

#### 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: <u>PDP Submissions</u> 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:
  - o Save time! Complete our easy online Form 6 here: PDP Online Form 6
  - Download a pdf version of Form 6: Form 6 pdf version
     THFN
  - o **Email it to:** districtplanreview@kaipara.govt.nz
  - Post it to: Planning and Policy Team, Kaipara District Council, Private Bag 1001, Dargaville 0340
  - o **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 <u>here</u>.

#### 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.



| Submission point No. | Submitter  | Provision | Position | Summary of decision requested  | Reasons   |
|----------------------|--|-----------|----------|--|---|
| 217.196              | Cato Bolam<br>Consultants<br>Limited   | General   |          | ADD Mangawhai/Hakaru as a growth node in the Proposed District Plan with criteria for infrastructure, triggered staging and collaborative funding models.  AND Any other relief that is consistent with and/or consequential to the submission.  | To meet the current predicted and future demand in the right place, the Mangawhai/Hakaru area must be recognised in the Proposed District Plan as a growth node. Not doing so is misaligned with the objectives under Part 2 – District-wide matters / Strategic Direction's Vision for Kaipara, Natural Environment, Natural Hazards and Resilience as well as parts of Urban Form and Development.  The boundary follows cadastral parcels rather natural catchments.  Limiting development in the Mangawhai/Hakaru Managed Growth Area is not the most appropriate way to manage current and future infrastructure and servicing requirements.   |
| 121.3                | Amanda (Mandy)<br>Harris   | General   | Amend    | ADD to the Urban Form and Development chapter infrastructure capacity as a prerequisite for new development approvals.   | <ul> <li>The existing council-managed wastewater treatment pond in Kaiwaka is degraded and no longer fit for purpose. It lacks the capacity and resilience to manage current flows, let alone the increased load anticipated from proposed zoning changes. The Plan's omission of any infrastructure upgrade contradicts its own growth objectives and exposes the community to escalating environmental and health risks.</li> <li>Climate change is intensifying rainfall and flooding events, leading to frequent overflows and leakage from the treatment pond into the Kaiwaka River. This contamination poses serious risks to ecosystems, public health and Māori cultural values.</li> <li>The Proposed District Plan promotes higher-density residential and commercial development in Kaiwaka's town centre, yet fails to provide for the infrastructure necessary to support this growth. This disconnect undermines the principles of integrated planning and sustainable development.</li> <li>While a full upgrade is staged in the Long-Term Plan, the District Plan should enable interim, scalable solutions that reduce environmental harm and build resilience. Including constructed wetlands, decentralised anaerobic digestion systems, community scale modular treatment units.</li> </ul> |
| 149.10               | Royal Forest and<br>Bird Protection<br>Society of New<br>Zealand<br>Incorporated | General   | Amend    | ADD a new Strategic Direction Urban Form and Development objective (SD-UFD-O6) as follows:  Our existing and new urban environments are well-functioning urban environments.  AND  Any consequential amendments and alternative relief to address the concerns raised.   | The NPS-UD requires urban environments to be well-functioning and resilient to the effects of climate change and Policy 14 of the NPS-IB seeks that Councils to promote an increase in urban environment vegetation cover. The submitter considers that well-functioning urban environments should have access to natural space and vegetation cover to reduce urban heat island effects, as well as slow stormwater, thus aiding in making urban environments climate change resilient. Considering this, the submitter believes that the Proposed District Plan Strategic direction should include such direction.  |
| 149.11               | Royal Forest and<br>Bird Protection<br>Society of New<br>Zealand<br>Incorporated | General   | Amend    | ADD a new Strategic Direction Urban Form and Development Objective (SD-UFD-O7) as follows: Provide space for indigenous biodiversity by using nature based solutions and by increasing indigenous vegetation cover, as a key aspect of urban form and development. AND Any consequential amendments and alternative relief to address the concerns raised. | The NPS-UD requires urban environments to be well-functioning and resilient to the effects of climate change and Policy 14 of the NPS-IB seeks that Councils to promote an increase in urban environment vegetation cover. The submitter considers that well-functioning urban environments should have access to natural space and vegetation cover to reduce urban heat island effects, as well as slow stormwater, thus aiding in making urban environments climate change resilient. Considering this, the submitter believes that the Proposed District Plan Strategic direction should include such direction.  |
| 216.49               | Cabra Mangawhai<br>Ltd & Pro Land<br>Matters Ltd                                 | General   | Amend    | AMEND the Urban Form and Development provisions in the Strategic Directions chapter to reflect that Kaipara District Council is a Tier 3 territorial authority because it contains an urban environment.  AND  | The current language is not positive or directive, The policies do not direct outcomes in relation to urban design. Currently they state 'high quality urban design' without stating what these outcomes will look like.  |



| Submission point No. | Submitter  | Provision | Position | Summary of decision requested   | Reasons  |
|----------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|--|
|                      |  |           |          | AMEND the Urban Form and Development provisions in the Strategic Directions chapter to have more positive and directive language.  AND  AMEND the Urban Form and Development policies in the Strategic Directions chapter to direct outcomes in relation to urban design and describe what high quality urban design looks like.  AND  ADD a clear framework so proposals can be properly and fairly assessed, and the community knows the outcomes to be achieved. | The current framework does not allow for proposals to be properly and fairly assessed or for the community to know the outcomes to be achieved.  |
| 144.3                | Pacific Coast<br>Surveys Ltd                     | General   | Oppose   | AMEND the SD-UFD Objectives (O1-O5) according to relevant Policies 3 and 5 of the National Policy Statement for Urban Development.  | Objectives and Policies for Strategic Direction -<br>Urban Form and Development should align with<br>Subpart 7 - Development Outcomes for Zones<br>(Policy 3.35) of the National Policy Statement for<br>Urban Development (NPS-UD). SD-UFD Objectives<br>O1-O5 must give effect to Policies 3 and 5 of the<br>NPS-UD. |
| 144.4                | Pacific Coast<br>Surveys Ltd                     | General   | Oppose   | AMEND the SD-UFD Policies (P1-P7) according to relevant Policies 3 and 5 of the National Policy Statement for Urban Development.  | Objectives and Policies for Strategic Direction -<br>Urban Form and Development should align with<br>Subpart 7 - Development Outcomes for Zones<br>(Policy 3.35) of the National Policy Statement for<br>Urban Development (NPS-UD). SD-UFD Policies P1-<br>P7 must give effect to Policies 3 and 5 of the NPS-<br>UD. |
| 245.4                | C & R Williamson                                 | SD-UFD-O1 |          | RETAIN SD-UFD-O1 as notified. AND Any further necessary consequential amendments required.  | Development of residential, commercial and<br>industrial land to meet current and predicted future<br>demand is supported.   |
| 216.50               | Cabra Mangawhai<br>Ltd & Pro Land<br>Matters Ltd | SD-UFD-O1 | Amend    | AMEND SD-UFD-O1 to address development capacity and growth timeframes - a future 30 plus year time horizon.   | The submitter believes that development capacity<br>and timeframes have not been addressed.  |
| 217.18               | Cato Bolam<br>Consultants<br>Limited             | SD-UFD-O1 | Support  | RETAIN SD-UFD-O1. AND Any other relief that is consistent with and/or consequential to the submission.  | The submitter has sought this relief without limiting<br>the scope of the submission on the details in other<br>Proposed District Plan chapters or maps.   |
| 231.14               | S Cullen   | SD-UFD-O1 | Support  | RETAIN SD-UFD-O1 as notified. AND Any necessary consequential amendments.   | Development of residential, commercial and<br>industrial land to meet current and predicted future<br>demand is supported.   |
| 248.17               | Journeys End<br>Limited                          | SD-UFD-O1 | Support  | RETAIN SD-UFD-O1 as notified. AND Any necessary consequential amendments.   | Objective is supported.  |
| 260.6                | The Rise Limited                                 | SD-UFD-O1 | Support  | RETAIN SD-UD-O1 as notified. AND Any further necessary consequential amendments required to achieve the relief sought.  | Supports the objective and the intent to meet current and predicted future demand.   |
| 277.5                | Mangawhai Hills<br>Limited                       | SD-UFD-O1 | Support  | RETAIN SD-UFD-O1 as notified.  AND  Any consequential amendments and alternative relief to address the concerns raised.   | Development of residential, commercial and<br>industrial land to meet current and predicted future<br>demand is supported.   |
| 281.5                | Moonlight Heights<br>Limited                     | SD-UFD-O1 | Support  | RETAIN SD-UFD-O1 as notified. AND Any further necessary consequential amendments required.  | The submitter supports this objective, as the development of residential, commercial and industrial land to meet current and predicted future demand is supported.   |
| 310.8                | Fonterra Limited                                 | SD-UFD-O1 | Support  | RETAIN SD-UFD-O1.   | SD-UFD-01 is supported.  |
| 315.22               | Horizon Surveying<br>& Land<br>Development       | SD-UFD-O1 | Support  | RETAIN SD-UFD-O1.   | No reasons provided.   |
| 322.1                | Kāinga Ora -<br>Homes and<br>Communities         | SD-UFD-O1 | Support  | RETAIN SD-UFD-O1 as notified.  AND  Any further, alternative or consequential relief as necessary to fully achieve the relief sought.   | The submitter supports this objective as notified.   |



| Submission point No. | Submitter                                  | Provision | Position | Summary of decision requested  | Re | asons   |
|----------------------|--|-----------|----------|--|----|---|
| 330.13               | New Zealand<br>Transport Agency            | SD-UFD-O1 | Support  | RETAIN SD-UFD-O1 as notified.  | •  | Objective is supported as it emphasises the critical matter of the extent of residential, commercial, and industrial development being to meet current and predicted future demand. This is of importance to infrastructure providers who are seeking to manage and invest in their networks, as it requires a level of predictability as to where development is enabled to do this effectively.   |
| 231.15               | S Cullen                                   | SD-UFD-O2 | Amend    | AMEND SD-UFD-O2 to clarify what is meant by the term 'compatible' with other uses. AND Any necessary consequential amendments.   | •  | Submitter supports the enablement of economic and business opportunities, but the term 'compatible' may cause uncertainty for plan users.   |
| 253.9                | McRobbie<br>Dowling Limited                | SD-UFD-O2 | Amend    | AMEND SD-UFD-O2 to clarify what is meant by the term 'compatible'. AND Any necessary consequential amendments.   | •  | Submitter supports the enablement of economic and business opportunities in Commercial and Industrial zones, and in other zones. Unclear what is meant by the term 'compatible' with other uses. This may cause uncertainty for plan users.   |
| 217.19               | Cato Bolam<br>Consultants<br>Limited       | SD-UFD-O2 | Support  | RETAIN SD-UFD-O2. AND Any other relief that is consistent with and/or consequential to the submission.   | •  | The submitter has sought this relief without limiting the scope of the submission on the details in other Proposed District Plan chapters or maps.  |
| 247.11               | Foodstuffs North<br>Island Limited         | SD-UFD-O2 | Support  | RETAIN SD-UFD-O2 as notified.  AND  Any necessary consequential amendments.  | •  | Four of the submitter's existing stores are located within the Commercial Zone or a Special Purpose Zone. The submitter therefore supports that economic and business development opportunities are enabled within Commercial and Industrial Zones, and in other zones where the activity is compatible.  |
| 248.18               | Journeys End<br>Limited                    | SD-UFD-O2 | Support  | RETAIN SD-UFD-O2 as notified. AND Any necessary consequential amendments.  | •  | Development of residential, commercial and industrial land to meet current and predicted future demand is supported.  |
| 287.30               | Silver Fern Farms                          | SD-UFD-O2 | Support  | RETAIN SD-UFD-O2 as notified.  OR Provisions or wording to similar effect.  AND Any necessary and consequential amendments.  AND All further relief necessary to give effect to the concerns raised in the submission. | •  | Appropriate to enable development in commercial and industrial zones.   |
| 310.9                | Fonterra Limited                           | SD-UFD-O2 | Support  | RETAIN SD-UFD-O2.  | •  | SD-UFD-O2 is supported.   |
| 315.96               | Horizon Surveying<br>& Land<br>Development | SD-UFD-O2 | Support  | RETAIN SD-UFD-O2.  | •  | No reasons provided.  |
| 119.1                | Amanda (Mandy)<br>Harris                   | SD-UFD-O3 | Amend    | AMEND SD-UFD-O3 to include stormwater management.  | •  | The submitter supports the inclusion of comprehensive urban stormwater planning provisions in the Proposed Kaipara District Plan 2025.  Kaiwaka is identified as a key growth area, therefore it is essential that the District Plan embeds robust, future-focused infrastructure policies to safeguard environmental health, reduce flood risk, and support sustainable community development.  Stormwater provisions should be embedded across multiple chapters of the District Plan to reflect the cross-cutting nature of water infrastructure and its impact on land use, biodiversity, and hazard management.  These methods align with Te Mana o te Wai, reduce pollution, and enhance climate resilience.  Without firm direction in the District Plan, Kaipara risks being reactive to changing government policy rather than proactive in protecting its unique environment. |



| Submission point No. | Submitter   | Provision | Position | Summary of decision requested  | Reasons  |
|----------------------|---|-----------|----------|--|--|
|                      |   |           |          |  | <ul> <li>Māori and local lived experience are essential for designing resilient, place-based infrastructure. I support the inclusion of policy that reflects the knowledge and expertise of local Tangata Whenua.</li> <li>Without enforceable obligations, stormwater systems risk becoming reactive rather than preventive.</li> <li>Extreme weather and rising groundwater levels are already impacting infrastructure resilience: <ul> <li>Kaiwaka's wastewater treatment plant leaked into the Kaiwaka River following heavy rainfall in May 2025.</li> <li>Urban runoff from SH1 contributes heavy metals, hydrocarbons, and sediment to receiving waters.</li> <li>Flood-prone development and limited Council resourcing have resulted in unsafe footpaths, damaged properties, and insufficient drainage.</li> <li>Insurance risks are climbing, with some properties potentially becoming uninsurable</li> </ul> </li> <li>Recent events underscore the urgent need for improved infrastructure: <ul> <li>The May 2025 overflow of the Kaiwaka Wastewater Treatment Plant led to a health warning for the Kaiwaka and Otamatea rivers and Kaipara Harbour.</li> <li>Urban development along SH1 has intensified runoff and pollutant loading.</li> <li>Two open gullies currently drain unfiltered stormwater directly into the Kaiwaka River.</li> <li>Many private properties have inadequate or unsafe stormwater systems, with limited Council capacity to enforce compliance.</li> <li>Kaiwaka's topography offers natural opportunities for bioretention and green infrastructure. These should be leveraged to: <ul> <li>Reduce runoff velocity and volume.</li> <li>Filter contaminants before they reach the river.</li> <li>Mitigate future leakage from the wastewater plan.</li> </ul> </li> <li>The submitter believes that addressing stormwater and wastewater issues in Kaiwaka through the District Plan is not only prudent, it is essential. The health of the river, the safety of the community, and the long-term viability of Kaiwaka as a growth node depend on it.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |
| 217.20               | Cato Bolam<br>Consultants<br>Limited  | SD-UFD-O3 | Amend    | AMEND SD-UFD-O3 as follows: Sufficient infrastructure capacity, including social infrastructure, is available to support the development of the land when zoning land for urban activities, or funding is committed to develop the infrastructure before development occurs unless adequate alternative solutions are provided. AND Any other relief that is consistent with and/or consequential to the submission. | The submitter has requested the amendment to<br>ensure provisions referenced in the objective are<br>current.  |
| 26.6                 | Chorus New<br>Zealand Ltd,<br>Connexa Ltd,<br>Spark NZ Trading<br>Ltd, Fortysouth<br>Group LP and<br>One NZ | SD-UFD-O3 | Support  | RETAIN SD-UFD-O3 as notified. AND Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.  | The objective appropriately addresses the need for<br>sufficient infrastructure capacity to support urban<br>development.  |
| 283.39               | Northpower<br>Limited and<br>Northpower Fibre<br>Limited  | SD-UFD-O3 | Support  | RETAIN SD-UFD-O3 as notified.  | The submitter supports the requirement for sufficient infrastructure capacity to be available to support the development of land when zoning land for urban activities.  |
| 308.10               | Fire and<br>Emergency New<br>Zealand  | SD-UFD-O3 | Support  | RETAIN SD-UFD-O3 as notified.  | Fire and Emergency supports this objective to the extent that, by definition, 'infrastructure' includes a 'water supply distribution system' and 'structures for transport on land.' The recognition and provision of infrastructure in this regard is supported.  |



| Submission point No. | Submitter                                  | Provision | Position | Summary of decision requested   | Rea | asons  |
|----------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|-----|--|
| 315.97               | Horizon Surveying<br>& Land<br>Development | SD-UFD-O3 | Support  | RETAIN SD-UFD-03.   | •   | No reasons provided.   |
| 322.2                | Kāinga Ora -<br>Homes and<br>Communities   | SD-UFD-O3 | Support  | RETAIN SD-UFD-O3 as notified. AND Any further, alternative or consequential relief as necessary to fully achieve the relief sought.   | •   | The submitter supports this objective as notified.   |
| 330.14               | New Zealand<br>Transport Agency            | SD-UFD-O3 | Support  | RETAIN SD-UFD-O3 as notified.   | •   | Objective is supported given the focus on ensuring sufficient infrastructure capacity exists to support the development of the land. Decision making must take into consideration the impact of infrastructure networks, including the State Highway network through the district.   |
| 322.3                | Käinga Ora -<br>Homes and<br>Communities   | SD-UFD-O4 | Amend    | AMEND SD-UFD-O4 as follows:  Urban development incorporates a good level of design quality high quality urban design that contributes positively to the local context, amenity and anticipated outcomes for the zone.  AND  Any further, alternative or consequential relief as necessary to fully achieve the relief sought. |     | The submitter supports SD-UFD-O4 in part but requests it is amended as the requirement to achieve "high-quality urban design" is aspirational and could be interpreted as an unachievable standard, therefore imposing additional costs on landowners and developers. Such additional costs will only reduce housing affordability.  The changes sought are consistent with the General residential zone objective GRZ-O5.   |
| 217.21               | Cato Bolam<br>Consultants<br>Limited       | SD-UFD-O4 | Support  | RETAIN SD-UFD-O4. AND Any other relief that is consistent with and/or consequential to the submission.  | •   | The submitter has sought this relief without limiting the scope of the submission on the details in other Proposed District Plan chapters or maps.   |
| 315.98               | Horizon Surveying<br>& Land<br>Development | SD-UFD-O4 | Support  | RETAIN SD-UFD-04.   | •   | No reasons provided.   |
| 245.5                | C & R Williamson                           | SD-UFD-O5 |          | RETAIN SD-UFD-O5 as notified.  AND  Any further necessary consequential amendments required.  | •   | The submitter supports consolidation and integration of future growth.   |
| 217.22               | Cato Bolam<br>Consultants<br>Limited       | SD-UFD-O5 | Amend    | AMEND SD-UFD-O5 after revisiting the approach and with a new supporting s32A evaluation.  AND  Any other relief that is consistent with and/or consequential to the submission.   | •   | The submitter has sought this relief without limiting the scope of the submission on the details in other Proposed District Plan chapters or maps.  The proposed urban form as expressed in the location and proportion of proposed urban unzoning around smaller settlements e.g. Kaiwaka, Maungaturoto, Paparoa does not support a consolidated and integrated urban form.  Zoning in itself will not guarantee an uptake of the development capacity as the presence of social and physical infrastructure and market forces play a determining factor.  Accordingly, the proposed urban form is not expected to provide sufficient development capacity to meet demand for housing and business land within or adjacent to urban areas.  Similarly, as a result of the lack of economies of scale and agglomeration benefits the expected benefit to be derived from providing development capacity across the wider District is unlikely to result in more cost- effective infrastructure delivery and upgrades to existing infrastructure network. |
| 231.16               | S Cullen                                   | SD-UFD-O5 | Support  | RETAIN SD-UFD-O5 as notified.  AND  Any necessary consequential amendments.   | •   | Submitter supports consolidation and integration of future growth.   |
| 256.12               | P Ryan                                     | SD-UFD-O5 | Support  | RETAIN SD-UFD-O5 as notified.   | •   | Submitter supports consolidation and integration of future growth.   |
| 260.7                | The Rise Limited                           | SD-UFD-O5 | Support  | RETAIN SD-UD-O5 as notified. AND Any further necessary consequential amendments required to achieve the relief sought.  | •   | Support consolidation and integration of future growth.  |
| 277.6                | Mangawhai Hills<br>Limited                 | SD-UFD-O5 | Support  | RETAIN SD-UFD-O5 as notified. AND Any consequential amendments and alternative relief to address the concerns raised.   | •   | The submitter supports consolidation and integration of future growth.   |



| Submission point No. | Submitter  | Provision | Position | Summary of decision requested  | Reas | sons  |
|----------------------|--|-----------|----------|--|------|---|
| 281.6                | Moonlight Heights<br>Limited                             | SD-UFD-O5 | Support  | RETAIN SD-UFD-O5 as notified. AND Any further consequential amendments required.   |      | The submitter supports the consolidation and integration of future growth.  |
| 282.18               | Murphy Property<br>Development<br>Limited                | SD-UFD-O5 | Support  | RETAIN SD-UFD-O5 as notified. AND Any necessary consequential amendments.  |      | Submitter supports consolidation and integration of future growth.  |
| 283.40               | Northpower<br>Limited and<br>Northpower Fibre<br>Limited | SD-UFD-O5 | Support  | RETAIN SD-UFD-O5 as notified.  |      | The submitter supports a compact urban form and avoiding urban sprawl into rural areas as it is easier to service in terms of electricity and telecommunications infrastructure and has efficiencies to reduce the amount of infrastructure required in the District.   |
| 293.15               | Vermont Street<br>Partners Limited                       | SD-UFD-O5 | Support  | RETAIN SD-UFD-O5. AND Any further necessary consequential amendments.  |      | Consolidation and integration of future growth is supported.  |
| 310.10               | Fonterra Limited   | SD-UFD-O5 | Support  | AMEND SD-UFD-O5, as follows: Urban form is consolidated and integrated to accommodate future growth and provide development capacity effectively and efficiently for residential, business and community activities, while avoiding reverse sensitivity effects between incompatible activities and zones. | -    | One of the most fundamental and well-established principles of good resource management planning practice is the separation of incompatible activities to avoid reverse sensitivity effects occurring. In this regard, with any future urban growth, it is important there is adequate separation between incompatible activities and zones (e.g. separating new residential areas from industrial areas). Amendment is sought to reflect this. |
| 315.99               | Horizon Surveying<br>& Land<br>Development               | SD-UFD-O5 | Support  | RETAIN SD-UFD-05.  | •    | No reasons provided.  |
| 322.4                | Kāinga Ora -<br>Homes and<br>Communities                 | SD-UFD-O5 | Support  | RETAIN SD-UFD-O4 as notified.  AND  Any further, alternative or consequential relief as necessary to fully achieve the relief sought.  | •    | The submitter supports this objective as notified.  |
| 330.15               | New Zealand<br>Transport Agency                          | SD-UFD-O5 | Support  | RETAIN SD-UFD-O5 as notified.  |      | Objective is supported as it emphasises the importance of promoting consolidation of urban form and the integration of growth, with effective and efficient 'development capacity', being a phrase that includes the provision of adequate development infrastructure to support the development of the land.   |
| 331.5                | Northland<br>Holdings 2016<br>Limited                    | SD-UFD-O5 | Support  | RETAIN SD-UFD-O5 as notified. AND Any further necessary consequential amendments required to achieve the relief sought.  |      | Supports consolidation and integration of future growth.  |
| 245.6                | C & R Williamson   | SD-UFD-P1 |          | RETAIN SD-UFD-P1 as notified. AND Any further necessary consequential amendments required.   |      | Provision of sufficient development capacity is consistent with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development.   |
| 231.17               | S Cullen   | SD-UFD-P1 | Amend    | AMEND SD-UFD-P1 as follows: Ensure sufficient residential and business land development capacity is provided within or adjacent in proximity to existing urban areas. AND Any necessary consequential amendments.  | ;    | The provisions for housing and business should extend beyond urban areas to provide for appropriate opportunities in all zones as intended by SD-UFD-O2.  |
| 310.11               | Fonterra Limited   | SD-UFD-P1 | Amend    | AMEND SD-UFD-P1, as follows: Ensure sufficient residential and business land development capacity is provided within or adjacent to existing urban areas, while avoiding reverse sensitivity effects between incompatible activities and zones.  |      | One of the most fundamental and well-established principles of good resource management planning practice is the separation of incompatible activities to avoid reverse sensitivity effects occurring. In this regard, with any future urban growth, it is important there is adequate separation between incompatible activities and zones (e.g. separating new residential areas from industrial areas). Amendment is sought to reflect this. |
| 217.23               | Cato Bolam<br>Consultants<br>Limited                     | SD-UFD-P1 | Support  | RETAIN SD-UFD-P1. AND  |      | The submitter has sought this relief without limiting the scope of the submission on the details in other Proposed District Plan chapters or maps.  |



| Submission point No. | Submitter  | Provision | Position | Summary of decision requested   | Re | asons  |
|----------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|----|--|
|                      |  |           |          | Any other relief that is consistent with and/or consequential to the submission.  |    |  |
| 247.12               | Foodstuffs North<br>Island Limited                       | SD-UFD-P1 | Support  | RETAIN SD-UFD-P1 as notified. AND Any necessary consequential amendments.   | •  | The policy gives effect to the NPS-UD.   |
| 256.13               | P Ryan   | SD-UFD-P1 | Support  | RETAIN SD-UFD-P1.   | •  | Provision of sufficient development capacity is consistent with the NPS-UD.  |
| 260.8                | The Rise Limited   | SD-UFD-P1 | Support  | RETAIN SD-UFD-P1 as notified. AND Any further necessary consequential amendments required to achieve the relief sought.   | •  | Provision of sufficient development capacity is consistent with the National Policy Statement for Urban Development.   |
| 277.7                | Mangawhai Hills<br>Limited                               | SD-UFD-P1 | Support  | RETAIN SD-UFD-P1 as notified. AND Any consequential amendments and alternative relief to address the concerns raised.   | •  | The provision of sufficient development capacity is consistent with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development.  |
| 281.7                | Moonlight Heights<br>Limited                             | SD-UFD-P1 | Support  | RETAIN SD-UFD-P1 as notified. AND Any further necessary consequential amendments required.  | •  | The submitter supports this objective as the provision of sufficient development capacity is consistent with the National Policy Statement for Urban Development.  |
| 282.19               | Murphy Property<br>Development<br>Limited                | SD-UFD-P1 | Support  | RETAIN SD-UFD-P1 as notified. AND Any necessary consequential amendments.   | •  | Provision of sufficient development capacity is consistent with the NPS-UD.  |
| 283.41               | Northpower<br>Limited and<br>Northpower Fibre<br>Limited | SD-UFD-P1 | Support  | RETAIN SD-UFD-P1 as notified.   | •  | The submitter supports a compact urban form and avoiding urban sprawl into rural areas as it is easier to service in terms of electricity and telecommunications infrastructure and has efficiencies to reduce the amount of infrastructure required in the District.  |
| 293.16               | Vermont Street<br>Partners Limited                       | SD-UFD-P1 | Support  | RETAIN SD-UFD-P1. AND Any further necessary consequential amendments.   | •  | Provision of sufficient development capacity is supported as it is consistent with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development.   |
| 315.23               | Horizon Surveying<br>& Land<br>Development               | SD-UFD-P1 | Support  | RETAIN SD-UFD-P1.   | •  | No reasons provided.   |
| 322.5                | Kāinga Ora -<br>Homes and<br>Communities                 | SD-UFD-P1 | Support  | RETAIN SD-UFD-P1 as notified.  AND  Any further, alternative or consequential relief as necessary to fully achieve the relief sought.   | •  | The submitter supports this policy as notified.  |
| 330.16               | New Zealand<br>Transport Agency                          | SD-UFD-P1 | Support  | RETAIN SD-UFD-P1.  AND  AMEND SD-UFD-P1 as follows:  Provide Ensure sufficient residential and business land development capacity is provided within or near adjacent to existing urban areas, ensuring infrastructure networks can effectively support the planned growth.  AND  Alternative or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully achieve the relief sought in the submission. | •  | Supports in part the wording of this policy. An amendment is sought to also require consideration of the adequacy of infrastructure networks to accommodate such development, and to ensure that overly sufficient capacity is not provided. This is particularly in the context of the substantial oversupply of 'live' zoned land well beyond the projected demand in the district.  |
| 331.6                | Northland<br>Holdings 2016<br>Limited                    | SD-UFD-P1 | Support  | RETAIN SD-UFD-P1 as notified. AND Any further necessary consequential amendments required to achieve the relief sought.   | •  | Supports the provision of sufficient development capacity as it is consistent with the National Policy Statement for Urban Development.  |
| 322.6                | Käinga Ora -<br>Homes and<br>Communities                 | SD-UFD-P2 | Amend    | AMEND SD-UFD-P2 as follows: Urban character and amenity values are managed through a good level of design quality high quality urban design, recognising that amenity values and characteristics change over time.  AND Any further, alternative or consequential relief as necessary to fully achieve the relief sought.   | •  | The submitter supports SD-UFD-P2 in part but requests it is amended as the requirement to achieve "high-quality urban design" is aspirational and could be interpreted as an unachievable standard, therefore imposing additional costs on landowners and developers. Such additional costs will only reduce housing affordability.  The changes sought will be consistent with the General residential zone objective GRZ-O5. |



| Submission point No. | Submitter                                  | Provision | Position | Summary of decision requested   | Rea | asons   |
|----------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|-----|---|
| 217.24               | Cato Bolam<br>Consultants<br>Limited       | SD-UFD-P2 | Support  | RETAIN SD-UFD-P2. AND Any other relief that is consistent with and/or consequential to the submission.  | •   | The submitter has sought this relief without limiting the scope of the submission on the details in other Proposed District Plan chapters or maps.  |
| 315.100              | Horizon Surveying<br>& Land<br>Development | SD-UFD-P2 | Support  | RETAIN SD-UFD-P2.   | •   | No reasons provided.  |
| 217.25               | Cato Bolam<br>Consultants<br>Limited       | SD-UFD-P3 | Amend    | AMEND SD-UFD-P3 to include multiple residential zone categories based on settlement character and anticipated outcomes, rather than a single General residential zone.  | •   | One residential zone is not considered appropriate across the District.  A variety of residential zones will ensure the implementation of SD-UFD-O4 SD-UFD-P2.  |
| 315.101              | Horizon Surveying<br>& Land<br>Development | SD-UFD-P3 | Support  | RETAIN SD-UFD-P3.   | •   | No reasons provided.  |
| 322.7                | Kāinga Ora -<br>Homes and<br>Communities   | SD-UFD-P3 | Support  | RETAIN SD-UFD-P3 as notified. AND Any further, alternative or consequential relief as necessary to fully achieve the relief sought.   | •   | The submitter supports this policy as notified.   |
| 245.7                | C & R Williamson                           | SD-UFD-P4 |          | AMEND SD-UFD-P4 as follows: Use the commercial zone to provide mixed use development comprising predominantly commercial and community activities. in a consolidated network of attractive commercial activity: AND Any further necessary consequential amendments required.  | •   | This policy as proposed is unclear and could cause confusion for plan users. The plan does not provide further description of what represents a consolidated network or what is an attractive commercial centre. Furthermore, it is noted that the National Planning Standards provide specific zones for 'centres' Neighbourhood Centre, Local Centre and Town Centre zones. |
| 247.13               | Foodstuffs North<br>Island Limited         | SD-UFD-P4 | Amend    | RETAIN SD-UFD-P4 as notified, except for changes required in response to the submitter's request to establish a centre hierarchy.  AND  Any necessary consequential amendments.   | •   | The submitter supports the policy, however, considers that changes will be needed in response to their submission seeking a centre hierarchy.   |
| 217.26               | Cato Bolam<br>Consultants<br>Limited       | SD-UFD-P4 | Support  | RETAIN SD-UFD-P4. AND Any other relief that is consistent with and/or consequential to the submission.  | •   | The submitter has sought this relief without limiting the scope of the submission on the details in other Proposed District Plan chapters or maps.  |
| 315.102              | Horizon Surveying<br>& Land<br>Development | SD-UFD-P4 | Support  | RETAIN SD-UFD-P4.   | •   | No reasons provided.  |
| 231.18               | S Cullen                                   | SD-UFD-P5 | Amend    | ADD a definition for "large-scale industrial activity" to assist interpretation of SD-UFD-P5.  OR  ADD a definition for "heavy industrial activity" to assist interpretation of SD-UFD-O5.  AND  AMEND SD-UFD-O5 by replacing 'large scale' with 'heavy' industrial activities.  AND  Any necessary consequential amendments. | •   | It is unclear what is intended to be a large scale industrial activity.   |
| 248.19               | Journeys End<br>Limited                    | SD-UFD-P5 | Amend    | AMEND SD-UFD-P5 as follows: Use the Heavy industrial zone predominantly for large-scale industrial activities that may generate adverse effects on the environment.  AND  Any necessary consequential amendments.   | •   | The policy is generally supported, but given the lack of provision for offensive activities in other zones, submission seeks the removal of reference to 'large scale' given this is not a defined term.  |
| 287.31               | Silver Fern Farms                          | SD-UFD-P5 | Amend    | AMEND SD-UFD-P5, as follows: Use the Heavy industrial zone predominantly for large-scale industrial activities and significant hazardous facilities that may generate adverse effects on the environment.  OR Provisions or wording to similar effect.  AND Any necessary and consequential amendments.  AND                  | •   | It is recommended that significant hazardous facilities be directed to this zone, as they are unlikely to be appropriate in most other zones.   |



| Submission point No. | Submitter  | Provision | Position | Summary of decision requested  | Reasons  |
|----------------------|--|-----------|----------|--|--|
|                      |  |           |          | All further relief necessary to give effect to the concerns raised in the submission.  |  |
| 217.27               | Cato Bolam<br>Consultants<br>Limited             | SD-UFD-P5 | Support  | RETAIN SD-UFD-P5. AND Any other relief that is consistent with and/or consequential to the submission.   | The submitter has sought this relief without limiting<br>the scope of the submission on the details in other<br>Proposed District Plan chapters or maps.   |
| 310.12               | Fonterra Limited                                 | SD-UFD-P5 | Support  | RETAIN SD-UFD-P5.  | SD-UFD-P5 is supported.  |
| 315.103              | Horizon Surveying<br>& Land<br>Development       | SD-UFD-P5 | Support  | RETAIN SD-UFD-P5.  | No reasons provided.   |
| 231.20               | S Cullen   | SD-UFD-P6 | Amend    | AMEND SD-UFD-P6 to replace 'Industrial Activity' with 'Light Industrial Activity' AND DEFINE "Light Industrial Activity" to assist interpretation of SD-UFD-P6. AND Any necessary consequential amendments.  | The policy provides for all industrial activities in the<br>Light industrial zone which is inconsistent with the<br>intent of the Light industrial zone.   |
| 217.28               | Cato Bolam<br>Consultants<br>Limited             | SD-UFD-P6 | Support  | RETAIN SD-UFD-P6. AND Any other relief that is consistent with and/or consequential to the submission.   | The submitter has sought this relief without limiting<br>the scope of the submission on the details in other<br>Proposed District Plan chapters or maps.   |
| 287.32               | Silver Fern Farms                                | SD-UFD-P6 | Support  | RETAIN SD-UFD-P6 as notified.  OR Provisions or wording to similar effect.  AND Any necessary and consequential amendments.  AND All further relief necessary to give effect to the concerns raised in the submission.   | Appropriate to specifically provide for industrial activities that do not generate the level of effects associated with heavy industry.  |
| 315.104              | Horizon Surveying<br>& Land<br>Development       | SD-UFD-P6 | Support  | RETAIN SD-UFD-P6.  | No reasons provided.   |
| 245.8                | C & R Williamson                                 | SD-UFD-P7 |          | DELETE SD-UFD-P7 AND Any further necessary consequential amendments required.  | Provision of infrastructure and services can be<br>provided to meet the requirements of urban areas<br>without applying an arbitrary spatial limitation. SD-<br>UFD-P1 is inconsistent with FC-O1.   |
| 216.51               | Cabra Mangawhai<br>Ltd & Pro Land<br>Matters Ltd | SD-UFD-P7 | Amend    | AMEND the extent of the Managed Growth Area and the policy framework needs to guide what the outcomes of the Managed Growth Area should be rather than just limiting growth. The submission refers to SD-UFD-P7.   | No reasons provided.   |
| 217.30               | Cato Bolam<br>Consultants<br>Limited             | SD-UFD-P7 | Amend    | PROVIDE an updated s32 analysis which expands on and assesses alternative growth-management mechanisms under Resource Management Act s32(1) & (2). This request is in the context of SD-UFD-P7.  AND  Any other relief that is consistent with and/or consequential to the submission. | To meet the current predicted and future demand in the right place, the Mangawhai-Hakaru area must be recognised in the Proposed District Plan as a growth node. Not doing so is misaligned with the objectives under Part 2 – District-wide matters / Strategic Direction's Vision for Kaipara, Natural Environment, Natural Hazards and Resilience as well as parts of Urban Form and Development.  The boundary follows cadastral parcels rather natural catchments. Limiting development in the Mangawhai-Hakaru Managed Growth Area is not the most appropriate way to manage current and future infrastructure and servicing requirements.  Expand the s32 analysis to assess alternative mechanisms as required under Resource Management Act s32(1) and (2). |
| 50.4                 | Evolve Planning<br>and Landscape<br>Architecture | SD-UFD-P7 | Oppose   | <b>DELETE</b> SD-UFD-P7. AND Any consequential amendments.   | It is inconsistent with Part II of the Resource     Management Act, especially Section 5 - sustainable     management of natural and physical resources and     section 7(b) efficient use and development of natural     and physical resources.     It does not appropriately give effect to national     direction of the National Policy Statement for Urban  Page 9 of 12   |



| Submission point No. | Submitter                            | Provision | Position | Summary of decision requested  | Reasons   |
|----------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------|----------|--|---|
|                      |                                      |           |          |  | Development (NPS-UD) and the Northland Regional Policy Statement.  It is inconsistent with the Councils Long Term Plan It essentially restricts infill residential development and directs this to large land holdings which have been subject to recent private plan changes.  The area is not rural in nature and has very limited rural character.  There is no sound justification or planning rationale behind this Overlay.   |
| 77.5                 | Richard (Rick)<br>Ruiterman          | SD-UFD-P7 | Oppose   | DELETE SD-UFD-P7.  | SD-UFD-P7 is inconsistent with FC-O1.     Infrastructure and services can be provided to meet the requirements of urban areas without applying an arbitrary spatial limitation.   |
| 151.5                | Mangawhai Bush<br>Estate             | SD-UFD-P7 | Oppose   | DELETE SD-UFD-P7.  | The Managed Growth Overlay is inconsistent with Part II of the Resource Management Act, section 7b) efficient use and development of natural and physical resources. The Managed Growth Overlay and Mapping Extent does not appropriately give effect to national direction of the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and the Northland Regional Policy Statement. The Proposed District Plan does not meet the requirements of the Northland Regional Policy Statement where key points of the Northland Regional Policy Statement where key points of the Northland Regional Policy Statement with respect to urban form and development, are covered. The Overlay is inconsistent with the Councils Long Term Plan. The Managed Growth Overlay which essentially restricts infill residential development and directs this to large land holdings which have been subject to recent private plan changes. The surrounding environment is not rural in nature and has very limited rural character, the Hakaru / Mangawhai catchment is rural lifestyle / rural residential in nature. |
| 217.195              | Cato Bolam<br>Consultants<br>Limited | SD-UFD-P7 | Oppose   | No specific decision requested; however the submission opposes SD-UFD-P7.  AND  Any other relief that is consistent with and/or consequential to the submission.   | To meet the current predicted and future demand in the right place, the Mangawhai/Hakaru area must be recognised in the Proposed District Plan as a growth node. Not doing so is misaligned with the objectives under Part 2 – District-wide matters / Strategic Direction's Vision for Kaipara, Natural Environment, Natural Hazards and Resilience as well as parts of Urban Form and Development.  The boundary follows cadastral parcels rather natural catchments.  Limiting development in the Mangawhai/Hakaru Managed Growth Area is not the most appropriate way to manage current and future infrastructure and servicing requirements.   |
| 217.29               | Cato Bolam<br>Consultants<br>Limited | SD-UFD-P7 | Oppose   | DELETE or reconsider the Mangawhai/Hakaru Managed Growth Area where it contradicts the intentions of the Operative District Plan and the Mangawhai Spatial Plan (Figure 3-4-5 "Preferred Growth Option").  AND  Any other relief that is consistent with and/or consequential to the submission. | To meet the current predicted and future demand in the right place, the Mangawhai/Hakaru area must be recognised in the Proposed District Plan as a growth node. Not doing so is misaligned with the objectives under Part 2 – District-wide matters / Strategic Direction's Vision for Kaipara, Natural Environment, Natural Hazards and Resilience as well as parts of Urban Form and Development.  The boundary follows cadastral parcels rather natural catchments. Limiting development in the Mangawhai/Hakaru Managed Growth Area. It is not the most appropriate way to manage current and future infrastructure and servicing requirements.  |
| 231.21               | S Cullen                             | SD-UFD-P7 | Oppose   | AND Any necessary consequential amendments.  | Provision of infrastructure and services can be provided to meet the requirements of urban areas without applying an arbitrary spatial limitation.  SD-UFD-P1 is inconsistent with FC-O1.   |
| 247.14               | Foodstuffs North<br>Island Limited   | SD-UFD-P7 | Oppose   | DELETE SD-UFD-P7<br>AND  | The Mangawhai/Hakaru Managed Growth Area is inappropriate because:  |



| Submission point No. | Submitter                                 | Provision | Position | Summary of decision requested  | Reasons  |
|----------------------|---|-----------|----------|--|--|
|                      |   |           |          | Any necessary consequential amendments.  | It represents an arbitrary spatial limitation on new subdivision and development within an area subject to population growth and demand.     Provision of infrastructure and services can be provided to meet the requirements of urban areas.     It will unnecessarily restrict growth and improvement of economic and social wellbeing.   |
| 256.14               | P Ryan The Rise Limited                   | SD-UFD-P7 |          | DELETE SD-UFD-P7. AND Any necessary consequential amendments.  DELETE SD-UFD-P7. AND Any further necessary consequential amendments required to achieve the relief sought.   | SD-UFD-P7 is inconsistent with FC-O1.     Provision of infrastructure and services can be provided to meet the requirements of urban areas without applying an arbitrary spatial limitation.  The submitter considers that provision for infrastructure and services to meet urban area requirements can be provided without the application of arbitrary spatial limitations. Moreover,   |
| 277.8                | Mangawhai Hills<br>Limited                | SD-UFD-P7 | Oppose   | DELETE SD-UFD-P7 AND Any consequential amendments and alternative relief to address the concerns raised  | the Policy is inconsistent with Financial Contributions Objective FC-O1.      Infrastructure and services can be provided to meet the requirements of urban areas without applying an arbitrary spatial limitation.      SD-UFD-O1 is inconsistent with FC-O1.   |
| 280.3                | Moir Point Park<br>Developments           | SD-UFD-P7 | Oppose   | DELETE Policy SD-UFD-P7 and the Mangawhai/Hakuru Managed Growth Area. OR AMEND the mapped extent of the Mangawhai/Hakuru Managed Growth Area to reduce it to apply to a much small land area where growth actually needs to be managed.  | The submitter has requested the above relief as there is no clear description of the Mangawhai/Hakuru Managed Growth Area and its intended purpose other than SD-UFD-P7 which states:  'Limit new subdivision development within the Mangawhai/Hakaru Managed Growth Area to ensure infrastructure and servicing requirements can be appropriately directed to meet the demand of existing urban areas and future urban growth.'  SUB-P2 Infrastructure Servicing Requirements covers this matter and Standard SUB-S5 sets out servicing requirements. |
| 281.8                | Moonlight Heights<br>Limited              | SD-UFD-P7 | Oppose   | DELETE SD-UFD-P7. AND Any further necessary consequential amendments required.   | The provision of infrastructure and services can be provided to meet the requirements of urban areas without applying an arbitrary spatial limitation.  SD-UFD-P1 is inconsistent with FC-O1.  |
| 282.9                | Murphy Property<br>Development<br>Limited | SD-UFD-P7 | Oppose   | DELETE SD-UFD-P7. AND Any necessary consequential amendments.  | <ul> <li>Provision of infrastructure and services can be provided to meet the requirements of urban areas without applying an arbitrary spatial limitation.</li> <li>Policy is inconsistent with FC-O1.</li> </ul>   |
| 291.10               | Tovolea Farm Ltd                          | SD-UFD-P7 | Oppose   | AMEND the Proposed District Plan to apply the Rural lifestyle zone at the urban fringe consistent with the Harbour Overlay in the Operative Plan and reconsider or remove the Mangawhai/Hakaru Managed Growth overlay, particularly where it contradicts the intentions of the operative plan and structure/spatial plans.  AND  PROVIDE recognition of Mangawhai-Hakaru as a growth node in the Proposed District Plan with criteria for infrastructure-triggered staging and collaborative funding models.  AND  PROVIDE expanded Section 32 analysis to assess alternative growth-management mechanisms under Resource Management Act Sections 32(1) and (2).  AND  Any other relief that is consistent with and/or consequential to this submission. | a growth node to meet current predicted and future demand in the right place. Not doing so is misaligned with many of the Strategic Direction objectives in the Proposed District Plan.  Limiting development in the Mangawhai/Hakaru Managed Growth Area overlay is not the most appropriate wat to manage current and future infrastructure and servicing requirements.  |
| 293.17               | Vermont Street<br>Partners Limited        | SD-UFD-P7 | Oppose   | DELETE SD-UFD-P7. AND Any further necessary consequential amendments.  | Provision of infrastructure and services can be provided to meet the requirements of urban areas without applying an arbitrary spatial limitation. SD-UFD-P1 is inconsistent with FC-O1.   |



| Submission point No. | Submitter                                  | Provision | Position | Summary of decision requested   | Reasons   |
|----------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|---|
| 315.24               | Horizon Surveying<br>& Land<br>Development | SD-UFD-P7 | Oppose   | DELETE SD-UFD-P7.   | Mangawhai/Hakaru Managed Growth Area is not supported by the submitter.   |
| 331.7                | Northland<br>Holdings 2016<br>Limited      | SD-UFD-P7 | Oppose   | DELETE SD-UFD-P7. AND Any further necessary consequential amendments required to achieve the relief sought. | Infrastructure and services required for urban areas<br>can be provided without the application of an<br>arbitrary spatial limitation. Moreover, the policy is<br>inconsistent with FC-O1.  |
| 308.11               | Fire and<br>Emergency New<br>Zealand       | SD-UFD-P7 | Support  | RETAIN SD-UFD-P7 as notified.   | It is important that subdivision and development in the 'Mangawhai/Hakaru Managed Growth Area' is enabled only where there is infrastructure capacity available and infrastructure and servicing requirements can be met. It is important that new development does not compromise the water supply network for existing development and that new development is not enabled where there is insufficient water supply capacity available. |