



Kaipara te Oranganui • Two Oceans Two Harbours

Proposed Kaipara District Plan **Volume 7 - Summary of Submissions** **for Submissions 300 - 365**

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 Summary Tables

- Decisions are organized by submitter number. To view which Volume of the Summary of Submissions contains other submissions outside this Volume, click [here](#).
- 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 12 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
 - **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
VOLUME 1
(includes Submissions 1 – 100)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons
1.1	Arjan van Woensel	Subdivision	Amend	<p>AMEND the Proposed District Plan to enable adequate electricity supply for subdivisions by either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Connection to the existing electricity network; or • Installation of a compliant renewable energy system designed to meet the ongoing energy needs of the dwelling(s) that meets guidelines or performance standards for reliability and suitability. 	<p>Submitter would like to see the plan enable “adequate electricity supply” for subdivisions which would be met by either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Connection to the existing electricity network; or • Installation of a compliant renewable energy system designed to meet the ongoing energy needs of the dwelling(s) that meets guidelines or performance standards for reliability and suitability.
2.1	Loralie Sheppard	Subdivision	Amend	<p>AMEND SUB-R3 1b as below:</p> <p>"Subdivision in the General rural zone does not contain: land defined as highly productive land (as determined by either the New Zealand Land Resource Inventory maps or a property scale site specific assessment Land Use Capability Classification prepared by a suitably qualified person and accepted by Council); and</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. <u>Highly productive land; or</u> ii. <u>Does contain highly productive land but has been determined an exception under clause 3.8 of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land 2022 and amended August 2024. (Highly productive land as determined by either the New Zealand Land Resource Inventory maps* or a property scale site specific assessment Land Use Capability Classification prepared by a suitably qualified person and accepted by Council); and</u> <p>c...</p> <p><u>* For the determination of whether or not a property or part thereof has highly productive land, it has been taken into consideration that the New Zealand Land Resource Inventory maps have a scale of 1 : 50,000, and that the minimum area that can be separately defined at their scale is 10 ha."</u></p>	<p>No allowance in the Subdivision rules for the exceptions provided under the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land 2022 and amended 2024.</p>
2.2	Loralie Sheppard	i. Subdivision	Amend	<p>AMEND SUB-R4.1.e as below:</p> <p><u>e. The land to be subdivided into the additional small lots is:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. <u>Not highly productive land (as determined by either the New Zealand Land Resource Inventory maps or a property scale site specific assessment Land Use Capability Classification prepared by a suitably qualified person; or</u> ii. <u>Is highly productive land but has been determined an exception under clause 3.8 of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land 2022 and amended August 2024.</u> <p><u>(Highly productive land as determined by either the New Zealand Land Resource Inventory maps* or a property scale site specific assessment Land Use Capability Classification prepared by a suitably qualified person and accepted by Council); and</u></p> <p><u>* For the determination of whether or not a property or part thereof has highly productive land, it has been taken into consideration that the New Zealand Land Resource Inventory maps have a scale of 1 : 50,000, and that the minimum area that can be separately defined at their scale is 10 ha."</u></p>	<p>No allowance in the Subdivision rules for the exceptions provided under the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land 2022 and amended August 2024.</p>
2.3	Loralie Sheppard	Subdivision	Amend	<p>AMEND SUB-R7.1.g. as follows:</p> <p><u>g. The land to be subdivided into the environmental benefit lots is:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. <u>Not highly productive land (as determined by either the New Zealand Land Resource Inventory maps or a property scale site specific assessment Land Use Capability Classification prepared by a suitably qualified person; or</u> ii. <u>Is highly productive land but has been determined an exception under clause 3.8</u> 	<p>No allowance in the Subdivision rules for the exceptions provided under the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land 2022 and amended August 2024.</p>

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 1
(includes Submissions 1 – 100)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons
				<p style="text-align: center;"><u>of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land 2022 and amended August 2024.</u></p> <p><u>(Highly productive land as determined by either the New Zealand Land Resource Inventory maps* or a property scale site specific assessment Land Use Capability Classification prepared by a suitably qualified person and accepted by Council); and</u></p> <p><u>* For the determination of whether or not a property or part thereof has highly productive land, it has been taken into consideration that the New Zealand Land Resource Inventory maps have a scale of 1 : 50,000, and that the minimum area that can be separately defined at their scale is 10 ha".</u></p>	
2.4	Loralie Sheppard	Subdivision	Amend	<p>AMEND SUB-R7.1.h (note possible referencing error) as follows:</p> <p><u>g. The land to be subdivided into the environmental benefit lots is</u></p> <p>i. <u>Not highly productive land (as determined by either the New Zealand Land Resource Inventory maps or a property scale site specific assessment Land Use Capability Classification prepared by a suitably qualified person; or</u></p> <p>ii. <u>Is highly productive land but has been determined an exception under clause 3.8 of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land 2022 and amended August 2024.</u></p> <p><u>(Highly productive land as determined by either the New Zealand Land Resource Inventory maps* or a property scale site specific assessment Land Use Capability Classification prepared by a suitably qualified person and accepted by Council); and</u></p> <p><u>* For the determination of whether or not a property or part thereof has highly productive land, it has been taken into consideration that the New Zealand Land Resource Inventory maps have a scale of 1 : 50,000, and that the minimum area that can be separately defined at their scale is 10 ha."</u></p>	No allowance in the Subdivision rules for the exceptions provided under the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land 2022 and amended August 2024.
3.1	Rex Roadley	SCHED2 – Notable Trees	Oppose	<p>DELETE from SCHED 2 - Notable trees the three trees T- MAU-01, T-MAU-02 and T-MAU-03 at 930 Batley Road, Maungatūroto.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The protected trees identified have already been felled, and therefore the Council reports are out of date. Council report say the trees are on Road Reserve, that is incorrect . Council has the owners of the property as GTA Trustees (2022) Limited that is also incorrect.
4.1	Mina Henare	Planning Maps	Amend	<p>AMEND the zoning of 99 Komiti Road, Tinopai (lot 21 DP 12065) from Residential zone to Natural open space zone;</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Commission ecological and cultural values assessments to inform the zoning review</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Investigate the original subdivision and title history of lot 21 in relation to the adjacent Komiti Road Recreation Reserve</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Formally recognise the area as a site of ecological, cultural, and recreational significance</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Place a moratorium on any further development or subdivision until this zoning review is complete.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental sensitivity of the site Climate and coastal hazard risks associated with the location Cultural significance and treaty obligations Proximity to Significant Ecological and Bird Areas Biodiversity and Indigenous Habitat Protection Coastal Hazards Risk (Tsunami etc) Wetlands and Water Quality. Potential for Visual, Cultural and Natural Character Impacts Legal and Natural Character impacts.
4.2	Mina Henare	Natural Open Space Zone		<p>PROVIDE an immediate restriction on all development activities at 99 Komiti Road pending further legal and ecological review</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Work with Northland Regional Council to reassess the site under the PRP and apply appropriate restrictions to align with regional coastal and biodiversity policies.</p>	refer to 4.1

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 1
(includes Submissions 1 – 100)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons
4.3	Mina Henare	SCHED3 – Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Amend	Consult mana whenua and initiate a process for formal recognition for the site at 99 Komiti Road, Tinopai as an Area of Significance to Māori under the district and regional planning frameworks.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cultural significance and Treaty obligations. This land is of cultural and spiritual significance to mana whenua and lies within the Marine and Coastal Area. Under the Marine and Coastal Area Act and Policy 2 of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement, tangata whenua rights and interests must be recognised and provided for. Development of this land without recognition of mana whenua's role as kaitiaki is a breach of tino rangitiratanga and mana tuku iho rights.
5.1	Kevin and Kathleen Le Noel	SCHED1 – Historic Heritage Resources	Amend	AMEND SCHED1 - Historic Heritage Resources HH-DAR-02, 84 Hokianga Road, Dargaville to correct information held about the property.	The submitter advises the records held by Council are out of date and requests these to be corrected to ensure the most accurate and recent information is held.
6.1	Julie Ann Ritchie	SCHED1 – Historic Heritage Resources	Support	RETAIN SCHED1 - Historic Heritage Resources HH-DAR-03 165 Victoria Street, Dargaville	Submitter owns this property and reinforces its historical significance and the need for it to be protected.
7.1	David Medland-Slater	Planning Maps	Oppose	DELETE the Mangawhai / Hakaru Managed Growth Area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The apparent blanket ban on subdivision within the Mangawhai/Hakaru Managed Growth Area is unreasonable and no other areas have such restrictions. Council have only listed insufficient infrastructure as being the reason for this decision but planning for infrastructure is within the Council's remit. Specific policy reasoning behind preventing growth within the Mangawhai/Hakaru Area would be helpful, rather than just the sparse explanation proposed. If Council have concerns regarding the availability of infrastructure, these concerns should be made clear and solutions provided within the District Plan. E.g., Subdivisions being required to provide water and septic systems to alleviate pressure on Council systems.
7.2	David Medland-Slater	Subdivision	Oppose	AMEND plan to include far more and reasonable detail on what could allowed rather than an almost blanket ban on subdivisions in this new area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The apparent blanket ban on subdivision within the Mangawhai/Hakaru Managed Growth Area is unreasonable and no other areas have such restrictions. Council have only listed insufficient infrastructure as being the reason for this decision but planning for infrastructure is within the Council's remit. Specific policy reasoning behind preventing growth within the Mangawhai/Hakaru Area would be helpful, rather than just the sparse explanation proposed. If Council have concerns regarding the availability of infrastructure, these concerns should be made clear and solutions provided within the District Plan. E.g., Subdivisions being required to provide water and septic systems to alleviate pressure on Council systems.
8.1	Dhivian Govender	Planning Maps	Amend	AMEND the zoning of properties from Kaihu along the Kaihu Valley cycle trail down to Ahikiwi Road from General rural zone to Rural lifestyle zone.	Rural lifestyle zones enable flexibility in rural land use and should be encouraged to support the growth and sustainability of rural areas. Properties that are used for residential activities and are not used for commercial farming activities should be zoned as Rural lifestyle zone to attract more people to the region. In particular, it makes sense to extend the Rural lifestyle zone along Kaihu Wood Road to Ahikiwi Road.
8.2	Dhivian Govender	General rural zone	Amend	AMEND GRUZ-R3 (inferred) to allow lots over 24 hectares to have multiple dwellings for worker accommodation, rental income and/or multi-generational living.	Only allowing for one residential dwelling per 24 hectare site is not feasible if the community is to grow, and growth is important for future revenue. Creating flexibility for rural landowners and permitting minor residential units will provide housing options and enable growth. There should be clear guidelines that balance development and safety.
8.3	Dhivian Govender	General rural zone	Amend	AMEND GRUZ-R4 (inferred) to increase the maximum gross floor area for minor residential dwellings from 90m ² to 120m ² .	Creating flexibility for rural landowners and permitting minor residential units will provide housing options and enable growth. There should be clear guidelines that balance development and safety.
8.4	Dhivian Govender	General	Amend	PROVIDE incentives for property clean-up and impose strong fines for non-compliance. AND	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter considers it is crucial to maintain the aesthetic and environmental quality of the Kaipara District. The current rates and land value assessments only disincentivise property maintenance.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

VOLUME 1

(includes Submissions 1 – 100)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons
				PROVIDE a retroactive clean-up program for broken-down cars, including strict fines for violations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Better property management should be encouraged. Cleaning up broken-down cars will also improve the appearance and safety of the Kaipara District.
8.5	Dhivian Govender	General	Amend	PROVIDE and enforce stricter regulations regarding roaming dogs and cattle. AND PROVIDE a greater police presence across the Kaipara District, especially in rural communities.	The Kaipara District must be safe for residents and visitors. This can be achieved by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementing strict regulations and giving animal control officers more authority to impound or destroy dangerous animals. A greater police presence within rural communities to enhance security and deter criminal activities.
8.6	Dhivian Govender	General	Amend	Council to partner with local landowners and residents to eradicate wandering stock and dangerous animals. AND Support for investment in facilities along the Kaihu Valley Cycle Trail.	Tourism is a vital component of the District's economy and contributes to community wellbeing. Investing in tourism infrastructure and services can create a more vibrant and prosperous community. The submitter has met people in Australia who speak highly of cycle trails in Northland and of New Zealand's natural beauty. As such, the Kaihu Valley Cycle Trail should be improved to address concerns about wild dogs and roaming cattle, as well as a lack of facilities such as toilets and emergency phones. In doing so, the safety and appeal of the Trail will be enhanced.
8.7	Dhivian Govender	Renewable Electricity Generation	Support	Support for partnerships with organisations to develop solar electricity generation, especially along the west coast where such work has already started.	Sustainable energy creates a safe and happy place and provides long-term benefits to the community. Kaipara District Council should embrace sustainable energy alternatives.
9.1	Sara Allsop	Planning Maps	Oppose	DELETE the proposed rezoning of land on Ripiro Drive and around Baylys Beach. AND Prioritise long-term environmental sustainability and community wellbeing over short-term pressure for development.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter has concerns regarding the rezoning and two proposed subdivisions at Baylys Beach and considers neither should go ahead without comprehensive impact assessments and infrastructure studies being undertaken. Rezoning and development at Baylys Beach are opposed for the following reasons: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Baylys Beach is a sensitive ecological area and increased development can exacerbate erosion and habitat degradation, as well as increase water runoff into freshwater and marine environments. One of the proposed subdivisions sits within a large catchment area and this location, as well as the intensifying impacts of climate change, raises concerns regarding increased flooding, land stability and water management for new and existing properties, particularly those toward the beachfront. The existing environment is already under seasonal stress from stormwater runoff, and it is unclear whether infrastructure upgrades will be undertaken to ensure there is capacity for the proposed development. Improperly managed stormwater can lead to flooding during heavy rainfall events, increased sediment and pollution in local watercourses and damage to property. These risks are only heightened in a coastal area vulnerable to changing weather patterns, like Baylys Beach. Water restrictions are imposed on residents during the summer months due to limited supply. Given that the current system struggles to meet existing demand, new development should be able to demonstrate a sustainable and/or independent water supply prior to be approved. It would be irresponsible to enable further subdivision without resolving existing infrastructure capacity issues. There is no evident demand for development. A steady growth is occurring, but this does not necessarily warrant rezoning or intensification at this time. Baylys Beach is a relatively remote and environmentally sensitive location. As such, any large-scale development should be justifiable by demand. The submitter also considers that the proposed subdivision applications at Baylys Beach currently being processed by Kaipara District Council should be paused. Without clear

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 1
(includes Submissions 1 – 100)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons
					demand, development is driven by speculative or short-term commercial interest as opposed to long-term sustainable planning.
10.1	Robin & Lynette Franklin	SCHED1 – Historic Heritage Resources	Oppose	DELETE from SCHED1-Historic Heritage Resources, HH-PAP-04 the house at 5 Hook Road, Paparoa; AND RETAIN in SCHED1-Historic Heritage Resources HH-PAP-04 which relates to the workshop only.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitters consider that listing the property as a Heritage Resource H41 (Former Evans Tinsmith Shop) under the Kaipara District Plan will impose stringent conditions which were not anticipated, including reduced purchase appeal and sale value. The property was purchased in mid-2024 and reporting on the Heritage Resource (dated May 2022) reads as if the house and workshop are one. The submitters note that their real estate agent was unaware of the proposal to list the property as a Heritage Resource. The workshop being listed with Heritage New Zealand was accepted by the submitters as not being a problem. The house, however, has undergone multiple alterations and is notably different than the original building.
11.1	Elysia Green	Planning Maps	Support	RETAIN the proposed Rural lifestyle zoning of 54 Te Tonga Road, Matakoho.	The Proposed District Plan presents valuable opportunities for the community. Making housing available to accommodate population increase will benefit future generations, and development can foster businesses and create accessible recreational activities for all ages. Many young adults in and around Paparoa are relocating to cities for better job prospects and social opportunities. The District Plan needs adapting in order to provide a more vibrant and sustainable environment.
12.1	Shara Knight	Planning Maps	Support	RETAIN the proposed Rural lifestyle zoning of 48 Te Tonga Road, Matakoho. AND IMPLEMENT the Rural lifestyle zone to its fullest extent.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strongly supports the Rural lifestyle zone and the ability to subdivide land into 4,000m² lots. The operative zoning restrictions do not cater to Kaipara's potential for growth and development, and it is considered that the proposed zone offers a sensible and sustainable way forward. The Rural lifestyle zone should be implemented to the fullest extent for the following reasons: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Subdivision of land will increase the number of rateable properties and help broaden Council's revenue base, meaning more funding for essential services, infrastructure upgrades and community projects. Rural lifestyle properties provide a balance between rural living and access to services. Such properties are attractive to families, retirees and professionals. Rural lifestyle development will stimulate local businesses and support economic resilience. If properly managed, lifestyle development can enhance the visual and environmental appeal of Kaipara. The Rural lifestyle zone balances rural sprawl and urban expansion. 4,000m² is enough space to be self-sufficient with a garden, water tanks and renewable energy, thus aligning with sustainability goals. Kaipara's potential can be realised through this proposed zoning and potential to grow.
12.2	Shara Knight	Planning Maps	Support	RETAIN the proposed Rural lifestyle zoning of 54 Te Tonga Road, Paparoa.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strongly supports the Rural lifestyle zone and the ability to subdivide land into 4,000m² lots. The operative zoning restrictions do not cater to Kaipara's potential for growth and development, and it is considered that the proposed zone offers a sensible and sustainable way forward. The Rural lifestyle zone should be implemented to the fullest extent for the following reasons: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Subdivision of land will increase the number of rateable properties and help broaden Council's revenue base, meaning more funding for essential services, infrastructure upgrades and community projects. Rural lifestyle properties provide a balance between rural living and access to services. Such properties are attractive to families, retirees and professionals. Rural lifestyle development will stimulate local businesses and support economic resilience.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 1
(includes Submissions 1 – 100)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons
					<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. If properly managed, lifestyle development can enhance the visual and environmental appeal of Kaipara. 4. The Rural lifestyle zone balances rural sprawl and urban expansion. 4,000m² is enough space to be self-sufficient with a garden, water tanks and renewable energy, thus aligning with sustainability goals. 5. Kaipara's potential can be realised through this proposed zoning and potential to grow.
12.3	Shara Knight	Planning Maps	Support	RETAIN the proposed Rural lifestyle zoning of the property legally described as Sec 30 SO542878 on Te Tonga Road, Paparaoa.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strongly supports the Rural lifestyle zone and the ability to subdivide land into 4,000m² lots. The operative zoning restrictions do not cater to Kaipara's potential for growth and development, and it is considered that the proposed zone offers a sensible and sustainable way forward. • The Rural lifestyle zone should be implemented to the fullest extent for the following reasons: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Subdivision of land will increase the number of rateable properties and held broaden Council's revenue base, meaning more funding for essential services, infrastructure upgrades and community projects. 2. Rural lifestyle properties provide a balance between rural living and access to services. Such properties are attractive to families, retirees and professionals. Rural lifestyle development will stimulate local businesses and support economic resilience. 3. If properly managed, lifestyle development can enhance the visual and environmental appeal of Kaipara. 4. The Rural lifestyle zone balances rural sprawl and urban expansion. 4,000m² is enough space to be self-sufficient with a garden, water tanks and renewable energy, thus aligning with sustainability goals. 5. Kaipara's potential can be realised through this proposed zoning and potential to grow.
13.1	Peter Rothwell	Coastal Environment	Oppose	AMEND 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"> • 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. • 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. • A Stormwater Management Plan should be prepared and include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A study of Mangawhai Harbour Catchment hydrology and macroinvertebrates. 2. An evaluation of the current stormwater infrastructure. 3. Recommendations for infrastructure within the Long-term Plan; and 4. Current engineering standards for stormwater and roading. • 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

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

VOLUME 1

(includes Submissions 1 – 100)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons
					on such habitats. Moreover, the ecological importance of the Mangawhai Harbour has been affirmed by the Environment Court in hearings regarding Mangawhai Central and the Wharf.
13.2	Peter Rothwell	General	Oppose	<p>AMEND all provisions relating to stormwater in the Proposed District Plan to directly reference the Auckland Council Unitary Plan Stormwater and Water-sensitive Design Standards until more suitable rules can be derived from a comprehensive stormwater management plan.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>DELETE the stormwater section of the Kaipara District Council Engineering Standards 2011.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Kaipara District Council Engineering Standards 2011 are out of date and no longer effective. Since 2011, the Mangawhai population has grown from 2500 to 8000 and there is now infrastructure including a piped network. There were less vehicles using the roads and many houses were unoccupied. The Kaipara District Council network discharge consent from Northland Regional Council is also considered out of date and ineffective. The consent has no provision for the treatment of urban stormwater discharges to the Mangawhai Harbour which means Kaipara District Council are creating road discharges without stormwater treatment being required under its discharge consent. The submitter draws upon the Mangawhai Hills Plan Change and Estuary Estates (Mangawhai Central) Plan Change 78 which both reference the Auckland Council Water-sensitive Design Standards. It would be rational to adopt the same standards into the Proposed District Plan to manage stormwater until an area-specific Stormwater Management Plan (SMP) is prepared. Once available, suitable rules can be derived from the SMP and incorporated into the Proposed District Plan.
14.1	Pouto Marine Hall Incorporated	Historic Heritage	Support	<p>RETAIN Historic Heritage Rule HH-R1.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>PROVIDE for a partnership agreement between Kaipara District Council and Pouto Marine Hall Incorporated whereby maintenance and repair costs for the Pouto Marine Hall are split evenly.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pouto Marine Hall Incorporated (Charitable Trust) support HH-R1 in part but express concern that additional impediments to maintenance or repairs will impact on financial solvency. The hall is owned by the community but is located on Kaipara District Council land. Moreover, the Hall toilets are advertised as a public toilet facility by Kaipara District Council. Given Council own the land, there should be an agreement to partner 50/50 in all future repairs and maintenance of the Hall. Such maintenance may include painting, roofing, guttering and window repair. The submitter does not pay rates and, as such, rate relief would not help. Therefore, a partnership agreement to split costs as described is considered the fairest outcome.
14.2	Pouto Marine Hall Incorporated	Historic Heritage	Support	<p>RETAIN Historic Heritage Rule HH-R2.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>PROVIDE for a partnership agreement between Kaipara District Council and Pouto Marine Hall Incorporated whereby maintenance and repair costs for the Pouto Marine Hall are split evenly.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pouto Marine Hall Incorporated (Charitable Trust) support HH-R2 in part but express concern that additional impediments to maintenance or repairs will impact on financial solvency. The hall is owned by the community but is located on Kaipara District Council land. Moreover, the Hall toilets are advertised as a public toilet facility by Kaipara District Council. Given Council own the land, there should be an agreement to partner 50/50 in all future repairs and maintenance of the Hall. Such maintenance may include painting, roofing, guttering and window repair. The submitter does not pay rates and, as such, rate relief would not help. Therefore, a partnership agreement to split costs as described is considered the fairest outcome.
14.3	Pouto Marine Hall Incorporated	Historic Heritage	Support	<p>RETAIN Historic Heritage Rule HH-R3.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>PROVIDE for a partnership agreement between Kaipara District Council and Pouto Marine Hall Incorporated whereby maintenance and repair costs for the Pouto Marine Hall are split evenly.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pouto Marine Hall Incorporated (Charitable Trust) support HH-R3 in part but express concern that additional impediments to maintenance or repairs will impact on financial solvency. The hall is owned by the community but is located on Kaipara District Council land. Moreover, the Hall toilets are advertised as a public toilet facility by Kaipara District Council. Given Council own the land, there should be an agreement to partner 50/50 in all future repairs and maintenance of the Hall. Such maintenance may include painting, roofing, guttering and window repair. The submitter does not pay rates and, as such, rate relief would not help. Therefore, a partnership agreement to split costs as described is considered the fairest outcome.
14.4	Pouto Marine Hall Incorporated	Historic Heritage	Support	<p>RETAIN Historic Heritage Rule HH-R4.</p> <p>AND</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pouto Marine Hall Incorporated (Charitable Trust) support HH-R4 in part but express concern that

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 1
(includes Submissions 1 – 100)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons
				PROVIDE for a partnership agreement between Kaipara District Council and Pouto Marine Hall Incorporated whereby maintenance and repair costs for the Pouto Marine Hall are split evenly.	<p>additional impediments to maintenance or repairs will impact on financial solvency. The hall is owned by the community but is located on Kaipara District Council land. Moreover, the Hall toilets are advertised as a public toilet facility by Kaipara District Council. Given Council own the land, there should be an agreement to partner 50/50 in all future repairs and maintenance of the Hall. Such maintenance may include painting, roofing, guttering and window repair.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter does not pay rates and, as such, rate relief would not help. Therefore, a partnership agreement to split costs as described is considered the fairest outcome.
14.5	Pouto Marine Hall Incorporated	Historic Heritage	Support	RETAIN Historic Heritage Rule HH-R5. AND PROVIDE for a partnership agreement between Kaipara District Council and Pouto Marine Hall Incorporated whereby maintenance and repair costs for the Pouto Marine Hall are split evenly.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pouto Marine Hall Incorporated (Charitable Trust) support HH-R5 in part but express concern that additional impediments to maintenance or repairs will impact on financial solvency. The hall is owned by the community but is located on Kaipara District Council land. Moreover, the Hall toilets are advertised as a public toilet facility by Kaipara District Council. Given Council own the land, there should be an agreement to partner 50/50 in all future repairs and maintenance of the Hall. Such maintenance may include painting, roofing, guttering and window repair. The submitter does not pay rates and, as such, rate relief would not help. Therefore, a partnership agreement to split costs as described is considered the fairest outcome.
14.6	Pouto Marine Hall Incorporated	Historic Heritage	Support	RETAIN Historic Heritage Objective HH-O1. AND PROVIDE for a partnership agreement between Kaipara District Council and Pouto Marine Hall Incorporated whereby maintenance and repair costs for the Pouto Marine Hall are split evenly.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pouto Marine Hall Incorporated (Charitable Trust) support HH-O1 but express concern that additional impediments to maintenance or repairs will impact on financial solvency. The hall is owned by the community but is located on Kaipara District Council land. Moreover, the Hall toilets are advertised as a public toilet facility by Kaipara District Council. Given Council own the land, there should be an agreement to partner 50/50 in all future repairs and maintenance of the Hall. Such maintenance may include painting, roofing, guttering and window repair. The submitter does not pay rates and, as such, rate relief would not help. Therefore, a partnership agreement to split costs as described is considered the fairest outcome.
15.1	Kauri Kottage Limited	Historic Heritage	Oppose	No specific decision sought but submission opposes in part rule HH-R1.	The submitter opposes HH-R1 in part because of the potential costs incurred by the owner of Kauri Kottage for repairs and maintenance.
15.2	Kauri Kottage Limited	Historic Heritage	Oppose	No specific decision sought but submission opposes in part rule HH-R1.	The submitter opposes HH-R2 in part because of the potential costs incurred by the owner of Kauri Kottage for repairs and maintenance.
15.3	Kauri Kottage Limited	Historic Heritage	Oppose	No specific decision sought but submission opposes in part rule HH-R1.	The submitter opposes HH-R3 in part because of the potential costs incurred by the owner of Kauri Kottage for repairs and maintenance.
15.4	Kauri Kottage Limited	Historic Heritage	Oppose	No specific decision sought but submission opposes in part rule HH-R1.	The submitter opposes HH-R4 in part because of the potential costs incurred by the owner of Kauri Kottage for repairs and maintenance.
15.5	Kauri Kottage Limited	Historic Heritage	Oppose	No specific decision sought but submission opposes in part rule HH-R1.	The submitter opposes HH-R5 in part because of the potential costs incurred by the owner of Kauri Kottage for repairs and maintenance.
15.6	Kauri Kottage Limited	SCHED1 – Historic Heritage Resources	Oppose	REASSESS the Kauri Kottage site (HH-POU-05 'Former Kaipara Heads Signal Station signalman's house' at 3 Signal Station Road, Pouto) to determine whether Heritage B status is appropriate due to modifications. AND If a Heritage B status is appropriate for Kauri Kottage then update the assessment to acknowledge current modifications such as the lean-to-roof on the northern side of the building. AND Council contribute 50:50 to future maintenance and repairs of the external structure including painting, roof, gutters, windows, flooring.	The submitter notes that modifications and development had already occurred at the site prior to purchasing the property and, as such, questions whether it should be a Heritage B site. It is requested that Kaipara District Council undertake a survey and acknowledge existing modifications to the site to determine whether it should remain listed as a Historic Heritage site.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 1
(includes Submissions 1 – 100)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons
15.7	Kauri Kottage Limited	Historic Heritage	Oppose	No specific decision requested, but submission opposes in part objective HH-O1.	The submitter opposes HH-O1 in part because of the potential costs incurred by the owner of Kauri Kottage for repairs and maintenance.
16.1	Marty Boakes	Planning Maps	Amend	AMEND the zoning of land on Whaka Street, Maungatūroto from General rural zone to Rural lifestyle zone.	The property is well placed to be within the Rural lifestyle zone and has an existing easement through 36 Whaka Street which is zoned Rural lifestyle. There is an agreement in place for the purchase of the property and ongoing negotiations regarding a boundary adjustment which would enable access from Judd Road between 40 and 46 Judd Road. This would mean the property would effectively adjoin the Rural lifestyle zone to the north, partly to the east and across Judd Road. The submitter has lived in Maungatūroto for some 45 years and currently resides on Judd Road. The area needs quality subdivision to reduce rural border sections down to rural lifestyle size and the property described would lend itself well to subdivision in accordance with Rural lifestyle zone provisions.
16.2	Marty Boakes	Planning Maps	Support	No specific decision sought but submission supports the other proposed changes across Maungatūroto.	The submitter has lived in Maungatūroto for some 45 years and currently resides on Judd Road. The area needs quality subdivision to reduce rural border sections down to rural lifestyle size.
17.1	Basil Foster	Planning Maps	Amend	AMEND the zone of the property at 89 Doctors Hill Road, Maungatūroto and all properties down the road towards the Maungatūroto township to Residential zone.	The submitter's property (and those down the road towards Maungatūroto) have access to reticulated wastewater and water supply, as well as electricity and telecommunication services.
17.2	Basil Foster	General	Support	SEAL Doctors Hill Road, Maungatūroto.	The services have been upgraded.
18.1	Paul Chambers	SCHED1 – Historic Heritage Resources	Oppose	DELETE the heritage listing HH-MAU-09 for the Davidson Memorial Congregational Church and Hall at 98 Hurndall Street East, Maungatūroto.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is insufficient justification for the application of the heritage status as the church does not meet heritage criteria. • There are inaccuracies in the Historic Heritage Item Record form. • By applying the designation there would be a loss of functionality and operational flexibility. • The application of the designation would impose a financial and maintenance burden. • Long term sustainability of the site would be impacted. • The church members have not been meaningfully consulted with, with regard to the application of the heritage status.
19.1	Sophia Egan-Reid	Planning Maps	Oppose	<p>DELETE the rezoned area on Oneriri Road, Kaiwaka from being Rural lifestyle zone.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>AMEND the Rural lifestyle zone rules applicable to Oneriri Road, Kaiwaka as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase minimum lot sizes from 0.4ha to 1ha. • Require significant native planting throughout development in this area, particularly around waterways, roadside boundaries, and coastal margins. • Limit the number of new access points onto Oneriri Road. • Require high-quality and environmentally sensitive water and wastewater systems. • Apply a 200m minimum setback from the edge of the harbour. • Include a clear restriction for further subdivision or rezoning in future to prevent future intensification. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The area is isolated, lacks infrastructure, and to be included within the Rural lifestyle zone would be inconsistent with the policies and objectives for the proposed zone. • Increased development will create increased risk to traffic safety, particularly at the intersection with State Highway 1. • The existing infrastructure in the environment cannot support future development. • Further development will cause environmental damage to Kaipara Harbour, wetlands and native bush, contradicting objectives and policies RLZ-O2, and RLZ-P1. • There has been inadequate community consultation. • Promoting development would reduce the unique environment of Kaiwaka and Oneriri areas. • In the instance that Oneriri Road remains within the proposed Rural lifestyle zone, alterations to the rules have been requested for the following reasons: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To lower housing density, reduce pressure on local services and preserve rural character. 2. To protect biodiversity, reduce runoff and support Kaipara Harbour. 3. To manage traffic volumes and maintain road safety. 4. To protect visual, ecological and cultural values. 5. To ensure future fragmentation does not occur.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

VOLUME 1

(includes Submissions 1 – 100)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons
20.1	Christine Silvester	General	Support	No specific decision sought but submission supports the Proposed District Plan in its entirety.	The submitter has read the proposed District Plan and supports it entirely.
20.2	Christine Silvester	General Residential Zone	Support	No specific decision requested, but submission supports the restrictions placed on running a business in a residential area.	The submitter likes this restriction as they believe that a residential should be primarily for living purposes, and not for commercial or industrial activities. Any business should be hidden from view (inside a home), with no associated equipment left outside, and should be limited in size.
20.3	Christine Silvester	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	Support	RETAIN indigenous vegetation protection in the Proposed District Plan.	The submitter supports this due to Kiwi living in the 'Bream Tail Farm', and in 'The Sanctuary'.
20.4	Christine Silvester	General	Support	No specific decision requested, but submission supports the requirement for any building to be setback 10m from environmental bush.	No reasons provided.
21.1	Christopher Carey	Planning Maps	Amend	AMEND the zoning of Purupuru Lane, Kaiwaka from General rural to Rural lifestyle zone.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are two other developments (Takaho Bay, and Hinamoki Estate) of the same nature (as that in Purupuru Lane) in proximity to the site which have been classified as 'Rural lifestyle'. • The development on Purupuru Lane has already been sold as lifestyle blocks, and the parcel sizes are not economically viable to be used for farming land but become a burden to maintain. • There would be a restriction on any further subdivision of the larger lots in the development. • Smaller lots offer opportunities for activities (such as horticulture) which require smaller land use. • There is demand for accommodation and housing in the area, and Oneriri Road offers convenient and accessible opportunities for lifestyle blocks which doesn't infringe on agricultural land. • Oneriri Road has easy access to State Highway 1 in connection to Auckland (for distribution of goods). • Rural lifestyle blocks bring diversity and sustainability to land use that is predominantly sheep and cattle. • Other places in Kaipara District have had a change in zone to Rural lifestyle zone, so the zoning requested is not unprecedented.
22.1	Geoff Wilson	General	Support	RETAIN the Proposed District Plan provisions insofar as they relate to 99-101 Komiti Road, Tinopai.	The submitter supports the proposed District Plan provisions insofar as they relate to 99 - 101 Komiti Road, Tinopai.
22.2	Geoff Wilson	Planning Maps	Support	RETAIN the coastal environment overlay which applies to 99-101 Komiti Road, Tinopai.	The submitter believes the application of this overlay is appropriate as the property (and adjacent neighbouring property and the waterfront) is naturally part of the coastal environment.
22.3	Geoff Wilson	Planning Maps	Support	ADD the High Natural Character overlay to the property at 99-101 Komiti Road, Tinopai.	The submitter believes this overlay should apply to the property at 99-101 Komiti Road as the adjacent properties are subject to this overlay.
22.4	Geoff Wilson	Planning Maps	Support	RETAIN the coastal flood hazard overlays which apply to the property at 99-101 Komiti Road, Tinopai.	The submitter has advised that much of the property is subject to flooding. Particularly during high tide, or with king tides.
22.5	Geoff Wilson	Planning Maps	Support	RETAIN the River Flood Hazard overlay which applies to 99-101 Komiti Road, Tinopai.	The submitter has advised that heavy rainfall causes ponding and overland flow at 99 - 101 Komiti Road.
22.6	Geoff Wilson	Planning Maps	Amend	AMEND the zoning of 99-101 Komiti Road, Tinopai from General residential zone to Natural open space zone. AND Do not allow any development of the property at 99-101 Komiti Road, Tinopai.	The submitter would like this change to ensure the natural character of the property is preserved and restored, and to protect it from inappropriate use and development.
22.7	Geoff Wilson	General	Oppose	The submission requests that Kaipara District Council instruct the landowner at 99-101 Komiti Road, Tinopai to remove existing illegal building framework and to remove limestone fill.	<p>The submitter seeks the removal of earthworks and building because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Earthworks in a wetland is illegal. • Illegal buildings have not been legally established. • On-site works are damaging the state of the natural environment.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

VOLUME 1

(includes Submissions 1 – 100)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons
22.8	Geoff Wilson	General	Amend	AMEND the ownership of 99 - 101 Komiti Road, Tinopai from private to public.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter would like the property to be changed into public ownership for the following reasons: The property is situated in the middle of the Tinopai Settlement. It is important ecologically, environmentally, and culturally for the future that this property remains undeveloped and as close as possible to its wetland state. Any private development would destroy the aesthetic of Tinopai's waterfront.
23.1	Wilton Douglas Turner	Planning Maps	Support	CONSIDER rezoning the submitter's property as Settlement zone in the future when demand and supply are more closely aligned.	The market does not match the idea in the previous District Plan when it was suggested that the submitter's property was to be rezoned to a Settlement zone.
24.1	Peter Anderson	General	Support	RETAIN the current three waters management structure with Kaipara District Council keeping full control of all the Kaipara water resource.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water is a natural resource, and all Kaipara residents should have an equal say in future management of the resource. Water management is best achieved when being managed by Kaipara District Council, not in joint partnership with neighbouring Councils or interest groups. If water management is amalgamated with neighbouring water entities/Council, Kaipara residents run the risk of losing management control of water. Kaipara residents loose management control when individual interest groups have direct control.
25.1	Matakohe Cemetery Trustees	SCHED1 – Historic Heritage Resources	Amend	AMEND HH-MAT-04 in Schedule 1 Historic Heritage Resources to ensure that the references to the legal description, the owner and the information included in the Historic Heritage Record Form is updated to reflect the correct information.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Coates Memorial Church is owned and administered by the Ministry for Culture and Heritage, not the Matakohe Cemetery Trustees. That Matakohe Cemetery Trustees receive a grant from Ministry for Culture and Heritage each year for maintenance of the lawns around the church building. The legal description is described as 4097m² more or less, being part allotments 37 and 56, suburbs of Matakohe situated in Block XIV, Matakohe Survey District.
25.2	Matakohe Cemetery Trustees	SCHED1 – Historic Heritage Resources	Amend	AMEND HH-MAT-05 in Schedule 1 Historic Heritage Resources to ensure that the reference to the name of the property is changed to 'Matakohe Udenominational Chapel'. AND AMEND The Historic Heritage Record Form under the 'history' heading to ensure that it is clear that the 'Matakohe Udenominational Chapel' is not part of the Kauri Museum's 'collection'.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The property has been labelled incorrectly in the list of schedules, and in the associated Historic Heritage Record Form. The 'Matakohe Udenominational Chapel' is not part of the Kauri Museum's collection and is owned by the Matakohe Cemetery Trustees who allow the museum to manage the building as an enhancement to the museum's visitor offering.
26.1	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Definitions	Oppose	AMEND clause (b) of the definition of "Regionally Significant Infrastructure" as follows: Key facilities required for communication (including telecommunication, broadband, wireless networks and radio); <u>Telecommunication and Radiocommunication Networks</u> AND Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	Whilst it is acknowledged that the clause of telecommunications replicates the equivalent clause in the Regional Policy Statement for Northland definition, a standard clause is being sought on plans nationally primarily for clarity that infrastructure such as fibre networks are included. This is considered to be consistent with the Regional Policy Statement but with improved clarity.
26.2	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Definitions	Oppose	DELETE the definition of "Root Protection Zone" and replace with: <u>the circular area surrounding a notable tree, measured from the centre of the trunk, with a radius calculated by multiplying the trunk diameter by 12, measured 1.5 above ground level.</u> AND Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	The definition appears to be unnecessarily complex. The equivalent definition recommended in the Section 42A report for notable trees in the Far North District Plan following further technical advice is preferred.
26.3	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading	Definitions	Oppose	ADD a new Clause (c) to the definition of "Temporary Infrastructure" as follows:	The definition provides for several scenarios that may require deployment of temporary infrastructure. However, one key reason telecommunications operators may install temporary radiocommunication

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

VOLUME 1

(includes Submissions 1 – 100)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons
	Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ			<p><u>c. Temporary wireless telecommunications and broadband coverage or capacity is required for an event or peak holiday demand.</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.</p>	equipment (poles, antennas and associated radio equipment) is to provide additional coverage for popular holiday locations over peak summer periods, or for festivals and events. This scenario should be included in the definition. If necessary, the period of time for this scenario can be addressed in the associated rule in the Infrastructure chapter. Enabling additional capacity for wireless services in peak holiday periods will better support the people and communities of Kaipara District who rely on such services such as Northland Field Days.
26.4	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Vision for Kaipara	Oppose	<p>AMEND SD-VK-O8 as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Development is supported by affordable <u>appropriate</u> infrastructure; <u>and</u> 2. Development is integrated and phased with the provision of appropriate and affordable infrastructure. <p>AND</p> <p>Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.</p>	It is unclear what the reference to affordable in the objective is intended to mean. The reface to “appropriate” should be sufficient and where relevant address any matters of affordability.
26.5	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Natural Hazards and Resilience	Support	<p>RETAIN SD-NH-O1 as notified.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.</p>	The objective appropriately provides a suitable framework for considering necessary infrastructure in hazard areas.
26.6	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Urban Form and Development	Support	<p>RETAIN SD-UFD-O3 as notified.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.</p>	The objective appropriately addresses the need for sufficient infrastructure capacity to support urban development.
26.7	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Financial Contributions	Support	<p>RETAIN FC-O1 as notified.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.</p>	The objective supports developers providing and meeting the costs of infrastructure to support development.
26.8	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Financial Contributions	Support	<p>RETAIN FC-P2 as notified.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.</p>	The policy and others collectively support developers providing and meeting the costs of infrastructure to support development.
26.9	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Financial Contributions	Support	<p>RETAIN FC-P3 as notified.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.</p>	This policy and others collectively support developers providing and meeting the costs of infrastructure to support development.
26.10	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Financial Contributions	Support	<p>RETAIN FC-P5 as notified.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.</p>	This policy and others collectively support developers providing and meeting the costs of infrastructure to support development.
26.11	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Financial Contributions	Amend	<p>AMEND the cross references in FC-R1 to correctly reference standards FC-S1-S6.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.</p>	Rule FC-R1 is supported but it requires some cross references to the standards to be corrected as they refer to incorrect provisions. In particular, FC-S6 is the correct clause for contributions to network utilities but is referred to in the rule as S8 which is not a standard.
26.12	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Financial Contributions	Support	<p>RETAIN FC-S6 as notified.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.</p>	The standard as notified is supported.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 1
(includes Submissions 1 – 100)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons
26.13	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Infrastructure	Support	RETAIN INF-O1 as notified. AND Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	This provision provides an appropriate and workable framework for telecommunications infrastructure.
26.14	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Infrastructure	Support	RETAIN INF-O2 as notified. AND Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	This provision provides an appropriate and workable framework for telecommunication infrastructure.
26.15	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Infrastructure	Support	RETAIN INF-O3 as notified. AND Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	This provision provides an appropriate and workable framework for telecommunications infrastructure.
26.16	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Infrastructure	Support	RETAIN INF-P1 as notified. AND Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	These provisions provide a workable and appropriate policy framework for telecommunications infrastructure.
26.17	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Infrastructure	Support	RETAIN INF-P2 as notified. AND Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	These provisions provide a workable and appropriate policy framework for telecommunications infrastructure.
26.18	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Infrastructure	Support	RETAIN INF-P3 as notified. AND Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	The provisions provide a workable and appropriate policy framework for telecommunications infrastructure.
26.19	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Infrastructure	Support	RETAIN INF-P4 as notified. AND Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	The provisions provide a workable and appropriate policy framework for telecommunications infrastructure.
26.20	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Infrastructure	Support	RETAIN INF-P6 as notified. AND Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	The provisions provide a workable and appropriate policy framework for telecommunications infrastructure.
26.21	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Infrastructure	Support	RETAIN INF-P7 as notified. AND Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	These provisions provide a workable and appropriate policy framework for telecommunications infrastructure
26.22	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Infrastructure	Support	RETAIN INF-P8 as notified. AND Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	These provisions provide a workable and appropriate policy framework for telecommunications infrastructure
26.23	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Infrastructure	Support	RETAIN INF-P12 as notified. AND Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	These provisions provide a workable and appropriate policy framework for telecommunications infrastructure.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 1
(includes Submissions 1 – 100)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons
26.24	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Infrastructure	Oppose	<p>AMEND INF-P5.2 as follows:</p> <p>Provide for new regionally significant infrastructure within an Overlay where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ... 2. It is demonstrated through an options assessment <u>commensurate with the extent of any expected adverse effects</u> that locating within an Overlay is the best practicable option <u>appropriate</u>, having particular regard to the financial implications, social, cultural and environmental effects of the preferred option, compared to other alternative options. <p>AND</p> <p>Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.</p>	Use of the term “best practicable option” in clause 2, is not supported. The extent of analysis of options needs to be commensurate to the scale of the work and its effects. For some minor works a best practical option approach may not be justified. Further, its definition, which is in s2 of the Resource Management Act, is focused on noise and discharges, which may cause confusion in application to other matters such as visual effects. Therefore, a change in terminology to “appropriate” is preferred, which will enable the extent of assessment of alternative options to be commensurate to the scale of what is proposed.
26.25	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Natural Hazards	Amend	<p>ADD a new policy to the Natural Hazards chapter as follows (or wording of like effect):</p> <p><u>INF-PX</u></p> <p><u>Enable network utilities in natural hazard overlays that:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Do not increase the risk from the natural hazard to people, other property or other infrastructure;</u> 2. <u>Have a functional need or operational need to be located within the area subject to the hazard; and</u> 3. <u>Where necessary and appropriate include design measures to reduce the potential for damage in a natural hazard event.</u> <p>AND</p> <p>Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.</p>	A new policy is requested that recognises that network utilities are appropriate in natural hazard areas where they have a functional or operational need to be there, do not exacerbate the hazard in terms of risks to people and property, and take into account design measures where necessary and appropriate for resilience in a natural hazard event. It is noted that regulated telecommunications infrastructure is exempt from district plan hazard rules by Regulation 57 of the National Environmental Standards for Telecommunication Facilities, reflecting the natural hazard risk profile for this type of infrastructure.
26.26	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Infrastructure	Support	<p>RETAIN the introductory statement in the Infrastructure chapter on how the infrastructure rules in the INF chapter work.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.</p>	The statement clearly sets out how the infrastructure rules work and their relationship to other parts of the district plan. The clear statement that zone rules do not apply is supported.
26.27	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Infrastructure	Support	<p>RETAIN INF-R1 as notified.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.</p>	The permitted activity rules which apply to telecommunications infrastructure are considered to be workable so are supported as notified.
26.28	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Infrastructure	Support	<p>RETAIN INF-R2 as notified.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.</p>	The permitted activity rules which apply to telecommunications infrastructure are considered to be workable so are supported as notified.
26.29	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Infrastructure	Support	<p>RETAIN INF-R3 as notified.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.</p>	The permitted activity rules which apply to telecommunications infrastructure are considered to be workable so are supported as notified.
26.30	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Infrastructure	Support	<p>RETAIN INF-R4 as notified</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.</p>	The permitted activity rules which apply to telecommunications infrastructure are considered to be workable so are supported as notified.
26.31	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth	Infrastructure	Support	<p>RETAIN INF-R7 as notified.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.</p>	The permitted activity rules which apply to telecommunications infrastructure are considered to be workable so are supported as notified.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 1
(includes Submissions 1 – 100)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons
	Group LP and One NZ				
26.32	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Infrastructure	Support	RETAIN INF-R9 as notified. AND Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	The permitted activity rules which apply to telecommunications infrastructure are considered to be workable so are supported as notified.
26.33	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Infrastructure	Support	RETAIN INF-R22 as notified. AND Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	The permitted activity rules which apply to telecommunications infrastructure are considered to be workable so are supported as notified.
26.34	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Infrastructure	Support	RETAIN INF-R23 as notified. AND Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	The permitted activity rules which apply to telecommunications infrastructure are considered to be workable so are supported as notified.
26.35	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Infrastructure	Support	RETAIN INF-R25 as notified. AND Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	The permitted activity rules which apply to telecommunications infrastructure are considered to be workable so are supported as notified.
26.36	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Infrastructure	Support	RETAIN INF-R32 as notified. AND Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	The permitted activity rules which apply to telecommunications infrastructure are considered to be workable so are supported as notified.
26.37	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Infrastructure	Support	RETAIN INF-R35 as notified. AND Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	The permitted activity rules which apply to telecommunications infrastructure are considered to be workable so are supported as notified.
26.38	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Infrastructure	Amend	ADD a new rule in the Infrastructure chapter providing for above ground telecommunications lines in rural zones and adjacent roads in the same manner as it provided for electricity distribution lines in INF-R14. clause (a) voltage and clause (c) colocation of operators from INF-R14 is not required for the telecommunications lines rule. AND Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	There is no rule enabling overhead lines for telecommunications network in suitable zones in the same manner as above ground electricity distribution lines in INF-R14.
26.39	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Infrastructure	Oppose	AMEND INF-R5.1.a. as follows: a. The temporary network utility, temporary electricity generator or self-contained power unit operates for a maximum of 12 months, <u>or in the case of a temporary telecommunications facility for the purpose of event or peak holiday wireless telecommunications and broadband coverage or capacity, is operated for a maximum of 12 weeks</u> ; AND Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	Whilst the rule and standards are supported for Temporary Infrastructure covered by the current definition, the definition does not cover temporary wireless telecommunications and broadband coverage solutions for events or peak holiday capacity. A separate submission seeking a change to the definition scope has been made. On the basis of that definition change, a bespoke timeframe for this additional scope of temporary infrastructure is sought. This aligns with the proposed timeframe for temporary coverage in the proposed amendments to the National Environmental Standards for Telecommunication Facilities released for public consultation on 29 May 2025.
26.40	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Infrastructure	Oppose	AMEND INF-R6 1.c. as follows: c. There is no connection to a structure or building identified in SCHED1 – Historic Heritage Resources, unless the connection is to a part of a building other than the front facade. This rule prevails over HH-R5 – Additions and Alterations. AND	Chorus has been working with Heritage NZ over various district plan reviews over appropriate rules for telecommunications connections to scheduled heritage buildings. In other jurisdictions an agreement has been reached that above ground connections are permitted if not connecting to the front face of a scheduled heritage building (e.g., consent order signed by Heritage NZ on the Opotiki District Plan). Connections to heritage buildings support their

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 1
(includes Submissions 1 – 100)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons
				Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	ongoing use which is consistent with the Historic Heritage policy framework (see HH-P3). This aligns with the proposed amendments to the National Environmental Standards for Telecommunication Facilities released for public consultation on 29 May 2025.
26.41	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Infrastructure	Oppose	AMEND INF-R6 4 to read as follows: There is no connection to a structure or building identified in SCHED1 — Historic Heritage Resources, <u>unless the connection is to a part of a building other than the front facade. This rule prevails over Rule HH-R5 – Additions and Alterations.</u> AND Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	Chorus has been working with Heritage NZ over various district plan reviews over appropriate rules for telecommunications connections to scheduled heritage buildings. In other jurisdictions an agreement has been reached that above ground connections are permitted if not connecting to the front face of a scheduled heritage building (e.g., consent order signed by Heritage NZ on the Opotiki District Plan). Connections to heritage buildings support their ongoing use which is consistent with the Historic Heritage policy framework (see HH-P3). This aligns with the proposed amendments to the National Environmental Standards for Telecommunication Facilities released for public consultation on 29 May 2025.
26.42	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Infrastructure	Oppose	AMEND INF-R24.1.a.ii. to read as follows: ... ii. a height of <u>3.5</u> metres measured from the natural ground level immediately below the structure; and..... AND Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	The height limit for communications kiosks of 2.5m is too low for a typical telecommunications kiosk such as a public phone/Wi-Fi box. A height of 3.5m is required and is used in other plans.
26.43	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Infrastructure	Oppose	AMEND INF-R26.1.b. to read as follows: ... b. Panel antenna do not exceed 0.7m <u>1m</u> in width. ... AND DELETE INF-R26.1.d. AND Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An increase in width to 1m is sought for clause b to align with proposed amendments to the National Environmental Standards for Telecommunication Facilities released for public consultation on 29 May 2025. As this rule applies to antennas attached to structures such as retaining walls, bridges and tunnels in roads, it is unclear how the "site" would be determined as required in Clause d, in assessing compliance, and why antennas attached to such structures are a concern in regard to environmental effects.
26.44	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Infrastructure	Oppose	AMEND INF-R27.1.b. as follows: b. The face of each antenna does not exceed 2.0m² <u>3.0m²</u> or 2.0m in diameter for dish antennas, or 1.6m in length for Yagi antenna; on an existing pole; AND AMEND INF-R27.6.b. as follows: b. The face of the antenna does not exceed 4.5m² <u>3.0m²</u> or 1.2m in diameter for dish antennas, or 1.6m in length for Yagi antenna on an existing pole; and ... AND Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The rule relates to structures attached to buildings and structures including antenna size dimensions. It is unclear why Clauses 1(b) and 6(b) have the proviso of being attached to an existing pole. Further, clauses 1(b) and 6(b) include panel and dish size restrictions that do not align with the proposed amendments to the National Environmental Standards for Telecommunication Facilities released for public consultation on 29 May 2025 (changes to regulation 37 antennas on buildings).
26.45	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Infrastructure	Oppose	DELETE INF-R28 1.a. AND Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	Clause 1(a) should be deleted as the rule is not seeking to enable buildings, only antennas inside them. A building may be established by consent without complying with the zone standards which is not relevant to the effects of any antennas inside the building.
26.46	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Infrastructure	Oppose	AMEND INF-R29 1.a. as follows: Where: a. GPS Antennas where they exceed the height limits provided for in INF-R31 that do not exceed the following dimensions: i. 300mm high; and ii. 130mm in diameter. AND Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	The Proposed District Plan has adopted the dimensions as notified as an absolute size restriction for GPS antennas in Clause 1(a) which would apply even where within the pole height and headframe width allowances. These antennas are very minor elements that do not require a size limit where within the overall permitted envelope for a pole and attached antennas.
26.47	Chorus New Zealand Ltd,	Infrastructure	Oppose	AMEND INF-R30 as follows:	An increase up to 0.33m ³ is sought which aligns with the permitted standard the proposed amendments to

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 1
(includes Submissions 1 – 100)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons
	Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ			Small cell units exceeding the permitted volumetric dimension of 0.14m ³ regulated in the National Environmental Standards for Telecommunication Facilities. 1. Activity Status: Permitted Where: a. The structure does not exceed a maximum volume of 0.250 0.33m ³ and b. ... AND Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	the National Environmental Standards for Telecommunication Facilities released for public consultation on 29 May 2025.
26.48	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Infrastructure	Oppose	AMEND INF-R31 1.a.ii.1. as follows: Where: a. For poles ... i. The structure complies with the height in relation to boundary limits for the zone in which it is located, <u>other than where it complies with b.iv;</u> and ii. ... ground level immediately below the structure: 1. General rural zone - 20 <u>35m</u> , or 25 <u>40m</u> for co-location of two or more operators. 2. b. For headframes: i. Comply with the height in relation to boundary limits for the zone in which it is located, <u>other than where it complies with b.iv;</u> ii. ... and iv. Within the Road must not exceed <u>0.71.2m</u> diameter; and v. ... AND Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The height limits are generally supported except for the General rural zone where the height limit is 20m for a pole and antennas (single operators) and 25m (5m height bonus) for more than one operator. This is inconsistent with the existing National Environmental Standards for Telecommunication Facilities where the permitted height limit for a new pole is 25m (even if for a single operator), and the proposed amendments to the National Environmental Standards for Telecommunication Facilities released for public consultation on 29 May 2025 of 35m in Rural zones and 40m for more than one operator. Alignment with the proposed National Environmental Standards for Telecommunication Facilities amendments is sought. Further, an exclusion from the requirement to meet zone height in relation to boundary controls from residential zones for poles and attracted antennas in roads is sought, subject to the headframe diameter provided for in roads of 1.2m in Clause 1(b)(iv) being met. A change to this standard for that notified is sought to align with the proposed amendments to the National Environmental Standards for Telecommunication Facilities released for public consultation on 29 May 2025. Structures with this width have minor bulk in regard to over-shadowing, privacy or dominance for width these controls are targeted.
26.49	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Infrastructure	Oppose	AMEND INF-R33 as follows: a. The height of the lightning rod <u>above its point of attachment to a structure</u> does not exceed 1.8m; and ... AND Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	Whilst the dimension for lightning rods is supported, an amendment is sought to clarify that this dimension relates to the length of the lightning rod and is not a restriction on its height above ground level.
26.50	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Infrastructure	Oppose	DELETE INF-R34. AND Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	This rule for antennas attached to existing poles in roads subject to National Environmental Standards for Telecommunication Facilities Regulations 26 and 27 overlaps with Rule INF-R37. Accordingly, this rule should be deleted to avoid confusion.
26.51	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Infrastructure	Oppose	ADD a new controlled activity standard to INF-R37 by adding a new clause as follows: <u>x. The width of the notional envelope of panel antennas mounted on a pole in a road does not exceed 1.2m</u> AND Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This rule provides a controlled activity framework for equipment not meeting the permitted standards for various regulations in the National Environmental Standards for Telecommunication Facilities. It also overlaps with proposed controlled activity Rule INF-34 in regard to Regulation 27, and accordingly deletion of Rule INF-R34 has been sought under a separate submission. The standards are generally considered to be appropriate, except that an allowance for the notional envelope width of antennas on poles in a road of 1.2m is requested as this aligns with the proposed amendments to the National Environmental Standards for Telecommunication Facilities released for public consultation on 29 May 2025.
26.52	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Natural Hazards	Support	RETAIN NH-P4 as notified. AND Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	Managing subdivision and land use to, among other things, avoid transfer of risks of natural hazards to infrastructure is supported.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 1
(includes Submissions 1 – 100)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons
26.53	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Natural Hazards	Support	RETAIN NH-P10 as notified. AND Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	The policy recognises that infrastructure may need to be located within natural hazard areas where there is a functional need or operational need to do so to service communities.
26.54	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Natural Hazards	Support	RETAIN NH-P12 as notified. AND Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	The policy, which allows for consideration of new protection structures including where necessary to protect infrastructure that has a functional need or operational need to be located in a hazard area, is supported.
26.55	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Natural Hazards	Oppose	AMEND NH-R11 1.a. by adding a new clause as follows: iii. <u>The area and volume limits in i. and ii. do not apply to underground infrastructure in roads.</u> AND Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	There should be exemptions for underground infrastructure in roads from needing to comply with the earthworks area and volume limitations. Whilst regulated activities under the National Environmental Standards for Telecommunication Facilities such as underground lines and their ancillary earthworks are already exempt from district plan natural hazard rules under Regulation 57 of the National Environmental Standards for Telecommunication Facilities, alignment of the plan with the National Environmental Standards for Telecommunication Facilities would provide better consistency between the district plan and National Environmental Standards for Telecommunication Facilities. Further, other infrastructure such as electricity lines does not have the benefit of a national environmental standard disapplying district plan natural hazard rule.
26.56	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Natural Hazards	Oppose	ADD a new permitted activity rule to NH-R13 (NH-R13.X) for low-risk infrastructure equipment in Coastal and River Flood Hazard Areas (including that not regulated by the National Environmental Standards for Telecommunication Facilities) consistent with Plan Change 1 to the Whangarei District Plan (decision version) as per the below example (NHR7(2)): Refer submission for full details. AND AMEND NH-R12.1.i restricted discretionary activity list as follows: i. Telecommunications facilities not provided for in the National Environmental Standards for Telecommunication Facilities, <u>other than as provided for as a permitted activity in NH-R13 X.</u> AND RETAIN matter of discretion NH-R13.3.a regarding the functional need and operational need to locate in a natural hazard area. AND Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As notified the rule does not provide for permitted activities for infrastructure located in the hazard areas. In particular, telecommunications facilities not provided for in the National Environmental Standards for Telecommunication Facilities are restricted discretionary activity. Regulated activities under the National Environmental Standards for Telecommunication Facilities are already exempt from any district plan natural hazard rules under Regulation 57 (examples provided refer submission for details). The risk profile of this type of equipment in natural hazards areas was not considered to warrant regulation in district plans. However, activities that are not regulated (e.g., a new pole in a non-rural zone) would be subject to the district plan controls. Mapping of hazard areas is sufficient for telecommunications networks to appropriately take into account risks in siting and designing equipment. The risk profile on non-regulated poles and equipment they support in district plans is no different to regulated equipment and is considered to be unnecessary regulation. Poles are not considered to be sensitive to flood risks or reasonably expected to exacerbate risks to others. More sensitive equipment in cabinets is exempt under Regulation 57 of the National Environmental Standards for Telecommunication Facilities, but operators may use solutions such as raised plinths to mitigate flood risk to them. This is consistent with the decision version of Plan Change 1 to the Whangarei District Plan – see Rule NH-R7 for flood zones example. The requested relief is also consistent with proposed amendments to the National Environmental Standards for Telecommunication Facilities 2016 have been publicly notified by the Ministry for the Environment, with submissions closing on 27 July 2025 with indicative date of amendments in place by the end 2025. The proposed amendments expand the permitted activities for new poles for antennas into all zones other than residential. Consequently, these poles will likely soon be regulated by the National Environmental Standards for Telecommunication Facilities and therefore exempt from natural hazard rules via Regulation 57.
26.57	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading	Historic Heritage	Support	RETAIN HH-P3 as notified. AND	The Policy encourages the use, development, and adaptive reuse of scheduled items. This is consistent with making practical allowances for providing service

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 1
(includes Submissions 1 – 100)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons
	Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ			Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	connections to scheduled buildings so they can be viably used.
26.58	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Notable Trees	Support	RETAIN Tree-R4 as notified. AND Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	The rule includes appropriate standards for infrastructure related earthworks work within notable tree protected root zones.
26.59	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	Support	RETAIN ECO-P3 as notified. AND Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	The policy appropriately recognises the operational need and functional need of regionally significant infrastructure to traverse areas of indigenous vegetation and biodiversity in appropriate circumstances.
26.60	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	Support	RETAIN ECO-R1 as notified. AND Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	The rule provides practical provision for operating, repairing and maintaining infrastructure.
26.61	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	Support	RETAIN ECO-R2 as notified. AND Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	The rule provides practical provision for clearance and associated disturbance for new infrastructure.
26.62	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Natural Character	Support	RETAIN NATC-P3.1 as notified. AND Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	These provisions provide recognition of operational need and functional need in regard to necessary structures and work within riparian margins.
26.63	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Natural Character	Support	RETAIN NATC-P5.7 as notified. AND Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	These provisions provide recognition of operational need and functional need in regard to necessary structures and work within riparian margins.
26.64	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Natural Character	Oppose	AMEND NATC-R3 by adding earthworks for network utility works within roads in the list for permitted activities. AND Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	Include earthworks for network utility works within roads in the list for permitted activities. Approaches to bridges in particular may be located within riparian margins.
26.65	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Natural Character	Oppose	AMEND NATC-R4 by adding vegetation clearance for network utility works within roads in the list for permitted activities. AND Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	Include vegetation clearance for network utility works within roads in the list for permitted activities. Approaches to bridges in particular may be located within riparian margins.
26.66	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Natural Features and Landscapes	Oppose	ADD the following clause to NFL-P4.2.c. as follows: v. <u>For new Regionally Significant Infrastructure, the constraints on form and location due to operational need or functional need.</u> AND Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notified policy is generally consistent with Policy 4.6.1 of the Regional Policy Statement in regard to managing effects on the characteristics and qualities of natural features and landscapes. However, Policy 5.3.3(1) includes a framework for new Regionally Significant Infrastructure which includes recognition of the constraints that limit the design and location of the activity. This element is not reflected in Policy NFL-P4. Regionally Significant Infrastructure may need to be located in these environments due to functional need or operational need.
26.67	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Natural Features and Landscapes	Support	RETAIN NFL-P5 as notified. AND Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	Provides a framework for enabling the operation, maintenance and upgrading of Regionally Significant Infrastructure in ONLs and ONFs which is consistent with Policy 5.3.3 of the Regional Policy Statement for Northland.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 1
(includes Submissions 1 – 100)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons
26.68	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Natural Features and Landscapes	Oppose	ADD a new clause to NFL-R2.1 for permitted buildings and structures (subject to standards NFL-S1, S2 and S3) as follows: iii. <u>Regionally Significant Infrastructure</u> AND Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Under clause 1 there is no permitted activity allowance for Regionally Significant Infrastructure in ONFs and ONLs. A permitted activity allowance in accordance with the standards in NFL-S1, s2 and s3 is sought, which is consistent with avoiding significant adverse effects from new structures outside of the Coastal Environment in NFL-P2. A new standard to provide an allowance for antennas on existing buildings and poles and attached antenna sin road reserves is also sought under separate submission point to provide some practical provision for telecommunications in ONL/ONF areas outside the coastal environment. Existing roads traversing ONL/ONF areas and where there are existing buildings, the values attributed to these areas in those locations have already been modified.
26.69	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Natural Features and Landscapes	Oppose	AMEND NFL-S1 such that there are exceptions to the general height standards as follows: i. Antennas attached to existing buildings not exceeding the highest point of the roof by more than 5m; and ii. Telecommunications poles and attached antennas in formed roads not exceeding 20m in height and a diameter including all antennas of 1.2m. AND Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	A new standard to provide an allowance for antennas on existing buildings and poles and attached antenna sin road reserves is sought in line with submission point 26.68 to provide some practical provision for telecommunications in ONL/ONF areas outside the coastal environment. Existing roads traversing ONL/ONF areas and where there are existing buildings, the values attributed to these areas in those locations have already been modified.
26.70	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Natural Features and Landscapes	Oppose	AMEND NFL-R2.6 by adding in standards to be complied with NFL-S1, S2 and S3. AND AMEND NFL-R2.7 as necessary to allow the correct cross-reference in regard to when non-complying activity status applies. AND Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Under clause 6, Regionally Significant Infrastructure is a permitted activity in the Coastal Environment, without standards. Standards NFL-S1, S2 and S3 should be applied to provide a permitted envelope. Clause 7 appears to have a cross-referencing error as it attributes non-complying activity status where NFL-R2.4 is not met. That cross-referred standard relates to matters of discretion for structures and buildings outside the coastal environment.
26.71	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Natural Features and Landscapes	Oppose	AMEND NFL-R4.4 by adding in a permitted earthworks allowance for Regionally Significant Infrastructure in the Coastal Environment of 20m ³ . AND Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	A small, permitted activity allowance is considered to be appropriate that would not materially adversely affect the values and qualities of ONLs and ONFs.
26.72	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Natural Features and Landscapes	Oppose	ADD the following clause to NFL-R3.1 as follows: c. <u>The indigenous vegetation clearance is associated with Regionally Significant Infrastructure including access.</u> AND AMEND NFL-R3.4 by adding in standard NFL-S5 to be complied with. AND Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clause 1 of this rule allows for indigenous vegetation clearance outside the coastal environment (subject to meeting Standard NFL-S5) for a list of activities that does not include clearance for Regionally Significant Infrastructure (only clearance around existing infrastructure). Clause 4 of this rule for indigenous vegetation clearance inside the coastal environment for Regionally Significant Infrastructure, but with no standards. Standard NFL-S5 should apply.
26.73	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Coastal Environment	Support	RETAIN CE-P5 as notified. AND Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	The policy appropriately seeks to enable operation, maintenance and upgrading of Regionally Significant Infrastructure in the Coastal Environment.
26.74	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Subdivision	Oppose	AMEND SUB-S5. OR ADD a new standard for telecommunications infrastructure similar (as per Porirua District Plan) to the following: <u>Residential, Commercial, Industrial, Specific Purpose Zone</u>	The servicing requirements for new lots in all zones only requires three-waters infrastructure and the option to connect to an electrical supply network. There is no requirement to connect to or be able to connect to a telecommunications network, even where open access fibre is available. This is inconsistent with objective SUB-O4 that requires subdivision to be integrated with infrastructure services in an efficient, effective and coordinated manner, and Policy SUB-P2 requiring infrastructure to be installed at the time of subdivision.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 1
(includes Submissions 1 – 100)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons
				<p><u>[X]. All new allotments must have provision for open access fibre optic cable connections to the legal boundary of the allotments.</u></p> <p>All Other Zones</p> <p><u>[XX]. All new allotments must have provision for connection to telecommunication infrastructure. This may be achieved by either:</u></p> <p><u>a. Provision for open access fibre optic cable connections to the legal boundary of the allotments; or</u></p> <p><u>b. Provision with any subdivision consent application of written confirmation from a telecommunication network operator confirming that connection to a telecommunications network can be provided to all new allotments and describing how this can be achieved.</u></p> <p><u>[XXX]. The written confirmation that connection to a telecommunications network can be achieved which is required under [XX. B] must include that the connection can be achieved to:</u></p> <p><u>a. A mobile and wireless network, including a satellite network, if connection to such a network is available.</u></p> <p>[XXXX] Activity status where compliance not achieved with [X]-[XXX]: Restricted Discretionary Activity</p> <p><u>Matters of discretion restricted to:</u></p> <p><u>1. The extent to which the proposed telecommunications services is sufficient for the development or activity it serves;</u></p> <p><u>2. Where any reticulated telecommunications system is not immediately available but is likely to be in the near future, the appropriateness of temporary supply solutions; and</u></p> <p><u>3. Whether any site constraints make compliance impracticable.</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.</p>	
26.75	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Coastal Environment	Support	<p>RETAIN CE-P6.7 as notified.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.</p>	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.
26.76	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Coastal Environment	Oppose	<p>AMEND 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>	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.
26.77	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Earthworks	Oppose	<p>AMEND EW-S2 such that utility pole foundations are exempt from any earthwork's depth controls.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.</p>	The cut depth standard is not suitable for a utility pole pile foundation that may be deeper than 1.5m. Utility poles are not authorised by building consents so the 2.5m depth does not apply but would also not be insufficient for many pile foundation designs. An exemption for utility pole foundations from the depth standards in EW-S2 is sought.
26.78	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Earthworks	Support	<p>RETAIN EW-S3.2.a as notified.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.</p>	The exemption of utility connections and infrastructure from earthworks set back controls from boundaries is appropriate and supported.
26.79	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth	General Residential Zone	Oppose	<p>DELETE GRZ-S9.2.d.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.</p>	The standard is a setback from the CMA stating that they do not apply to infrastructure and network utilities. As the Infrastructure chapter states that no zone rules apply to infrastructure, these standards (even as exemption clauses) may cause confusion

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

VOLUME 1

(includes Submissions 1 – 100)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons
	Group LP and One NZ				and are inconsistent with the intent of the plan structure.
26.80	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	General Rural Zone	Oppose	DELETE GRUZ-S3.2.d AND Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	The standard is a setback from the CMA stating that they do not apply to infrastructure and network utilities. As the Infrastructure chapter states that no zone rules apply to infrastructure, these standards (even as exemption clauses) may cause confusion and are inconsistent with the intent of the plan structure.
26.81	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Rural Lifestyle Zone	Oppose	DELETE RLZ-S3.2.d. AND Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	The standard is a setback from the CMA stating that they do not apply to infrastructure and network utilities. As the Infrastructure chapter states that no zone rules apply to infrastructure, these standards (even as exemption clauses) may cause confusion and are inconsistent with the intent of the plan structure.
26.82	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Commercial Zone	Oppose	DELETE COMZ-S11.2.d. AND Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	The standard is a setback from the CMA stating that they do not apply to infrastructure and network utilities. As the Infrastructure chapter states that no zone rules apply to infrastructure, these standards (even as exemption clauses) may cause confusion and are inconsistent with the intent of the plan structure.
26.83	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Heavy Industrial Zone	Oppose	DELETE HIZ-S4.2.d. AND Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	The standard is a setback from the CMA stating that they do not apply to infrastructure and network utilities. As the Infrastructure chapter states that no zone rules apply to infrastructure, these standards (even as exemption clauses) may cause confusion and are inconsistent with the intent of the plan structure.
26.84	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Light Industrial Zone	Oppose	DELETE LIZ-S5.2.c. AND Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	The standard is a setback from the CMA stating that they do not apply to infrastructure and network utilities. As the Infrastructure chapter states that no zone rules apply to infrastructure, these standards (even as exemption clauses) may cause confusion and are inconsistent with the intent of the plan structure.
26.85	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Natural Open Space Zone	Oppose	DELETE NOSZ-S3.2.d. AND Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	The standard is a setback from the CMA stating that they do not apply to infrastructure and network utilities. As the Infrastructure chapter states that no zone rules apply to infrastructure, these standards (even as exemption clauses) may cause confusion and are inconsistent with the intent of the plan structure.
26.86	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Open Space Zone	Oppose	DELETE OSZ-S4.2.d. AND Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	The standard is a setback from the CMA stating that they do not apply to infrastructure and network utilities. As the Infrastructure chapter states that no zone rules apply to infrastructure, these standards (even as exemption clauses) may cause confusion and are inconsistent with the intent of the plan structure.
26.87	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Sport and Active Recreation Zone	Oppose	DELETE SARZ-S4.2.d. AND Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	The standard is a setback from the CMA stating that they do not apply to infrastructure and network utilities. As the Infrastructure chapter states that no zone rules apply to infrastructure, these standards (even as exemption clauses) may cause confusion and are inconsistent with the intent of the plan structure.
26.88	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Māori Purpose Zone	Oppose	DELETE MPZ-S5.2.d. AND Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	The standard is a setback from the CMA stating that they do not apply to infrastructure and network utilities. As the Infrastructure chapter states that no zone rules apply to infrastructure, these standards (even as exemption clauses) may cause confusion and are inconsistent with the intent of the plan structure.
26.89	Chorus New Zealand Ltd, Connexa Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Fortysouth Group LP and One NZ	Mangawhai Hills Special Purpose Zone	Oppose	DELETE MHSPZ-S7.2.d. AND Any alternative relief and/or consequential amendments.	The standard is a setback from the CMA stating that they do not apply to infrastructure and network utilities. As the Infrastructure chapter states that no zone rules apply to infrastructure, these standards (even as exemption clauses) may cause confusion and are inconsistent with the intent of the plan structure.
27.1	Brae Simpkin	Planning Maps	Oppose	AMEND the zoning of the site at 27 Bassett Street, Dargaville from Rural lifestyle to General residential zone.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter believes this is consistent with the adjacent land use and the existing development environment.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

VOLUME 1

(includes Submissions 1 – 100)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site and immediate surrounding area is within a dense urban context and have been developed for residential purposes. A recent subdivision has been developed which indicates residential growth in this area. The site and area are serviced with three waters infrastructure, connected to the road network and surrounded by public utilities. The Rural lifestyle zone does not reflect the Long-Term Plan, or the objective of enabling housing supply where viable and connected. The residential zoning of the site would support a more efficient land use. Housing availability would be increased in Dargaville and respond to residential demand in line with National Policy.
28.1	Mark Veale	Planning Maps	Oppose	<p>No specific decision sought; however, the submission opposes the changes in zoning to Rural lifestyle zone around Pettley Road and Merrill Road.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Only increase residential areas where there is appropriate infrastructure access.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KDC should only increase residential areas in areas with the appropriate infrastructure access. The area does not have sufficient infrastructure to support this amount of extra housing. Roads, schools, medical and emergency services are already poorly funded. Pettley Road condition can barely cope with its current weight of traffic and the surface is almost in constant need of repair. Rezoning would mean the junction with State Highway 12 would also need improvement. Submitter moved to the area to have space and nature around them; the rezoning would destroy everything they love about their location. Concerned with amount of sewage, or possibility of sewage entering the harbour in runoff water during periods of heavy rain with housing close to the harbour shoreline.
29.1	Murray Foster	Planning Maps	Support	RETAIN Rural lifestyle zone of 113 Franklin Road, Paparoa.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriate and sustainable land use - land currently used for low production farming. Rezoning to Rural lifestyle allows for more appropriate land use. Responding to community demand - Families and individuals increasingly seek opportunities to live in a rural environment. Rezoning would help meet that demand in a controlled and balanced manner. Environmental and lifestyle benefits - Rural lifestyle zoning often leads to better land care practices from owners of lifestyle blocks who typically invest in land maintenance, tree planting, soil regeneration, and habitat protection. These activities contribute to long-term environmental benefits and biodiversity enhancement in the area. Boost to local economy and services - Attracting new residents through Rural lifestyle zoning can have a positive economic ripple effect. Low infrastructure impact - Compared to urban subdivision, Rural lifestyle lots usually require less investment in council infrastructure and services. Sensible and forward-looking decision that supports sustainable growth, community needs, and the preservation of rural values. Provides a balanced way to accommodate population growth without compromising the integrity of the rural environment.
30.1	Alex Flavell	Vision for Kaipara	Oppose	AMEND SD-VK-O1 to include reference to environmental wellbeing as follows: "Social, <u>environmental</u> , economic, and cultural wellbeing are promoted..."	While social, economic and cultural wellbeing are promoted there is no mention of environment.
30.2	Alex Flavell	Planning Maps	Oppose	ADD mapping of area of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna.	The Proposed District Plan does not include mapped areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna. Mapping should be done prior to the Proposed District Plan being approved, in order to ensure council obligations to protecting and enhancing biodiversity are met.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 1
(includes Submissions 1 – 100)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons
30.3	Alex Flavell	General	Oppose	Simplify submission process and consultation should be started over.	Submitting process is flawed. The website was not working and the submission template is flawed. It is difficult for the public to provide feedback.
30.4	Alex Flavell	General	Oppose	DELETE the Proposed District Plan AND PROVIDE a re-written, better and more robust District Plan that prioritises the protection of the environment, cultural and historic sites, the community, and honours KDC's treaty obligations.	The Proposed District Plan attempts to streamline process at the expense of environmental protection and enhancement.
31.1	Nicole Masters	General	Oppose	ADD the precautionary and prohibitive GE/GMO provisions, policies, and rules (in alignment with what Whangarei District Council, Northland Regional Council, Far North District Council and Auckland Council have already achieved in their Operative Plans) that were previously in the KDC draft District Plan (i.e. the same wording) to the Proposed District Plan.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KDC should act on its obligations as a formative member of the Northland/ Auckland "Inter Council Working Party on GMO Risk Evaluation & Management Options" irrespective of any controversial proposals for legislative change (that may or may not occur). Protect the District (and wider Regions) biosecurity, wider environment, economy, valuable "Northland, naturally" brand, existing GM Free farmers/ primary producers, our food sovereignty, and the ability of Kaipara residents to grow and eat clean and safe, nourishing, GM free food. KDC should act in keeping with case law, the findings of the Northland/ Auckland ICWP on GMOs (of which KDC was a formative member), the wishes of local ratepayers and KDC should protect the District (and wider Regions) biosecurity, wider environment, economy, valuable "Northland, naturally" brand, existing GM Free farmers/ primary producers, our food sovereignty, and the ability of Kaipara residents to grow and eat clean and safe, nourishing, GM free food. Outdoor GE/GMO experiments, field trials, or releases in the Kaipara are risky. It is not enough for council to rely on a national regulator. Outdoor GE/GMOs do not respect boundaries- GE contamination spreads through all the known vectors of pollen, seeds, wind, soils, waterways, machinery, animals, insects, extreme weather events (including but not limited to floods), and human error. KDC should respect and support the precautionary and prohibitive GE/GMO policies of various Tai Tokerau Iwi for their respective rohe.
32.1	Jacqueline Bramwell	Planning Maps	Oppose	No specific decision requested, but submission opposes the Rural lifestyle zoning of the property at 161 Mount Wesley Coast Road, Dargaville and surrounding properties.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter purchased their property in 1989 to live rurally and do not wish to have the surrounding properties urbanized into small lifestyle blocks. There are too many restrictions that they would have to adhere to if the zoning is changed. The changes in the area are already occurring, with the existing size blocks being carved up. This is pristine farmland and they do not want any more town like folk coming out here objecting to their rural activities.
33.1	Adrian Hughes	Planning Maps	Oppose	AMEND the zoning of 104 Moir Street from General residential zone to Commercial zone AND AMEND the zoning of 110 and 114 Moir Street from Special purpose zone - Mangawhai Hills Development Area to Commercial zone.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All three properties are currently being used commercially. The properties were inappropriately included as part of the Mangawhai Hills private zone change but the properties don't relate to the rest of this precinct. The rest of Moir St is predominantly going commercial; therefore it would be more appropriate for the properties to be commercially zoned.
34.1	Adrian Hughes	Planning Maps	Oppose	AMEND the zoning of 8 Moir Street from General residential zone to Commercial zone.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commercial zoning is consistent with all other properties along this side of Moir St (except the next door housing complex). Commercial zone is a more appropriate zoning for this property given the road front nature of the property. Commercial zoning will also give better continuity between the current Moir St commercial village and the Mangawhai tavern property that is two properties down the road from 8 Moir Street.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

VOLUME 1

(includes Submissions 1 – 100)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons
35.1	Adrian Hughes	Planning Maps	Support	RETAIN the Commercial zone for 62A Moir Street, Mangawhai.	Commercial zoning is an appropriate extension to Moir St. commercial village.
36.1	Adrian Hughes	Planning Maps	Oppose	AMEND the zoning of properties from 13 Moir Street to 37 Moir Street, Mangawhai from General residential zone to Commercial zone.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commercial zoning reflects and complements the proposed zoning activity opposite This side of the street has the pedestrian access (footpath) providing better commercial amenity This side of the street is north facing providing better commercial amenity This section of Moir St already has significant commercial activity operating including clothing retail and the police station, showing the demand for this zone here Mangawhai village (Moir Street) has a shortage of commercially zoned land It connects with the current Commercial zone.
37.1	Matthew Dunning	General Rural Zone	Support	RETAIN General rural zone provisions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Proposed District Plan is consistent with recommendations of the Spatial Plan for a cohesive and consolidated approach to development in Mangawhai, and the approach to rural and/or highly productive land. Tightening of the approach to the general rural zone, and not expanding urbanisation across the estuary, consolidating around existing developments and not over-extending infrastructure, and ensuring protection of rural character where appropriate (particularly highly productive land). Projected growth in Mangawhai has been more than catered for in the long term as the report for KDC by Formative clearly sets out. The considered approach to zoning in the Proposed District Plan is properly informed by all relevant documents (KDC, regional and national).
37.2	Matthew Dunning	Planning Maps		RETAIN General rural zoning on eastern side of the estuary in Mangawhai.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Proposed District Plan is consistent with recommendations of the Spatial Plan for a cohesive and consolidated approach to development in Mangawhai, and the approach to rural and/or highly productive land. Tightening of the approach to the general rural zone, and not expanding urbanisation across the estuary, consolidating around existing developments and not over-extending infrastructure, and ensuring protection of rural character where appropriate (particularly highly productive land). Projected growth in Mangawhai has been more than catered for in the long term as the report for KDC by Formative clearly sets out. The considered approach to zoning in the Proposed District Plan is properly informed by all relevant documents (KDC, regional and national).
38.1	Kirsti Burns	Planning Maps	Support	RETAIN the General rural zone to the east of Mangawhai Estuary - the southeastern rural corridor to Mangawhai and within the coastal environment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the spatial plan and prior community consultation. The submitter states that by not reducing lot sizes the plan will protect the environment and limit urban sprawl.
39.1	Troy Tipene	Commercial Zone	Support	RETAIN the Commercial zone at 11 Wood Street, Mangawhai.	The submitter supports the rezoning of the property at 11 Wood Street, Mangawhai to commercial zone due to its location.
40.1	Glen Lewis	Subdivision	Amend	AMEND SUB-S1 General residential zone (including SUB-P12 - Mangawhai/Hakaru Managed Growth area) to reduce the minimum lot size from 600m ² to 475m ² .	The submitter recommends that the minimum lot size for the general residential zone (including in the SUB-P12 - Mangawhai/Hakaru Managed Growth area) should be reduced from 600m ² to 475m ² .
40.2	Glen Lewis	General Residential Zone	Support	RETAIN GRZ-R4 which permits a minor residential unit / second dwelling of up to 90m ² maximum not including a garage.	The submitter supports retaining the minor residential unit / second dwelling provision of up to 90m ² maximum not including a garage.
41.1	Ken McDonald	Planning Maps	Amend	AMEND the General rural zoning of the higher density areas, in particular Devich Road (Mangawhai), to Rural lifestyle zone.	Rural lifestyle zone - The submitter suggests changing the zoning around the Devich Road, Mangawhai areas from General Rural zone to Rural lifestyle zone due to the existing higher density of residential properties in these areas. The submitter also states that these areas are more aligned to the

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

VOLUME 1

(includes Submissions 1 – 100)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons
					Objectives, Activities and Policies of the Rural lifestyle zone.
42.1	Birgit Rahm	Planning Maps	Oppose	<p>AMEND the zoning of Petley Road from Rural lifestyle zone back to General rural zone with no option to subdivide to 4,000m² blocks in this area.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>PROVIDE a detailed impact study considering if a proposed zone is appropriate or feasible and who pays for the new infrastructure and the necessary mitigation for environmental pressure on the harbour/environment before any zone change is actioned.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Character of the Area - Rural lifestyle zoning of the area would allow blocks of land to be subdivided into even smaller lot sizes which would change the area's fundamental character. More intense housing would impact the farming operations on the existing larger blocks of land. Rural lifestyle zoning is supposed to be close to an urban area. The Petley Peninsula is not an urban area. Highly Productive Land is important and must be protected. Employment opportunities in the Paparoa/Matakohe area are limited. Infrastructure is not suitable. Potential for adverse impacts on the Kaipara Harbour from more intense housing in this area. Natural Hazard risks increased. No impact studies and/or business cases have been done by Kaipara District Council to understand the impact of changing the zone.
43.1	Kevin Eddington	General	Oppose	No specific decision requested; however, the submission opposes the Black Swamp Road development (legally described as SEC 25 BLK IV MANGAWHAI SD LOT 2 DP 29903) and seeks that Council reject this plan based on the intensity of the development.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development at Black Swamp Road will create a separate development east of Mangawhai and raises questions on roading, bridges and proximity to the school. The submitter notes that there are already access issues around the school in the mornings and afternoons. The development appears to be ad hoc and without a plan as to how existing infrastructure will cope. Moreover, there is already flooding on lower-lying land and the submitter considers development will only worsen this.
44.1	Jesse Williams	Planning Maps	Oppose	AMEND the zoning of the property at 118 Ngatoto Road, Tinopai from General rural zone to Rural lifestyle zone.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Power and phone lines are at the boundary, and it is serviced with a well-formed road. It is "over 10 years since it was production forest. It is now replanted in native and very suitable for 4000m² lots."
45.1	Lyndon Boakes	Planning Maps	Amend	AMEND zoning of land on Doctors Hill Road, Maungatūroto to Rural lifestyle zone.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The land would benefit from being zoned Rural lifestyle zone. Would match that on the western side of the blocks.
45.2	Lyndon Boakes	Planning Maps	Amend	AMEND zoning of some of the site at 1160 State Highway 12, Maungatūroto-Paparoa from General rural zone to Industrial zone, especially behind the houses.	Some of the land would be ideal for Industrial zone.
45.3	Lyndon Boakes	Planning Maps	Amend	AMEND the zoning of 983 Whakapirau Road, Maungatūroto from General rural zone to Rural lifestyle zone.	Submitter considers the land would lend itself well to some rural lifestyle sections.
45.4	Lyndon Boakes	General	Support	No specific decision requested, but submitter notes that they fully support the Proposed District Plan overall.	The Plan opens up huge opportunity to grow the town and add real value to the District.
46.1	Jesse Williams	Planning Maps	Oppose	AMEND the zoning of 29 Sandy Beach Road, Tinopai from Rural lifestyle zone to General residential zone.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter advises that the property shares two boundaries with the current residential zone in Tinopai. The land has a favourable contour for residential lots, that it is serviced with a well-formed tar sealed road, electricity and phone are at the roadside boundary, there's no historical or cultural values on the land and that the land is not in a flood zone. There is a need for residential zoning in Tinopai to allow more affordable housing options.
47.1	David Clarke	General	Oppose	No specific decision requested; however the submission seeks the Hinamoki Estate not be allowed to be further subdividable.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poor roading, including a flood prone one-lane bridge. The only public transport is a school bus. There is only community provision for roading, sewage and storm water based on existing lots.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

VOLUME 1

(includes Submissions 1 – 100)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rubbish and postal services are on Oneriri Road, with Hinamoki Drive being some 3-4km long. Highway access from Oneriri Road at peak times is already difficult.
47.2	David Clarke	Infrastructure		No specific decision requested; however the submission seeks that development is integrated and phased with the provision of appropriate and affordable infrastructure.	No reasons provided.
48.1	E Woodward	Planning Maps	Oppose	AMEND the rezoning of Oneriri Road, Takahoa Bay and Hinamoki Estates, Kaiwaka from Rural lifestyle zone to the existing Rural zone.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inconsistency with Rural lifestyle zone objectives and policy intent, including the need for Rural lifestyle zone to be “concentrated in appropriate locations, closer to urban area with good access to services and transport networks”. Environmental sensitivity and ecological incompatibility – Takahoa Lake is a Department of Conservation-managed Government Wildlife Reserve and habitat for endangered and at-risk species. Geotechnically unsuitable for building platforms Risk of reverse sensitivity Absence of urban-scale infrastructure in place Additional septic tanks and stormwater runoff will be a risk for the Kaipara Harbour The Rural lifestyle zone is intended to provide for smaller rural lots in areas that: “Are already fragmented” and “close to services and commercial activities.” This area does not meet those criteria. Undermines the integrity of the Proposed District Plan and set an undesirable precedent for similar applications in inappropriate rural areas. Erodes the character and amenity Takahoa Bay and Hinamoki are of significant historical, spiritual, and cultural importance to Te Uri o Hau. Takahoa Bay Estate alone contains 21 archaeologically recognised sites. Increasing housing density and associated earthworks would place these taonga at unacceptable risk and would not uphold Te Tiriti o Waitangi principles of protection and partnership. Increase in rates. Unwise to increase the population in a flood-prone, single-access peninsula with poor infrastructure and limited emergency access. Will not result in a community resilient to climate change. Would increase risk and directly conflict with Kaipara District Council’s climate strategy and national expectations for climate-resilient planning. Sets a precedent for development.
49.1	Dargaville Bridge Club Incorporated	Sport and Active Recreation Zone	Amend	AMEND the terms used in the Sport and active recreation zone chapter to be more consistent. AND AMEND the terms used in the Sport and active recreation zone chapter to align with the requested amendments to definitions (refer to submission point 49.3).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Terms used for sport and recreation activities are not consistently used throughout the Sport and active recreation zone chapter which leads to confusion. It is not clear what activities are covered and what are not. For example, a range of inconsistent terms are used throughout overview, objectives, policies, rules and standards to describe activities provided for in the zone, such as ‘recreation activities’, ‘active recreation’, ‘appropriate ancillary activities’ and ‘ancillary informal leisure activities’. The outcome sought is that the range of permitted activities (and associated definitions) in the Sport and active recreation zone chapter be expanded to provide for all of the current types of activities that Memorial Park is used for.
49.3	Dargaville Bridge Club Incorporated	Definitions	Amend	AMEND the definition of “Recreation Activities” to capture a broader range of activities, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ancillary activities. Sport and recreation activities. Other activities such as corporate functions, weddings, funerals, church groups, community forums, government agencies and business meetings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Terms used for sport and recreation activities are not consistently used throughout the Sport and active recreation zone chapter which leads to confusion. It is not clear what activities are covered and what are not. The submitter is concerned that the current definitions (and associated rules) will not allow for all the activities that currently take place in this zone, specifically in Memorial Park in Dargaville.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

VOLUME 1

(includes Submissions 1 – 100)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons
				<p>OR</p> <p>ADD additional definitions or categories of activities to cover non-recreational activities such as corporate functions, weddings, funerals, church groups, community forums, government agencies and business meetings.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For example, SARZ-R3 permits "recreation activities", but it does not seem to cover: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 'Ancillary activity' - also defined and included in the SARZ objectives. 'Sport and recreation activity' - by implication is wider than just 'recreation activity', but it isn't clear what is included or whether the new term is needed. Other public events, including corporate functions (which are included in the overview). Other types of activities that currently occur, such as weddings, funerals, church groups, community forums, government agencies, business meetings.
49.5	Dargaville Bridge Club Incorporated	Sport and Active Recreation Zone	Amend	AMEND SARZ-S7 hours of operation to extend these to 11pm for quiet, indoor activities.	Quiet, indoor activities (such as bridge) that are held in the evenings often run past 10pm because of the required start (enough to accommodate working hours) and to play a full game. These activities do not cause nuisance in terms of noise or lights to neighbours by their nature.
49.7	Dargaville Bridge Club Incorporated	Sport and Active Recreation Zone	Amend	AMEND SARZ-R3 to permit all activities (sports and recreation, ancillary and other non-recreation activities) that currently take place in the Sport and active recreation zone.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter is concerned that SARZ-R3 will not allow for all the activities that currently take place in this zone, specifically in Memorial Park in Dargaville, to be permitted. Under SARZ-R3 "recreation activities" are allowed, but this defined term does not seem to cover: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 'Ancillary activity' - also defined and included in the Sport and active recreation zone objectives. 'Sport and recreation activity' - by implication is wider than just 'recreation activity', but it isn't clear what is included or whether the new term is needed. Other public events, including corporate functions (which are included in the overview). Other types of activities that currently occur, such as weddings, funerals, church groups, community forums, government agencies, business meetings.
50.1	Evolve Planning and Landscape Architecture	General	Oppose	<p>DELETE the entire Proposed District Plan and replace it with the Exposure Draft Plan.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>ADD the recent plan changes that have been approved.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed District Plan has been altered drastically from the Spatial Plan and the Exposure Draft Plan, both of which were prepared by experts and undertaken with community wide consultation. The alterations have not had public input or sound planning rationale. The Plan fails to meet statutory requirements under Part 2 of the Resource Management Act, the National Policy Statement for Urban Development (NSP-UD), National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL) and the Regional Policy Statement. The Proposed District Plan does not align with Council's Long Term Plan.
50.2	Evolve Planning and Landscape Architecture	Planning Maps	Oppose	DELETE the Mangawhai/Hakaru Managed Growth Overlay from the District Plan and associated provisions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inconsistent with part II of the Resource Management Act, especially Section 5 Sustainable management of natural and physical resources and Section 7b) efficient use and development of natural and physical resources. The blanket restriction constrains development within and close to existing services and infrastructure. It encourages inefficient land use and pressure on general rural and rural lifestyle zones and small townships with limited infrastructure. Does not give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development (NPS-UD) and the Northland Regional Policy Statement (NRPS). Mangawhai/Mangawhai Heads should be considered urban due to the NPS-UD definition including "or is intended to be" a housing and labour market of at least 10,000 people. With the current population growth and the undeveloped residential zones land, private plan changes, unimplemented developments and

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 1
(includes Submissions 1 – 100)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons
					<p>vacant sections, the population is likely to be over this threshold.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NPS-UD: Objective 1 and 2, Policy 1 must be given effect to in District Plans under s75 of the Resource Management Act. With demonstrated high population growth rates (higher than national average). Overlay does not enable and ensure coordinated subdivision and development. • NRPS objective 3.5, Policy 5.1.1 and 5.1.3 are not met in the Proposed District Plan. The policy aims to ensure that urban development is strategically planned, integrated with infrastructure and located in appropriate areas and consolidated compact urban form. • Inconsistent with the Council's Long Term Plan <i>"Kaipara is projected to grow steadily reaching a population of 35,700 in 2054, however most growth will continue to be centred on Mangawhai due to its proximity to Auckland and coastal lifestyle offerings. The adopted spatial plans provide for the blueprint for sustainable growth not only in Mangawhai, but also in new areas that are developing such as Kaiwaka, Maungatūroto and Dargaville."</i> • It restricts infill residential development and directs to large land holdings which have been subject to recent private plan changes (Mangawhai Hills, Cove Road North Precinct and Mangawhai Central) with no sound planning rationale behind this. Residential development is being directed to areas that are un-serviced for wastewater, stormwater, footpaths, and restricted in areas that have good public infrastructure (Residential zone within this Overlay). • The area proximate to Mangawhai and Hakaru is not rural in nature and has very limited rural character. The Overlay over this extent is inappropriate. The Overlay includes a large extent of rural catchment, when the policy behind this Overlay (SUB-P12) is related to infrastructure, this does not make sense when rural development are serviced via on site servicing. The restrictions in this area enables creating smaller sites elsewhere in the District creating a level or rural sprawl and adverse effects on rural character in the wider District. • No sound justification or planning rationale behind this Overlay. Restricting infill growth where Council services are available and directing to areas where it is not available does not make sense. No reference to social infrastructure in section 32 report or clarity in definitions.
50.3	Evolve Planning and Landscape Architecture	General	Amend	DELETE any policy framework associated with the Mangawhai/Hakaru Manged Growth Overlay.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 Development 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.
50.4	Evolve Planning and Landscape Architecture	Urban Form and Development	Oppose	DELETE SD-UFD-P7. AND Any consequential amendments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

VOLUME 1

(includes Submissions 1 – 100)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons
					<p>Urban Development and the Northland Regional Policy Statement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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.
50.5	Evolve Planning and Landscape Architecture	Subdivision	Oppose	DELETE SUB-P6. AND Any consequential amendments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 Development 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.
50.6	Evolve Planning and Landscape Architecture	Subdivision	Oppose	DELETE SUB-P12. AND Any consequential amendments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 Development 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.
50.7	Evolve Planning and Landscape Architecture	Subdivision	Amend	AMEND SUB-P8 as a result of deleting the Mangawhai/Hakaru Managed Growth Area. AND Any consequential amendments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 Development 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.
50.8	Evolve Planning and Landscape Architecture	General	Amend	Remove any methods including rules associated with the Mangawhai/Hakaru Managed Growth Area from the District Plan, including SUB-R2.11.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 Development and the Northland Regional Policy Statement.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

VOLUME 1

(includes Submissions 1 – 100)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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.
50.10	Evolve Planning and Landscape Architecture	Planning Maps	Amend	<p>AMEND the zoning within Mangawhai and Hakaru from General rural zone to Rural lifestyle zone.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Include areas identified as Rural lifestyle in the Exposure Draft District Plan as well as areas that have been approved for rural lifestyle subdivisions after the Exposure Draft District Plan was prepared.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mangawhai and Hakaru do not meet the zone overview as per the Overview in the General rural zone chapter, but falls into the Rural lifestyle zone, as per the Overview in the Proposed District Plan. Also noting the proposed zoning is inconsistent with the adopted Spatial Plan. There are reverse sensitivity issues from having a General rural zone over an area that is predominately Rural lifestyle, where rural production activities are permitted and may result in reverse sensitivity effects. There is no adequate buffer zone between residential and general rural, rural lifestyle zone between residential zone and general rural would provide a buffer between these two significantly different zones. From a landscape perspective, the General rural zone is typically characterised by a high level of rural character. The rural character of Mangawhai and Hakaru is rural lifestyle and residential (predominately characterised by the visual presence of individual or clusters of dwellings, smaller lot sizes, cultured nature landscapes) rather than high rural character (openness with dominance of pasture and open spaces, limited buildings, considerable distance between houses and presence of rural land use such as farm animals, horticulture activity, shelterbelts, structures such as sheds, fences, races etc).
50.11	Evolve Planning and Landscape Architecture	General Residential Zone	Oppose	<p>AMEND the zoning in Mangawhai and Mangawhai Heads from General residential zone to Large lot residential, Medium density residential and High density residential.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Having one blanket Residential zone for the whole District is inappropriate. There are significant differences in the residential areas between the townships of the District. Mangawhai is a growing and desired coastal settlement and should reflect good urban planning, including varying residential zones.
50.12	Evolve Planning and Landscape Architecture	General Residential Zone	Amend	<p>AMEND the residential zoning to provide for varying type residential zones where suited (e.g., Dargaville may suit medium density residential zones where smaller settlements may suit a large lot residential zone).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Having one blanket Residential zone for the whole District is inappropriate. There are significant differences in the residential areas between the townships of the District.
50.13	Evolve Planning and Landscape Architecture	General Rural Zone	Oppose	<p>ADD a Rural production zone with appropriate rules and apply it to Class 1 and 2 Soils with Class 3 soils covered under the General rural zone.</p>	<p>There is no protection of productive soils where the General rural zone provides for sites of 12ha as a Controlled Activity, which is contrary to the National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land.</p>
50.14	Evolve Planning and Landscape Architecture	Subdivision	Oppose	<p>ADD objectives and policies to the Subdivision chapter to protect:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Character (rural, rural lifestyle, residential); Amenity values (in line with the definition of the Resource Management Act); and Ecological values and natural features. 	<p>Submitter opposes the wording of the objective and policy framework because they are light on protecting rural character and amenity values at the time of subdivision as well as ecological and natural features.</p>
50.15	Evolve Planning and Landscape Architecture	Subdivision	Oppose	<p>DELETE SUB-R3.11.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter opposes the wording of these rules as they are permissive and will result in poor development outcomes across the District within the General rural zone, Rural lifestyle zone and Outstanding Natural Landscape. When subdivisions are controlled, there is no ability for a subdivision to be declined and the assessment criteria does not include any aspects related to the natural environment including ecology, landscape and the like. The environmental benefit type provision provides for the same number of lots as the general rule which provides no incentive to protect or restore any natural features.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 1
(includes Submissions 1 – 100)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The title date reference provides no use and within the Operative Plan is not upheld. There is no provision to require the protection of Outstanding Natural Landscapes, Outstanding Natural Features or areas of Outstanding Natural Character at the time of subdivision which is contrary to Part II of the Resource Management Act and other high level national and regional planning documents.
50.16	Evolve Planning and Landscape Architecture	Subdivision	Amend	<p>AMEND the activity status of SUB-R3 from Controlled to Restricted Discretionary or Discretionary.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>ADD assessment criteria to SUB-R3 in relation to character and amenity values.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>AMEND the wording of SUB-R3 based on the above.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter opposes the wording of these rules as they are permissive and will result in poor development outcomes across the District within the General rural zone, Rural lifestyle zone and Outstanding Natural Landscape. When subdivisions are controlled, there is no ability for a subdivision to be declined and the assessment criteria does not include any aspects related to the natural environment including ecology, landscape and the like. The environmental benefit type provision provides for the same number of lots as the general rule which provides no incentive to protect or restore any natural features. The title date reference provides no use and within the Operative Plan is not upheld. There is no provision to require the protection of Outstanding Natural Landscapes, Outstanding Natural Features or areas of Outstanding Natural Character at the time of subdivision which is contrary to Part II of the Resource Management Act and other high level national and regional planning documents.
50.17	Evolve Planning and Landscape Architecture	Subdivision	Amend	<p>AMEND the activity status of SUB-R4 from Controlled to Restricted Discretionary or Discretionary.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>ADD assessment criteria to SUB-R4 in relation to character and amenity values.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>DELETE the title date from SUB-R4.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>DELETE the reference to Growth Area from SUB-R4.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter opposes the wording of these rules as they are permissive and will result in poor development outcomes across the District within the General rural zone, Rural lifestyle zone and Outstanding Natural Landscape. When subdivisions are controlled, there is no ability for a subdivision to be declined and the assessment criteria does not include any aspects related to the natural environment including ecology, landscape and the like. The environmental benefit type provision provides for the same number of lots as the general rule which provides no incentive to protect or restore any natural features. The title date reference provides no use and within the Operative Plan is not upheld. There is no provision to require the protection of Outstanding Natural Landscapes, Outstanding Natural Features or areas of Outstanding Natural Character at the time of subdivision which is contrary to Part II of the Resource Management Act and other high level national and regional planning documents.
50.18	Evolve Planning and Landscape Architecture	Subdivision	Amend	<p>AMEND the activity status of SUB-R5 from Controlled to Restricted Discretionary or Discretionary.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>ADD assessment criteria to SUB-R5 in relation to character and amenity values.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter opposes the wording of these rules as they are permissive and will result in poor development outcomes across the District within the General rural zone, Rural lifestyle zone and Outstanding Natural Landscape. When subdivisions are controlled, there is no ability for a subdivision to be declined and the assessment criteria does not include any aspects related to the natural environment including ecology, landscape and the like. The environmental benefit type provision provides for the same number of lots as the general rule which provides no incentive to protect or restore any natural features. The title date reference provides no use and within the Operative Plan is not upheld. There is no provision to require the protection of Outstanding Natural Landscapes, Outstanding Natural Features or areas of Outstanding Natural Character at the time of subdivision which is contrary to Part II of the Resource Management Act and other high level national and regional planning documents.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 1
(includes Submissions 1 – 100)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons
50.19	Evolve Planning and Landscape Architecture	Subdivision	Amend	<p>AMEND the activity status of SUB-R6 from Controlled to Restricted Discretionary or Discretionary.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>ADD assessment criteria to SUB-R6 in relation to character and amenity values as well as ecological value.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>DELETE the title date from SUB-R6.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>AMEND SUB-R6 to provide for further lot entitlements to allow for further incentives.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>AMEND SUB-R6 to be more clearly drafted with ecological input.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter opposes the wording of these rules as they are permissive and will result in poor development outcomes across the District within the General rural zone, Rural lifestyle zone and Outstanding Natural Landscape. When subdivisions are controlled, there is no ability for a subdivision to be declined and the assessment criteria does not include any aspects related to the natural environment including ecology, landscape and the like. The environmental benefit type provision provides for the same number of lots as the general rule which provides no incentive to protect or restore any natural features. The title date reference provides no use and within the Operative Plan is not upheld. There is no provision to require the protection of Outstanding Natural Landscapes, Outstanding Natural Features or areas of Outstanding Natural Character at the time of subdivision which is contrary to Part II of the Resource Management Act and other high level national and regional planning documents. The rule needs a re-write as it is confusing and hard to understand.
50.20	Evolve Planning and Landscape Architecture	Subdivision	Amend	<p>AMEND the wording of SUB-R7 to be clearer and with ecological and landscape architect input.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>DELETE the title date from SUB-R7.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>AMEND the activity status of SUB-R7 from Controlled to Restricted Discretionary.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>ADD assessment criteria to SUB-R7 in relation to character and amenity values as well as ecological value.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter opposes the wording of these rules as they are permissive and will result in poor development outcomes across the District within the General rural zone, Rural lifestyle zone and Outstanding Natural Landscape. When subdivisions are controlled, there is no ability for a subdivision to be declined and the assessment criteria does not include any aspects related to the natural environment including ecology, landscape and the like. The environmental benefit type provision provides for the same number of lots as the general rule which provides no incentive to protect or restore any natural features. The title date reference provides no use and within the Operative Plan is not upheld. There is no provision to require the protection of Outstanding Natural Landscapes, Outstanding Natural Features or areas of Outstanding Natural Character at the time of subdivision which is contrary to Part II of the Resource Management Act and other high level national and regional planning documents. Rule is confusing and hard to understand.
50.21	Evolve Planning and Landscape Architecture	Subdivision	Amend	<p>AMEND the Subdivision rules to include a rule for subdivisions within the Outstanding Natural Landscapes, Outstanding Natural Features and High Natural Character to provide protection for these features at the time of subdivision and ensure development is appropriate.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter opposes the wording of these rules as they are permissive and will result in poor development outcomes across the District within the General rural zone, Rural lifestyle zone and Outstanding Natural Landscape. When subdivisions are controlled, there is no ability for a subdivision to be declined and the assessment criteria does not include any aspects related to the natural environment including ecology, landscape and the like. The environmental benefit type provision provides for the same number of lots as the general rule which provides no incentive to protect or restore any natural features. The title date reference provides no use and within the Operative Plan is not upheld. There is no provision to require the protection of Outstanding Natural Landscapes, Outstanding Natural Features or areas of Outstanding Natural Character at the time of subdivision which is contrary to Part II of the Resource Management Act and other high level national and regional planning documents.
50.22	Evolve Planning and Landscape Architecture	Subdivision	Amend	<p>AMEND the Subdivision chapter to include an integrated development type provision for subdivision similar to the rule in the Operative Plan.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter opposes the wording of these rules as they are permissive and will result in poor development outcomes across the District within the General rural zone, Rural lifestyle zone and Outstanding Natural Landscape.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

VOLUME 1

(includes Submissions 1 – 100)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> When subdivisions are controlled, there is no ability for a subdivision to be declined and the assessment criteria does not include any aspects related to the natural environment including ecology, landscape and the like. The environmental benefit type provision provides for the same number of lots as the general rule which provides no incentive to protect or restore any natural features. The title date reference provides no use and within the Operative Plan is not upheld. There is no provision to require the protection of Outstanding Natural Landscapes, Outstanding Natural Features or areas of Outstanding Natural Character at the time of subdivision which is contrary to Part II of the Resource Management Act and other high level national and regional planning documents.
50.23	Evolve Planning and Landscape Architecture	Natural Features and Landscapes	Oppose	ADD objectives and policies to the Natural Features and Landscapes chapter, using Whangarei District Plan as an example.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adequate protection for Outstanding Natural Landscapes, High Natural Character and Outstanding Natural Features is not provided. Inconsistent with the purpose and principles of Part II of the Resource Management Act, NSCPA and Northland Regional Policy Statement. Rules are weak and offer no protection to these features either through land use or subdivision. Exclusions are provided that are site specific and should not be in the District Plan, but in their consent and associated conditions. Colour rule provides for colours that are not appropriate, also within the Coastal Environment Overlay. Both need revising to be specific in terms of colours.
50.24	Evolve Planning and Landscape Architecture	Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	ADD more rules to the Natural Features and Landscapes chapter using Whangarei District Plan as an example.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adequate protection for Outstanding Natural Landscapes, High Natural Character and Outstanding Natural Features is not provided. Inconsistent with the purpose and principles of Part II of the Resource Management Act, NSCPA and Northland Regional Policy Statement. Rules are weak and offer no protection to these features either through land use or subdivision. Exclusions are provided that are site specific and should not be in the District Plan, but in their consent and associated conditions. Colour rule provides for colours that are not appropriate, also within the Coastal Environment Overlay. Both need revising to be specific in terms of colours.
50.25	Evolve Planning and Landscape Architecture	Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	AMEND the Natural Features and Landscapes chapter to require the protection of these features through subdivision and development.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adequate protection for Outstanding Natural Landscapes, High Natural Character and Outstanding Natural Features is not provided. Inconsistent with the purpose and principles of Part II of the Resource Management Act, NSCPA and Northland Regional Policy Statement. Rules are weak and offer no protection to these features either through land use or subdivision. Exclusions are provided that are site specific and should not be in the District Plan, but in their consent and associated conditions. Colour rule provides for colours that are not appropriate, also within the Coastal Environment Overlay. Both need revising to be specific in terms of colours.
50.26	Evolve Planning and Landscape Architecture	Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	DELETE all references to “This rule does not apply to: The defined Exclusive Use Areas shown on the Survey Plan for lots 1-29, 32,34,40,41 and 45 DP 348513 consented by RM050086 (Bream Tail) provided that the other conditions of the Consent Notices (dated 2 February 2004) on these titles are complied with, which shall rely on Rule 12.10.3c.2 in Chapter 12 of the Kaipara Operative District Plan.” within the Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes chapter. AND Any consequential amendments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adequate protection for Outstanding Natural Landscapes, High Natural Character and Outstanding Natural Features is not provided. Inconsistent with the purpose and principles of Part II of the Resource Management Act, NSCPA and Northland Regional Policy Statement. Rules are weak and offer no protection to these features either through land use or subdivision. Exclusions are provided that are site specific and should not be in the District Plan, but in their consent and associated conditions.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

VOLUME 1

(includes Submissions 1 – 100)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Colour rule provides for colours that are not appropriate, also within the Coastal Environment Overlay. Both need revising to be specific in terms of colours.
50.27	Evolve Planning and Landscape Architecture	Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	<p>DELETE all references to lots 1-4 and 6-14 as shown on the Survey Plan consented by RM090103 for lot 2 DP 316176 (Mangawhai Heads Holdings Limited) in the Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes chapter.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adequate protection for Outstanding Natural Landscapes, High Natural Character and Outstanding Natural Features is not provided. Inconsistent with the purpose and principles of Part II of the Resource Management Act, NSCPA and Northland Regional Policy Statement. Rules are weak and offer no protection to these features either through land use or subdivision. Exclusions are provided that are site specific and should not be in the District Plan, but in their consent and associated conditions. Colour rule provides for colours that are not appropriate, also within the Coastal Environment Overlay. Both need revising to be specific in terms of colours.
50.28	Evolve Planning and Landscape Architecture	Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	AMEND NFL-R3.a to include 'Colours to be natural and in keeping with the landscape'.	The colour rule provides for colours that are not appropriate and need to be revised to be specific in terms of colours.
50.29	Evolve Planning and Landscape Architecture	Coastal Environment	Amend	AMEND CE-S2.a to include 'Colours to be natural and in keeping with the landscape'.	The colour rule provides for colours that are not appropriate and needs to be revised to be specific in terms of colours.
50.30	Evolve Planning and Landscape Architecture	General rural zone	Oppose	DELETE GRZ-R11 and replace with the current impervious surfaces percentage in the Rural zone.	The increase in the impervious areas permitted in the residential zone is not appropriate with the extent of flooding and stormwater issues within the District.
50.31	Evolve Planning and Landscape Architecture	General rural zone	Oppose	AMEND the General rural zone rules to provide an appropriate impervious area rule that mitigates any increase in impervious areas and is related to the size of the site.	There are no impervious area rules which is inappropriate given the size of General rural zone sites, that the majority of Hakaru and Mangawhai fall within this zone and the extent of flooding and stormwater issues within the District.
50.32	Evolve Planning and Landscape Architecture	Financial Contributions	Oppose	DELETE the Financial Contributions rules and provide a method that relies on Council's Development Contributions Policy.	Development contributions are better dealt with outside the District Plan. The methods should refer to the Council's Development Contributions Policy.
51.1	Elaine and Josephine Reddy	Earthworks	Oppose	No specific decision requested; however, the submission opposes EW-O1 Earthworks activities within the District.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose all mining and quarrying activities of Bald Rock dacite dome and the surrounding area. There is no effective way to manage adverse effects regarding public safety. The density of housing and proximity to proposed mining sites. People in the area having dog kennel's, cattery business and farms. Previous mining attempts have caused damage to a house and stress and harm to human and animal life. Rock derby falling and noise will scare animals and humans. Dust will cover land and houses, having an adverse effect on people and animals. Roading will be damaged by trucks and heavy machinery, increased traffic movement will require upgrades and repairs to roading infrastructure. <p>Noise pollution of machinery, blasting, rock derby and movement.</p>
51.2	Elaine and Josephine Reddy	Earthworks	Oppose	No specific decision requested; however, the submission opposes EW-P5 Effects on infrastructure.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose all mining and quarrying activities of Bald Rock dacite dome and the surrounding area. There is no effective way to manage adverse effects regarding public safety. The density of housing and proximity to proposed mining sites. People in the area having dog kennel's, cattery business and farms. Previous mining attempts have caused damage to a house and stress and harm to human and animal life. Rock derby falling and noise will scare animals and humans.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

VOLUME 1

(includes Submissions 1 – 100)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dust will cover land and houses, having an adverse effect on people and animals. Roading will be damaged by trucks and heavy machinery, increased traffic movement will require upgrades and repairs to roading infrastructure. Noise pollution of machinery, blasting, rock derby and movement.
51.3	Elaine and Josephine Reddy	Earthworks	Oppose	No specific decision requested; however, the submission opposes EW-P2 Manage the effects of earthworks.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose all mining and quarrying activities of Bald Rock dacite dome and the surrounding area. Pukepohatu/Bald Rock is noted as a fragile structure, not stable. Surrounding land will become unstable through movement from above ground and blasting vibrations. Infrastructure, buildings and structures will become unstable through movement in the ground and above-ground blasting vibrations.
51.4	Elaine and Josephine Reddy	Earthworks	Oppose	No specific decision requested; however, the submission opposes EW-P3 Quarrying activities and mining activities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposed to all mining and quarrying activities of Bald Rock dacite dome and the surrounding area. The area surrounding Pukepohatu/Bald Rock has cultural and ecological values which would be damaged and destroyed by any mining or quarrying. Bald Rock will become unstable. There are many endangered species; native and exotic bird species, trees and flora; and native freshwater species of fish and crayfish. Rivers and waterways surrounding Bald Rock are used as the water source for people and animals.
51.5	Elaine and Josephine Reddy	Earthworks	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No specific decision requested; however, the submission opposes EW-S7 Accidental discovery protocol. The submitter opposes all mining and quarrying activities of Bald Rock dacite dome and the surrounding area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pukepohatu/Bald Rock and the surrounding area are of cultural significance to Te Uri o Hau of Ngati Whatua, the submission references the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the 1825 Battle of Te Ika a Ranganui, Ngati Whatua battled Ngapuhi invasion led by Hongi Heke; Carving by Māori on the rock face; and Known areas of tapu/sacred land.
51.6	Elaine and Josephine Reddy	Natural Features and Landscapes	Support	RETAIN NFL-O1 insofar as it gives greater significance and protection to Pukepohatu/Bald Rock and the surrounding valley that sits between Pukepohatu/Bald Rock and Pukekaroro.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To protect the valley and surrounding area by prohibiting mining, quarrying and adverse effects from large-scale earthworks and infrastructure that will impact the natural features and landscape. To protect the surrounding natural environment of Pukepohatu/Bald Rock and Pukekaroro, whose aesthetic values are of great value to the community. These maunga/mountains are connected to the surrounding landscape and hold historical significance to Te Uri o hau of Ngati Whatua, not as single identities and need to be viewed as an area of outstanding natural landscape.
51.7	Elaine and Josephine Reddy	Natural Features and Landscapes	Support	RETAIN NFL-O2 insofar as it gives greater significance and protection to Pukepohatu/Bald Rock and the surrounding valley that sits between Pukepohatu/Bald Rock and Pukekaroro.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All maintenance will enhance the outstanding natural landscapes. For the protection of native and exotic vegetation through regenerative planting, to which quarrying and mining would cause damage and delay regeneration. Natural science factor, including geological, topographical, ecological, and dynamic components. It is an example of a dacite dome, considered a fragile landform and mining/quarrying would damage the integrity of the structure. Maintenance of water, streams and rivers surrounding Pukepohatu/Bald Rock needs to be protected.
51.8	Elaine and Josephine Reddy	Natural Features and Landscapes	Support	RETAIN NFL-P1 insofar as it gives greater significance and protection to Pukepohatu/Bald	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All maintenance will enhance the outstanding natural landscapes.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 1
(includes Submissions 1 – 100)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons
				Rock and the surrounding valley that sits between Pukepohatu/Bald Rock and Pukekaroro.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For the protection of native and exotic vegetation through regenerative planting, to which quarrying and mining would cause damage and delay regeneration. Natural science factor, including geological, topographical, ecological, and dynamic components. It is an example of a dacite dome, considered a fragile landform and mining/quarrying would damage the integrity of the structure. Maintenance of water, streams and rivers surrounding Pukepohatu/Bald Rock needs to be protected.
51.9	Elaine and Josephine Reddy	Natural Features and Landscapes	Oppose	No specific decision requested; however, the submission opposes NFL-P2.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To allow to continue without restriction the lawfully established land use and development within Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes. The site is no longer safe for quarrying, mining or earthworks because of significant development in housing, subdivision and business in the area. The tangata whenua insight of the connection between land and people needs to be upheld and the site protected. There are aesthetic values, memorability and naturalness which are of great value to the community, including local activities and history. The aesthetic harmony of the two maunga and the valley, including views and giving a sense of place, strong community association, public esteem and sense of home and belonging.
51.10	Elaine and Josephine Reddy	Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	RETAIN NFL-P4.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The best way to "avoid, remedy, and mitigate" adverse effects to Pukepohatu/Bald Rock and the surrounding valleys is to prohibit mining, quarrying and earthworks, which would negatively impact the natural features and landscape of the surrounding area.
51.11	Elaine and Josephine Reddy	Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	RETAIN NFL-P6.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There will be a negative impact on the ridgelines and skyline if there is a collapse or damage to the dacite dome or side of the rock faces. Prohibiting quarrying and mining will avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects on the Natural Features and Landscapes characteristics. Pukepohatu/Bald Rock was once an existing quarry site. The site is no longer safe for quarrying, mining or earthworks because of significant development in housing, subdivision and business in the area. The tangata whenua insight of the connection between land and people needs to be upheld and the site protected. There are aesthetic values, memorability and naturalness which are of great value to the community, including local activities and history. The aesthetic harmony of the two maunga and the valley, including views and giving a sense of place, strong community association, public esteem and sense of home and belonging.
51.12	Elaine and Josephine Reddy	General		AMEND the Proposed District Plan to obtain protection for the Pukepohatu / Bald Rock dacite dome and its adjoining landscape by prohibiting all new and existing mining, quarrying and adverse effects from large-scale earthworks and infrastructure.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To protect the valley and surrounding area. The beauty of Pukepohatu/Bald Rock and Pukekaroro is dependent on its surrounding natural environment. Their aesthetic values, including memorability and naturalness are of great value to the community. These maunga/mountains are connected to the surrounding landscape and hold historical significance to tangata whenua Te Uri o Hau of Ngati Whatua. They are not single identities and need to be viewed as an area of outstanding natural landscape.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

VOLUME 1

(includes Submissions 1 – 100)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons
52.1	Kristeen Prangley	Planning Maps	Support	RETAIN the Rural lifestyle zone in Tinopai, at 29 Sandy Beach Road and other locations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Major need for affordable housing in Tinopai, which the rezoning would help address. The submitters property borders residential zoned land. Rezoning will help bring in more people, businesses and school children (to support the school roll). There are minimal effects on local infrastructure as new builds will have their own rainwater and septic systems. Rezoning will support families (including Tangata Whenua) to be able to purchase property and return home.
53.1	Leighton Taylor	Planning Maps	Amend	AMEND the zoning of the property at 67 Ngatoto Road, Tinopai, from General rural zone to Rural lifestyle zone.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Serviced by a well-formed road. There are power and phone lines at the boundary. This property shares a boundary with the proposed rural lifestyle zone.
54.1	Murray Foster	Planning Maps	Amend	AMEND the zoning of 89 Doctors Hill Road, Maungatūroto from General rural zone to Rural lifestyle zone.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent access and Connectivity - it is a short distance to the state highway and has a long road frontage. Suitable building sites available - provides opportunities for low-density housing while maintaining open space and rural aesthetics Efficient infrastructure accommodation - can accommodate the constraints of the site including existing power line corridors and flood prone areas while still using the land efficiently. Strong demand for lifestyle sections near town - rezoning will help meet this demand. Noise sensitivity Addressed by existing covenant - this legal mechanism ensures that future development will be compatible with noise management requirements, avoiding potential land use conflict Balanced growth and rural character preservation - allows for managed growth that complements the surrounding rural environment.
55.1	Kevin and Fiona Brljevič	Planning Maps	Amend	AMEND the zoning of three adjoining lots at 49 Whakapirau Road, Maungatūroto, (comprising Part Lot 1 DP 12683, Lot 4 DP 154353, and Section 4 SO 493195), for industrial purposes. the site currently has a split zoning of Heavy industry zone and General rural zone.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support the additional provision of industrial land. Aligns with the Spatial Plan for Maungatūroto. The site is located within the 'Railway Village' and in close proximity to rail infrastructure as well as the town centre, making it a valuable location for industrial activities. The site offers a unique opportunity to provide for nearly 75% of the desired industrial land (as set out in the Spatial Plan) under one land ownership. Industrial zoning is proposed for a row of six former railway worked cottages which are heritage buildings under the District Plan. Incorporating industrial activities in this space alongside residential heritage elements may be difficult to manage, and the site offers a superior alternative. The line between Heavy Industrial Zone and Rural Zone on the Site appears to be arbitrarily drawn. Rezoning the whole site would provide greater clarity to the Submitter and ensure that the site can be utilised for one clear purpose in the future. The submitters support of the rezoning is contingent on there being no material increase in rates until services are available to the site.
56.1	Kelvin Rountree	Planning Maps	Amend	AMEND the zone of the area between the "Field days property" and Lot 1 DP 65922 BLK IX Maungaru SD to light commercial, with the extent restricted to the land along State Highway 14 and onto North Road to include the main entrance to the property running down to the boundary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No reasons were provided.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

VOLUME 1

(includes Submissions 1 – 100)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons
				between the submitter's property and the Northpoint property.	
57.1	Graeme Wrack	General Residential Zone	Amend	RETAIN GRZ-R12 and provisions that enable multi-unit development as a means to provide more affordable and diverse housing options across the district.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As Kaipara's towns grow, multiunit housing developments are an inevitable and necessary evolution that can provide more affordable housing options and accommodation for essential workers, contributing to the district's economic and social resilience.
57.2	Graeme Wrack	General Residential Zone	Amend	ADD stronger design controls to GRZ-R12 to ensure high-quality outcomes multi-housing developments, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimum architectural design standards that reflect the character of the beachside and rural environments. This could be achieved by mandating that all multi-unit developments are designed by a Registered Architect. Privacy protections between dwellings through appropriate setback, screening and window placement.. A design review is carried out by a Kaipara District registered Architect as part of the Resource Consent application. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter supports multi-unit developments as necessary and inevitable, giving greater affordability and housing options, contributing to the district's economic and social resilience. Submitter supports strong design controls to avoid pitfalls with these types of developments.
57.3	Graeme Wrack	General Residential Zone	Amend	AMEND the provisions to require a minimum of one carpark per dwelling in multi-housing developments to manage on-street parking and traffic impacts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter supports multi-unit developments as necessary and inevitable, giving greater affordability and housing options, contributing to the district's economic and social resilience. Submitter supports strong design controls to avoid pitfalls with these types of developments.
57.4	Graeme Wrack	General Residential Zone	Amend	AMEND provisions to mandate the use of permeable paving for driveways and shared surfaces to reduce stormwater runoff and support sustainable land management.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter supports multi-unit developments as necessary and inevitable, giving greater affordability and housing options, contributing to the district's economic and social resilience. Submitter supports strong design controls to avoid pitfalls with these types of developments.
57.5	Graeme Wrack	General Residential Zone	Amend	AMEND provisions to encourage shared underground water tanks for multi-unit developments, with capacity for both domestic use and firefighting, rather than multiple individual tanks.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter supports multi-unit developments as necessary and inevitable, giving greater affordability and housing options, contributing to the district's economic and social resilience. Submitter supports strong design controls to avoid pitfalls with these types of developments.
57.6	Graeme Wrack	General Residential Zone	Amend	AMEND provisions to promote the integration of green technologies, including solar energy systems and rainwater harvesting, to reduce infrastructure demand and environmental impact.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter supports multi-unit developments as necessary and inevitable, giving greater affordability and housing options, contributing to the district's economic and social resilience. Submitter supports strong design controls to avoid pitfalls with these types of developments.
57.7	Graeme Wrack	General Residential Zone	Amend	AMEND provisions to require dedicated storage areas for bicycles, beach equipment, and gardening tools to support liveability in compact housing formats.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter supports multi-unit developments as necessary and inevitable, giving greater affordability and housing options, contributing to the district's economic and social resilience. Submitter supports strong design controls to avoid pitfalls with these types of developments.
57.8	Graeme Wrack	General Residential Zone	Amend	AMEND provisions to restrict multi-unit housing developments to walkable catchments around existing town centres and amenities to reduce car dependency and enhance community connectivity. I.e. Limit the areas suitable for Multi-Unit housing on the planning to within a 10-15 minute walk of a Settlement/Town Centre.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter supports multi-unit developments as necessary and inevitable, giving greater affordability and housing options, contributing to the district's economic and social resilience. Submitter supports strong design controls to avoid pitfalls with these types of developments.
57.9	Graeme Wrack	General Residential Zone	Amend	AMEND the district plan to prioritise "density done well" (best practice) ensuring that intensification contributes positively to the character, function, and sustainability of Kaipara's Settlements.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter supports multi-unit developments as necessary and inevitable, giving greater affordability and housing options, contributing to the district's economic and social resilience. Submitter supports strong design controls to avoid pitfalls with these types of developments.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

VOLUME 1

(includes Submissions 1 – 100)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons
58.1	Gary Serjeant	Planning Maps	Oppose	AMEND the zoning 98 Ngatoto Road from General rural zone to Rural lifestyle zone.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proximity to Tinopai Township. Change of nature of access (roading) and electrical supply The surrounding properties changing from pine forest to lifestyle blocks. The submitter wants grandchildren to be able to subdivide and build on the property.
59.1	Claire McInnes	General	Support	RETAIN the Proposed District Plan but consider how the aims in terms of encouraging appropriate development balanced against the need to preserve the character that makes the Kaipara an attractive area to live and work can be achieved. The submission observes that this will mean not just allowing for development but supporting development with policies and practices that make development achievable and affordable. The submission mentions the area of Pahi which is proposed to change from Rural zone to Rural lifestyle zone.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The requirements for subdivision consent may make subdivision unaffordable. The contribution that small block holders can bring in terms of environmental, economic and community benefits should be a consideration when assessing development applications. If the requirements are too arduous or expensive the aims will not be achieved.
60.1	Bill Stewart	Planning Maps	Support	RETAIN expansion of residential zoning.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Centres will need to be able to support more smaller (affordable) properties to really get ahead and attract serious investment. The best way to get more funding to improve the district is to attract more rate payers and businesses. The submission supports the increased zoning in this plan.
60.2	Bill Stewart	General	Support	MAKE long term provision to upgrade the infrastructure to support more dwellings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commercial enterprises will need staff, and employees can't usually afford to live on a lifestyle block
60.3	Bill Stewart	Planning Maps		RETAIN expansion of commercial zoning throughout Kaipara	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter states the best way to get more funding to improve the district is to attract more rate payers & businesses.
60.4	Bill Stewart	General	Support	No specific decision sought but submission considers that to really get ahead and attract serious investment the centres will need to be able to support more smaller properties.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commercial enterprises will need staff and employees can't usually afford to live on a lifestyle block which most new developments are the region are.
61.1	Aaron Simpkin	Planning Maps	Support	RETAIN areas suggested in the Dargaville region for residential development.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will improve overall conditions in the district. Supports encouraging growth in the area.
61.2	Aaron Simpkin	Planning Maps	Support	RETAIN areas suggested in the Dargaville region for industrial development.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will improve overall conditions in the district. Support encouraging growth in the area.
62.1	Jennifer Brown	Planning Maps	Support	RETAIN the zoning of 30B Settlement Rd, Kaiwaka as General residential zone.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No reasons provided.
63.1	David Bell	Planning Maps	Oppose	AMEND the Proposed District Plan to match the Mangawhai spatial plan (see submission for details) and enable rural subdivisions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rural subdivisions only require roading, stormwater, electrical and telecommunication and these are easily provided (set out in the submission). If rural subdivision is allowed, it would slow the development of large-scale subdivisions giving the Council more time to sort infrastructure issues. The protection and enhancement of Environmental Benefits is greatly advanced with Rural Subdivision as it is generally a condition for approval to subdivide The submitter has a rural property and would like to protect and enhance the environmental benefits on my property. In order to protect and enhance these areas the submitter would need to subdivide to fund this project.
64.1	Paul Greig	Planning Maps	Support	RETAIN the Commercial zone for the property at 12 Kaiwaka-Mangawhai Road, Kaiwaka	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More commercial zoning is needed for the growth of Kaiwaka. It makes good sense for this property to be zoned commercial as the neighbouring properties are already commercial.
64.2	Paul Greig	Planning Maps	Support	RETAIN the Commercial zone for the property at 1942 State Highway 1, Kaiwaka, State Highway 1, Kaiwaka.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More commercial zoning is needed for the growth of Kaiwaka. It makes good sense for this property to be commercial zone as the neighbouring properties are already commercial.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

VOLUME 1

(includes Submissions 1 – 100)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons
65.1	Aggregate and Quarry Association (AQA)	Definitions	Support	RETAIN the definition of "Quarry".	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The definition corresponds with the National Planning Standards
65.2	Aggregate and Quarry Association (AQA)	Definitions	Support	RETAIN the definition of "Quarrying Activities".	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It corresponds with the National Planning Standards
65.3	Aggregate and Quarry Association (AQA)	Definitions	Support	RETAIN the definition of "Primary Production".	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The definition includes quarrying activities which is important.
65.4	Aggregate and Quarry Association (AQA)	Definitions		No specific decision requested, but submission observes that the definition of "Land-based primary production" is not taken from the National Planning Standards. Because of the words 'soil resource', this definition is likely to exclude quarrying activities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This definition becomes important in terms of the objectives and policies in the General rural zone such GRUZ-O3 and GRUZ-P1.
65.5	Aggregate and Quarry Association (AQA)	Earthworks	Oppose	ADD a chapter that specifically addresses quarrying with objectives, policies, rules and standards rather than it being included in the Earthworks chapter.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Even though a large component of quarrying activities involves earthworks, quarrying activities are significantly different from general earthworks and, consistent with the definitions in the Definitions section as discussed above, are much broader in scope. Quarrying is distinct and includes ancillary activities such as processing (including crushing, screening, washing, and blending), transport, storage, sale and recycling of aggregates (clay, silt, rock, sand), the deposition of overburden material, rehabilitation, landscaping and cleanfilling of the quarry, and the use of land and accessory buildings for offices, workshops and car parking areas associated with the operation of the quarry.
65.6	Aggregate and Quarry Association (AQA)	Earthworks		RETAIN EW-P3 Quarrying activities and mining activities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The term "appropriate locations" lacks specificity but policy is supported because it enables discretion and the opportunity for the quarry to demonstrate its appropriateness.
65.7	Aggregate and Quarry Association (AQA)	Earthworks	Oppose	AMEND EW-R4 from discretionary activity to restricted discretionary activity for new quarrying activities, mining activities or the expansion of existing quarrying activities or mining activities. The matters of discretion could include adverse landscape and visual amenity effects, traffic safety, amenity effects and any adverse effects on land values.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Location specific characteristic of aggregate resources (they need to be close to where they will be utilised). Other district councils in New Zealand (for example Selwyn District Council) provide a Restricted Discretionary activity status for quarrying and the matters for discretion could come from those districts.
65.8	Aggregate and Quarry Association (AQA)	General Rural Zone	Support	RETAIN GRUZ-O1 with respect to permitting primary production (including quarrying) on highly productive land.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter contends that quarrying extraction activities are the most productive of all primary production activities given the value of the aggregate resource. The submission interprets GRUZ-O1 as providing quarrying activities with a consenting pathway on highly productive land.
65.9	Aggregate and Quarry Association (AQA)	General	Oppose	POSTPONE the finalisation of the Proposed plan until after the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity changes are confirmed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity is shortly due to be amended
65.10	Aggregate and Quarry Association (AQA)	General	Amend	AMEND the Proposed District Plan to allow for sand dredging.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sand dredging is an increasingly important activity in Kaipara and around the country to ensure supplies of sand for concrete manufacture and other uses are met. Alternatives to sand dredging are land extraction and manufactured sand and both are under pressure with constrained supplies around the country. Sand dredging is currently occurring in the Kaipara Harbour to meet community needs. While it may not be occurring within the Kaipara District boundaries, it is important that the proposed plan allows for this activity.
65.11	Aggregate and Quarry Association (AQA)	Earthworks	Support	RETAIN the recognition of quarrying activities and mining activities in the Overview of the Earthworks chapter.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aggregate is a finite resource. It can only be sourced from where it is physically located and whether the industry is able to economically access it. There are limited opportunities to

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 1
(includes Submissions 1 – 100)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons
					establish new quarries because of the 'location specific' characteristic of aggregate deposits.
65.12	Aggregate and Quarry Association (AQA)	Earthworks	Support	AMEND the Proposed District Plan to be enabling for quarry developments in zones other than General rural zone.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There will be a need for new quarries throughout the district. There needs to be a consenting pathway provided for quarrying with appropriate conditions given the location specific characteristics of aggregate resource.
65.13	Aggregate and Quarry Association (AQA)	General Rural Zone	Oppose	No specific decision requested but submission observes that GRUZ-O3 and GRUZ-P1 are likely to be excluded quarrying activities because of the definition of "land based primary activities".	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extractive activities are the most productive of all primary production activities given the value of the aggregate resource. For these reasons, and due to its location specific characteristics as set out earlier, the inclusion of quarrying activity on highly productive land under certain circumstances is appropriate.
65.14	Aggregate and Quarry Association (AQA)	Definitions	Amend	AMEND the Definitions section and elsewhere in the Proposed District Plan to reflect changes to the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land, including the removal of LUC-3 protections. AND POSTPONE decisions on this matter until after the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land has been finalised.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Government has signalled changes to the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land. The submitter recommends decisions made in this area of the proposed plan are consistent with this.
66.1	Don Champion	Vision for Kaipara	Support	No specific decision sought but submission refers to SD-VK-O2 and seeks to facilitate the planning and implementation environment so that development is not held up by endless screeds of red tape and bureaucratic roadblocks.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No reasons provided.
66.2	Don Champion	Transport	Support	No specific decision requested, but submission considers that a well-planned transport network is one of the key enablers of economic efficiency and involves long term decisions around where development happens and ensuring that development supports that.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No reasons provided.
66.3	Don Champion	General	Support	RETAIN the direction to enhance and drive growth in Kaipara especially in Dargaville and the Western half of the district.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mangawhai is mostly driven by the overflow from Auckland but Dargaville needs to have the conditions for a sustainable growth path both in residential development and business and industrial development, to provide employment opportunities and the economic engine to sustain that growth.
67.1	Adam Booth	Notable Trees	Amend	AMEND TREE-R7 to make removal of notable trees a discretionary activity instead of a permitted activity.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allows removal of any scheduled notable tree
67.2	Adam Booth	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	Support	RETAIN ECO-R1 insofar as it provides for clearance to form a building site on a property and the ability to maintain clearance between dwellings and vegetation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No reasons provided.
67.3	Adam Booth	Natural Hazards	Support	RETAIN NH-R8 New buildings (other than accessory buildings) in a coastal erosion hazard area or coastal flood hazard area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submission supports the ability to build in the hazard areas as long as the height requirements as specified are met.
67.4	Adam Booth	Natural Hazards	Oppose	DELETE NH-11 within a coastal erosion hazard area, coastal flood hazard area or river flood hazard area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter considers that the rule is covered adequately by Northland Regional Council controls. Northland Regional Council should be the controlling authority with regard to this. An additional rule will require an additional consent application to be made, costing applicants upward of \$10,000 and for no good reason. The Regional Council provides adequate oversight of the earthworks in its statutory area. The double up of consents required is unnecessary.
67.5	Adam Booth	Subdivision	Oppose	DELETE the reference to the Mangawhai/Hakaru Managed Growth Area from the Proposed District Plan entirely OR AMEND the activity status for subdivision in SUB-R4 for the Mangawhai/Hakaru Managed Growth Area to be restricted discretionary.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter considers that the creation of the Mangawhai/Hakaru Managed Growth Area is short sighted. It is the market that will decide where people want to live. Hampering development through this rule will not generate any development

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 1
(includes Submissions 1 – 100)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons
					<p>contributions, and thereby Council will not have the funds to undertake any future infrastructure upgrades.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The current scenario will result in stymieing growth in the district, driving up property prices as the wealthy move into the area, resulting in increasing rates and rental costs in the area. The amendment to a restricted discretionary status is a significant change from discretionary but will still allow the council the ability to push back on developments that are not adequately serviced and are not within areas that are planned for infrastructure upgrades.
67.6	Adam Booth	Earthworks	Oppose	<p>DELETE all earthworks rules in the Proposed District Plan.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>DELETE EW-S1 controls over earthworks.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Earthworks are adequately controlled by Northland Regional Council controls. Should earthworks remain in the Proposed District Plan, the volumes and areas listed in EW-S1 are unreasonable. Good outcomes can be achieved by simply including EW-S2-S7 and removing EW-S1.
67.7	Adam Booth	Signs	Support	RETAIN SIGN-R1.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No reason provided.
67.8	Adam Booth	General Residential Zone	Support	RETAIN GRZ-R3 and the ability to have two or more units on same freehold title.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No reasons provided.
67.9	Adam Booth	General Residential Zone	Oppose	<p>RETAIN GRZ-S1 and the 50% site coverage maximum.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>DELETE the matters of discretion in GRZ-S1 pertaining to the amenity and character of the surrounding area.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for the 50% site coverage. This clause is very ambiguous and ill defined, and I feel that it does not belong within Matters for Discretion for Restricted Discretionary Activities.
67.10	Adam Booth	General	Oppose	DELETE all matters of discretion relating to amenity and character within the Proposed District Plan.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> People processing consent application take this phrase to mean whatever they choose. It is very ambiguous and ill defined. Including amenity within restrict discretionary activities essentially means that there is not any restriction at all on the Council discretion.
68.1	Hamish Campion	General	Support	RETAIN the District Plan as proposed, particularly the direction Council is taking to facilitate the growth of Dargaville and district.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dargaville needs to have conditions for sustainable growth firmly established in the plan.
69.1	Laura Peddie	Planning Maps	Oppose	<p>AMEND the zoning of the Oneriri area from Rural lifestyle zone back to the Operative District Plan zoning.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>UNDERTAKE further geotechnical and ecological assessments before considering any future rezoning proposals in the area.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>ENGAGE meaningfully with affected landowners and communities to ensure planning decisions reflect local values and environmental constraints.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental and Ecological Concerns - Oneriri Peninsula is home to ecologically sensitive environments. Rezoning the area to Rural lifestyle to allow for increased subdivision poses significant risk to these habitats. Conflict with Existing Resource Consents and Covenants - Rezoning is in direct conflict with covenants and constitution of Hinamoki Estate Residents Society Inc including density, design controls, ecological protections, infrastructure limitations and covenants. Geological Unsuitability and Infrastructure Limitations and Inadequate Infrastructure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The land in the Oneriri development is geologically unsuitable for intensive development. Subdivision down to 4,000m² lots would increase the risk of erosion, slope failure, and contamination of groundwater and surface water systems. Infrastructure in Oneriri area is inadequate to support proposed level of development and is already under pressure from current development. Inconsistency with the Council's Original vision for the Oneriri area - Original vision was to maintain the area as a high-value, low-density lifestyle estate. Proposed rezoning is contradictory to this vision and risks eroding the unique character and amenity of the area. Contradiction with National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land - Oneriri area may not fall

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 1
(includes Submissions 1 – 100)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons
					under the strict definition of Highly Productive Land, but Section 32 report acknowledges importance of protecting rural land from fragmentation and reverse sensitivity effects. The proposed rezoning to Rural lifestyle would contribute to land fragmentation and reduce viability of surrounding rural production activities.
70.1	James Barrett	SCHED3 – Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Oppose	ADD to Schedule 3 Site and Area of Significance to Māori a new site identified as: the awa from the junction of Pukehuia Road and Girls High School Road, to the junction of the Wairoa, Wairua and Mangakahia awa.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The awa site is of significance to tangata whenua of Tangiteroria and the degradation of their awa is not just an environmental concern but is a cultural and spiritual loss.
70.2	James Barrett	General Rural Zone	Oppose	ADD new clause to GRUZ-S2 that requires all building and development to be setback 25 metres from all riverbanks as it relates to the submitter's request for an additional Site and Area of Significance to Māori (see submission point 70.1) AND ADD requirement for sediment and water quality management monitoring to GRUZ-S2 for submitter's requested additional Site and Area of Significance to Māori (see submission point 70.1).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Deterioration of water quality and sediment build up within the submitter's site of significance.
70.3	James Barrett	Planning Maps	Oppose	ADD the following sites of significance to the Esplanade Priority Areas mapping in relation to the submitter's requested new Site and Areas of Significance to Māori (see submission point 70.1): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Paerata Te Aotahi Waitotama Kirikopuni Mareikura Pukehuia AND Kaipara District Council to uphold Section 229 of the Resource Management act for the submitters requested new Site and Areas of Significance to Māori (see submission point 70.1) for all to enjoy.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establishment of the listed sites as Esplanade Reserves in the Proposed District Plan will enable managed public access to these sites, providing opportunities to educate the community about the cultural and ecological significance of the Wairoa River and Tangiteroria's site of significance.
70.4	James Barrett	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Support	ADD sediment and water quality management monitoring for the additional Site and Area of Significance to Māori (see submission point 70.1).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Deterioration of water quality and sediment build up.
71.1	Bruce Fox	Earthworks	Support	RETAIN EW-R3 Farm quarrying as notified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See attached pdf of submission and appendices for full details of submitter's detailed reasons for supporting inclusion of a rule controlling Farm Quarrying activities. In particular, submitter raises concern with existing farm quarrying activities being undertaken by Tarakohe Farms and supports stricter controls on farm quarrying activities as they consider that scale and frequency of what Tarakohe Farms quarries has carried out is so far out of step with the norm and has at times been staggering.
71.2	Bruce Fox	Earthworks	Support	RETAIN all provisions in the Earthworks chapter that relate to quarrying and earthworks.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See pdf and appendices attached to submission point 71.1. for full details of submitter's reasons for support of Earthworks provisions controlling quarrying earthworks activities.
72.1	Bradley Knight	Planning Maps	Support	RETAIN the proposed rezoning of land to Rural lifestyle zone to its fullest extent.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Paparoa and Matakahe are growing and dynamic communities with immense potential. Rural lifestyle type of development can enhance the character of the area, support sustainable growth, and provide diverse living options for families and individuals seeking a balance between rural living and community connection. Rural lifestyle zoning is well-suited to the natural landscape and offers an opportunity to grow in a way that respects the environment, strengthens the local economy, and preserves the unique charm of our region

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

VOLUME 1

(includes Submissions 1 – 100)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons
72.2	Bradley Knight	General		No specific decision requested however the submission supports localised use of development contributions so that development contributions collected from developments in Paparoa and Matakoho are reinvested directly back into the area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Too often funding is redirected toward larger centres leaving rural communities under-resourced despite increased development. Submitter supports a transparent and equitable approach, ensuring that our community receives the necessary funding to maintain and improve infrastructure and services in line with local growth.
72.3	Bradley Knight	General	Support	No specific decision sought; however the submission supports zoning and infrastructure development for retail, industrial and commercial areas to attract business investment and allow local businesses to thrive.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One of the most pressing issues facing our community is the lack of local employment and business opportunities, especially for young people. If we do not create new pathways for economic growth, we risk losing an entire generation to larger urban centres.
72.4	Bradley Knight	General	Support	No specific decision sought, however the submission supports policies that enable business start-ups and remote work infrastructure, such as improved digital connectivity.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One of the most pressing issues facing our community is the lack of local employment and business opportunities, especially for young people. If we do not create new pathways for economic growth, we risk losing an entire generation to larger urban centres. Creating a thriving local economy will not only make our community more resilient, but it will also give our children real opportunities to live and work where they grew up.
72.5	Bradley Knight	General	Support	No specific decision requested; however the submission supports significant upgrades to amenity services, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Roading improvements and safer transport links. Expanded water, wastewater, and stormwater infrastructure. Recreational facilities such as parks, playgrounds, and sports areas. Provision for local retail services, including food stores, pharmacies, takeaways, restaurants, etc to ensure convenient access to everyday needs. Access to essential services like health, childcare, and education.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> These services are the backbone of a healthy, thriving community and must keep pace with growth.
72.6	Bradley Knight	General	Support	No specific decision sought; however the submission supports development that enhances, not detracts from the natural beauty of the Kaipara region by including design elements, planting and public spaces that reflect and preserve this beauty.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Paparoa and the surrounding areas are known for their unique landscapes and rural charm. Any new development should include design elements, planting and public spaces that reflect and preserve this beauty.
72.7	Bradley Knight	General	Support	No specific decision sought; however the submissions supports beautification and maintenance of the State Highway corridor, including regular rubbish removal and litter control along the highway corridor, planting of native and attractive vegetation on approach to Paparoa and nearby settlements, ongoing weed control, improved signage and highway-edge maintenance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The improvements suggested will contribute significantly to the region's image, support tourism, and reflect the pride Kaipara's residents take in the place they call home.
73.1	PF Olsen Ltd	Planning Maps	Amend	AMEND the boundaries of ONL23 (North Head Coast and Western Dune Lakes) to exclude areas that do not exhibit Outstanding Natural Landscape characteristics and undertake a site-specific review of these Outstanding Natural Landscape boundaries using recent aerial imagery and land use records to ensure that only areas meeting Outstanding Natural Landscape criteria are included in Schedule 5 (see map contained in original submission for extent of area of ONL23 that the submitter seeks be amended).	See submission for detailed reasons. Reasons are summarised as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inaccuracy of Outstanding Natural Landscape Mapping Failure of the area to meet Outstanding Natural Landscape criteria Delay between the assessment undertaken by Kaipara District Council of Outstanding Natural Landscape areas, and the notification of the Proposed District Plan. Inconsistencies with Higher-Order Documents, including the Northland Regional Policy Statement. Practical and legal implications of incorrect mapping - including recently planted commercial forestry or pastureland within Outstanding Natural Landscape boundaries undermines the integrity and credibility of the Outstanding Natural Landscape overlay creating uncertainty for landowners.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 1
(includes Submissions 1 – 100)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons
73.2	PF Olsen Ltd	Planning Maps	Amend	AMEND the boundaries of ONL9 (Tangihua Range) to exclude areas that do not exhibit Outstanding Natural Landscape characteristics and undertake a site-specific review of these Outstanding Natural Landscape boundaries using recent aerial imagery and land use records to ensure that only areas meeting Outstanding Natural Landscape criteria are included in Schedule 5 (see map contained in original submission for extent of area of ONL9 that the submitter seeks be amended).	See submission for full reasons. Reasons are summarised as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inaccuracy of Outstanding Natural Landscape Mapping - ONL9 boundaries encompass areas that either had pasture landscape or have been planted in commercial forestry. Failure to meet Outstanding Natural Landscape criteria Delay in notification of the Proposed District Plan - Section 32 Report states ground-truthing undertaken by Kaipara District Council in 2019 but Proposed District Plan was notified in 2025. This is a 6 year gap. Practical and legal implications of incorrect mapping - Including recently planted commercial forestry or pastureland within Outstanding Natural Landscape boundaries undermines the integrity and credibility of the Outstanding Natural Landscape overlay creating uncertainty for landowners.
73.3	PF Olsen Ltd	Planning Maps	Amend	AMEND the boundaries of ONL8 (Maungaru Range) to exclude areas that do not exhibit Outstanding Natural Landscape characteristics and undertake a site-specific review of these Outstanding Natural Landscape boundaries using recent aerial imagery and land use records to ensure that only areas meeting Outstanding Natural Landscape criteria are included in Schedule 5 (see map contained in original submission for extent of area of ONL8 that the submitter seeks be amended).	See submission for detailed reasons. Reasons are summarised as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inaccuracy of Outstanding Natural Landscape Mapping Failure of the area to meet Outstanding Natural Landscape criteria Delay between the assessment undertaken by Kaipara District Council of Outstanding Natural Landscape areas, and the notification of the Proposed District Plan. Practical and legal implications of incorrect mapping - including recently planted commercial forestry or pastureland within Outstanding Natural Landscape boundaries undermines the integrity and credibility of the Outstanding Natural Landscape overlay creating uncertainty for landowners.
73.4	PF Olsen Ltd	Coastal Environment	Oppose	DELETE "All Coastal Environment (excluding ONCA)" from CE-R5 so that commercial forests are permitted for erosion control purposes. AND AMEND 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.	The reasons are summarised as follows (see submission for full details of reasoning): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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, and unless justified under the National Environmental Standard for Commercial Forestry's stringency provisions, local rules should not impose more restrictive provisions than those provided for in the national standard. 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. The rule fails to meet the Resource Management Act and National Environmental Standard for Commercial Forestry stringency tests.
73.5	PF Olsen Ltd	Definitions	Support	RETAIN the definition of "Commercial Forestry" as notified.	The definition is clear, robust, and aligns with the National Environmental Standards for Commercial Forestry. This provides certainty for landowners, the forestry sector, and the community.
73.6	PF Olsen Ltd	Definitions	Support	RETAIN the definition of "Plantation Forestry" as notified.	The definition replicates that of the National Environmental Standards for Commercial Forestry, which is supported.
73.7	PF Olsen Ltd	Definitions	Support	RETAIN the definition of "Afforestation" as notified.	The definition replicates the National Environmental Standards for Commercial Forestry definition. This ensures consistency and clarity. It supports sustainable land use and effective compliance.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 1
(includes Submissions 1 – 100)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons
73.8	PF Olsen Ltd	National Environmental Standards	Support	RETAIN references to the National Environmental Standards for Commercial Forestry throughout the Proposed District Plan. AND AMEND provisions related to the National Environmental Standard for Commercial Forestry where appropriate to strengthen them.	The references to the National Environmental Standards for Commercial Forestry promote national consistency and regulatory certainty.
73.9	PF Olsen Ltd	Coastal Environment	Amend	AMEND CE-R4 to align with the National Environmental Standards for Commercial Forestry. AND ADD a note to CE-R4 that clarifies/confirms that CE-R4 does not apply to commercial forestry-related earthworks. AND PROVIDE detailed justification, supported by robust evidence, for any deviation from the National Environmental Standard for Commercial Forestry in relation to permitted forestry activities, including reviewing the section 32 report to ensure that any proposed deviation from the National Environmental Standard for Commercial Forestry is fully evaluated and justified in terms of efficiency, effectiveness, and necessity.	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. Their reasons for opposition are summarised as follows (see submission for detail): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Deviation from the National Environmental Standard for Commercial Forestry - CE-R4 as notified requires permitted activities in the Coastal Environment to meet additional standards not required by the National Environmental Standard for Commercial Forestry. This approach undermines the intent of the National Environmental Standard for Commercial Forestry and creates unnecessary regulatory complexity for forestry operators. Lack of justification in the section 32 report - section 32 report does not demonstrate that the National Environmental Standard for Commercial Forestry 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. 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.
73.10	PF Olsen Ltd	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Amend	AMEND SASM-R3.1.a.ii. as follows: 1. Permitted Activity Where: a. The activity is for the purposes of: i. Installation of fence posts; ii. Repair and maintenance of existing farm <u>and commercial forestry</u> infrastructure, including tracks and drains, provided the area and volume of land disturbed is limited to what is necessary to maintain the existing infrastructure along its existing alignment;...	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure consistent terminology and application across the Proposed District Plan, where both farming and forestry infrastructure are recognised under similar permitted activity rules. Avoid ambiguity and improve clarity for plan users, including commercial forestry operators. Align with the principle of equitable treatment of primary production sectors in planning provisions.
73.11	PF Olsen Ltd	Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	AMEND the reference to forestry tracks in NFL-R3.1.b.vii as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The activity complies with NFL-S5 Indigenous vegetation clearance; or b. Clearance for the operation, repair or maintenance of the following activities where they have been lawfully established: i. Fences; ii. Infrastructure, including effluent disposal systems; iii. Buildings and swimming pools; iv. Driveways, parking areas and access; v. Walking tracks; vi. Cycling tracks; vii. Farming and <u>commercial</u> forestry tracks; and viii. Farm drains.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The term forestry tracks is imprecise and risks inconsistent interpretation and implementation. 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.
73.12	PF Olsen Ltd	Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	AMEND the reference to forestry tracks in NFL-R4.1.b. as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The term forestry tracks is imprecise and risks inconsistent interpretation and implementation.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

VOLUME 1

(includes Submissions 1 – 100)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons
				<p>a. The earthworks complies with NFL-S4 Earthworks; or</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 <u>commercial</u> forestry tracks</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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.
73.13	PF Olsen Ltd	Coastal Environment	Amend	<p>AMEND 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 connections, driveways, parking areas, effluent disposal systems, swimming pools, walking or cycling tracks, or farm and <u>commercial</u> forestry tracks.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The term forestry tracks is imprecise and risks inconsistent interpretation and implementation. 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.
73.14	PF Olsen Ltd	Natural Character	Amend	<p>AMEND the reference to forestry tracks in NATC-R4.1.b. as follows:</p> <p>1. Activity status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>a. The activity complies with NATC-S3 - Indigenous vegetation clearance; or</p> <p>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 <u>commercial</u> forestry tracks.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The term forestry tracks is imprecise and risks inconsistent interpretation and implementation. 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.
73.15	PF Olsen Ltd	General	Amend	<p>AMEND all references to 'forestry tracks' within the Proposed District Plan.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The term forestry tracks is imprecise and risks inconsistent interpretation and implementation. To improve clarity and ensure alignment with other plan provisions, the terminology should be standardised to "commercial forestry tracks". This terminology more accurately reflects the scope and intent of the rules, which are designed to manage the environmental effects of tracks associated with commercial plantation forestry rather than informal or private-use tracks in rural or indigenous forest areas. Refer to other submissions in respect of individual provisions.
74.1	Clive Foster	Planning Maps	Amend	<p>AMEND the zoning of the property at 10 Griffin Road, Maungatūroto from Rural lifestyle zone to General residential zone.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The property is on town sewer, water and comes off the sealed road. Not changing the zoning of the site may cause issues for the neighbours in the future, it won't fit with the surrounding medium density housing. The land is gently sloping to the north so it would make a great spot for residential housing.
75.1	Lynda Von-Lyn	Planning Maps	Oppose	<p>AMEND the zoning of properties described as Part Allots E 62 W6263 Wairau PSH BLK XII WAIPU SD (1044 State Highway 12 to 1066 State Highway 12, Maungatūroto-Paparua, Otamatea/Central), otherwise known as the Maungatūroto Railway Settlement or Station Village, back to the Residential zoning of the Operative District Plan.</p> <p>Refer to map included with submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The houses are kauri cottages and will be designated as Heritage Buildings and Items under the Proposed District Plan. Changing the zoning of these properties to Light industrial seems to be counterproductive for any attempts or future requirements to preserve them. The submitters' properties have historically been classified as General Residential and the railway houses and use of the land has always been for housing. The proposed Light industrial zoning would make residential activities non-complying, leading to loss of residential activity rights for the submitters. The proposed Light industrial zoning does not align with the purpose of the Light

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 1
(includes Submissions 1 – 100)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons
					<p>industrial Zone stated in the Proposed District Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The intent of Light industrial zone policies LIZ-P1 and LIZ-P7 does not align with the existing residential use of the submitters' properties and land. The submitters' do not want other activities such as Industrial Activity and Community Corrections Activities permitted by rules LIZ-R3 and LIZ-R9 near their homes. They only want activities that are permitted in a residential zone. The submitters' properties are all privately owned and are subject to a cross-lease land title that has been in place since 1991. Therefore, establishing light industry on the submitters' properties would be financially and practically difficult process as it would require the agreement of all of the individual landowners for purchase of the land or establishment of light industry activities on the land. The effects of activities in the Light industrial zone including noise, odour, dust, fumes, smoke, and associated activities would have adverse effects on the quality of the lives of the submitters.
75.2	Lynda Von-Lyn	Planning Maps	Oppose	<p>AMEND the zoning of the properties described as Part Allots E62 W62 63 Wairau PSHBLKXII WAIPU SD (1044 State Highway 12 to 1066 State Highway 12, Maungatūroto-Paparoa, Otamatea/Central), from Light industrial zone back to Residential zone.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>That Council consult with the submitters collectively before a decision is made on the zoning of their properties.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The houses are kauri cottages and will be designated as Heritage Buildings and Items under the Proposed District Plan. Changing the zoning of these properties to Light industrial seems to be counterproductive for any attempts or future requirements to preserve them. The submitters' properties have historically been classified as General Residential and the railway houses and use of the land has always been for housing. The proposed Light industrial zoning would make residential activities non-complying, leading to loss of residential activity rights for the submitters. The proposed Light industrial zoning does not align with the purpose of the Light industrial Zone stated in the Proposed District Plan. The intent of Light industrial zone policies LIZ-P1 and LIZ-P7 does not align with the existing residential use of the submitters' properties and land. The submitters' do not want other activities such as Industrial Activity and Community Corrections Activities permitted by rules LIZ-R3 and LIZ-R9 near their homes. They only want activities that are permitted in a residential zone. The submitters' properties are all privately owned and are subject to a cross-lease land title that has been in place since 1991. Therefore, establishing light industry on the submitters' properties would be financially and practically difficult process as it would require the agreement of all of the individual landowners for purchase of the land or establishment of light industry activities on the land. The effects of activities in the Light industrial zone including noise, odour, dust, fumes, smoke, and associated activities would have adverse effects on the quality of the lives of the submitters.
76.1	Huband Contractors Limited	Planning Maps	Amend	<p>AMEND the zoning of the property at 2088 Paparoa Valley Road from Rural lifestyle zone to Light industrial zone.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>AMEND the zoning of the neighbouring sites at 2074 and 2078 Paparoa Valley Road from Rural lifestyle zone to Light industrial zone.</p> <p>AND</p>	<p>2088 Paparoa Valley Road is currently utilised as a depot and operations yard by the submitter. The existing use of the site more closely aligns with the definition of Light industrial Activities under the Proposed District Plan. The activities on site do not reflect the typical expectations of the Rural lifestyle zone, which prioritises low-density rural living and lifestyle development. The submitter plans to expand industrial and contracting operations into the two</p>

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

VOLUME 1

(includes Submissions 1 – 100)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons
				<p>Make any consequential amendments necessary to give effect to the rezoning.</p> <p>Submission for map showing locations of sites sought to be rezoned.</p>	<p>additional sites at 2074 and 2078 Paparoa Valley Road.</p> <p>The proposed zoning change will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognise and legitimise the long-standing industrial use of the site. Provide certainty for the ongoing operation and future growth of Huband Contractors Limited. Enable better alignment between zoning provisions and on-the-ground activities. Avoid future consenting issues and potential non-compliances. Support the objectives of economic resilience and employment growth for the Kaipara District.
76.2	Huband Contractors Limited	Light industrial Zone	Support	RETAIN LIZ-O1.	The objective aligns with the submitter's operations and enables industrial growth in the region.
76.3	Huband Contractors Limited	Light industrial Zone	Support	RETAIN LIZ-P1.	The provision supports a wide range of activities suitable for the submitter's operations and is consistent with the purpose of the Light industrial zone.
76.4	Huband Contractors Limited	Light industrial Zone	Amend	<p>AMEND the activity status of LIZ-R4.2. as follows:</p> <p>2. Activity status where compliance not achieved: Discretionary <u>Restricted Discretionary</u>.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>AMEND the activity status of LIZ-R4.2. as follows:</p> <p>2. Activity status where compliance not achieved: Discretionary <u>Controlled</u>.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Insert relevant matters of discretion or control.</p>	There may be instances where sites can comfortably accommodate larger floor areas than permitted without compromising the function or character of the zone. Therefore, a more enabling activity status would be more appropriate in such cases, subject to relevant assessment criteria.
76.5	Huband Contractors Limited	Light industrial Zone	Amend	<p>AMEND the activity status of LIZ-R6.2. as follows:</p> <p>2. Activity status when compliance not achieved: Discretionary <u>Restricted Discretionary</u>.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>AMEND the activity status of LIZ-R6.2. as follows:</p> <p>2. Activity status when compliance not achieved: Discretionary <u>Controlled</u>.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Insert appropriate matters of discretion or control.</p>	The intent of the Light industrial Zone is to accommodate a broad range of industrial and supporting activities. The submitter opposes the Discretionary activity status as it places unnecessary constraints on sites that can comfortably accommodate larger buildings. The submitter considers that a more enabling activity status such as Restricted Discretionary would enable appropriate assessment without unduly limiting development potential aligned with the purpose of the zone.
76.6	Huband Contractors Limited	Light industrial Zone	Amend	<p>AMEND LIZ-S8 to reduce the minimum depth of the landscape strip from 2 m to 1.5 m, particularly along internal road boundaries or where site constraints limit available space as follows (inferred as submission referred to LIZ-S4 but content of submission related to LIZ-S8 Landscaping):</p> <p>AND</p> <p>AMEND LIZ-S8 (inferred) to allow for alternative screening measures, such as fencing, earth bunding, or other form of screening, to be considered in place of full vegetative screening where appropriate.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>AMEND LIZ-S8 (inferred) to clarify that the landscaping requirement applies only where a Light industrial zone directly adjoins a more sensitive zone (i.e., a shared boundary), not where zones are separated by roads or other buffers.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>AMEND LIZ-S8 (inferred) to provide discretion for Council to waive or modify the requirement for landscaping based on site-specific context, existing vegetation, or functional layout of the site.</p>	Landscaping requirements should be balanced to support industrial functionality and not reduce useable land area. The submitter supports the intention of the landscaping provision to manage visual amenity and interface effects between Light industrial activities and more sensitive zones. However, the submitter requests amendments to allow greater flexibility for industrial operators while still maintaining appropriate site screening and amenity outcomes.
76.7	Huband Contractors Limited	Planning Maps		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No specific decision requested but submitter supports submission 52 (note 	

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 1
(includes Submissions 1 – 100)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons
				<p>this is possibly a reference to submission point 222.60 of Kaipara District Council).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submission from Kaipara District Council seeks a zoning change at 2088 Paparua Valley Road to Commercial zone, but the submitter (Huband Contractors Ltd) notes that their preferred zoning is Light industrial, not an alternative zone. 	
77.1	Richard (Rick) Ruiterman	Planning Maps	Amend	<p>AMEND the zoning of 3956 Paul Road (Lot 2 DP 328843) in Mangawhai from General rural zone to Rural lifestyle zone.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refer to Figures 1 and 2 of attached pdf submission delineating location of submitter's site requested to be rezoned. 	<p>Refer to pdf of submission for detailed reasons. Reasons are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The character and amenity of the site is consistent with large lot residential or rural residential zone. The property does not fit with the purpose of the General rural zone. The General rural zone fails to enable the sustainable use and development of the site. The purpose of a rural lifestyle zone is predominantly for residential activities larger than those of the low density residential and general residential zones where there are landscape characteristics, physical limitations or other constraints to other more intensive development. The section 32 report for the rural zones does not provide any justification or evaluation of the extent or zone and appears to follow an arbitrary cadastral boundary. The site is considered materially compromised for rural production activities due to the existing fragmentation and potential for reverse sensitivity effects. <p>The focus of GRUZ-O1 is on primary production activities and protection of Highly Productive Land but the submitter considers that large areas can no longer support primary production activities given the existing and consented cadastral pattern.</p>
77.2	Richard (Rick) Ruiterman	Planning Maps	Amend	<p>AMEND the application of the General rural and Rural lifestyle zoning across the District so that it is applied consistently and reflects existing and consented cadastral patterns.</p> <p>Submission points relating to fragmentation, maximum parent lot size, Mangawhai/Hakaru Managed Growth Area, and impervious surfaces are addressed in separate submission points.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The application of rural zoning (General rural and Rural lifestyle zones) in the Proposed District Plan is inconsistent. The submitter provides examples such as Takahoa Bay which is a rural development in Oneriri that is proposed to be Rural lifestyle zone but developments such as "Lake View Estate" of Devich Road, Mangawhai and Paul Road Development have been proposed as General rural zone. Rural areas which have already been fragmented into rural residential lots such as Paul Road, Lake View Estate, the sanctuary, Mangawhai, King Road, Mangawhai have been zoned general rural and areas such as Paparua surrounds are to be rural lifestyle further fragmenting larger blocks of rural land. Submitter is concerned that clusters of 4,000m² lots does not align with a General rural zone and in these cases, Rural lifestyle zone would be more appropriate. <p>The focus of GRUZ-O1 is on primary production activities and protection of Highly Productive Land but the submitter considers that large areas can no longer support primary production activities given the existing and consented cadastral pattern.</p>
77.3	Richard (Rick) Ruiterman	Planning Maps	Amend	<p>AMEND the zoning of "Lake View Estate" on Devich Road from General rural zone to Rural lifestyle zone.</p> <p>Refer to the map on page 10 of submission showing the Devich Road site.</p>	<p>Refer to the submission for detailed reasons. Reasons are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The character and amenity of the site is consistent with large lot residential or rural residential zone. The property does not fit with the purpose of the General rural zone. The General rural zone fails to enable the sustainable use and development of the site. The purpose of a rural lifestyle zone is predominantly for residential activities larger than those of the low density residential and general residential zones where there are landscape characteristics, physical

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

VOLUME 1

(includes Submissions 1 – 100)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons
					<p>limitations or other constraints to other more intensive development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The section 32 report for the rural zones does not provide any justification or evaluation of the extent or zone and appears to follow an arbitrary cadastral boundary. The site is considered materially compromised for rural production activities due to the existing fragmentation and potential for reverse sensitivity effects. The focus of GRUZ-O1 is on primary production activities and protection of Highly Productive Land but the submitter considers that large areas can no longer support primary production activities given the existing and consented cadastral pattern.
77.4	Richard (Rick) Ruiterman	Planning Maps		DELETE the Mangawhai/Hakaru Managed Growth Area overlay from the rural areas of Mangawhai.	<p>Submitter raises general concern that the application of the Mangawhai/Hakaru Growth Area overlay is a very broad approach to managing infrastructure and appears to be inconsistently applied. The submitter also raises concern that the Mangawhai/Hakaru Growth Area overlay has been applied to the rural zone surrounding Mangawhai despite rural lots having self-contained three waters infrastructure.</p>
77.5	Richard (Rick) Ruiterman	Urban Form and Development	Oppose	DELETE SD-UFD-P7.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SD-UFD-P7 is inconsistent with FC-O1. <p>Infrastructure and services can be provided to meet the requirements of urban areas without applying an arbitrary spatial limitation.</p>
77.7	Richard (Rick) Ruiterman	Subdivision	Oppose	AMEND the minimum lot size for subdivision in the General rural zone from 12ha to 20ha.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The subdivision rules for the General Rural Zone will not achieve the outcomes sought by SUB-O3. The provision for 12ha lots and the expansive application of the General rural zone across the district will result in unnecessary fragmentation. General rural areas are being allowed to be fragmented which is contradictory to the objectives for the zone. Rural areas which have already been fragmented into rural residential lots such as Paul Road, Lake View Estate, the sanctuary, Mangawhai, King Road, Mangawhai have been zoned general rural and areas such a Paparoa surrounds are to be rural lifestyle further fragmenting larger blocks of rural land.
77.8	Richard (Rick) Ruiterman	Subdivision	Oppose	DELETE SUB-R3.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development should not be limited by the Mangawhai/Hakaru Managed Growth Area.
77.9	Richard (Rick) Ruiterman	General Residential Zone	Amend	AMEND GRZ-R11 to allow only 40% of the site area to be impervious except where a suitable stormwater attenuation report is provided which then enables an increase to 60% impervious surface area as a permitted activity.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is an existing stormwater problem in the Mangawhai region this rule will only serve to exacerbate the problem.
77.11	Richard (Rick) Ruiterman	Subdivision	Oppose	No specific decision sought however the submission refers to SUB-P12 and does not support the limitation of development based upon the proposed Mangawhai/Hakaru Managed Growth Area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The application of the managed growth zone around the Mangawhai region is a very broad-brush approach to managing infrastructure and it appears to be inconstantly applied. Baylys beach has been marked for residential expansion yet has limited public sewer available (KDC GIS Assets). Whereas, Mangawhai has an extensive existing wastewater scheme and is marked for Managed growth. The Managed Growth Area is proposed to manage growth to align with infrastructure development. However, this has been applied to the rural zone surrounding Mangawhai despite rural lots being self-contained with sanitary sewer, stormwater and potable water on-site.
77.12	Richard (Rick) Ruiterman	Subdivision	Oppose	DELETE SUB-R4. OR AMEND SUB-R4 to limit the parent lot size to 5ha.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This rule seeks to fragment rural allotments with no limit on parent lot size. General rural areas are being allowed to be fragmented, in contradiction to the General rural zone objectives.
77.13	Richard (Rick) Ruiterman	General Rural Zone	Amend	AMEND GRUZ-O1 to better zoning to match the existing and consented cadastral pattern.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GRUZ-O1 outlines the purpose of the General rural zone, however the focus of this objective is on primary production activities and protection of

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

VOLUME 1

(includes Submissions 1 – 100)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons
					Highly Productive Land. Large areas can no longer support primary production activities given the cadastral pattern.
78.1	Bruce Yang	Planning Maps	Support	RETAIN the prevention of intensification of the Mangawhai southeastern boundary consistent with the Spatial Plan and prior community consultation. The submission supports not expanding development across the east of Mangawhai estuary and within the coastal environment for sustainability, not over-extending infrastructure (wastewater) and consolidating already developing zones.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter has been a summer resident of Mangawhai for over 30 years and helps to maintain the natural environment. The Mangawhai Spatial Plan and Proposed District Plan direction to not intensify the southeastern boundary of Mangawhai is supported.
79.1	Christopher Rea	Planning Maps	Support	RETAIN the proposed Rural lifestyle zoning of the Paparoa/Pahi area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The area would benefit from an increase in population to revitalise the Paparoa community and its services, including medical and retail.
79.2	Christopher Rea	Subdivision		RETAIN SUB-S1 Minimum allotment sizes (excluding access legs) of 4000m ² for Rural lifestyle zone.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No reasons provided.
80.1	David Clarke	Planning Maps	Oppose	<p>AMEND the zoning of the Oneriri area from Rural lifestyle zone back to the Operative District Plan zoning.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Undertake further geotechnical and ecological assessments before considering any future zoning proposals in the area.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Engage meaningfully with affected landowners and communities to ensure planning decisions reflect local values and environmental constraints.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental and ecological concerns. - Oneriri Peninsula is home to ecologically sensitive environments. Rezoning the area to Rural lifestyle to allow for increased subdivision poses significant risks to these habitats. Conflict with existing resource consents and land covenants. - Rezoning is in direct conflict with covenants and constitution of Hinamoki Estate Residents Society Inc., including density, design, design controls, ecological protections, infrastructure limitations and covenants. Geological and infrastructural limitations. - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The land in the Oneriri development is geologically unsuitable for intensive development. Subdivision down to 4,000m² lots would increase the risk of erosion, slope failure, and contamination of groundwater and surface water systems. Infrastructure in Oneriri area is inadequate to support proposed level of development and is already under pressure from current development. Inconsistency with Council's original vision for the Oneriri area. - Original vision was to maintain the area as a high-value, low-density lifestyle estate. Proposed rezoning is contradictory to this vision and risk eroding the unique character and amenity of the areas. Contradiction with the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land - Oneriri area may not fall under the strict definition of Highly Productive Land but section 32 report acknowledges importance of protecting rural land from fragmentation and revers sensitivity effects. The proposed rezoning to Rural lifestyle would contribute to land fragmentation and reduce viability of surrounding rural production activities.
81.1	Ngairé Hames	SCHED1 – Historic Heritage Resources	Oppose	<p>DELETE the Former Pahi Hotel (HH-PAH-02) from SCHED1.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>AMEND Historic Heritage provisions relevant to the Former Pahi Hotel (HH-PAH-02) as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove the requirement for the house to be painted certain colours in keeping with its history; Remove the requirement for use of historically accurate materials; Remove the inability to part demolish the property; Recognise that there will be no archaeological significance of its surrounds; and Retain protection of the structure from being demolished. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter opposes the Former Pahi Hotel being listed within SCHED1. It is now a private residence and there have been several alterations made to the building, such that it is no longer historically accurate. These changes include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changing windows into doors; Adding decking; Removing fire escapes; Adding a new garage; Repainting to a different colour; and a rock wall built to protect the house from floodwaters. None of the changes above are in keeping with the original hotel and there is unlikely to be anything of archaeological significance owing to the area having been surrounded

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

VOLUME 1

(includes Submissions 1 – 100)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons
				<p>AND</p> <p>Kaipara District Council to cover any resource consent costs associated with Historic Heritage provisions.</p>	<p>by beach and therefore unlikely to hold evidence of human life pre-1900.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter supports protecting the building from being demolished and acknowledges it does have some historical significance but opposes all other provisions and requests its removal from SCHED1.
81.2	Ngairé Hames	SCHED1 – Historic Heritage Resources		<p>RETAIN the provision that the Former Pahi Hotel (HH-PAH-02) building not be demolished.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>DELETE the Former Pahi Hotel (HH-PAH-02) from SCHED1-Historic Heritage Resources.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter agrees that the Former Pahi Hotel should be protected from being demolished owing to its historical significance but requests that this is the only provision retained in relation to the site.
82.1	James Dow	Subdivision	Amend	<p>AMEND SUB-R3 activity status from discretionary to controlled for subdivisions within the developed part of Mangawhai Heads township where SUB-S1 to SUB-S15 are complied with.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A discretionary activity status should not apply to the areas of Mangawhai that were developed a long time ago and feature very few properties that could be subdivided and achieve a minimum lot size of 600m². The submitter considers that the discretionary activity status (for subdivision within already developed parts of Mangawhai) imposed by the Mangawhai/Hakaru Managed Growth Area Overlay too prohibitive and unjustifiable. As stated, there are minimal properties able to be subdivided further and application of the restrictive Growth Area Overlay to those areas already developed is not in line with Policy SUB-P12. The area near the estuary and Wood Street shops is the well-established core of the Mangawhai Heads township and should be afforded infrastructure in the first instance in any subdivision scenario. If there are limitations on Council infrastructure, this core area should be prioritised and Council should not be free to decide whether to develop new areas over those that are existing within the Mangawhai/Hakaru Managed Growth Area.
83.1	Melissa McMahon	Planning Maps	Oppose	<p>AMEND the zoning of the property at 7 Blakey Road, Maungatūroto to either residential in keeping with the Operative District Plan or another suitable alternative.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter owns the property at number 7 Blakey Road in Maungatūroto which is a 1940s two-bedroom cottage on some 814m² of land. Since purchasing the property in 2016, the submitter has carried out extensive renovations and significant landscaping. The property is surrounded by commercial and residential activities, and this mixed use works well for those who reside in the area. The submitter considers the proposed rezoning of their property from Residential to Light industrial Zone will disadvantage them by reducing its market value and restricting residential use. The property at 7 Blakey Road being within the Light industrial Zone is opposed for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The property is too small to develop for industrial purposes. Existing adjacent commercial properties are already developed and therefore, do not require the submitters land for any extensions. There is a stream which runs through the adjoining site, meaning any industrial activity would be inappropriate, restricted and costly. Therefore, development of that site for industrial purposes is unlikely. The property adjoining the rear of 7 Blakey Road is an operational farm set to retain rural zoning (i.e., zoning appropriate for the existing activity). There is no reason why adjoining properties cannot be in different zones. Bank lending for the property might be subject to commercial lending which is more onerous and restrictive than residential. Future purchasers will be put off by the property being within an industrial zone.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 1
(includes Submissions 1 – 100)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The property is located at the end of a cul-de-sac with limited availability for parking or manoeuvring large vehicles. • Additional use of Blakey Road for commercial purposes is undesirable from a safety perspective without improvements being made to the intersection of Blakey and Whakapirau Roads and State Highway 12.
83.2	Melissa McMahon	Planning Maps	Oppose	AMEND the zoning of the land along State Highway 12 and Whakapirau Road in Maungatūroto.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes the notified Heavy Industrial zoning of land along State Highway 12 and Whakapirau Road (e.g., 1066 SH12 Maungatūroto-Paparua, Otamatea/Central). By definition, the Heavy Industrial Zone is for activities which generate potentially significant adverse effects. Heavy industrial activities should not be near residential zones and the area subject to this submission is within proximity to the school and outer reaches of the Maungatūroto township. • The submitter considers that any Heavy Industrial Zone should be further away and suggests the proposed zoning assumes the notified Light industrial zoning of adjacent sites such as those on Blakey Road will remain. • Potential traffic generated by Heavy Industrial zoning is of concern. This is not the right area to enable an increase in heavy vehicle traffic owing to there being nearby accessways leading to residential and commercial properties. • It is requested that Council find a different location for the Heavy Industrial Zone.
84.1	Te Uri o Hau	Coastal Environment	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 landowners beyond what already exists.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 High Natural Character Area and Outstanding Natural Character Area - 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"> ○ The submitter considers Council should be managing adverse coastal effects on the coast before putting extra cost and restriction on private landowners beyond what already exists. • The preservation of the natural character of the coastal environment (inferred as submission relates to CE-O1) has previously been addressed by the High Natural Character Area and Outstanding Natural Character Area 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.
84.2	Te Uri o Hau	Coastal Environment	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 extra cost and restriction on private landowners beyond what already exists.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 High Natural Character Area and Outstanding Natural Character Area - 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

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

VOLUME 1

(includes Submissions 1 – 100)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons
					<p>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"> ○ Managing adverse effects on the natural character of the coastal environment (inferred as submission relates to CE-P1) has previously been addressed by the High Natural Character Area and Outstanding Natural Character Area 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.
84.3	Te Uri o Hau	Coastal Environment	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"> ● Existing coastal settlements are limited and unsuitable for larger lifestyle opportunities. ● 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. ● The Coastal Environment chapter does not provide direction on subdivision other than it is likely to be costly. ● The submitters land is not productive and, therefore, suited for living whilst respecting the coastal environment. ● 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.
84.4	Te Uri o Hau	Coastal Environment	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"> ● Existing coastal settlements are limited and unsuitable for larger lifestyle opportunities. ● 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. ● The Coastal Environment chapter does not provide direction on subdivision other than it is likely to be costly. ● The submitters land is not productive and, therefore, suited for living whilst respecting the coastal environment. ● Should Council want to protect a large area of land within a coastal reserve of sorts, then coastal properties should be bought.
84.5	Te Uri o Hau	Coastal Environment	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"> ● The submitter questions who gets to determine whether there is a functional need for a building or activity within the coastal environment. ● 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.
84.6	Te Uri o Hau	Coastal Environment	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"> ● 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. ● The submitter owns a large property, much of which is within the coastal environment and resource consent pathways are uncertain, costly and onerous. ● Obtaining professional help means spending more money to obtain consents for proposals

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 1
(includes Submissions 1 – 100)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons
					which might not be visually connected to the coast. Money could be spent on the land instead.
84.7	Te Uri o Hau	Coastal Environment	Oppose	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 the coastal environment without really showing how the word "restricted" is applied, is not appropriate.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. The submitter owns a large property, much of which is within the coastal environment and resource consent pathways are uncertain, costly and onerous. 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.
84.8	Te Uri o Hau	Coastal Environment	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"> The rule does not consider size and/or position. 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. The submitter questions why coastal environment rural land should be treated differently? 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.
84.9	Te Uri o Hau	Coastal Environment	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"> The rule does not consider size and/or position. 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. The submitter questions why coastal environment rural land should be treated differently? 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.
84.10	Te Uri o Hau	Coastal Environment	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"> The rule does not consider size and/or position. 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. The submitter questions why coastal environment rural land should be treated differently? 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.
84.11	Te Uri o Hau	Coastal Environment	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"> The rule does not consider size and/or position. 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. The submitter questions why coastal environment rural land should be treated differently?

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 1
(includes Submissions 1 – 100)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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.
84.12	Te Uri o Hau	Coastal Environment	Oppose	AMEND CE-S1 so that the building height is 10m to match the Rural zone.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter asks how it can 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. 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 Outstanding Natural Character Area zones mostly completely out of view from the coast. The submitter believes this is wrong.
84.13	Te Uri o Hau	Coastal Environment	Amend	AMEND 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"> 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. 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. 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.
85.1	Dominic Leigh	Coastal Environment	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 landowners beyond what already exists.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 High Natural Character Area and Outstanding Natural Character Area - 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"> ix. The preservation of the natural character if the coastal environment (inferred as submission relates to CE-O1) has previously been addressed by the High Natural Character Area and Outstanding Natural Character Area 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

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 1
(includes Submissions 1 – 100)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons
					and is unrestricted and subject to minimal policing.
85.2	Dominic Leigh	Coastal Environment	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 landowners beyond what already exists.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 High Natural Character Area and Outstanding Natural Character Area - 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: Managing adverse effects on the natural character of the coastal environment (inferred as submission relates to CE-P1) has previously been addressed by the High Natural Character Area and Outstanding Natural Character Area 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.
85.3	Dominic Leigh	Coastal Environment	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"> 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. The Coastal Environment chapter does not provide direction on subdivision other than it is likely to be costly. The submitters land is not productive and, therefore, suited for living whilst respecting the coastal environment. 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.
85.4	Dominic Leigh	Coastal Environment	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"> 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. The Coastal Environment chapter does not provide direction on subdivision other than it is likely to be costly. The submitters land is not productive and, therefore, suited for living whilst respecting the coastal environment. Should Council want to protect a large area of land within a coastal reserve of sorts, then coastal properties should be bought.
85.5	Dominic Leigh	Coastal Environment	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"> 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. The submitter's property is privately-owned, and Clause 7 would give too much weight to a third party rather than landowners reasonable plans.
85.6	Dominic Leigh	Coastal Environment	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"> The submitters own a large property, much of which is within the coastal environment and resource consent pathways are uncertain, costly and onerous. 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.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 1
(includes Submissions 1 – 100)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons
85.7	Dominic Leigh	Coastal Environment	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"> The submitter owns a large property, much of which is within the coastal environment and resource consent pathways are uncertain, costly and onerous. 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.
85.8	Dominic Leigh	Coastal Environment	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"> The rule does not consider size and/or position. Much of the submitter's land is within the coastal environment but is largely paddocks, i.e., rural land. 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? 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.
85.9	Dominic Leigh	Coastal Environment	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"> The rule does not consider size and/or position. Much of the submitter's land is within the coastal environment but is largely paddocks, i.e., rural land. 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? 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.
85.10	Dominic Leigh	Coastal Environment	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"> Much of the submitter's land is within the coastal environment but is largely paddocks, i.e., rural land. 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? 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.
85.11	Dominic Leigh	Coastal Environment	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 reasonable. Any restrictions should be based on area not lots.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The rule does not consider size and/or position. Much of the submitter's land is within the coastal environment but is largely paddocks, i.e., rural land. 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? 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.
85.12	Dominic Leigh	Coastal Environment	Oppose	AMEND CE-S1 so that the building height is 10m to match the Rural zone.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter asks how it can 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. As an example of how inappropriate this is, the submitter notes that the block to their south

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 1
(includes Submissions 1 – 100)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons
					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 High Natural Character Area and Outstanding Natural Character Area zones mostly completely out of view from the coast. The submitter believes this is wrong.
85.13	Dominic Leigh	Planning Maps	Amend	AMEND the extent of the Coastal Environment to reduce the area so it runs parallel to the coast (inferred) with the view from the coast being the other consideration.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 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. 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.
86.1	Blair Hilditch	Planning Maps	Oppose	DELETE the Mangawhai/Hakaru Managed Growth Area, in particular as it applies to 28 Bush Lane, Mangawhai.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposes the site-specific controls that apply to the property at 28 Bush Lane being within the Mangawhai/Hakaru Managed Growth Area. The submitter considers the Managed Growth Area to be contrary to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development as it does not allow for the growth of Mangawhai in an area within proximity to the township and amenities. Mangawhai Heads cannot grow to the east, as it meets the sea. Therefore, it can only grow west which is where the Managed Growth Area and the submitter's property is. Under the Operative District Plan, sites toward the end of King Road can be subdivided down to 4,00m² which results in more affordable and accessible lifestyle properties. The area has a mixture of olive groves, vineyards, farm shops and galleries etc. The area is a tourist destination for those visiting Mangawhai and the Council should encourage growth rather than restricting it. The Mangawhai/Hakaru Managed Growth Area is an unnecessary constraint on growth and the submitter requests it is removed.
87.1	Laura Allen-Andrews	General	Oppose	PROVIDE a comprehensive independent impact study on the environment and health of Kaipara Harbour. AND PROVIDE for an increase in budget allocation to maintain infrastructure and services in order to accommodate potential growth within the Otamatea and Kaipara area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposes the Rural lifestyle zone minimum lot size being 4,000m² and building area being 1,000m². While not opposed to smaller secondary dwellings (i.e., granny flats) the submitter is opposed to the Rural lifestyle zone minimum lot size or the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Areas including the Pahi peninsula, Petley Road and Tinopai all run-off into the Kaipara Harbour and are proposed as being rezoned. The submitter notes that no comprehensive environmental impact assessment has been undertaken, in order to understand the potential long-term effects of intensification of land bordering the Harbour. Increased housing will increase hardstand surfaces and decrease permeability, resulting in increased sediment flow into the harbour.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 1
(includes Submissions 1 – 100)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Enabling development will increase instability, especially as the area is already prone to slips. This could lead to further deterioration of roads which are already not adequately maintained within the submitter's area. Roading within the area is already failing and not able to accommodate the type of development proposed. For example, a slip has ruined the south-bound lane of the road to Pahi Wharf, and this has not been fixed for years. • The submitter requests that a comprehensive independent impact study on the environment and health of Kaipara Harbour is undertaken and budget is allocated for the maintenance of infrastructure in the area. Without knowing the long-term effects of development, the submitter opposes proposed Rural lifestyle zone minimum lot size.
87.2	Laura Allen-Andrews	Planning Maps	Amend	AMEND the extent of Commercial zoning for Paparaoa.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter questions why the commercial area in Paparaoa has not been increased. There is a lack of amenities/infrastructure capable of servicing the potential increase in population which could result from the proposed zoning. By increasing the extent of Commercial Zone in Paparaoa, it will enable services to locate here and serve residents. • It is noted that the Council has left the sewerage issue within the Paparaoa township Commercial zone untouched. As such, the submitter has little confidence in Council's decision-making for the long-term benefit of residents. There are programs to increase water quality of the Kaipara harbour, yet Council allow sewerage to flow into tidal rivers. Such actions inhibit the success of programs such as the Paparaoa whitebait project.
87.3	Laura Allen-Andrews	Subdivision	Oppose	No specific decision requested; however the submission opposes the 4,000m ² minimum site size for the Rural lifestyle zone due to the potential effects.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Particularly noting the areas on the Kaipara district plan, where the rezoning has chosen areas such as Pahi peninsula, Petley Road and Tinopai that all run off into the Kaipara Harbour. I believe there has not been a comprehensive impact environmental study to look at the long term effect of such intensification on the land bordering the Kaipara harbour and what significance this could have on the health of our beautiful harbour which has drawn many to the area. • Without knowing the long term effect for our area, the submitter is against the current proposed minimum sizing of 4000sqm for the Rural lifestyle zone.
88.1	James Diamond	Planning Maps	Support	RETAIN the commercial zoning proposed for properties bordering Bayly's Coast Road.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This change will provide an opportunity to develop commercial services that Bayly's Beach needs.
88.2	James Diamond	Planning Maps	Support	RETAIN the rezoning of land bordering the Northern Wairoa Golf Course as residential with a part of overlay of commercial.	<p>The submitter supports the rezoning of this land for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will accommodate and foster sustainable growth, enhance community development and contribute to the economic vitality of the region. • It will provide for additional housing and open up the housing market, • It will provide the possibility of pedestrian access and connectivity to Baylys Beach, • It will provide the opportunity to provide recreation areas, and offer vegetation/dune restoration and enhancements, • It gives opportunity to provide better access and road planning, • Extending residential zoning in an 'even direction' is easier on the community, • If a development plan is accepted by Council, then Council will benefit from an increased rate intake, • Rezoning will promote the ability for industrial/commercial businesses to operate

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

VOLUME 1

(includes Submissions 1 – 100)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> in Baylys Beach, and for services to expand outside of Dargaville with more demand, and The Bayly's Beach economy will be improved.
89.1	HWA KIAT LOW	Subdivision	Support	RETAIN the subdivision provisions for the Rural lifestyle zone, applicable to 23 Hinamoki Drive, Kaiwaka.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Subdivision can provide opportunities for regional development, economic diversification, community sustainability, Subdivision can create smaller more manageable properties that can support types of land use which contribute to the local economy, Subdivision can encourage population growth in rural areas which helps to sustain education and healthcare facilities and services, <p>Subdivision can preserve New Zealand's natural heritage with appropriate planning and environmental safeguards.</p>
89.2	HWA KIAT LOW	General	Amend	PROVIDE lower rates for vacant land.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is an economic burden for investors to have vacant land which has high rates without any benefit.
90.1	Danielle Green	Planning Maps	Support	RETAIN the rezoning to allow subdivision and benefit the Matakoho, Paparua, Maungatūroto and Pahi communities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter supports rezoning as it will allow for subdivision.
90.2	Danielle Green	General	Support	RETAIN the changes within the proposed district plan.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitted believes these changes will benefit the Matakoho, Paparua, Maungatūroto, and Pahi communities.
91.1	Joel Green	Planning Maps	Support	RETAIN the rezoning to allow subdivision and benefit the Matakoho, Paparua, Maungatūroto and Pahi communities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter supports rezoning as it will allow for subdivision.
91.2	Joel Green	General	Support	RETAIN the changes within the proposed district plan.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitted believes these changes will benefit the Matakoho, Paparua, Maungatūroto, and Pahi communities.
92.1	Kim Bolton-Stewart	Subdivision	Oppose	AMEND the Proposed District Plan to prevent an increase in the number of dwellings on the access way for 956 Oneriri Road, Kaiwaka.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter has requested this relief for the following reasons: Any further subdivision and further development on the submitters shared accessway is undesirable, Further subdivision and development would hinder lifestyle quality and lower valuations, The access to the site (and others on the shared access) is unsafe for an increase in vehicles and residents, Further subdivision and development will affect the submitters BNB business, Additional development will adversely affect the ecology of the Kaipara Harbour.
92.2	Kim Bolton-Stewart	General	Amend	AMEND the Proposed District Plan so that all waterways, drainage areas as riparian zones and these are fenced and planted in native species i.e. flax to mitigate runoff of silt and pollutants and restore native birds.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter has requested the above relief to protect the ecology of Kaipara Harbour.
92.3	Kim Bolton-Stewart	Subdivision	Support	AMEND the Proposed District Plan to require subdivisions to enable public access to the foreshore and harbour.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter is of the opinion that open space for the public is necessary. Every resident should be entitled to visit the foreshore and gain access to the harbour.
92.4	Kim Bolton-Stewart	General	Amend	No specific decision requested; however the submitter expresses concern that an increase in people brings an increase in predator species including cats which kill shore birds.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No reasons provided.
92.5	Kim Bolton-Stewart	General	Amend	PROVIDE public access to recreation directly off a road without exclusive gated communities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter has requested the above relief to enable public access to recreation. The submitter supports walkways, parkland, cultural and reserve zone for all people.
92.6	Kim Bolton-Stewart	General	Amend	UNDERTAKE an engineering assessment of Oneriri Road and fix the roads.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter is disappointed with the state of the roading infrastructure of Oneriri Road, and the access to State Highway 1.
92.7	Kim Bolton-Stewart	Subdivision	Amend	AMEND the Proposed District Plan to not allow more subdivision and dwellings on small, limited width access ways with poor access and which	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety and amenity effects.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

VOLUME 1

(includes Submissions 1 – 100)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons
				are unsafe for increase in number of vehicles and potential residents.	
93.1	Sin Yee Phang	Planning Maps	Oppose	DELETE the proposed Rural lifestyle zone for the area around 3 Country Heights Terrace, Kaiwaka. AND RETAIN the existing zone in the Operative District Plan.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The zone change will increase traffic volumes, The community sewerage system has limited capacity for 60 households only, Electricity and power provision has limited capacity for 60 households only, There may be an increase in light pollution, The surrounding environment will change from a low-density rural environment, The environment, wildlife, bush blocks and harbour protection may be compromised.
94.1	Jackie Green	Planning Maps	Support	RETAIN the rezoning outlined in the Proposed District Plan.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter is of the opinion that the proposed changes will benefit the Matakoho, Paparoa, Maungatūroto and Pahi communities.
95.1	Pearl Williams	Planning Maps	Amend	ADD more residential zoning in Tinopai. Submission mentions Sandy Beach Road adjacent current residential zoning.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter is of the opinion that there is not enough residential zoning, or residential properties available in the Tinopai area.
96.1	Progressive Paparoa	Planning Maps	Amend	AMEND the commercial zoning in Paparoa to include the whole 'main road' between the 70km signs in Paparoa Township including a continuation up Franklyn Road, and Paparoa Oakleigh Road.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensures there is room for the commercial growth of Paparoa in future. There is a lack of diversity in the zoning of Paparoa. There is no room for commercial or industrial growth which will be the saviour for our town and its long term economic viability.
97.1	Alan Williams	Planning Maps	Support	RETAIN the Rural lifestyle zone on Oneriri Road, Kaiwaka.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This zoning is logical for the area, particularly given the type of development existing in the surrounding environment, and the proximity to Kaiwaka. The road is tar sealed and there is already this type of development in the area at Takahora Drive and Hinamoki Drive. This side of the road is more lifestyle blocks already.
98.1	DEAN WILLIAMS	Planning Maps	Support	RETAIN the Rural lifestyle zone on Oneriri Road, Kaiwaka.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This zoning is logical for the area, particularly given the type of development existing in the surrounding environment, and the proximity to Kaiwaka. The road is tar sealed and there is already this type of development in the area Takahora Drive and Hinamoki Drive. This side of the road is more lifestyle blocks already.
99.1	Venessa Anich	Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	AMEND NFL-P3 to include reference to Ripiro Beach and the Wild West Coast Outstanding Natural Landscape (West Coast Ocean Beach).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It has "special characteristics for Kaipara District."
99.2	Venessa Anich	Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	RETAIN the statement in the Overview of the Natural Features and Landscapes chapter that Outstanding Natural Landscapes are undeveloped and should be protected from inappropriate subdivision and development, as a Part II Resource Management Act matter and should be protected as per New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement requirements. AND ADD a statement to the Overview in the Natural Features and Landscapes chapter that the intention of the District Plan for Outstanding Natural Landscapes to remain undeveloped.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No reasons provided.
99.3	Venessa Anich	Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	ADD to NFL-P6.4 that buildings should not be visible within the Outstanding Natural Landscape West Coast Ocean Beach from Ripiro beach, including at low tide.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ripiro Beach is worthy of special mention because of its unique characteristics of being the Wild West Coast. Built form visible from the beach detracts from the unique characteristics, with the exception of established communities like Baylys or Glinks Gully. Ripiro Beach needs to be protected from development being visible from the beach even at low tide.
99.4	Venessa Anich	Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	ADD to NFL-P3 provision to mention Ripiro Beach as being the Wild West Coast.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter requests including Ripiro Beach as being the Wild West Coast to this provision.
99.5	Venessa Anich	Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	AMEND NFL-R2 to clarify how the rule controls new buildings and structures in the Coastal Environment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is unclear which sub part of this rule controls new buildings and structures in an Outstanding Natural Landscape in the Coastal Environment.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

VOLUME 1

(includes Submissions 1 – 100)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons
99.6	Venessa Anich	Coastal Environment	Amend	RETAIN 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 ADD 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"> No reasons provided.
99.7	Venessa Anich	Coastal Environment	Amend	ADD 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"> This is a very special part of Kaipara District and is under pressure from development. Other west coast beaches like Muriwai have become developed or restricted resulting in additional pressure on Ripiro Beach as those folk move north. Properties with riparian rights can build close to the beach, or within view of beach users altering the special wild west coast characteristics.
99.8	Venessa Anich	Coastal Environment	Amend	ADD 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"> Ripiro Beach and the West Coast is a special area of Kaipara District and needs to be protected from inappropriate use and development. Its character is being adversely affected by the visibility of buildings from the beach. Built form should not be visible from the beach even at low tide.
99.9	Venessa Anich	Coastal Environment	Amend	ADD 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"> 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.
99.10	Venessa Anich	Open Space Zone	Amend	ADD to the Overview Statement in the Open space zone acknowledgement of equestrian uses as one of the types of public access use.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Horse riding in appropriate parts of the Open Space Zone should be supported as this is a large part of the Kaipara District's community. The definition of Recreational Activities does not preclude horse riding.
99.11	Venessa Anich	Open Space Zone	Support	RETAIN OSZ-O2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter seeks to retain OSZ-O2 as horse riding is included within the definition of Recreational Activities.
99.12	Venessa Anich	Open Space Zone	Support	RETAIN OSZ-P1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter seeks to retain this provision due to horse riding being included within the definition of Recreational Activities.
99.13	Venessa Anich	Open Space Zone	Amend	ADD to OSZ-R3 the requirement for equestrian paths and connections.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Horse riding is a large part of the Kaipara District communities and should be provided for. It is an active mode of transport, equally as important as walking and cycling.
99.14	Venessa Anich	Public Access	Amend	ADD to the Overview Statement for the Public Access chapter acknowledgement that users of unformed legal roads can be walking, cycling and horse riders.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Kaipara District has an abundance of unformed legal roads and this roading network is a valuable asset for these types of transport.
100.1	Fiona Stark	Planning Maps	Oppose	RETAIN Rural lifestyle zoning of Petley Road area subject to amendments sought to minimum lot size elsewhere in submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No reasons provided.
100.2	Fiona Stark	Subdivision	Oppose	AMEND the minimum lot size for the Rural lifestyle zone to a minimum of 3 acres (approximately 12,000 m ²) for the Petley Road area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This would better reflect the rural setting and align with the expectations of current residents who value space, privacy, and a natural environment. Limit the number of small lots created in any one subdivision. Traffic and road safety concerns. Lack of infrastructure and services. Environmental impact. Access and land productivity will be impacted. The areas around Petley Road are rural localities and lack essential services. Densities expected in the Rural lifestyle zone are more appropriate for semi-urban areas.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 1
(includes Submissions 1 – 100)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons
100.3	Fiona Stark	Rural lifestyle zone	Oppose	<p>ADD requirement for public notification for all proposed developments within the Rural lifestyle zone in the Petley Road area.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>No specific decision requested, but submitter requests that each development proposed is assessed individually with regard to its social and environmental impacts.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public notification ensures that residents have the opportunity to be informed and to participate in decisions that may affect their community. Many current residents are actively committed to the restoration of native bush and the health of the harbour. Development should not undermine these ongoing efforts, which contribute significantly to the long-term wellbeing of the area.
					<ul style="list-style-type: none">