

## **Proposed Kaipara District Plan**

### **Summary of Submissions**

This document contains a summary of decisions requested by persons making submissions on the Proposed Kaipara District Plan in accordance with clause 7 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act. The summary of decisions requested for Light was notified on 21 October 2025 and those submissions are therefore not included in this document.

#### **Important Notes**

- Where submissions are unclear, the summary of decisions requested contain the word *inferred*.
- This summary is **not a substitute** for reading the full submission. If you think your interests may be affected, please review the full submission online here: [PDP Submissions](#) - submissions are also available for viewing online at our offices and libraries in **Dargaville** or **Mangawhai**.
- Submission point numbers may not be sequential due to quality assurance checks.
- Submission numbers are unique identifiers and must be stated when making a further submission.

#### **Guide to the Summary of Submissions**

- Decisions are organized by provision number.
- Where specific wording changes have been requested in submissions, those changes shown as:
  - Underlined = new wording
  - ~~Strikethrough~~ = deletions

#### **How to Make a Further Submission**

- From 1 December to 15 December 2025, you can:
    - **Save time! Complete our easy online Form 6 here:** [PDP Online Form 6](#)
    - OR
    - **Download a pdf version of Form 6:** [Form 6 pdf version](#)
  - THEN
  - **Email it to:** [districtplanreview@kaipara.govt.nz](mailto:districtplanreview@kaipara.govt.nz)
  - **Post it to:** Planning and Policy Team, Kaipara District Council, Private Bag 1001, Dargaville 0340
  - **Deliver it to either Council office:** 32 Hokianga Road, Dargaville or 6 Molesworth Drive, Mangawhai
- Deadline: Further submissions close at 5:00pm on Monday 15 December 2025.**

**Important:** You must send a copy of your further submission to the original submitter **within 5 working days** of lodging it with Kaipara District Council. To access a list containing Submitter Contact Details, click [here](#).

#### ***Disclaimer:***

*This summary of submissions has been prepared and published in accordance with the Resource Management Act to assist the public in understanding the points raised by submitters. Kaipara District Council has used its best endeavours to accurately summarise the relief sought in the submissions, however, we cannot guarantee the accuracy or completeness of the information provided in this document.*

*Users are advised to take specific independent professional advice before taking any action as a result of information contained in this summary.*

*Please note that all original submissions and names of submitters are publicly available on the Council website. Submitters should read the full submission for themselves.*

## Proposed Kaipara District Plan

### Summary of Submissions for the topic of: Coastal Environment (in Provision order)

Submission point No.	Submitter	Provision	Position	Summary of decision requested	Reasons
84.1	Te Uri o Hau	CE-O1	Oppose	No specific decision requested; however, the submission opposes in part CE-O1 and considers Council should be managing adverse coastal effects on the coast before putting extra cost and restriction on private land owners beyond what already exists.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter owns 113.5 ha of land on Rehutai Road (legally described as Lot 3 DP 425236). The property features 1.1km of riparian beach frontage. An area of the property is currently subject to the HNCA and ONCA - neither of which have been opposed. However, the proposed Coastal Environment Overlay extends hundreds of metres from the coast into the site. Some of the land proposed as being within the coastal environment cannot be seen from the coast. Aspects of the Coastal Environment Overlay are opposed in full and in part, as outlined below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter considers Council should be managing adverse coastal effects on the coast before putting extra cost and restriction on private land owners beyond what already exists.</li> <li>The preservation of the natural character of the coastal environment (inferred as submission relates to CE-O1) has previously been addressed by the HNCA and ONCA Zones. Landowners along the coast respect nature and the coastal environment. The submitters note that they have fenced along the coast where it used to be open, and this has stopped farmers from dumping rubbish. However, they constantly see vehicles from the coastal frontage of their property and consider it is inappropriate for Council to propose coastal protection from private landowners when vehicle access to the coastal environment causes degradation and is unrestricted and subject to minimal policing.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
85.1	Dominic Leigh	CE-O1	Oppose	No specific decision requested; however the submission opposes in part CE-O1 and considers that Council should be managing adverse coastal effects on the coast before putting extra cost and restriction on private land owners beyond what already exists.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitters own 113.5 ha of land on Rehutai Road (legally described as Lot 3 DP 425236). The property features 1.1km of riparian beach frontage. An area of the property is currently subject to the HNCA and ONCA - neither of which have been opposed. However, the proposed Coastal Environment Overlay extends hundreds of metres from the coast into the site. Some of the land proposed as being within the Coastal Environment Overlay cannot be seen from the coast.</li> <li>Aspects of the Coastal Environment Overlay are opposed in full and in part, as outlined below:</li> <li>The preservation of the natural character if the coastal environment (inferred as submission relates to CE-O1) has previously been addressed by the HNCA and ONCA Zones. Landowners along the coast respect nature and the coastal environment. The submitters note that they have fenced along the coast where it used to be open, and this has stopped farmers from dumping rubbish. However, they constantly see vehicles from the coastal frontage of their property and consider it is inappropriate for Council to propose coastal protection from private landowners when vehicle access to the coastal environment causes degradation and is unrestricted and subject to minimal policing.</li> </ul>
136.107	Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc) - Northland Province	CE-O1	Support	<b>AMEND</b> CE-O1 as follows: The characteristics, qualities and values of the natural character of the coastal environment are preserved <u>to support its natural function and its social and cultural values, while enabling and are protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development to provide for the wellbeing of people and communities.</u> OR With wording with similar intent. AND Any consequential amendments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objective CE-O1 is consistent with the requirements of s6(a) of the RMA and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement Policy 13. However, the submitter would prefer this objective to be positively framed by acknowledging appropriate activities are enabled to occur. The submitter also suggests amendments to improve capture of the resource management issue the objective is addressing.</li> </ul>
149.78	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated	CE-O1	Amend	<b>AMEND</b> CE-O1 by adding elements that contribute to natural character, as identified in Policy 13(2) of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement. AND Any consequential amendments and alternative relief to address the concerns raised.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy 13(2) of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement sets out elements of natural character within the coastal environment. The submitter requests that CE-O1 is amended to include these elements for certainty and effectiveness for plan</li> </ul>

## Proposed Kaipara District Plan

### Summary of Submissions for the topic of: Coastal Environment (in Provision order)

Submission point No.	Submitter	Provision	Position	Summary of decision requested	Reasons
					users and decision-makers to manage adverse effects on natural character.
263.29	Daytona Trust	CE-O1	Amend	<b>AMEND</b> CE-O1, as follows: The characteristics, <del>and</del> qualities and values of the natural character of the coastal environment are <del>preserved and are</del> protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development. AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The amendments will better give effects to the Regional Policy Statement Objective 3.14 in respect to the coastal environment, which requires the protection of the qualities and characteristics that make up the natural character of the coastal environment from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.</li> </ul>
283.171	Northpower Limited and Northpower Fibre Limited	CE-O1	Amend	<b>AMEND</b> CE-O1 as follows: "The characteristics, qualities and values of the natural character of the coastal environment are preserved and are protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development, <u>while enabling the safe and efficient use, development, maintenance, operation, upgrading and repair of infrastructure.</u> " AND Any further necessary consequential amendments required.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To ensure the preservation and protection of the natural character of the coastal environment is balanced with enabling the safe and efficient development, use, maintenance, operation, upgrading and repair of infrastructure.</li> </ul>
289.29	Tappenden Holdings Limited	CE-O1	Amend	<b>AMEND</b> CE-O1, as follows: The characteristics, <del>and</del> qualities and values of the natural character of the coastal environment are <del>preserved and are</del> protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development. AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The amendments will better give effects to the Regional Policy Statement Objective 3.14 in respect to the coastal environment.</li> </ul>
300.41	Bream Tail Residents Association Incorporated	CE-O1	Amend	<b>AMEND</b> CE-O1, as follows: The characteristics, <del>and</del> qualities and values of the natural character of the coastal environment are <del>preserved and are</del> protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development. AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The amendments will better give effects to the Regional Policy Statement Objective 3.14 in respect to the coastal environment.</li> </ul>
304.107	Director General of Conservation	CE-O1	Amend	<b>AMEND</b> CE-O1 as follows: The Characteristics, qualified of the natural character, <u>including Outstanding Natural Character Areas, Natural Character Areas, and all other areas</u> of the coastal environment are preserved and are protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development. AND Any further or alternative relief to like effect to that sought.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Though CE-O1 generally aligns with New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement Policy 13, it fails to outline the requirement of avoiding adverse effects on Outstanding Natural Character Areas and High Character Areas. The submitter requests that the CE-O1 is amended to include reference to Outstanding Natural Character Areas and High Character Areas.</li> </ul>
263.30	Daytona Trust	CE-O2	Support	<b>RETAIN</b> CE-O2. AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It properly gives effect to the Regional Policy Statement and the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement.</li> </ul>
289.30	Tappenden Holdings Limited	CE-O2	Support	<b>RETAIN</b> CE-O2. AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It properly gives effect to the Regional Policy Statement and the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement.</li> </ul>
300.42	Bream Tail Residents Association Incorporated	CE-O2	Support	<b>RETAIN</b> CE-O2. AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It properly gives effect to the Regional Policy Statement and the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement.</li> </ul>
149.79	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated	CE-O3	Amend	<b>AMEND</b> CE-O3 so the text does not include the objective title. AND Any consequential amendments and alternative relief to address the concerns raised.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter supports CE-O3 but raises what appears to be a drafting error which should be corrected.</li> </ul>
84.2	Te Uri o Hau	CE-P1	Oppose	No specific decision requested; however the submission opposes in part CE-P1 and considers Council should be managing adverse coastal effects on the coast before putting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitters own 113.5 ha of land on Rehutai Road (legally described as Lot 3 DP 425236). The property features 1.1km of riparian beach frontage. An area of the property is currently subject to the</li> </ul>

## Proposed Kaipara District Plan

### Summary of Submissions for the topic of: Coastal Environment (in Provision order)

Submission point No.	Submitter	Provision	Position	Summary of decision requested	Reasons
				extra cost and restriction on private land owners beyond what already exists.	<p>HNCA and ONCA - neither of which have been opposed. However, the proposed Coastal Environment Overlay extends hundreds of metres from the coast into the site. Some of the land proposed as being within the Coastal Environment cannot be seen from the coast. Aspects of the Coastal Environment Overlay are opposed in full and in part, as outlined below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Managing adverse effects on the natural character of the coastal environment (inferred as submission relates to CE-P1) has previously been addressed by the HNCA and ONCA Zones.</li> <li>Landowners along the coast respect nature and the coastal environment. The submitters note that they have fenced along the coast where it used to be open, and this has stopped farmers from dumping rubbish. However, they constantly see vehicles from the coastal frontage of their property and consider it is inappropriate for Council to propose coastal protection from private landowners when vehicle access to the coastal environment causes degradation and is unrestricted and subject to minimal policing.</li> </ul>
85.2	Dominic Leigh	CE-P1	Oppose	No specific decision requested; however the submission opposes in part CE-P1 and considers that Council should be managing adverse coastal effects on the coast before putting extra cost and restriction on private land owners beyond what already exists.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitters own 113.5 ha of land on Rehutai Road (legally described as Lot 3 DP 425236). The property features 1.1km of riparian beach frontage. An area of the property is currently subject to the HNCA and ONCA - neither of which have been opposed. However, the proposed Coastal Environment Overlay extends hundreds of metres from the coast into the site. Some of the land proposed as being within the Coastal Environment cannot be seen from the coast. Aspects of the Coastal Environment Overlay are opposed in full and in part, as outlined below:</li> <li>Managing adverse effects on the natural character of the coastal environment (inferred as submission relates to CE-P1) has previously been addressed by the HNCA and ONCA Zones. Landowners along the coast respect nature and the coastal environment. The submitters note that they have fenced along the coast where it used to be open, and this has stopped farmers from dumping rubbish. However, they constantly see vehicles from the coastal frontage of their property and consider it is inappropriate for Council to propose coastal protection from private landowners when vehicle access to the coastal environment causes degradation and is unrestricted and subject to minimal policing.</li> </ul>
99.7	Venessa Anich	CE-P1	Amend	<b>ADD</b> to CE-P1 a need to ensure built development is not visible from the beach even at low tide on the West Coast and Ripiro Beach, so that the Wild West Coast characteristics are maintained.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is a very special part of Kaipara District and is under pressure from development.</li> <li>Other west coast beaches like Muriwai have become developed or restricted resulting in additional pressure on Ripiro Beach as those folk move north.</li> <li>Properties with riparian rights can build close to the beach, or within view of beach users altering the special wild west coast characteristics.</li> </ul>
149.81	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated	CE-P1	Amend	<b>AMEND</b> CE-P1 by changing 'land use and development' to 'activities' throughout. AND Any consequential amendments and alternative relief to address the concerns raised.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter supports a policy regarding the management of adverse effects on natural character, Policy 13 of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement requires adverse effects of 'activities' to be managed, not only of 'land use and development'. Land use and development does not include subdivision and CE-P1 should be amended to cover 'activities' in order to give effect to the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement.</li> </ul>
263.31	Daytona Trust	CE-P1	Amend	<b>AMEND</b> CE-P1 to ensure a cross-reference to the accurate inclusion and description of the characteristics, qualities and values that make an area a High or Outstanding Natural Character Area in Schedule 6 - Natural Character Areas, as sought elsewhere in this submission. AND	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The policy is supported, subject to the accurate inclusion and description of the characteristics, qualities and values that make an area a High or Outstanding Natural Character Area in Schedule 6.</li> </ul>

## Proposed Kaipara District Plan

### Summary of Submissions for the topic of: Coastal Environment (in Provision order)

Submission point No.	Submitter	Provision	Position	Summary of decision requested	Reasons
				Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	
289.31	Tappenden Holdings Limited	CE-P1	Amend	<b>AMEND</b> CE-P1 to ensure a cross-reference to the accurate inclusion and description of the characteristics, qualities and values that make an area a High or Outstanding Natural Character Area in Schedule 6 - Natural Character Areas, as sought elsewhere in the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The policy is supported, subject to the accurate inclusion and description of the characteristics, qualities and values that make an area a High or Outstanding Natural Character Area in Schedule 6.</li> </ul>
300.43	Bream Tail Residents Association Incorporated	CE-P1	Amend	<b>AMEND</b> CE-P1 to ensure a cross-reference to the accurate inclusion and description of the characteristics, qualities and values that make an area a High or Outstanding Natural Character Area in Schedule 6 - Natural Character Areas, as sought elsewhere in the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The policy is supported, subject to the accurate inclusion and description of the characteristics, qualities and values that make an area a High or Outstanding Natural Character Area in Schedule 6.</li> </ul>
304.108	Director General of Conservation	CE-P1	Amend	<b>AMEND</b> CE-P1 as follows: To preserve the natural character of the coastal environment and protect it from inappropriate subdivision, land use, and development: 1. Avoiding adverse effects of subdivision, land use and development on natural character the characteristics, qualities and values that make an area of Outstanding Natural Character Area in areas of the coastal environment with outstanding natural character as set out in Schedule 6 – Natural Character Areas. 2. Avoiding significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects of subdivision, land use and development on natural character other characteristics, qualities and values of natural character in all other areas of the coastal environment.  AND Any further or alternative relief to like effect to that sought.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As drafted, CE-P1 does not align with New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 13(1)(a) as it does not include effects associated with subdivision.</li> </ul>
136.108	Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc) - Northland Province	CE-P1	Support	<b>RETAIN</b> CE-P1 as notified. OR With wording that achieves similar intent. AND Any consequential amendments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter supports CE-P1 as notified.</li> </ul>
304.109	Director General of Conservation	CE-P3	Amend	<b>AMEND</b> CE-P3.3. as follows: 3. effective weed and animal pest management the removal of pest plant and animal species. AND Any further or alternative relief to like effect to that sought.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The wording of CE-P3 is not consistent with Policy 14(ii) of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement. Moreover, Policy 4.4.2 of the Northland Regional Policy Statement outlines the district plan requirement to implement controls for the reduction or management of species with recognised pest potential.</li> <li>The submitter requests that CE-P3 is amended to include New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement wording and to align with the Northland Regional Policy Statement.</li> </ul>
84.3	Te Uri o Hau	CE-P2	Oppose	No specific decision requested; however the submission opposes in part CE-P2 and considers that the existing coastal settlements are limited and do not account for what people may want.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existing coastal settlements are limited and unsuitable for larger lifestyle opportunities.</li> <li>The submitter considers that the existing coastal settlements are limited and do not account for what people may want and notes that many people would like land on the coast, not just a small suburban section.</li> <li>The Coastal Environment chapter does not provide direction on subdivision other than it is likely to be costly.</li> <li>The submitters land is not productive and, therefore, suited for living whilst respecting the coastal environment.</li> <li>Should Council want to protect a large area of land within a coastal reserve of sorts (as per CE-P3), then coastal land should be bought.</li> </ul>
84.4	Te Uri o Hau	CE-P3	Oppose	No specific decision requested; however the submission opposes in part CE-P3 and considers that the existing coastal settlements are limited and do not account for what people may want.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existing coastal settlements are limited and unsuitable for larger lifestyle opportunities.</li> <li>The submitter considers that the existing coastal settlements are limited and do not account for what people may want and also notes that many people would like land on the coast, not just a small suburban section.</li> </ul>

## Proposed Kaipara District Plan

### Summary of Submissions for the topic of: Coastal Environment (in Provision order)

Submission point No.	Submitter	Provision	Position	Summary of decision requested	Reasons
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Coastal Environment chapter does not provide direction on subdivision other than it is likely to be costly.</li> <li>The submitters land is not productive and, therefore, suited for living whilst respecting the coastal environment.</li> <li>Should Council want to protect a large area of land within a coastal reserve of sorts, then coastal properties should be bought.</li> </ul>
85.3	Dominic Leigh	CE-P2	Oppose	No specific decision requested; however the submission opposes in part CE-P2 and considers that the existing coastal settlements are limited and do not account for what people may want.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existing coastal settlements are limited unsuitable for larger lifestyle opportunities. The submitter notes that many people would like land on the coast, but not a small suburban section.</li> <li>The Coastal Environment chapter does not provide direction on subdivision other than it is likely to be costly.</li> <li>The submitters land is not productive and, therefore, suited for living whilst respecting the coastal environment.</li> <li>Should Council want to protect a large area of land within a coastal reserve of sorts (as per CE-P3), then coastal properties should be bought.</li> </ul>
85.4	Dominic Leigh	CE-P3	Oppose	No specific decision requested; however the submission opposes in part CE-P3 and considers that the existing coastal settlements are limited and do not account for what people may want.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existing coastal settlements are limited and unsuitable for larger lifestyle opportunities. The submitter notes that many people would like land on the coast, not just a small suburban section.</li> <li>The Coastal Environment chapter does not provide direction on subdivision other than it is likely to be costly.</li> <li>The submitters land is not productive and, therefore, suited for living whilst respecting the coastal environment.</li> <li>Should Council want to protect a large area of land within a coastal reserve of sorts, then coastal properties should be bought.</li> </ul>
136.109	Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc) - Northland Province	CE-P2	Support	<b>AMEND</b> CE-P2 as follows: Enable people and communities to provide for their social, economic and cultural wellbeing through appropriate subdivision, use, and development in the coastal environment that: 1. ... 3. Avoids sprawling or sporadic patterns of development; <u>and</u> 4. <u>Recognises and supports the ongoing use and sustainable development of rural land, including farming activities, where these contribute to the resilience and wellbeing of rural communities and do not compromise natural character of the coastal environment.</u> OR With wording of similar intent. AND Any consequential amendments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter supports CE-P2, however would prefer the policy explicitly recognises and provides for rural land uses.</li> </ul>
136.110	Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc) - Northland Province	CE-P3	Support	<b>AMEND</b> CE-P3 as follows: Promote the restoration and enhancement of the natural character of the coastal environment, including High Natural Character Areas and Outstanding Natural Character Areas, including by: (a) <u>encouraging, using a range of tools, including financial incentives, education and advocacy, to encourage owners, community groups and others to take action; and</u> (b) <u>enabling, through the provisions of this plan:</u> 1. The protection and rehabilitation of ... OR Wording with similar intent. AND Any consequential amendments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter supports CE-P3 in part, however, it is unclear how some of these actions will be encouraged by the Council, for example, by provision of funding or leadership. Amendments are sought to provide clarity on this matter and recommend the inclusion of non-regulatory methods in the Proposed District Plan.</li> </ul>
263.32	Daytona Trust	CE-P2	Support	<b>RETAIN</b> CE-P2. AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It properly gives effect to the Regional Policy Statement and the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement.</li> </ul>



## Proposed Kaipara District Plan

### Summary of Submissions for the topic of: Coastal Environment (in Provision order)

Submission point No.	Submitter	Provision	Position	Summary of decision requested	Reasons
263.33	Daytona Trust	CE-P3	Support	<b>RETAIN</b> CE-P3. AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It properly gives effect to the Regional Policy Statement and the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement.</li> </ul>
289.32	Tappenden Holdings Limited	CE-P2	Support	<b>RETAIN</b> CE-P2. AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It properly gives effect to the Regional Policy Statement and the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement.</li> </ul>
289.33	Tappenden Holdings Limited	CE-P3	Support	<b>RETAIN</b> CE-P3. AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It properly gives effect to the Regional Policy Statement and the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement.</li> </ul>
300.44	Bream Tail Residents Association Incorporated	CE-P2	Support	<b>RETAIN</b> CE-P2. AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It properly gives effect to the Regional Policy Statement and the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement.</li> </ul>
300.45	Bream Tail Residents Association Incorporated	CE-P3	Support	<b>RETAIN</b> CE-P3. AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It properly gives effect to the Regional Policy Statement and the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement.</li> </ul>
283.172	Northpower Limited and Northpower Fibre Limited	CE-P5	Amend	<b>ADD</b> a new policy to the Coastal Environment chapter to recognise and provide for infrastructure within the coastal environment when there is an operational or functional need and where adverse effects are appropriately managed. AND Any further necessary consequential amendments required.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To provide a policy which acknowledges the operational or functional need to locate other electricity infrastructure in the coastal environment where adverse effects are appropriately managed.</li> <li>To support regionally significant infrastructure by a sufficient local distribution network to reach isolated people and communities.</li> <li>To be consistent with Policy 6 of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement.</li> <li>To reflect the direction of Policy 5.1.2(d) of the Regional Policy Statement.</li> </ul>
292.71	Transpower New Zealand Limited	CE-P5	Amend	<b>AMEND</b> CE-P5 as follows: Enable the <u>development</u> , operation, maintenance and upgrading of regionally significant infrastructure, <u>other than the National Grid</u> , in the coastal environment where: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is an operational need or functional need to be in the coastal environment; and</li> <li>Adverse effects on the characteristics, qualities and values of natural character are avoided, remedied or mitigated in accordance with CE-P1.</li> </ol> <u>Note: For the avoidance of doubt, adverse effects from the National Grid are managed in accordance with Policies INF-P10 in the Infrastructure chapter.</u> OR <b>AMEND</b> CE-P5 (and consequential amendments to CE-P1, and CE-P2) to appropriately recognise the National Grid and give effect to the National Policy Statement on Electricity Transmission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To provide clarity to plan users regarding the application of the policies.</li> <li>CE-P5 as worded does not give effect to the National Policy Statement on Electricity Transmission, and there is no reconciliation with the National Grid (INF-P10 or any other policies in the Infrastructure chapter).</li> <li>The policy does not refer to development, and reference is sought to provide a comprehensive policy.</li> </ul>
26.73	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	CE-P5	Support	<b>RETAIN</b> CE-P5 as notified. AND Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The policy appropriately seeks to enable operation, maintenance and upgrading of Regionally Significant Infrastructure in the Coastal Environment.</li> </ul>
284.21	New Zealand Defence Force	CE-P5	Support	<b>RETAIN</b> approach set out in CE-P5. OR Wording to similar effect. AND Any necessary further alternative or consequential relief as necessary to give effect to the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NZDF supports this policy which provides for use and development where there is a functional or operational need for regionally significant infrastructure to be located within the coastal environment.</li> </ul>
99.8	Venessa Anich	CE-P6	Amend	<b>ADD</b> to CE-P6 an assessment matter for the location of built form to ensure that buildings and structures are not visible from Ripiro beach even at low tide.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ripiro Beach and the West Coast is a special area of Kaipara District and needs to be protected from inappropriate use and development.</li> <li>Its character is being adversely affected by the visibility of buildings from the beach.</li> <li>Built form should not be visible from the beach even at low tide.</li> </ul>

## Proposed Kaipara District Plan

### Summary of Submissions for the topic of: Coastal Environment (in Provision order)

Submission point No.	Submitter	Provision	Position	Summary of decision requested	Reasons
223.13	KMA IQ Trustee Limited	CE-P6	Amend	<b>DELETE</b> CE-P6.7.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Given the Coastal Environment Overlay extends over large areas of land which has a right to be developed in accordance with its zoning, this criteria is overreaching.</li> </ul>
263.34	Daytona Trust	CE-P6	Amend	<b>AMEND</b> CE-P6 to have regard to whether land use and development is on a previously approved building platform or necessary to provide access to a previously approved building platform. AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Specific recognition should be given to the existence of consented building platforms and access to those platforms when considering resource consent applications under CE-P6.</li> </ul>
289.34	Tappenden Holdings Limited	CE-P6	Amend	<b>AMEND</b> CE-P6 to have regard to whether land use and development is on a previously approved building platform or necessary to provide access to a previously approved building platform.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Specific recognition should be given to the existence of consented building platforms and access to those platforms when considering resource consent applications under CE-P6.</li> </ul>
300.46	Bream Tail Residents Association Incorporated	CE-P6	Amend	<b>AMEND</b> CE-P6 to have regard to whether land use and development is on a previously approved building platform or necessary to provide access to a previously approved building platform.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Specific recognition should be given to the existence of consented building platforms and access to those platforms when considering resource consent applications under CE-P6.</li> </ul>
304.110	Director General of Conservation	CE-P6	Amend	<b>AMEND</b> CE-P6.1. as follows: 1. <u>Any actual and potential</u> adverse and positive effects on natural character and identified characteristics, qualities and values identified in Schedule 6 – Natural Character. AND Any further or alternative relief to like effect to that sought.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter requests CE-P6 is amended to provide for the consideration of actual and potential adverse effects as required under Section 104(1)(a) of the RMA.</li> </ul>
348.2	Thelma and Louise Mangawhai Limited	CE-P6	Amend	<b>DELETE</b> CE-P6.7 which relates to "the functional need or operational need for the activity or development to be in the coastal environment;"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Coastal Environment overlay extends over a large area of land. Given that it extends over large areas of land that have a right to be developed in accordance with their zoning, submitter considers criteria CE-P6.7 is overreaching and should be deleted.</li> </ul>
84.5	Te Uri o Hau	CE-P6	Oppose	No specific decision requested; however the submission opposes CE-P6.7. and questions who gets to determine whether there is a functional need for a building or activity to be in the coastal environment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter questions who gets to determine whether there is a functional need for a building or activity within the coastal environment.</li> <li>Based on the area of their land within the coastal environment, the submitter considers that the only place they could build without breaching CE-P6.7, is a driveway, paddocks, or at least 1km from the coast where no coastal sounds can be heard. The submitter's property is privately-owned, and Clause 7 would give too much weight to a third party rather than landowners reasonable plans.</li> </ul>
85.5	Dominic Leigh	CE-P6	Oppose	No specific decision requested; however the submission opposes CE-P6.7. and questions who gets to determine whether there is a functional need for a building or activity to be in coastal environment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter notes that, based on the area of their land within the Coastal Environment, the only place they could build without breaching CE-P6.7. is a driveway, paddocks, or at least 1km from the coast where no coastal sounds can be heard.</li> <li>The submitter's property is privately-owned, and Clause 7 would give too much weight to a third party rather than landowners reasonable plans.</li> </ul>
140.66	Horticulture New Zealand	CE-P6	Oppose	<b>DELETE</b> CE-P6 AND any consequential or alternative amendments required to address the concerns raised by the submitter.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The assessment of resource is not a policy in itself. Rather, when a consent is applied for the proposal is assessed against policies, objectives and rules.</li> </ul>
26.75	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	CE-P6	Support	<b>RETAIN</b> CE-P6.7 as notified. AND Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clause 7 requires regard to be had to the functional need or operational need of an activity or development in the Coastal Environment when assessing a resource consent application.</li> </ul>
136.111	Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc) - Northland Province	CE-P6	Support	<b>RETAIN</b> CE-P6 as notified. OR With wording of similar intent. AND Any consequential amendments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter supports CE-P6 as notified.</li> </ul>



## Proposed Kaipara District Plan

### Summary of Submissions for the topic of: Coastal Environment (in Provision order)

Submission point No.	Submitter	Provision	Position	Summary of decision requested	Reasons
223.17	KMA IQ Trustee Limited	CE-R1	Amend	<b>AMEND</b> CE-R1 so that additions and alterations simply have to comply with maximum height standards, rather than not increasing the height of the existing building.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No further reason given.</li> </ul>
263.36	Daytona Trust	CE-R1	Amend	<b>DELETE</b> from CE-R1 the requirement to comply with CE-S3. AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gross floor area should not be limited to achieve permitted activity status.</li> </ul>
289.36	Tappenden Holdings Limited	CE-R1	Amend	<b>AMEND</b> CE-R1 to delete reference to and requirement to comply with CE-S3 Gross Floor Area. AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gross floor area should not be limited to achieve permitted activity status.</li> </ul>
300.48	Bream Tail Residents Association Incorporated	CE-R1	Amend	<b>AMEND</b> CE-R1 to delete reference to and requirement to comply with CE-S3 Gross Floor Area. AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gross floor area should not be limited to achieve permitted activity status.</li> </ul>
348.6	Thelma and Louise Mangawhai Limited	CE-R1	Amend	<b>AMEND</b> CE-R1 so that the addition and alteration only has to comply with the maximum height standards rather than not increasing the height of the existing building.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No reasons provided.</li> </ul>
84.6	Te Uri o Hau	CE-R1	Oppose	No specific decision requested; however the submission opposes CE-R1 and considers that going from Permitted to Restricted Discretionary activity status for the vast areas of the coastal environment without really showing how the word "restricted" is applied, is not appropriate.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter opposes the Restricted Discretionary activity status in CE-R1 applying to much of the coastal environment without clarification of how the word "restricted" is applied.</li> <li>The submitter owns a large property, much of which is within the coastal environment and resource consent pathways are uncertain, costly and onerous.</li> <li>Obtaining professional help means spending more money to obtain consents for proposals which might not be visually connected to the coast. Money could be spent on the land instead.</li> </ul>
85.6	Dominic Leigh	CE-R1	Oppose	No specific decision requested; however the submission opposes CE-R1 and considers that going from Permitted to Restricted Discretionary activity status for the vast areas of the coastal environment without really showing how the word "restricted" is applied, is not appropriate.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitters own a large property, much of which is within the coastal environment and resource consent pathways are uncertain, costly and onerous.</li> <li>Obtaining professional help means spending more money to obtain consents for proposals which might not be visually connected to the coast. Money could be spent on the land instead.</li> </ul>
251.2	Leighway Holdings Limited	CE-R1	Oppose	<b>AMEND</b> CE-R1 as follows: <b>1. Activity status: Permitted</b> <b>Where:</b> a. The alteration or addition of any existing building or structure shall not increase the height of the existing building; and b. The activity complies with the following standards: i. CE-S1 Maximum building height; ii. CE-S2 Exterior colour and reflectivity; and iii. CE-S3 Gross floor area. AND Any consequential or further amendments necessary to give effect to the relief sought and reasons given.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CE-R1 inappropriately restricts alterations or additions to existing buildings or structures that increase height. There is no credible analysis that suggests increase in height will create risks of significant effects on the coastal environment from inappropriate development.</li> <li>CE-S1 sets a maximum building height. Therefore, CE-R1 should be amended to only require consent if that maximum height would be exceeded by the additions or alterations.</li> </ul>
136.112	Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc) - Northland Province	CE-R1	Support	<b>RETAIN</b> CE-R1 as notified. OR Wording with similar intent. AND Any consequential amendments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter supports CE-R1 as notified.</li> </ul>
247.30	Foodstuffs North Island Limited	CE-R1	Support	<b>RETAIN</b> CE-R1 as notified. AND Any necessary consequential amendments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submitter supports the permitted activity status for external additions and alterations of buildings within the coastal environment, subject to compliance with permitted standards.</li> <li>Submitter also supports the restricted discretionary activity status for non-compliance with the permitted standards.</li> </ul>
99.9	Venessa Anich	CE-R2	Amend	<b>ADD</b> to CE-R2 a standard to control the location of buildings within the Coastal Environment, to ensure that they are not visible from Ripiro Beach even at low tide.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An additional standard is required in this provision in order to control the location of buildings within the Coastal Environment, to ensure that they are not visible from Ripiro Beach even at low tide.</li> </ul>

## Proposed Kaipara District Plan

### Summary of Submissions for the topic of: Coastal Environment (in Provision order)

Submission point No.	Submitter	Provision	Position	Summary of decision requested	Reasons
149.82	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated	CE-R2	Amend	<b>AMEND</b> CE-R2 by providing standards for regionally significant infrastructure limiting gross floor area to 10m <sup>2</sup> and height to 2m (inferred). AND Any consequential amendments and alternative relief to address the concerns raised.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter considers that providing for new buildings and structures for regionally significant infrastructure without standards could result in adverse effects on natural character and indigenous biological diversity within the Coastal Environment. Standards are required under CE-R2 to ensure effects are appropriately managed.</li> </ul>
263.37	Daytona Trust	CE-R2	Amend	<b>DELETE</b> from CE-R2 the requirement to comply with NFL-S2. AND <b>AMEND</b> CE-R2.1.a.ii.ii. as follows: ii. On a building platform identified in an <del>existing</del> approved subdivision consent and/or land use consent <del>lodged with Council prior to 30 April 2025</del> . AND <b>ADD</b> the following permitted activity to CE-R2: <b>2. Activity Status: Permitted</b> <u>c. Where the building or structure is on a defined exclusive use area as shown on the survey plan for Lots 1-4, 6-8, 10, 12-17, 22-29, 34 and 40-45 DP348513, Lot 1 DP493396, Lots 5 and 9 DP435202, Lots 101 and 102 DP528288, Lots 1 and 2 DP408561, Lots 3 and 4 DP404524, Lots 5 and 6 DP400385, and Lots 7 and 8 DP404525 (Bream Tail), or a nominated buildable area or a building platform otherwise approved on those properties.</u> AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bream Tail is an example where the subdivision has been carefully designed, mitigation planting established and controls imposed through consent notices to manage the effects of buildings. Owners have purchased lots on the understanding that their entitlement to build on them is protected, designed and have detailed controls imposed by way of consent condition and consent notices on the titles.</li> <li>Permitted activity status is an efficient and effective way of recognising these existing expectations to build under the terms of consents and avoids the costs associated with new consent for buildings on locations already confirmed as appropriate by way of previous consents.</li> <li>Gross floor area limitations are opposed on the basis that the limitations are too low to accommodate many residential dwellings. The submitter considers this is out of line with the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement and Regional Policy Statement.</li> <li>Reference to the date in CE-R2.1.a.ii.ii. is unnecessary.</li> <li>Specific provision is sought in the rule for the Bream Tail subdivision to recognise it has defined exclusive use areas and nominated buildable areas.</li> </ul>
283.173	Northpower Limited and Northpower Fibre Limited	CE-R2	Amend	<b>AMEND</b> the activity status of CE-R2.4. from Discretionary to Permitted. AND <b>AMEND</b> the left column of CE-R2.4. as follows: “All coastal environment (including ONCA)” AND Any further necessary consequential amendments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To provide a permitted activity status for buildings and structures associated with regionally significant infrastructure within Outstanding Natural Character Areas in the Coastal Environment.</li> <li>To better align with the provisions in the Natural Features and Landscapes chapter which enable buildings and structures associated with regionally significant infrastructure within Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Outstanding Natural Features in the coastal environment as a permitted activity.</li> <li>To clarify that the permitted activity status also applies to regionally significant infrastructure within the Coastal Environment generally.</li> </ul>
284.22	New Zealand Defence Force	CE-R2	Amend	<b>AMEND</b> CE-R2 to provide for temporary buildings and structures and earthworks associated with temporary military training activities as a permitted activity, explicitly in the Coastal Environment chapter or preferably by excluding the application of the Coastal Environment chapter to temporary military training activities as follows: Notes: <u>6. The rules in the Coastal Environment chapter to do not apply to temporary military training activities.</u> OR Wording to similar effect. AND Any necessary further alternative or consequential relief as necessary to give effect to the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Temporary military training activities may require the placement of temporary buildings and structures in the coastal environment to enable training exercises such as beach landings.</li> </ul>
289.37	Tappenden Holdings Limited	CE-R2	Amend	<b>AMEND</b> CE-R2 to delete reference to and requirement to comply with CE-S3 Gross Floor Area (note error in submission). AND <b>AMEND</b> CE-R2.1.a.ii.ii., as follows: ii. On a building platform identified in an <del>existing</del> approved subdivision consent and/or land use consent <del>lodged with Council prior to 30 April 2025</del> . AND <b>AMEND</b> Rule CE-R2 to add the following additional permitted activity: <b>4. Activity Status: Permitted</b> <u>c. Where the building or structure is on a defined exclusive use area as shown on the survey plan for Lots 1-4, 6-8, 10,</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Refer to submission for detailed reasoning. Reasons summarised as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bream Tail is an example where the subdivision has been carefully designed, mitigation planting established and controls imposed through consent notices to manage the effects of buildings. Owners have purchased lots on the understanding that their entitlement to build on them is protected, designed and have detailed controls imposed by way of consent condition and consent notices on the titles.</li> <li>Permitted activity status is an efficient and effective way of recognising these existing expectations to build under the terms of</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

## Proposed Kaipara District Plan

### Summary of Submissions for the topic of: Coastal Environment (in Provision order)

Submission point No.	Submitter	Provision	Position	Summary of decision requested	Reasons
				<p><u>12-17, 22-29, 34 and 40-45 DP348513, Lot 1 DP493396, Lots 5 and 9 DP435202, Lots 101 and 102 DP528288, Lots 1 and 2 DP408561, Lots 3 and 4 DP404524, Lots 5 and 6 DP400385, and Lots 7 and 8 DP404525 (Bream Tail), or a nominated buildable area or a building platform otherwise approved on those properties.</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	<p>consents and avoids the costs associated with new consent for buildings on locations already confirmed as appropriate by way of previous consents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gross Floor Area limitations are opposed on the basis that the limitations are too low to accommodate many residential dwellings. Submitter considers this is out of line with the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement and Regional Policy Statement.</li> <li>Reference to the date in CE-R2.1.a.ii.ii is unnecessary.</li> <li>Specific provision is sought in the rule for the Bream Tail subdivision to recognise it has defined exclusive use areas and nominated buildable areas.</li> </ul>
292.72	Transpower New Zealand Limited	CE-R2	Amend	<p><b>PROVIDE</b> clarity regarding the rule framework and activity cascade for CE-R2 to appropriately provide for indigenous vegetation clearance and earthworks associated with the operation, maintenance and upgrading of regionally significant infrastructure as a permitted activity.</p> <p>AND</p> <p><b>AMEND</b> CE-R2 to ensure that the most restrictive activity status for these activities within the Outstanding Natural Coastal Areas is discretionary.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Alternative or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully achieve the relief sought in the submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As drafted the rules impose (under clause 5) a non-complying activity status for Regionally Significant Infrastructure in Outstanding Natural Coastal Areas. This activity status is not clear as there are no standards which trigger a non-complying activity status, and it is not clear why Regionally Significant Infrastructure alone warrants such as activity status.</li> <li>Specific to the National Grid, as currently drafted, there is no reconciliation with the National Grid specific policy INF-P10, or the National Policy Statement on Electricity Transmission.</li> </ul>
300.49	Bream Tail Residents Association Incorporated	CE-R2	Amend	<p><b>AMEND</b> CE-R2 to delete reference to and requirement to comply with CE-S3 Gross Floor Area (note error in submission).</p> <p>AND</p> <p><b>AMEND</b> CE-R2.1.a.ii.ii., as follows:</p> <p>ii. On a building platform identified in an existing approved subdivision consent and/or land use consent lodged with Council prior to 30 April 2025:</p> <p>AND</p> <p><b>AMEND</b> Rule CE-R2 to add the following additional permitted activity:</p> <p><u><b>2. Activity Status: Permitted</b></u></p> <p><u>c. Where the building or structure is on a defined exclusive use area as shown on the survey plan for Lots 1-4, 6-8, 10, 12-17, 22-29, 34 and 40-45 DP348513, Lot 1 DP493396, Lots 5 and 9 DP435202, Lots 101 and 102 DP528288, Lots 1 and 2 DP408561, Lots 3 and 4 DP404524, Lots 5 and 6 DP400385, and Lots 7 and 8 DP404525 (Bream Tail), or a nominated buildable area or a building platform otherwise approved on those properties.</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Refer to submission for detailed reasoning. Reasons summarised as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bream Tail is an example where the subdivision has been carefully designed, mitigation planting established and controls imposed through consent notices to manage the effects of buildings. Owners have purchased lots on the understanding that their entitlement to build on them is protected, designed and have detailed controls imposed by way of consent condition and consent notices on the titles.</li> <li>Permitted activity status is an efficient and effective way of recognising these existing expectations to build under the terms of consents and avoids the costs associated with new consent for buildings on locations already confirmed as appropriate by way of previous consents.</li> <li>Gross floor area limitations are opposed on the basis that the limitations are too low to accommodate many residential dwellings. Submitter considers this is out of line with the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement and Regional Policy Statement.</li> <li>Reference to the date in CE-R2.1.a.ii.ii is unnecessary.</li> <li>Specific provision is sought in the rule for the Bream Tail subdivision to recognise it has defined exclusive use areas and nominated buildable areas.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
26.76	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	CE-R2	Oppose	<p><b>AMEND</b> CE-R2 such that infrastructure meeting the permitted standards of the Infrastructure chapter in urban zones is a permitted activity.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The rule is considered to provide too stringent a framework in combination with the cross-referenced standards for Infrastructure such as poles and attached antennas in urban zones (e.g. an 8.5m height limit would apply in Commercial Zones). The Coastal Environment overlaps some urban zones, including parts of Mangawhai. Infrastructure within urban zones otherwise meeting the permitted standard of the Infrastructure chapter would not be expected to have a significant adverse effect on the natural character of the Coastal Environment.</li> </ul>
84.7	Te Uri o Hau	CE-R2	Oppose	<p>No specific decision requested; however the submission opposes CE-R2 and considers that to go from Permitted to Restricted Discretionary activity status for the vast areas of</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter opposes the Restricted Discretionary activity status in CE-R2 applying to much of the coastal environment without clarification of how the word "restricted" is applied.</li> </ul>

## Proposed Kaipara District Plan

### Summary of Submissions for the topic of: Coastal Environment (in Provision order)

Submission point No.	Submitter	Provision	Position	Summary of decision requested	Reasons
				the coastal environment without really showing how the word "restricted" is applied, is not appropriate.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter owns a large property, much of which is within the coastal environment and resource consent pathways are uncertain, costly and onerous.</li> <li>Obtaining professional help means spending more money to obtain consents for proposals which might not be visually connected to the coast. Money could be spent on the land instead.</li> </ul>
85.7	Dominic Leigh	CE-R2	Oppose	No specific decision requested; however the submission opposes CE-R2 and considers that going from Permitted to Restricted Discretionary activity status for the vast areas of the coastal environment without really showing how the word "restricted" is applied, is not appropriate.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter owns a large property, much of which is within the coastal environment and resource consent pathways are uncertain, costly and onerous.</li> <li>Obtaining professional help means spending more money to obtain consents for proposals which might not be visually connected to the coast. Money could be spent on the land instead.</li> </ul>
251.3	Leighway Holdings Limited	CE-R2	Oppose	<p><b>AMEND</b> CE-R2.1, as follows:</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>a. The building or structure is:</p> <p>i. Located within the General residential, Commercial, or Estuary Estate zone; or</p> <p>ii. Located within any other zone and is:</p> <p>i. Ancillary to an existing lawfully established use; or</p> <p>ii. On a building platform identified in an existing subdivision consent approved prior to 1 April 2025; and</p> <p>b. The building or structure complies with the following standards:</p> <p>i. CE-S1 Maximum building height;</p> <p>ii. CE-S2 Exterior colour and reflectivity; and</p> <p>iii. CE-S3 Gross floor area.</p> <p>OR</p> <p><b>AMEND</b> CE-R2.1, as follows:</p> <p>1. Activity status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>a. For a The building or structure is located within the High Natural Character Area, it is:</p> <p>i. Located within the General residential, Commercial, or Estuary Estate zone; or ...</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential or further amendments necessary to give effect to the relief sought and reasons given.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CE-R2 inappropriately restricts new dwellings or structures throughout the Coastal Environment overlay that are not within the General Residential, Commercial or Estuary Estate zone, ancillary to established land uses or on approved building platforms. The consequence is that large areas of Kaipara District will require resource consent for dwellings or simple structures, which are unlikely to detract from the coastal character of the environment. No s32 analysis of efficiency and effectiveness of this approach has been provided. Given the assessment that informed the extent of the Coastal Environment overlay, imposing additional regulatory costs is not justified. Submitter seeks a more appropriate approach to either enable buildings and structures within the Coastal Environment, subject to appropriate standards or only restrict buildings and structures within the High Natural Character Areas.</li> </ul>
136.113	Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc) - Northland Province	CE-R2	Support	<p><b>AMEND</b> CE-R2 as follows:</p> <p><b>ONCA</b></p> <p><b>Where:</b></p> <p>...</p> <p>X. the activity is associated with essential farming activities such as fencing, farm tracks and farm drains.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>With wording of similar effect.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter supports CE-R2 in part and the restricted discretionary status when compliance is not achieved.</li> <li>The restriction for ONCA where the building or structure is only permitted if it is associated with regionally significant infrastructure is not supported.</li> <li>The coastal environment overlay covers over 57 percent of farms located in the Kaipara district. The requirement for farmers to have to go through a non-complying resource consent application each time they want to establish a new building or structure on their land is restrictive and unnecessary.</li> </ul>
140.67	Horticulture New Zealand	CE-R2	Support	<p><b>RETAIN</b> CE-R2 as notified.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential or alternative amendments required to address the concerns raised by the submitter.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter supports provision for new buildings and structures as a permitted activity.</li> </ul>
247.31	Foodstuffs North Island Limited	CE-R2	Support	<p><b>RETAIN</b> CE-R2 as notified.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any necessary consequential amendments.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submitter supports the permitted activity status for new buildings in the coastal environment (excluding ONCA), subject to compliance with permitted standards.</li> <li>Submitter also supports the restricted discretionary activity status for non-compliance with the permitted standards.</li> </ul>
73.13	PF Olsen Ltd	CE-R3	Amend	<p><b>AMEND</b> the reference to forestry tracks in CE-R3.1.b. as follows:</p> <p>1. Activity status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>a. The activity complies with CE-S6 Maximum area of indigenous vegetation clearance; or</p> <p>b. The indigenous vegetation clearance is for the maintenance of lawfully established roads, fences, utility</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The term forestry tracks is imprecise and risks inconsistent interpretation and implementation.</li> <li>The amendment to refer to <u>commercial</u> forestry tracks is to improve clarity and ensure alignment with other plan provisions. The terminology more accurately reflects the scope and intent of the rules.</li> </ul>

## Proposed Kaipara District Plan

### Summary of Submissions for the topic of: Coastal Environment (in Provision order)

Submission point No.	Submitter	Provision	Position	Summary of decision requested	Reasons
				connections, driveways, parking areas, effluent disposal systems, swimming pools, walking or cycling tracks, or farm and <del>commercial</del> forestry tracks.	
140.68	Horticulture New Zealand	CE-R3	Amend	<b>AMEND</b> CE-R3 to include biosecurity clearance. AND any consequential or alternative amendments required to address the concerns raised by the submitter.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If not included, biosecurity clearance would require consent (a change from the ODP). Incursions require rapid responses.</li> </ul>
149.83	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated	CE-R3	Amend	<b>AMEND</b> CE-R3 by providing standards for regionally significant infrastructure that limit vegetation clearance area to 500m <sup>2</sup> over the lifetime of the plan. AND Any consequential amendments and alternative relief to address the concerns raised.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter considers that providing for vegetation clearance for regionally significant infrastructure without standards could result in adverse effects on natural character and indigenous biological diversity within the Coastal Environment. Standards are required under CE-R3 to ensure effects are appropriately managed.</li> </ul>
158.7	Manulife Forest Management NZ Ltd	CE-R3	Amend	<b>AMEND</b> CE-R3.1.b as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The activity complies with CE-S6 Maximum area of indigenous vegetation clearance; or b. The indigenous vegetation clearance is for the maintenance of lawfully established roads, fences, utility connections, driveways, parking areas, effluent disposal systems, swimming pools, walking or cycling tracks, or farm and <del>commercial</del> forestry tracks.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter supports this rule in principle, however, has suggested the amendment above to ensure consistency throughout the proposed district plan.</li> </ul>
263.38	Daytona Trust	CE-R3	Amend	<b>AMEND</b> CE-R3 to add as permitted activities, indigenous vegetation clearance for the following purposes (without a requirement for these to comply with the area limitation standards under NFL-S5 and in addition to the repair and maintenance allowances in the rule as proposed): a. <u>To address an immediate risk to the public safety or damage to property;</u> b. <u>The formation of walking tracks less than 1.5m wide;</u> c. <u>The construction of a new fence where the purpose of the new fence is to exclude stock and/or pests from the area of indigenous vegetation, provided that the clearance does not exceed 3.5m in width either side of the fence line;</u> d. <u>To remove pest species in accordance with any approved pest management plan or biosecurity operational plan;</u> e. <u>To create or maintain a 20m setback from an area of indigenous vegetation to a residential unit (excluding accessory buildings);</u> f. <u>The removal or clearance of indigenous vegetation from land that was previously cleared and where the indigenous vegetation to be cleared is less than 10 years old; and</u> g. <u>Creation and maintenance of firebreaks to manage fire risk.</u> AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Make additional allowances for indigenous vegetation clearance which by its nature will have minor effects on the coastal environment and High Natural Character Areas, is required to enable positive effects, or is required for the health and safety of people. The exclusion is sought only to apply to the High Natural Character Areas and not Outstanding Natural Character Areas.</li> </ul>
283.174	Northpower Limited and Northpower Fibre Limited	CE-R3	Amend	<b>AMEND</b> CE-R3.1. as follows: ... b. The indigenous vegetation clearance is for the <del>operation</del> , maintenance, <del>repair or upgrading</del> of lawfully established roads, fences, <del>utility connections infrastructure</del> , driveways, parking areas, effluent disposal systems, swimming pools, walking or cycling tracks, or farm and forestry tracks; <del>or</del> c. <del>The indigenous vegetation clearance is associated with regionally significant infrastructure.</del> AND <b>AMEND</b> the activity status of CE-R3.4. from Discretionary to Permitted. AND Any further necessary consequential amendments required.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>"Utility Connections" is not defined in the Proposed District Plan.</li> <li>To provide clarity, and to remain consistent with infrastructure enabling provisions within other chapters of the Proposed District Plan.</li> <li>To allow for indigenous vegetation clearance for the operation, repair, upgrading and maintenance of all infrastructure within Outstanding Natural Character Areas in the coastal environment to be a permitted activity in order to align with the rules within the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter.</li> <li>To provide a permitted activity status for indigenous vegetation clearance associated with regionally significant infrastructure within Outstanding Natural Character Areas in the Coastal Environment for better alignment with the provisions in the Natural Features and Landscapes chapter.</li> <li>To provide clarification that the permitted activity status also applies to regionally significant</li> </ul>



## Proposed Kaipara District Plan

### Summary of Submissions for the topic of: Coastal Environment (in Provision order)

Submission point No.	Submitter	Provision	Position	Summary of decision requested	Reasons
					infrastructure within the Coastal Environment generally.
289.38	Tappenden Holdings Limited	CE-R3	Amend	<p><b>ADD</b> permitted activities to CE-R3 for indigenous vegetation clearance for the following purposes (without a requirement for these to comply with the area limitation standards under NFL-S5 and in addition to the repair and maintenance allowances in the rule as proposed):</p> <p><u>a. To address an immediate risk to the public safety or damage to property;</u></p> <p><u>b. The formation of walking tracks less than 1.5m wide;</u></p> <p><u>c. The construction of a new fence where the purpose of the new fence is to exclude stock and/or pests from the area of indigenous vegetation, provided that the clearance does not exceed 3.5m in width either side of the fence line;</u></p> <p><u>d. To remove pest species in accordance with any approved pest management plan or biosecurity operational plan;</u></p> <p><u>e. To create or maintain a 20m setback from an area of indigenous vegetation to a residential unit (excluding accessory buildings);</u></p> <p><u>f. The removal or clearance of indigenous vegetation from land that was previously cleared and where the indigenous vegetation to be cleared is less than 10 years old; and</u></p> <p><u>g. Creation and maintenance of firebreaks to manage fire risk.</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Make additional allowances for indigenous vegetation clearance which by its nature will have minor effects on the coastal environment and Hight Natural Character Areas, is required to enable positive effects, or is required for the health and safety of people. The exclusion is sought only to apply to the Hight Natural Character Areas and not Outstanding Natural Character Areas.</li> </ul>
292.85	Transpower New Zealand Limited	CE-R3	Amend	<p><b>PROVIDE</b> clarity regarding the rule framework and activity cascade for CE-R3 to appropriately provide for indigenous vegetation clearance and earthworks associated with the operation, maintenance and upgrading of regionally significant infrastructure as a permitted activity.</p> <p>AND</p> <p><b>AMEND</b> CE-R3 to ensure that the most restrictive activity status for these activities within the Outstanding Natural Coastal Areas is discretionary.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Alternative or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully achieve the relief sought in the submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As drafted the rules impose (under clause 5) a non-complying activity status for Regionally Significant Infrastructure in Outstanding Natural Coastal Areas. This activity status is not clear as there are no standards which trigger a non-complying activity status, and it is not clear why Regionally Significant Infrastructure alone warrants such as activity status.</li> <li>Specific to the National Grid, as currently drafted, there is no reconciliation with the National Grid specific policy INF-P10, or the National Policy Statement on Electricity Transmission.</li> </ul>
300.50	Bream Tail Residents Association Incorporated	CE-R3	Amend	<p><b>AMEND</b> permitted activities to CE-R3 for indigenous vegetation clearance for the following purposes (without a requirement for these to comply with the area limitation standards under NFL-S5 and in addition to the repair and maintenance allowances in the rule as proposed):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To address an immediate risk to the public safety or damage to property;</li> <li>The formation of walking tracks less than 1.5m wide;</li> <li>The construction of a new fence where the purpose of the new fence is to exclude stock and/or pests from the area of indigenous vegetation, provided that the clearance does not exceed 3.5m in width either side of the fence line;</li> <li>To remove pest species in accordance with any approved pest management plan or biosecurity operational plan;</li> <li>To create or maintain a 20m setback from an area of indigenous vegetation to a residential unit (excluding accessory buildings);</li> <li>The removal or clearance of indigenous vegetation from land that was previously cleared and where the indigenous vegetation to be cleared is less than 10 years old; and</li> <li>Creation and maintenance of firebreaks to manage fire risk.</li> </ol> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Make additional allowances for indigenous vegetation clearance which by its nature will have minor effects on the coastal environment and Hight Natural Character Areas, is required to enable positive effects, or is required for the health and safety of people. The exclusion is sought only to apply to the Hight Natural Character Areas and not Outstanding Natural Character Areas.</li> </ul>
304.111	Director General of Conservation	CE-R3	Amend	<p><b>AMEND</b> CE-R3 to include an ecological assessment requirement to confirm whether indigenous taxa is classified as threatened or at-risk under the New Zealand Threat Classification System List.</p> <p>AND</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To enable indigenous vegetation clearance in the Coastal Environment without an ecological assessment having been undertaken contradicts Policy 11 of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement.</li> </ul>



## Proposed Kaipara District Plan

### Summary of Submissions for the topic of: Coastal Environment (in Provision order)

Submission point No.	Submitter	Provision	Position	Summary of decision requested	Reasons
				Any further or alternative relief to like effect to that sought.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submission provides examples as to why the Rule should require ecological assessment prior to any clearance of indigenous vegetation.</li> </ul>
332.25	Northland Regional Council	CE-R3	Amend	<b>AMEND</b> CE-R3.4. and CE-R3.5. to provide for the maintenance of lawfully established structures, roads and tracks and removal of hazardous trees as a permitted activity.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As drafted, CE-R3.4. and CE-R3.5. appear to apply a non-complying activity status to all indigenous vegetation clearance unless it is associated with regionally significant infrastructure. The submitter considers this is onerous and recommends the rule is amended to provide for the maintenance of lawfully established activities (e.g., the removal of hazardous trees, maintenance of roads, tracks or buildings).</li> <li>The submitter also requests the same maintenance provisions are applied to Earthworks chapter rule CE-R4 and Natural Features and Landscapes chapter rules NFL-R3(4) and NFL-R4(4) - refer to subsequent submission points.</li> </ul>
84.8	Te Uri o Hau	CE-R3	Oppose	No specific decision requested; however the submission opposes CE-R3 and considers that treating the land away from the coast differently from all other rural land is not reasonable. Any restriction should be based on area not lots.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Rule does not consider size and/or position.</li> <li>Much of the submitter's land is within the coastal environment but is largely paddocks, i.e., rural land and they believe that treating land set back from the coast differently to other rural land is unreasonable.</li> <li>All rural land will have indigenous plants, many with greater diversity than along the west coast.</li> <li>The submitter questions why coastal environment rural land should be treated differently?</li> <li>The permitted removal amount on a larger block is tiny, and it would be more reasonable for a restriction to be based on area rather than lots.</li> </ul>
85.8	Dominic Leigh	CE-R3	Oppose	No specific decision requested; however the submission opposes CE-R3 and considers that treating the land away from the coast differently from all other rural land is not reasonable. Any restriction should be based on area not lots.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The rule does not consider size and/or position.</li> <li>Much of the submitter's land is within the coastal environment but is largely paddocks, i.e., rural land.</li> <li>Treating land set back from the coast differently to other rural land is unreasonable - all rural land will have indigenous plants, many with greater diversity than along the west coast and the submitter questions why coastal environment rural land should be treated differently?</li> <li>The permitted removal amount on a larger block is tiny and it would be more reasonable for a restriction to be based on area rather than lots.</li> </ul>
136.114	Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc) - Northland Province	CE-R3	Support	<b>AMEND</b> CE-R3 as follows: <b>ONCA</b> <b>Where:</b> ... <u>X. the activity is associated with essential farming activities such as fencing, farm tracks and farm drains.</u> OR With wording with similar effect. <b>ADD</b> CE-R3 from the Coastal Environment chapter and into the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter. <b>AND</b> Any consequential amendments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter supports CE-R3 in part.</li> <li>The restriction for ONCA where the building or structure is only permitted if it is associated with regionally significant infrastructure is not supported. The coastal environment overlay covers over 57 percent of farms located in the Kaipara district. The requirement for farmers to have to go through a non-complying resource consent application each time they want to establish a new building or structure on their land is restrictive and unnecessary.</li> <li>Federated Farmers considers that the Proposed District Plan may be easier to use if all rules for indigenous vegetation clearance, including those in the overlays, are located in the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter. The National Planning Standards gives mandatory direction for the layout of District Plans. Section 7, clause 19 states that matters relating to the maintenance of biological diversity must be located in the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter, with clause 20 also provides for provisions to protect natural character to be located in the Natural Character chapter.</li> <li>Section 7, clause 28 (a) allows the Coastal Environment chapter to set out provisions for implementing coastal environment functions and duties, while (c) provides for cross referencing to specific coastal provisions that may be located in other chapters. It is considered that the Proposed District Plan would be easier to understand if rule</li> </ul>

## Proposed Kaipara District Plan

### Summary of Submissions for the topic of: Coastal Environment (in Provision order)

Submission point No.	Submitter	Provision	Position	Summary of decision requested	Reasons
					CE-R3 was relocated into the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter.
73.9	PF Olsen Ltd	CE-R4	Amend	<p><b>AMEND</b> CE-R4 to align with the National Environmental Standards for Commercial Forestry (NES-CF)</p> <p>AND</p> <p><b>ADD</b> a note to CE-R4 that clarifies/ confirms that CE-R4 does not apply to commercial forestry-related earthworks.</p> <p>AND</p> <p><b>PROVIDE</b> detailed justification, supported by robust evidence, for any deviation from the NES-CF in relation to permitted forestry activities, including reviewing the Section 32 report to ensure that any proposed deviation from the NES-CF is fully evaluated and justified in terms of efficiency, effectiveness, and necessity.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submission seeks to ensure that permitted commercial forestry activities in the Coastal Environment are not subject to additional standards beyond those required by the National Environmental Standards for Commercial Forestry (NES-CF).</li> <li>Their reasons for opposition are summarised as follows (see submission for detail): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Deviation from the NES-CF - CE-R4 as notified requires permitted activities in the Coastal Environment to meet additional standards not required by the NES-CF. This approach undermines the intent of the NES-CS and creates unnecessary regulatory complexity for forestry operators.</li> <li>Lack of justification in the Section 32 Report - Section 32 Report does not demonstrate that the NES-CF standards are insufficient to manage the effects of permitted forestry activities in the Coastal Environment and does not identify any unique local circumstances that warrant a more restrictive approach.</li> <li>Economic and Operational Implications - Imposing additional standards on permitted activities creates unnecessary regulatory burden and uncertainty for forestry operators. This can result in increased compliance costs, delays, and reduced investment in sustainable land management practices.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
140.69	Horticulture New Zealand	CE-R4	Amend	<p><b>AMEND</b> CE-R4.1.b. as follows:</p> <p>b. The earthworks is for the maintenance of lawfully established roads, fences, utility connections, driveways, parking areas, effluent disposal systems, swimming pools, walking or cycling tracks, or farm and forestry tracks <u>and biosecurity clearance</u>.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential or alternative amendments required to address the concerns raised by the submitter.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biosecurity clearance needs to be provided for in case of an incursion.</li> </ul>
149.84	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated	CE-R4	Amend	<p><b>AMEND</b> CE-R4 by providing standards for regionally significant infrastructure that limit earthworks to 500m<sup>3</sup> over the lifetime of the plan.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments and alternative relief to address the concerns raised.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter considers that providing for earthworks for regionally significant infrastructure without standards could result in adverse effects on natural character and indigenous biological diversity within the Coastal Environment. Standards are required under CE-R4 to ensure effects are appropriately managed.</li> </ul>
158.8	Manulife Forest Management NZ Ltd	CE-R4	Amend	<p><b>AMEND</b> CE-R4.1.b.vii as follows:</p> <p>Activity Status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>(b)...</p> <p>viii. The earthworks is for the maintenance of lawfully established roads, fences, utility connections, driveways, parking areas, effluent disposal systems, swimming pools, walking or cycling tracks, or farm and <del>commercial</del> forestry tracks.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter supports this rule in principle, however, has suggested the amendment above to ensure consistency throughout the proposed district plan.</li> </ul>
283.175	Northpower Limited and Northpower Fibre Limited	CE-R4	Amend	<p><b>AMEND</b> CE-R4.1. as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>b. The earthworks is for the <u>operation, maintenance, upgrading or repair</u> of lawfully established roads, fences, <del>utility connections</del> <u>infrastructure</u>, driveways, parking areas, effluent disposal systems, swimming pools, walking or cycling tracks, or farm and forestry tracks.</p> <p><u>c. The earthworks is associated with regionally significant infrastructure.</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p><b>AMEND</b> CE-R3.4. as follows:</p> <p>a. The earthworks is associated with regionally significant infrastructure; <u>or</u></p> <p><u>b. the earthworks is for the operation, maintenance, repair or upgrading of existing infrastructure."</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>"Utility Connections" is not defined in the Proposed District Plan.</li> <li>To provide clarity and to remain consistent with infrastructure enabling provisions within other chapters of the Proposed District Plan.</li> <li>To provide for earthworks for the operation, repair, upgrading and maintenance of all infrastructure within Outstanding Natural Character Areas in the coastal environment as a permitted activity to align with the rules within the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter.</li> <li>To provide clarification that the permitted activity status also applies to regionally significant infrastructure within the Coastal Environment generally.</li> </ul>

## Proposed Kaipara District Plan

### Summary of Submissions for the topic of: Coastal Environment (in Provision order)

Submission point No.	Submitter	Provision	Position	Summary of decision requested	Reasons
				AND Any further necessary consequential amendments required.	
292.86	Transpower New Zealand Limited	CE-R4	Amend	<b>PROVIDE</b> clarity regarding the rule framework and activity cascade for CE-R4 to appropriately provide for indigenous vegetation clearance and earthworks associated with the operation, maintenance and upgrading of regionally significant infrastructure as a permitted activity. AND <b>AMEND</b> CE-R4 to ensure that the most restrictive activity status for these activities within the Outstanding Natural Coastal Areas is discretionary. AND Alternative or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully achieve the relief sought in the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As drafted the rules impose (under clause 5) a non-complying activity status for Regionally Significant Infrastructure in Outstanding Natural Coastal Areas. This activity status is not clear as there are no standards which trigger a non-complying activity status, and it is not clear why Regionally Significant Infrastructure alone warrants such as activity status.</li> <li>Specific to the National Grid, as currently drafted, there is no reconciliation with the National Grid specific policy INF-P10, or the National Policy Statement on Electricity Transmission.</li> </ul>
332.26	Northland Regional Council	CE-R4	Amend	<b>AMEND</b> CE-R4 to provide for maintenance of lawfully established structures, roads and tracks and removal of hazardous trees as a permitted activity.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As drafted, CE-R4 appears to apply a non-complying activity status to all indigenous vegetation clearance unless it is associated with regionally significant infrastructure. The submitter considers this is onerous and recommends the rule is amended to provide for the maintenance of lawfully established activities (e.g., the removal of hazardous trees, maintenance of roads, tracks or buildings).</li> <li>The submitter also requests the same maintenance provisions are applied to indigenous vegetation clearance rule CE-R3 in the Coastal Environment chapter and Natural Features and Landscapes chapter rules NFL-R3.4. and NFL-R4.4. - refer to preceding and subsequent submission points.</li> </ul>
84.9	Te Uri o Hau	CE-R4	Oppose	No specific decision requested; however the submission opposes CE-R4 and considers that treating the land away from the coast differently from all other rural land is not reasonable. Any restriction should be based on area not lots.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The rule does not consider size and/or position.</li> <li>Much of the submitter's land is within the coastal environment but is largely paddocks, i.e., rural land and they believe that treating land set back from the coast differently to other rural land is unreasonable. All rural land will have indigenous plants, many with greater diversity than along the west coast.</li> <li>The submitter questions why coastal environment rural land should be treated differently?</li> <li>The permitted removal amount on a larger block is tiny, and it would be more reasonable for a restriction to be based on area rather than lots.</li> </ul>
85.9	Dominic Leigh	CE-R4	Oppose	No specific decision requested; however the submission opposes CE-R4 and considers that treating the land away from the coast differently from all other rural land is not reasonable. Any restriction should be based on area not lots.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The rule does not consider size and/or position.</li> <li>Much of the submitter's land is within the coastal environment but is largely paddocks, i.e., rural land.</li> <li>Treating land set back from the coast differently to other rural land is unreasonable - all rural land will have indigenous plants, many with greater diversity than along the west coast and the submitter questions why coastal environment rural land should be treated differently?</li> <li>The permitted removal amount on a larger block is tiny and it would be more reasonable for a restriction to be based on area rather than lots.</li> </ul>
251.5	Leighway Holdings Limited	CE-R4	Oppose	<b>DELETE</b> CE-R4 as it applies to the Coastal Environment (excluding ONCA). (Note referencing error in submission) AND Any consequential or further amendments necessary to give effect to the relief sought and reasons given.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The 500m<sup>3</sup> per decade limit for earthworks in the Coastal Environment is arbitrary and unjustified.</li> </ul>
136.115	Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc) - Northland Province	CE-R4	Support	<b>AMEND</b> CE-R4 as follows: <b>ONCA</b> <b>Where:</b> ... <u>X. the activity is associated with essential farming activities such as fencing, farm tracks and farm drains.</u> OR With wording with similar effect. AND <b>ADD</b> CE-R4 from the Coastal Environment chapter into the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter. AND Any consequential amendments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter supports CE-R4. However, the restriction for ONCA where the building or structure is only permitted if it is associated with regionally significant infrastructure is not supported. The coastal environment overlay covers over 57 percent of farms located in the Kaipara district. The requirement for farmers to have to go through a non-complying resource consent application each time they want to establish a new building or structure on their land is restrictive and unnecessary.</li> <li>The submitter considers that the Proposed District Plan may be easier to use if all provisions for earthworks are in the Earthworks chapter. The</li> </ul>

## Proposed Kaipara District Plan

### Summary of Submissions for the topic of: Coastal Environment (in Provision order)

Submission point No.	Submitter	Provision	Position	Summary of decision requested	Reasons
					National Planning Standards gives mandatory direction for the layout of District Plans. Section 7, clause 29 states that provisions for managing earthworks must be located in the Earthworks chapter.
263.39	Daytona Trust	CE-R4	Support	<b>RETAIN</b> CE-R4. AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CE-R4 is appropriate.</li> </ul>
289.39	Tappenden Holdings Limited	CE-R4	Support	<b>RETAIN</b> CE-R4. AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The rule is appropriate.</li> </ul>
300.51	Bream Tail Residents Association Incorporated	CE-R4	Support	<b>RETAIN</b> CE-R4. AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The rule is appropriate.</li> </ul>
73.4	PF Olsen Ltd	CE-R5	Oppose	<b>DELETE</b> "All Coastal Environment (excluding ONCA)" from CE-R5 so that commercial forests are permitted for erosion control purposes AND <b>AMEND</b> the Proposed District Plan to explicitly recognise and provide for the role of both plantation forestry and exotic continuous cover forestry as erosion control tools in the coastal environment, and that any rules do not unduly restrict these important land management practices.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The reasons are summarised as follows (see submission for full details of reasoning): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The definition of Commercial Forestry includes both plantation forestry and exotic continuous cover forestry. These forests fall within the regulatory scope of the National Environmental Standard for Commercial Forestry (NES-CF), and unless justified under the NES-CF's stringency provisions, local rules should not impose more restrictive provisions than those provided for in the national standard.</li> <li>Sedimentation of the Kaipara Harbour is a long-standing and well-documented issue. Commercial forests offer considerable benefits for erosion control in steep and sensitive catchments. Commercial forests are therefore consistent with the broader environmental objectives of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement and the Northland Regional Policy Statement, especially in the context of coastal resilience and catchment management.</li> <li>The rule fails to meet the RMA and NES-CF stringency tests.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
251.4	Leighway Holdings Limited	CE-S1	Amend	<b>AMEND</b> CE-S1 as follows: 1. The maximum height of the building or structure is <del>8.5m above ground level in the coastal environment outside HNCA and ONCA complies with the height limit of the underlying zone.</del> OR <b>AMEND</b> CE-S1 as follows: 1. The maximum height of the building or structure is <del>8.5</del> 10m above ground level in the coastal environment outside HNCA and ONCA. AND Any consequential or further amendments necessary to give effect to the relief sought and reasons given.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is a difference in height limits in the Coastal Environment and the High Natural Character and Outstanding Natural Character Areas. Submitter considers that a differentiation between the height limits is generally understandable but raises concern that no assessment has been provided in the Section 32 Report for the 8.5 m height limit and no analysis to support the conclusion that height about that level will result in significant adverse effects on coastal character.</li> </ul>
263.40	Daytona Trust	CE-S1	Amend	<b>AMEND</b> CE-S1 to exempt the following from maximum height: a. <u>Chimney structures not exceeding 1.2m in width and 1m in height on any elevation; and</u> b. <u>Architectural features (e.g. finials, spires) that do not exceed 1m in height.</u> c. <u>Solar and water heating components provided these do not exceed the height by more than 0.5m on any elevation.</u> d. <u>Satellite dishes and aerials that do not exceed 1m in height and/or diameter on any elevation.</u> AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional allowances should be made for rooftop projections within specified parameters. Within the specified height limits as sought in the submission, these features will have no or negligible impact on the on the characteristics, qualities and values of the Outstanding Natural Landscape or Outstanding Natural Feature.</li> </ul>
289.40	Tappenden Holdings Limited	CE-S1	Amend	<b>AMEND</b> CE-S1 to exempt the following from maximum height:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional allowances should be made for rooftop projections within specified parameters. Within the specified height limits as sought in the submission,</li> </ul>

## Proposed Kaipara District Plan

### Summary of Submissions for the topic of: Coastal Environment (in Provision order)

Submission point No.	Submitter	Provision	Position	Summary of decision requested	Reasons
				<p>a. Chimney structures not exceeding 1.2m in width and 1m in height on any elevation; and</p> <p>b. Architectural features (e.g. finials, spires) that do not exceed 1m in height.</p> <p>c. Solar and water heating components provided these do not exceed the height by more than 0.5m on any elevation.</p> <p>d. Satellite dishes and aerials that do not exceed 1m in height and/or diameter on any elevation.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	these features will have no or negligible impact on the on the characteristics, qualities and values of the Outstanding Natural Landscape or Outstanding Natural Feature.
300.52	Bream Tail Residents Association Incorporated	CE-S1	Amend	<p><b>AMEND</b> CE-S1 to exempt the following from maximum height:</p> <p>a. Chimney structures not exceeding 1.2m in width and 1m in height on any elevation; and</p> <p>b. Architectural features (e.g. finials, spires) that do not exceed 1m in height.</p> <p>c. Solar and water heating components provided these do not exceed the height by more than 0.5m on any elevation.</p> <p>d. Satellite dishes and aerials that do not exceed 1m in height and/or diameter on any elevation.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional allowances should be made for rooftop projections within specified parameters. Within the specified height limits as sought in the submission, these features will have no or negligible impact on the on the characteristics, qualities and values of the ONL or ONF.</li> </ul>
84.12	Te Uri o Hau	CE-S1	Oppose	<p><b>AMEND</b> CE-S1 so that the building height is 10m to match the Rural zone.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter asks how can it possibly be reasonable to chop 1.5m of peoples building rights (height)? The coastal environment rural land is just that, rural land and it is grossly inappropriate and not unfair to say morally wrong to treat it any different than any other rural land building requirement. It should be 10m like all Rural zones.</li> <li>As an example of how inappropriate this is, the submitter notes that the block to their south above Maules Gorge could build a 10m dwelling in full view from the coast closer than large areas of our block yet they are restricted to 8.5m for vast areas away from the existing HNCA and ONCA zones mostly completely out of view from the coast. The submitter believes this is wrong.</li> </ul>
85.12	Dominic Leigh	CE-S1	Oppose	<p><b>AMEND</b> CE-S1 so that the building height is 10m to match the Rural zone.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter asks how can it possibly be reasonable to chop 1.5m of peoples building rights (height)? The coastal environment rural land is just that, rural land and it is grossly inappropriate and not unfair to say morally wrong to treat it any different than any other rural land building requirement. It should be 10m like all Rural zones.</li> <li>As an example of how inappropriate this is, the submitter notes that the block to their south above Maules Gorge could build a 10m dwelling in full view from the coast closer than large areas of our block yet they are restricted to 8.5m for vast areas away from the existing HNCA and ONCA zones mostly completely out of view from the coast. The submitter believes this is wrong.</li> </ul>
247.32	Foodstuffs North Island Limited	CE-S1	Support	<p><b>RETAIN</b> CE-S1 as notified.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any necessary consequential amendments.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submitter supports the permitted height and exterior colour and reflectivity thresholds for buildings in the coastal environment.</li> </ul>
50.29	Evolve Planning and Landscape Architecture	CE-S2	Amend	<p><b>AMEND</b> CE-S2.a to include 'Colours to be natural and in keeping with the landscape'.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The colour rule provides for colours that are not appropriate and needs to be revised to be specific in terms of colours.</li> </ul>
223.14	KMA IQ Trustee Limited	CE-S2	Amend	<p><b>AMEND</b> CE-S2 to allow for the use of natural exterior materials.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No reason provided.</li> </ul>
263.41	Daytona Trust	CE-S2	Amend	<p><b>AMEND</b> CE-S2 to allow for natural materials as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The building and structure exteriors must: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Be constructed of natural materials or if the exterior surface is coloured or painted with then be a colour with a reflectance value no greater than 35% (provided that 2% of each exterior elevation</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Natural materials are visually suitable in coastal areas.</li> </ul>

## Proposed Kaipara District Plan

### Summary of Submissions for the topic of: Coastal Environment (in Provision order)

Submission point No.	Submitter	Provision	Position	Summary of decision requested	Reasons
				is exempt) and with a roof colour with a reflectance value no greater than 30%; and b. Not utilise mirror glazing.  AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	
289.41	Tappenden Holdings Limited	CE-S2	Amend	<b>AMEND</b> CE-S2 to allow for natural materials as follows: 1. The building and structure exteriors must: a. Be <u>constructed of natural materials or if the exterior surface is coloured or painted, with then be</u> a colour with a reflectance value no greater than 35% (provided that 2% of each exterior elevation is exempt) and with a roof colour with a reflectance value no greater than 30%; and b. Not utilise mirror glazing. AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Natural materials are visually suitable in coastal areas.</li> </ul>
300.53	Bream Tail Residents Association Incorporated	CE-S2	Amend	<b>AMEND</b> CE-S2 to allow for natural materials as follows: 1. The building and structure exteriors must: a. Be <u>constructed of natural materials or if the exterior surface is coloured or painted with then be</u> a colour with a reflectance value no greater than 35% (provided that 2% of each exterior elevation is exempt) and with a roof colour with a reflectance value no greater than 30%; and b. Not utilise mirror glazing. AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Natural materials are visually suitable in coastal areas.</li> </ul>
348.3	Thelma and Louise Mangawhai Limited	CE-S2	Amend	<b>AMEND</b> CE-S2 to allow for the use of natural exterior materials.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No reasons provided.</li> </ul>
247.33	Foodstuffs North Island Limited	CE-S2	Support	<b>RETAIN</b> CE-S2 as notified. AND Any necessary consequential amendments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submitter supports the permitted height and exterior colour and reflectivity thresholds for buildings in the coastal environment.</li> </ul>
223.15	KMA IQ Trustee Limited	CE-S3	Oppose	<b>DELETE</b> CE-S3 Gross floor area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The standard is too restrictive.</li> </ul>
263.42	Daytona Trust	CE-S3	Oppose	<b>DELETE</b> CE-S3. AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gross floor area is opposed because it is too low to accommodate many residential dwellings, including the average size of a dwelling in New Zealand.</li> <li>It is unnecessary in terms of managing effects on the coastal environment, having regard to the balance of other rules and standards which apply.</li> </ul>
289.42	Tappenden Holdings Limited	CE-S3	Oppose	<b>DELETE</b> CE-S3. AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gross Floor Area is opposed because it is too low to accommodate many residential dwellings, including the average size of a dwelling in New Zealand.</li> <li>It is unnecessary in terms of managing effects on the coastal environment, having regard to the balance of other rules and standards which apply.</li> </ul>
300.54	Bream Tail Residents Association Incorporated	CE-S3	Oppose	<b>DELETE</b> CE-S3. AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gross Floor Area is opposed because it is too low to accommodate many residential dwellings, including the average size of a dwelling in New Zealand.</li> <li>It is unnecessary in terms of managing effects on the coastal environment, having regard to the balance of other rules and standards which apply.</li> </ul>
348.4	Thelma and Louise Mangawhai Limited	CE-S3	Oppose	<b>DELETE</b> CE-S3.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The 300m<sup>2</sup> gross floor area total for all buildings on a site is too restrictive and should be deleted.</li> </ul>
247.34	Foodstuffs North Island Limited	CE-S3	Support	<b>RETAIN</b> CE-S3 as notified. AND Any necessary consequential amendments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the permitted threshold of 300m<sup>2</sup> for buildings in the coastal environment outside HNCA and ONCA.</li> </ul>
149.85	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New	CE-S4	Amend	<b>AMEND</b> CE-S4 by shortening the timeframe for reinstatement to as soon as practicable and within 1-month or a more conservative timeframe.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter is concerned about the 12-month timeframe between the completion of earthworks and site reinstatement. Over 12-months, there is</li> </ul>



## Proposed Kaipara District Plan

### Summary of Submissions for the topic of: Coastal Environment (in Provision order)

Submission point No.	Submitter	Provision	Position	Summary of decision requested	Reasons
	Zealand Incorporated			AND Any consequential amendments and alternative relief to address the concerns raised.	potential for disturbed land to enter coastal waters or become unstable as it is exposed to the coastal environment, resulting in adverse effects on the coastal environment. By shortening the reinstatement timeframe to as soon as practicable and within 1-month (or something more conservative), exposed areas will not become unstable or enter coastal waters.
84.10	Te Uri o Hau	CE-S4	Oppose	No specific decision requested; however the submission opposes CE-S4 and considers that treating the land away from the coast differently from all other rural land is not reasonable. Any restriction should be based on area not lots.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The rule does not consider size and/or position.</li> <li>Much of the submitter's land is within the coastal environment but is largely paddocks, i.e., rural land and they believe that treating land set back from the coast differently to other rural land is unreasonable. All rural land will have indigenous plants, many with greater diversity than along the west coast.</li> <li>The submitter questions why coastal environment rural land should be treated differently?</li> <li>The permitted removal amount on a larger block is tiny, and it would be more reasonable for a restriction to be based on area rather than lots.</li> </ul>
85.10	Dominic Leigh	CE-S4	Oppose	No specific decision requested, however the submission opposes CE-S4 and considers that treating the land away from the coast differently from all other rural land is not reasonable. Any restriction should be based on area not lots.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Much of the submitter's land is within the coastal environment but is largely paddocks, i.e., rural land.</li> <li>Treating land set back from the coast differently to other rural land is unreasonable - all rural land will have indigenous plants, many with greater diversity than along the west coast and the submitter questions why coastal environment rural land should be treated differently?</li> <li>The permitted removal amount on a larger block is tiny and it would be more reasonable for a restriction to be based on area rather than lots.</li> </ul>
223.16	KMA IQ Trustee Limited	CE-S4	Oppose	<b>DELETE</b> CE-S4 Maximum earthworks volume.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The standard is too restrictive.</li> </ul>
251.6	Leighway Holdings Limited	CE-S4	Oppose	<b>DELETE</b> CE-S4. AND Any consequential or further amendments necessary to give effect to the relief sought and reasons given.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The 500m<sup>3</sup> per decade limit is arbitrary and unjustified. The General standards in the Earthworks chapter are sufficient.</li> </ul>
348.5	Thelma and Louise Mangawhai Limited	CE-S4	Oppose	<b>DELETE</b> CE-S4.1.a.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is too restrictive.</li> </ul>
251.7	Leighway Holdings Limited	CE-S5	Oppose	<b>DELETE</b> CE-S5. AND Any consequential or further amendments necessary to give effect to the relief sought and reasons given.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The 500m<sup>3</sup> per decade limit for earthworks in the coastal environment is arbitrary and unjustified. The general standards in the Earthworks chapter are sufficient.</li> </ul>
140.70	Horticulture New Zealand	CE-S6	Amend	<b>ADD</b> a Note to CE-S6 as follows: <u>Note: Biosecurity clearance is exempt from maximum area clearance.</u> AND any consequential or alternative amendments required to address the concerns raised by the submitter.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To restrict biosecurity clearance will result in incursion spread threatening indigenous biodiversity.</li> </ul>
84.11	Te Uri o Hau	CE-S6	Oppose	No specific decision requested; however the submission opposes CE-S6 and considers that treating the land away from the coast differently from all other rural land is not reasonable. Any restriction should be based on area not lots.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The rule does not consider size and/or position.</li> <li>Much of the submitter's land is within the coastal environment but is largely paddocks, i.e., rural land and they believe that treating land set back from the coast differently to other rural land is unreasonable. All rural land will have indigenous plants, many with greater diversity than along the west coast.</li> <li>The submitter questions why coastal environment rural land should be treated differently?</li> <li>The permitted removal amount on a larger block is tiny, and it would be more reasonable for a restriction to be based on area rather than lots.</li> </ul>
85.11	Dominic Leigh	CE-S6	Oppose	No specific decision requested; however the submission opposes CE-S6 and considers that treating the land away from coast differently from all other rural land is not	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The rule does not consider size and/or position.</li> <li>Much of the submitter's land is within the coastal environment but is largely paddocks, i.e., rural land.</li> </ul>

## Proposed Kaipara District Plan

### Summary of Submissions for the topic of: Coastal Environment (in Provision order)

Submission point No.	Submitter	Provision	Position	Summary of decision requested	Reasons
				reasonable. Any restrictions should be based on area not lots.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Treating land set back from the coast differently to other rural land is unreasonable - all rural land will have indigenous plants, many with greater diversity than along the west coast and the submitter questions why coastal environment rural land should be treated differently?</li> <li>The permitted removal amount on a larger block is tiny and it would be more reasonable for a restriction to be based on area rather than lots.</li> </ul>
84.13	Te Uri o Hau	General	Amend	<b>AMEND</b> the extent of the Coastal Environment so it runs parallel to the coast (inferred) with the view from the coast being the other consideration.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Coastal Environment chapter and extent is opposed in part. The submitter considers that the coastal environment extends excessively into private land and use rights based on the amount of sand and green grass. For example, the Ripiro Beach coastline is straight and, therefore, the coastal environment should be straight along the coastline if Council's concern is regarding excessive and/or inappropriate development. The Proposed District Plan discusses the effects of development as viewed from the coast. As such, the coastal environment should be parallel to the coast, and the only consideration should be how development is viewed from the coast.</li> <li>The submitter notes that their land has hundreds of metres within the coastal environment that cannot be seen from the coast and believes this is inappropriate without visual effects being a consideration.</li> <li>The coastal environment imposes additional costs on landowners and is unfairly restrictive compared to Rural zones. Notably, a manmade water retention pond on a nearby dairy farm has been mapped within the coastal environment. This 'pond' is not a coastal feature or sand lake and should not be within the coastal environment.</li> </ul>
99.6	Venessa Anich	Overview	Amend	<b>RETAIN</b> the acknowledgement in the Overview statement in the Coastal Environment chapter that most of the coastline is undeveloped within limited built development, with the exception of Mangawhai. AND <b>ADD</b> to the Overview Statement in the Coastal Environment chapter mention of the West Coast and Ripiro Beach as being under pressure from development that will ruin the Wild West Coast characteristics.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No reasons provided.</li> </ul>
136.193	Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc) - Northland Province	General	Amend	<b>DELETE</b> any rules and associated policies for indigenous vegetation clearance in the Coastal Environment chapter (no specific provisions mentioned but CE-R3 is inferred). AND <b>ADD</b> any deleted rules and associated policies for indigenous vegetation clearance (such as CE-R3) to the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter. AND Any consequential amendments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter considers that the Proposed District Plan may be easier to use if all rules for indigenous vegetation clearance, including those in the overlays, are located in the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter.</li> <li>The National Planning Standards gives mandatory direction for the layout of District Plans. Section 7, clause 19 states that matters relating to the maintenance of biological diversity must be located in the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter, although clause 20 also provides for provisions to protect natural character to be located in the Natural Character chapter.</li> <li>Section 7, clause 28 (a) allows the Coastal Environment chapter to set out provisions for implementing coastal environment functions and duties, while (c) provides for cross-referencing to specific coastal provisions that may be located in other chapters.</li> </ul>
149.146	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated	General	Amend	<b>ADD</b> to the Coastal Environment chapter an explanation and reference to the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter regarding biodiversity matters within the coastal environment. AND Any consequential amendments and alternative relief to address the concerns raised.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter is concerned that it may not be clear to plan users to look beyond the Coastal Environment chapter. A clear explanation and reference in the Coastal Environment chapter/section to the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter is needed to ensure the Proposed District Plan is clear and effective.</li> </ul>
149.77	Royal Forest and Bird Protection	Overview	Amend	<b>AMEND</b> the first line of the Overview to the Coastal Environment chapter as follows	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amendment to the start of the Coastal Environment Overview is required to clarify the purpose of the</li> </ul>

## Proposed Kaipara District Plan

### Summary of Submissions for the topic of: Coastal Environment (in Provision order)

Submission point No.	Submitter	Provision	Position	Summary of decision requested	Reasons
	Society of New Zealand Incorporated			<p>This chapter aims to preserve and restore the natural character of the coastal environment and protect it from inappropriate subdivision, use and development. <u>The purpose of this chapter is to preserve and restore the natural character of the coastal environment and protect it from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p><b>ADD</b> to text into the Overview stating the scope of the section is not just covering natural character, but other matters as set out in the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement and explaining where in the District Plan biodiversity matters within the Coastal Environment are addressed.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments and alternative relief to address the concerns raised.</p>	<p>chapter being to preserve and restore natural character rather than aiming to. Section 6(a) RMA and the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement requires preservation to be both recognised and provided for and the Proposed District Plan should give effect to this direction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter notes that, as drafted, the text gives the impression of scope only extending to natural character; however, the NZCPS provides direction on other matters including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Safeguarding the integrity, form, functioning and resilience of the coastal environment;</li> <li>Maintaining and enhancing public open space and recreation opportunities;</li> <li>Coastal hazards and risk; and</li> <li>Enabling people and communities to provide for their wellbeing and health and safety.</li> </ul> </li> <li>It is requested that these matters are integrated into the Coastal Environment Overview.</li> </ul>
149.80	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated	General	Amend	<p><b>ADD</b> new objectives and policies that give effect to the Coastal Environment chapter following New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement policies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy 1 – extent and characteristics of the coastal environment</li> <li>Policy 2 – the Treaty of Waitangi, tangata whenua and Māori heritage</li> <li>Policy 3 – Precautionary approach</li> <li>Policy 4 – integration</li> <li>Policy 6 – activities in the coastal environment</li> <li>Policy 7 – strategic planning</li> <li>Policy 10 – reclamation and de-reclamation</li> <li>Policy 11 – indigenous biological diversity (unless referred to in this section as being included fully in the ECO chapter)</li> <li>Policy 12 – Harmful aquatic organisms</li> <li>Policy 17 – Historic heritage identification and protection</li> <li>Policy 18 – Public open space</li> <li>Policy 19 – Walking access</li> <li>Policy 20 – vehicle access</li> <li>Policy 21 – enhancement of water quality</li> <li>Policy 22(2) – (4) – Sedimentation</li> <li>Policy 23(4)</li> <li>Policy 24 – Identification of coastal hazards</li> <li>Policy 25 – Subdivision, use and development in areas of coastal hazard risk</li> <li>Policy 26 – Natural defences against coastal hazards</li> <li>Policy 27 – Strategies for protecting significant existing development from coastal hazard risk</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments and alternative relief to address the concerns raised.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional Coastal Environment objectives and policies are required to give effect to the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement.</li> </ul>
149.86	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated	General	Amend	<p><b>ADD</b> a new standard to the Coastal Environment rules requiring dust, silt and sediment controls similar to EW-S4 for earthworks activities within the Coastal Environment.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments and alternative relief to address the concerns raised.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A dust, silt, sediment control standard (like EW-S4) is required for earthworks in the Coastal Environment to appropriately manage the effects of earthworks.</li> </ul>
216.64	Cabra Mangawhai Ltd & Pro Land Matters Ltd	General	Amend	<p>AMEND the provisions of the Coastal Environment chapter to provide a more extensive and directive policy framework to guide decision making on subdivision and land use development in the coastal environment and ensure this aligns with the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement and the Northland Regional Policy Statement.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter has requested the above resolutions to ensure that the policy framework and guidance aligns with the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement, and the Northland Regional Policy Statement.</li> </ul>
251.1	Leighway Holdings Limited	General	Amend	<p><b>AMEND</b> the location and extent of the Coastal Environment overlay, particularly as it relates to the submitter's site held in Records of Title 499504 and NA1044/230, legal descriptions Lot 3 DP 425236 and Section 33 Block I Kopuru Survey District (Refer to Map in Appendix A of submission).</p> <p>AND</p> <p><b>AMEND</b> the Coastal Environment overlay so that it is reduced to align with the High Natural Character Area overlay on the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Northland Regional Council (NRC) undertook a mapping exercise during the development of its Regional Policy Statement (RPS) between 2011 and 2014. In relation to the site, NRC's worksheet appears to base the coastal environment line assessment on land contour, presence of dune fields, and presence of coastal lakes. The submitter notes it does not appear a site visit was undertaken to confirm the findings.</li> </ul>

## Proposed Kaipara District Plan

### Summary of Submissions for the topic of: Coastal Environment (in Provision order)

Submission point No.	Submitter	Provision	Position	Summary of decision requested	Reasons
				<p>submitter's site, as shown in light green in Appendix A of the submission.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential or further amendments necessary to give effect to the relief sought and reasons given.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy 4.5.4 of the RPS contemplates further assessment will be undertaken. Despite changing the regulatory impact of the coastal environment maps, the Proposed District Plan has not sought to undertake more detailed mapping.</li> <li>In relation to the Site, the Coastal Environment overlay is inaccurate. The vast majority of the site is in exotic pasture and used for livestock grazing. The submitter considers only the forefront of the site has coastal influence and character, being the area of the site identified as Outstanding Natural Landscape and High Natural Character.</li> <li>Lake Rehutai (identified on NRC's worksheet is approximately 1.4 km north west of the Site and is not visually connected to the site.</li> <li>Refer submission for further details.</li> </ul>
263.35	Daytona Trust	General	Amend	<p><b>ADD</b> a new policy in the Coastal Environment chapter, as follows:</p> <p><u>Existing subdivision, use and development</u></p> <p><u>Recognise that lawfully established subdivision, land use and development are located within the coastal environment, including High Natural Character Areas and Outstanding Natural Character Areas and allow them to continue without undue restriction.</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To recognise that lawfully established existing subdivision, use and development are located within the coastal environment and allow them to continue without undue restriction. The submitter's site at Bream Tail is an example of this.</li> </ul>
263.57	Daytona Trust	General	Amend	<p><b>DELETE</b> the mapped extent of the Coastal Environment overlay from the following properties at Bream Tail so that it accurately follows characteristics and features, including the first prominent ridge line or contour from the coastal marine area:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>15 Tuaraki Road, Mangawhai (LOT 6 DP 400385); and</li> <li>17 Tuaraki Road, Mangawhai (LOT 5 DP 400385).</li> </ol> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The mapped extent of the coastal environment at Bream Tail Farm follows a simplified straight-line form and an approximation of key features set out in the Coastal Environment Assessment Criteria of the Regional Policy Statement.</li> <li>Method 4.5.4(2) of the Regional Policy Statement allows for the mapped areas to be changed at any time (using the Schedule 1 process).</li> </ul>
265.7	Environmental Defence Society Incorporated	General	Amend	<p><b>AMEND</b> the entire Coastal Environment chapter to give effect to national direction.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any similar, consequential or alternative relief as is necessary to address the issues raised.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter opposes the Coastal Environment chapter in part. chapter 7, paragraph 28 of the NPS requires that cross-referencing to other specific coastal provisions within other chapters is provided. Though the Natural Features and Landscapes chapter is referred to, other chapters such as Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity are not referred to, even though ECO-P1 refers to biodiversity within the Coastal Environment.</li> <li>The submitter requests that the chapter is reviewed in line with the NPS and s75 RMA requirements.</li> </ul>
283.176	Northpower Limited and Northpower Fibre Limited	General	Amend	<p><b>ADD</b> a new rule in the Coastal Environment chapter which reads as follows (or to a similar effect):</p> <p><u>"Infrastructure within the Coastal Environment (including OCNA)</u></p> <p><u>Activity Status: Restricted Discretionary</u></p> <p><u>This rule shall not apply to:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>1. Infrastructure that is located underground;</u></li> <li><u>2. Operation, maintenance, repair or upgrading of any existing above ground infrastructure;</u></li> <li><u>3. Connections to buildings or structures for network utilities;</u></li> <li><u>4. New Small-scale Electricity and Telecommunications Assets; or</u></li> <li><u>5. New above ground infrastructure that is wholly located within the road reserve.</u></li> </ol> <p><u>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>a. The matters in CE-P6; and</u></li> <li><u>b. The positive effects of the activity.</u></li> </ol> <p>AND</p> <p>Any further necessary consequential amendments required.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To provide for new electricity and telecommunications infrastructure that is not regionally significant infrastructure as a restricted discretionary activity.</li> </ul>
289.35	Tappenden Holdings Limited	General	Amend	<p><b>ADD</b> a new policy in the Coastal Environment chapter, as follows:</p> <p><u>CE-PX Existing subdivision, use and development</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To recognise that lawfully established existing subdivision, use and development are located within the coastal environment and allow them to continue</li> </ul>

## Proposed Kaipara District Plan

### Summary of Submissions for the topic of: Coastal Environment (in Provision order)

Submission point No.	Submitter	Provision	Position	Summary of decision requested	Reasons
				<p><u>Recognise that lawfully established subdivision, land use and development are located within the coastal environment, including High Natural Character Areas and Outstanding Natural Character Areas and allow them to continue without undue restriction.</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	without undue restriction. The submitter's site at Bream Tail is an example of this.
300.47	Bream Tail Residents Association Incorporated	General	Amend	<p><b>ADD</b> a new policy in the Coastal Environment chapter, as follows:</p> <p><u>Existing subdivision, use and development</u></p> <p><u>Recognise that lawfully established subdivision, land use and development are located within the coastal environment, including High Natural Character Areas and Outstanding Natural Character Areas and allow them to continue without undue restriction.</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To recognise that lawfully established existing subdivision, use and development are located within the coastal environment and allow them to continue without undue restriction. The submitter's site at Bream Tail is an example of this.</li> </ul>
300.74	Bream Tail Residents Association Incorporated	General	Amend	<p><b>AMEND</b> the mapped extent of the Coastal Environment overlay on the properties at Bream Tail shown in Attachment 1 of the submission so that it accurately follows characteristics and features, including the first prominent ridge line or contour from the Coastal Marine Area.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The mapped extent of the Coastal Environment at Bream Tail Farm follows a simplified straight-line form and an approximation of key features set out in the Coastal Environment Assessment Criteria of the Regional Policy Statement.</li> <li>Method 4.5.4(2) of the Regional Policy Statement allows for the mapped areas to be changed at any time (using the Schedule 1 process).</li> </ul>
304.106	Director General of Conservation	Overview	Amend	<p><b>AMEND</b> the Overview in the Coastal Environment chapter to include threatened or at-risk indigenous taxa located along or within the Kaipara District coastline, including the following:</p> <p>Much of the coastline in the Kaipara District is relatively undeveloped in the sense that there is limited built development and supporting infrastructure. The past few decades have seen increased pressure for development in coastal areas, particularly at Mangawhai where there is a continued pattern of settlement which has placed additional pressure on coastal resources and natural character. <u>The Kaipara District comprises of various threatened or at-risk indigenous taxa including the following:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Tara iti (Sternulua nereis davisae Threatened nationally critical) principal breeding grounds are at Mangawhai sandspit and principal overwintering areas include the coastal margins of the Kaipara Harbour</u></li> <li><u>Leptinella rotundata (Threatened – Nationally Critical) is found at several locations on the Kaipara District coastline (near Kaiwi Stream Mouth and Maunganui Bluff); also in the Far North at Scott Point, Mitimiti; and on the Auckland coast near Muriwai. This is a small plant and is easily overlooked, so there could be more populations. Leptinella rotundata has male and female flowers on separate plants, and some populations are entirely only one sex.</u></li> <li><u>Roimata a Tohe Pimelea eremitica (Threatened – Nationally Critical) is endemic to Maunganui Bluff, where it is found on the steep cliffs and clifftops.</u></li> <li><u>Veronica speciosa (Threatened – Nationally Vulnerable) is found naturally at only three locations: Maunganui Bluff (Kaipara); Arai Te Uru (Far North); Muriwai (Auckland).</u></li> <li><u>Pingao Ficinia spiralis (At Risk – Declining) is a common feature on dunes throughout the District (Mangawhai, Bayly's Beach, Pouto)</u></li> <li><u>sand coprosma Coprosma acerosa (At Risk – Declining) is also common on dunes throughout the District (Mangawhai, Bayly's Beach, Pouto).</u></li> <li><u>sand daphne Pimelea villosa (At Risk – Declining) is present on dunes throughout the District (Mangawhai, Pouto)</u></li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <p>Any further or alternative relief to like effect to that sought.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter generally supports the Coastal Environment Overview, especially the identification of Outstanding Natural Character Areas and High Natural Character Areas by way of scheduling the Coastal Environment area, Outstanding Natural Character Areas and Natural Character Areas.</li> <li>It is submitted that the Overview does not, however, reference indigenous taxa listed as threatened or at risk in the New Zealand Threat Classification Lists. This is required under Policy 11 (a)(i) of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement.</li> <li>Refer to the submission for a list of threatened plants which feature along Kaipara's coastline.</li> </ul>

## Proposed Kaipara District Plan

### Summary of Submissions for the topic of: Coastal Environment (in Provision order)

Submission point No.	Submitter	Provision	Position	Summary of decision requested	Reasons
349.8	WS & R Smellie and McConaughy Family Trusts	General	Amend	<b>AMEND</b> the Coastal Environment rules to provide for greater flexibility for residential development on large sites which do not currently support residential development on large sites. AND <b>AMEND</b> any other rules and standards that do not support residential development on large sites.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter notes that 'site' is defined in the Proposed District Plan to comprise land on a single record of title. The submitter has several existing titles of over 25ha and although they have no immediate plans to subdivide they may contemplate providing for their extended family by developing several residences on one site (title).</li> <li>• The Rural lifestyle zone is intended to be characterised by low residential development with limited buildings and structures but the objectives and rules in the Proposed District Plan seems to disadvantage people wanting to develop within existing large sites. This would preclude developments for extended families and seems perverse as development on large sites would be at a lower density than anticipated in the Proposed District Plan and result in less cumulative adverse effects on natural and other values.</li> </ul>
349.9	WS & R Smellie and McConaughy Family Trusts	General	Amend	<b>AMEND</b> the Coastal Environment standards such as CE-S3, CE-S4, and CE-S5 to provide for greater flexibility for residential development on large sites which do not currently support residential development on large sites. AND <b>AMEND</b> any other rules and standards that do not support residential development on large sites.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter notes that 'site' is defined in the Proposed District Plan to comprise land on a single record of title. The submitter has several existing titles of over 25ha and although they have no immediate plans to subdivide they may contemplate providing for their extended family by developing several residences on one site (title).</li> <li>• The Rural lifestyle zone is intended to be characterised by low residential development with limited buildings and structures but the objectives and rules in the Proposed District Plan seems to disadvantage people wanting to develop within existing large sites. This would preclude developments for extended families and seems perverse as development on large sites would be at a lower density than anticipated in the Proposed District Plan and result in less cumulative adverse effects on natural and other values.</li> </ul>
13.1	Peter Rothwell	General	Oppose	<b>AMEND</b> the Proposed District Plan so that no further intensification within the Mangawhai Harbour catchment is allowed until a comprehensive Stormwater Management Plan is created.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submitter is concerned for the health and well-being of the Mangawhai Harbour, as well as all other waterways throughout the Kaipara District. In particular, the submitter is concerned with the long-term adverse effects of untreated stormwater on waterways and harbours. The area is growing at a rate exceeding Council's predictions and infrastructure is at capacity. Stormwater is increasingly becoming a problem and is best dealt with at the development stage, becoming much harder to manage once piped underground.</li> <li>• Mangawhai has over 24.8km of stormwater pipeline and 7.3km of open drains as per the Kaipara District Environmental Scan 2023. This stormwater has not been treated in Mangawhai, it is merely collected in roadside drains and discharged straight into the harbour. This existing arrangement does not adequately address the potential adverse impacts of growth stimulated by the Proposed District Plan, as intensification will result in increased stormwater runoff. Stormwater is the largest contributor to harbour and waterway pollution, and water entering the harbour from land is able to be controlled.</li> <li>• A Stormwater Management Plan should be prepared and include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A study of Mangawhai Harbour Catchment hydrology and macroinvertebrates.</li> <li>• An evaluation of the current stormwater infrastructure.</li> <li>• Recommendations for infrastructure within the Long-term Plan; and</li> <li>• Current engineering standards for stormwater and roading.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Mangawhai Harbour is recognized under the NZ Coastal Policy Statement 2010 (NZCPS) as being a habitat for rare avian fauna. E.g., Fairy Tern, Australasian Bittern and Banded Rail. The NZCPS imposes a duty to avoid adverse effects on such habitats. Moreover, the ecological importance of the</li> </ul>



## Proposed Kaipara District Plan

### Summary of Submissions for the topic of: Coastal Environment (in Provision order)

Submission point No.	Submitter	Provision	Position	Summary of decision requested	Reasons
					Mangawhai Harbour has been affirmed by the Environment Court in hearings regarding Mangawhai Central and the Wharf.
270.51	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Overview	Support	<b>AMEND</b> the Overview of the Coastal Environment chapter as follows: ...Much of the coastline in the Kaipara District is relatively undeveloped in the sense that there is limited built development and supporting infrastructure. <u>The coastal environment is also where sites of early human settlement are common. As such, sites and areas of significance to Māori and examples of historic heritage can be found throughout the coastal environment...</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Many archaeological and heritage sites are located within the Coastal Environment. HNZPT consider it important that this is recognised in the overview statement.</li> </ul>
270.52	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Overview	Support	<b>ADD</b> to the Overview of the Coastal Environment chapter the following note: <u>Note: In addition to the requirements of the District Plan, it should be noted that the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 ("HNZPTA") requires all applicants to obtain an archaeology authority from the HNZPTA before any archaeological site is modified or destroyed. This is the case regardless of whether the land on which the site is located is designated, or the activity is permitted under the District Plan or a resource or building consent has been granted.</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>HNZPT is concerned that unrecorded archaeology can be accidentally destroyed when undertaking activities within sensitive environments. HNZPT therefore request that a reminder note be added to each relevant section of the Proposed District Plan to raise awareness of responsibilities for landowners and developers under the HNZPT Act 2014.</li> </ul>