helicopter

Name of original submitter	Submission point	Support/ Oppose	Plan provision / Section	Summary of submission	Reasons for supporting or opposing	Decision sought by NZDF
					including for the term 'heliport' NZDF requests that it is made clear that helicopter landings associated with TMTA and Defence activities are excluded from the noise limits for helicopter landing.	landing e.g.  <i>Heliport means a facility for helicopter movements including support services for passengers or aircraft. A heliport may include passenger terminals, administration, freight, refuelling, helicopter parking or hangaring, and helicopter maintenance and servicing. <b><u>It does not include land used on an intermittent, infrequent or temporary basis or helicopter landings associated with emergencies, Defence activities, or temporary military training activities.</u></b></i>
FS84.27 New Zealand Helicopter Association	147.7	Support in part	Definitions – new definition of Temporary Helicopter Landing Area	The submitter is seeking to distinguish between a landing area used on an intermittent, infrequent or temporary basis versus a permanent heliport used on a regular basis or as a base. The submitter is seeking a new definition for "Temporary Helicopter Landing Area" to clarify this distinction.	As outlined in its original submission, NZDF agrees that greater clarity is required on the application of the rules to permanent versus temporary helicopter landings. NZDF considers this could be achieved through providing a definition of helicopter landing area (the term used in Rule NOISE-R6) and clarify that this term covers permanent helicopter landing areas, not temporary. If additional definitions are included, including for the term	Allow the submission point to the extent that the plan provisions are amended to provide clarity in the provisions and distinguish between a landing area used on an intermittent, infrequent or temporary basis versus a permanent heliport used on a regular basis or as a base. Ensure it is clear that helicopter landings associated with TMTA and Defence activities are excluded from the noise limits for helicopter landing.

Name of original submitter	Submission point	Support/ Oppose	Plan provision / Section	Summary of submission	Reasons for supporting or opposing	Decision sought by NZDF
					'temporary helicopter landing area' NZDF requests that it is made clear that helicopter landings associated with TMTA and Defence activities are excluded from the noise limits for helicopter landing.	
FS84.28 New Zealand Helicopter Association	147.11	Support	New NOISE policy for managing reverse sensitivity	The submitter requests the addition of a new NOISE policy to reduce the potential for reverse sensitivity and give effect to NOISE-O2:  <i>NOISE-PX Manage reverse sensitivity Reduce the potential for reverse sensitivity effects by employing land use controls that manage the design and/or location of new noise sensitive activities in proximity to areas that consistently experience higher noise levels.</i>	NZDF supports this provision to manage reverse sensitivity effects.	Allow the submission point.
FS84.29 New Zealand Helicopter Association	147.15	Support in part	Rule NOISE-R6	The submitter opposes NOISE-R6 in part as they consider separate provisions should be added for the use of temporary helicopter landing areas for emergencies and/or ad-hoc commercial activities. The submitter seeks an amendment to the title of NOISE-R6 as follows: <i>NOISE-R6 Noise levels from a helicopter landing area <u>heliport</u></i>	NZDF supports this submission point to the extent that it seeks to clarify that this rule applies to permanent helicopter landing facilities and not temporary. NZDF considers that this could alternatively be achieved by providing a definition for 'helicopter landing area' that defines this as a permanent facility.	Allow the submission point in part and add amendments to clarify that Rule NOISE-R6 excludes temporary helicopter landings including those associated with TMTA.

Name of original submitter	Submission point	Support/ Oppose	Plan provision / Section	Summary of submission	Reasons for supporting or opposing	Decision sought by NZDF
FS84.30	147.16	Support in part	New NOISE rule for temporary helicopter landing areas	The submitter requests the addition of a new NOISE Rule to provide for Temporary helicopter landing areas as a permitted activity, for helicopters responding to emergencies including medical, wildfire, search and rescue and/or adverse weather events.	NZDF supports this submission point to the extent that it provides clarity around the provisions for permanent and temporary helicopter landings but considers the exemption should also include movements for emergency by Defence including associated with TMTA.	<p>Allow the submission point in so far as the provisions are amended to provide clarity around the provisions for permanent and temporary helicopter landings. If a new NOISE rule is included for temporary helicopter landing areas include an exemption from standards for Defence activities, e.g.:</p> <p><i>The following activities are exempt from the provisions of 1. a, b, and c:</i></p> <p><i>1. Helicopter movements for emergencies by police, fire and emergency, ambulance, medical, civil defence or for search and rescue purposes</i>  <b><u>or for Defence purposes; or</u></b></p> <p>---</p>
FS84.31	146.7	Support in part	Definitions – new definition of Heliport	The submitter seeks to clarify the difference between a temporary helicopter landing area used on an intermittent, infrequent or temporary basis, and a heliport used on a regular basis or as a permanent base, and is seeking the addition of a new definition for the term 'Heliport'.	As outlined in its original submission, NZDF agrees that greater clarity is required on the application of the rules to permanent versus temporary helicopter landings. NZDF considers this could be achieved through providing a definition of helicopter landing area (the term used in Rule NOISE-R6) and clarify that this term covers permanent	Allow the submission point to the extent that the plan provisions are amended to provide clarity in the provisions and distinguish between a landing area used on an intermittent, infrequent or temporary basis versus a permanent heliport used on a regular basis or as a base. Ensure it is clear that helicopter landings associated

Name of original submitter	Submission point	Support/ Oppose	Plan provision / Section	Summary of submission	Reasons for supporting or opposing	Decision sought by NZDF	
					<p>helicopter landing areas, not temporary. If additional definitions are included, including for the term 'heliport' NZDF requests that it is made clear that helicopter landings associated with TMTA and Defence activities are excluded from the noise limits for helicopter landing.</p>	<p>with TMTA and Defence activities are excluded from the noise limits for helicopter landing e.g.  <i>Heliport means a facility for helicopter movements including support services for passengers or aircraft. A heliport may include passenger terminals, administration, freight, refuelling, helicopter parking or hangaring, and helicopter maintenance and servicing. <b><u>It does not include land used on an intermittent, infrequent or temporary basis or helicopter landings associated with emergencies, Defence activities, or temporary military training activities.</u></b></i></p>	
FS84.32	New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association	146.14	Support in part	Definitions - new definition of Temporary Helicopter Landing Area	<p>The submitter is seeking to distinguish between a landing area used on an intermittent, infrequent or temporary basis versus a permanent heliport used on a regular basis or as a base. The submitter is seeking a new definition for "Temporary Helicopter Landing Area" to clarify this distinction.</p>	<p>As outlined in its original submission, NZDF agrees that greater clarity is required on the application of the rules to permanent versus temporary helicopter landings. NZDF considers this could be achieved through providing a definition of helicopter landing area (the term used in Rule NOISE-R6) and clarify that this term covers permanent helicopter landing areas, not temporary. If additional</p>	<p>Allow the submission point to the extent that the plan provisions are amended to provide clarity in the provisions and distinguish between a landing area used on an intermittent, infrequent or temporary basis versus a permanent heliport used on a regular basis or as a base. Ensure it is clear that helicopter landings associated with TMTA and Defence activities are excluded from</p>

FS84.33

Name of original submitter	Submission point	Support/ Oppose	Plan provision / Section	Summary of submission	Reasons for supporting or opposing	Decision sought by NZDF
					definitions are included, including for the term 'temporary helicopter landing area' NZDF requests that it is made clear that helicopter landings associated with TMTA and Defence activities are excluded from the noise limits for helicopter landing.	the noise limits for helicopter landing.
New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association	146.38	Oppose in part	Rule NOISE-R6	The submitter is seeking to change the term used in NOISE-R6 from "helicopter landing area" to "helicopter landing area heliport".	NZDF agrees that greater clarity is required on the application of the rules to permanent versus temporary helicopter landings. NZDF considers this could be achieved through providing a definition of helicopter landing area rather than adding the term heliport.	Allow the submission point to the extent that the plan provisions are amended to provide clarity in the provisions and distinguish between a landing area used on an intermittent, infrequent or temporary basis versus a permanent heliport used on a regular basis or as a base. Ensure it is clear that helicopter landings associated with TMTA and Defence activities are excluded from the noise limits for helicopter landing.