

Proposed Kaipara District Plan **Volume 5 - Summary of Submissions** **for Submissions 251 - 280**

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 15 December 2025, you can:
 - **Save time! Complete our easy online Form 6 here:** [PDP Online Form 6](#)
 - OR
 - **Download a pdf version of Form 6:** [Form 6 pdf version](#)
 - THEN
 - **Email it to:** districtplanreview@kaipara.govt.nz
 - **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 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
251.1	Leighway Holdings Limited	Coastal Environment	Amend	<p>AMEND the location and extent of the Coastal Environment overlay, particularly as it relates to the submitter's site held in Records of Title 499504 and NA1044/230, legal descriptions Lot 3 DP 425236 and Section 33 Block I Kopuru Survey District (Refer to Map in Appendix A of submission).</p> <p>AND</p> <p>AMEND the Coastal Environment overlay so that it is reduced to align with the High Natural Character Area overlay on the submitter's site, as shown in light green in Appendix A of the submission.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential or further amendments necessary to give effect to the relief sought and reasons given.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Northland Regional Council undertook a mapping exercise during the development of its Regional Policy Statement between 2011 and 2014. In relation to the site, NRC's worksheet appears to base the coastal environment line assessment on land contour, presence of dune fields, and presence of coastal lakes. The submitter notes it does not appear a site visit was undertaken to confirm the findings. Policy 4.5.4 of the Regional Policy Statement contemplates further assessment will be undertaken. Despite changing the regulatory impact of the coastal environment maps, the Proposed District Plan has not sought to undertake more detailed mapping. In relation to the Site, the Coastal Environment overlay is inaccurate. The vast majority of the site is in exotic pasture and used for livestock grazing. The submitter considers only the forefront of the site has coastal influence and character, being the area of the site identified as Outstanding Natural Landscape and High Natural Character. Lake Rehutai (identified on NRC's worksheet is approximately 1.4 km north west of the Site and is not visually connected to the site. Refer submission for further details.
251.2	Leighway Holdings Limited	Coastal Environment	Oppose	<p>AMEND CE-R1 as follows:</p> <p>1. Activity status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>a. The alteration or addition of any existing building or structure shall not increase the height of the existing building; and</p> <p>b. The activity complies with the following standards:</p> <p><u>a. CE-S1 Maximum building height;</u></p> <p>b. CE-S2 Exterior colour and reflectivity; and</p> <p>c. CE-S3 Gross floor area.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential or further amendments necessary to give effect to the relief sought and reasons given.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CE-R1 inappropriately restricts alterations or additions to existing buildings or structures that increase height. There is no credible analysis that suggests increase in height will create risks of significant effects on the coastal environment from inappropriate development. CE-S1 sets a maximum building height. Therefore, CE-R1 should be amended to only require consent if that maximum height would be exceeded by the additions or alterations.
251.3	Leighway Holdings Limited	Coastal Environment	Oppose	<p>AMEND CE-R2.1, as follows:</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>a. The building or structure is:</p> <p>i. Located within the General residential, Commercial, or Estuary Estate zone; or</p> <p>ii. Located within any other zone and is:</p> <p>i. Ancillary to an existing lawfully established use; or</p> <p>ii. On a building platform identified in an existing subdivision consent approved prior to 1 April 2025; and</p> <p>b. The building or structure complies with the following standards:</p> <p>a. CE-S1 Maximum building height;</p> <p>b. CE-S2 Exterior colour and reflectivity; and</p> <p>c. CE-S3 Gross floor area.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>AMEND CE-R2.1, as follows:</p> <p>1. Activity status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:</p> <p><u>a. For a The building or structure is located within the High Natural Character Area, it is:</u></p> <p>i. Located within the General residential, Commercial, or Estuary Estate zone; or ...</p> <p>AND</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CE-R2 inappropriately restricts new dwellings or structures throughout the Coastal Environment overlay that are not within the General Residential, Commercial or Estuary Estate zone, ancillary to established land uses or on approved building platforms. The consequence is that large areas of Kaipara District will require resource consent for dwellings or simple structures, which are unlikely to detract from the coastal character of the environment. No section 32 analysis of efficiency and effectiveness of this approach has been provided. Given the assessment that informed the extent of the Coastal Environment overlay, imposing additional regulatory costs is not justified. Submitter seeks a more appropriate approach to either enable buildings and structures within the Coastal Environment, subject to appropriate standards or only restrict buildings and structures within the High Natural Character Areas.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
				Any consequential or further amendments necessary to give effect to the relief sought and reasons given.	
251.4	Leighway Holdings Limited	Coastal Environment	Amend	<p>AMEND CE-S1 as follows:</p> <p>1. The maximum height of the building or structure is 8.5m above ground level in the coastal environment outside High Natural Character Area and Outstanding Natural Character Area <u>complies with the height limit of the underlying zone.</u></p> <p>OR</p> <p>AMEND CE-S1 as follows:</p> <p>1. The maximum height of the building or structure is 8.510m above ground level in the coastal environment outside High Natural Character Area and Outstanding Natural Character Area.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential or further amendments necessary to give effect to the relief sought and reasons given.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a difference in height limits in the Coastal Environment and the High Natural Character and Outstanding Natural Character Areas. Submitter considers that a differentiation between the height limits is generally understandable but raises concern that no assessment has been provided in the Section 32 Report for the 8.5 m height limit and no analysis to support the conclusion that height about that level will result in significant adverse effects on coastal character.
251.5	Leighway Holdings Limited	Coastal Environment	Oppose	<p>DELETE CE-R4 as it applies to the Coastal Environment (excluding Outstanding Natural Character Area). (Note referencing error in submission)</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential or further amendments necessary to give effect to the relief sought and reasons given.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 500m³ per decade limit for earthworks in the Coastal Environment is arbitrary and unjustified.
251.6	Leighway Holdings Limited	Coastal Environment	Oppose	<p>DELETE CE-S4.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential or further amendments necessary to give effect to the relief sought and reasons given.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 500m³ per decade limit is arbitrary and unjustified. The General standards in the Earthworks chapter are sufficient.
251.7	Leighway Holdings Limited	Coastal Environment	Oppose	<p>DELETE CE-S5.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential or further amendments necessary to give effect to the relief sought and reasons given.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 500m³ per decade limit for earthworks in the coastal environment is arbitrary and unjustified. The general standards in the Earthworks chapter are sufficient.
251.8	Leighway Holdings Limited	General Rural Zone	Oppose	<p>AMEND GRUZ-P5 as follows:</p> <p>Avoid <u>Discourage</u> non-rural activities in the General rural zone unless they:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Have a functional or operational need to locate in the General rural zone; Are compatible with primary production activities; and Do not result in the loss of availability and productive capacity of highly productive land, including consideration of the cumulative effects of such losses. <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential or further amendments necessary to give effect to the relief sought and reasons given.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The effect of the three criteria is that almost all non-rural activities would fail to pass the criteria. The policy should be amended to clarify that such non-rural activities are discouraged, but not necessarily avoided.
251.9	Leighway Holdings Limited	General Rural Zone	Oppose	<p>No specific decision requested but submitter raises concern that the objectives and policies of the General rural zone do not reflect the wide range of non-rural activities that may occur in the environment. The submitter provides an example where the zone enables dwellings (up to three on sites of 36 hectares or more but GRUZ-P5 requires that non-rural activities are avoided, unless all three criteria are met.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential or further amendments necessary to give effect to the relief sought and reasons given.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The General rural zone covers a large area of the Kaipara District and while it predominantly is used for rural production, there are a number of other activities that occur in the General rural zone. As proposed, the objectives and policies do not reflect this wide range of non-rural activities.
252.1	M Robinson	General	Amend	<p>ADD the precautionary and prohibitive Genetic Engineering / Genetically Modified Organisms</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shares the concerns of their Kaipara farming colleagues and other Northlanders about the

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
				provisions policies, and rules consistent with the Draft District Plan, the findings of the Northland/Auckland ICWP on GMOs and the operative Northland Regional Policy Statement.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> omission of the precautionary and prohibitive GE/GMO provisions. It would be in the interest of Northland's biosecurity, wider environment, existing GM free producers, food sovereignty, cultural values, economy, valuable "Northland naturally" brand, and public health. Act on Kaipara District Council's duty of care as part of the findings of the Northland/Auckland ICWP on GMOs. Do not be influenced by the Gene Technology Bill and act on Council's responsibilities in keeping with the current legislation.
253.1	McRobbie Dowling Limited	General	Amend	<p>AMEND the Proposed District Plan, particularly the proposed zoning and General rural zone provisions to give effect to the Northland Regional Policy Statement, particularly Objective 3.5 Enabling Economic Wellbeing and Objective 3.6 Economic activities - reverse sensitivity and sterilisation and Policy 5.1.3 Avoiding the adverse effects on new uses.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any necessary consequential amendments.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Proposed District Plan does not manage Kaipara's resources in a way that is attractive for business and investment that will improve Northland's wellbeing. The Proposed District Plan zoning framework, particularly the application to the General rural zone, does not adequately protect the rural environment from the negative impacts of new subdivision, use and development and reverse sensitivity effects are not avoided.
253.2	McRobbie Dowling Limited	Strategic Direction	Amend	<p>AMEND the Strategic Direction chapter to contain policies for all objectives and provide clear direction for the consideration of resource consents where there is conflict between different areas of strategic direction.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>No specific decision requested, however the submission notes a disconnect between the Strategic Directions chapter and the outcomes sought through the provisions within the plan, particularly in regard to the rural environment.</p> <p>Any necessary consequential amendments.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If retained as proposed, it could result in unintended outcomes for the district and weak policy framework which can be readily eroded. The Strategic Direction is fundamental to the tone and direction of the Proposed District Plan, and there is a degree of disconnect between the Strategic Direction chapter and the outcomes sought through the provisions within the plan. The Strategic Direction section includes a Vision for Kaipara chapter which includes the only strategic direction for primary production activities (SD-VK-O3) with no policy direction. The Strategic Direction section includes provision for primary production activities however this is not supported by policies and rules of the applicable zones. MDL considers that this is a flaw in the structure of the Strategic Direction, which flows through to a lack of policy direction throughout the Proposed District Plan.
253.3	McRobbie Dowling Limited	General Rural Zone	Amend	<p>RETAIN the General rural zone to the sites at 93 Arapohue Road, Arapohue (Part Lot 20 DP 9973) and 524 Arapohue Road, Arapohue (Lot 2 DP 35655 and Lot 3 DP 610233) which already contain primary production activities.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any other necessary consequential amendments.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Proposed District Plan provides for a general rural zone separate to the rural lifestyle zone and in doing so creates a clear distinction for primary production activities separate to the sensitive reciters of the rural lifestyle zone. MDL supports the application of general rural zoning to sites which already contain primary production activities.
253.4	McRobbie Dowling Limited	Relationship Between Spatial Layers	Amend	<p>AMEND the How the Plan Works - Relationship Between Spatial Layers section to provide direction for split-zoned sites to provide clarity for the plan user and be clear that provisions apply only to the extent of the mapped area.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any necessary consequential amendments.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provisions do not provide direction for split zoned sites.
253.5	McRobbie Dowling Limited	Vision for Kaipara	Support	RETAIN SD-VK-O1 as notified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter supports the intent of this objective being to promote social, economic and cultural wellbeing through providing for appropriate activities and outcomes in the zones.
253.6	McRobbie Dowling Limited	Vision for Kaipara	Support	<p>RETAIN SD-VK-O2</p> <p>AND</p> <p>AMEND GRUZ provisions to align with the objective as per submitter's other submissions.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any necessary consequential amendments.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This objective seeks to enable economic development through flexible and accommodating approach to business opportunities Objective is unsupported by zone provisions.
253.7	McRobbie Dowling Limited	Vision for Kaipara	Support	RETAIN SD-VK-O3.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Intent of objective is supported being to enable primary production activities operate efficiently and effectively..
253.8	McRobbie Dowling Limited	Vision for Kaipara	Support	RETAIN SD-VK-O6.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitters supports avoidance and mitigation of reverse sensitivity effects.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
253.9	McRobbie Dowling Limited	Urban Form and Development	Amend	AMEND SD-UFD-O2 to clarify what is meant by the term 'compatible'. AND Any necessary consequential amendments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitter supports the enablement of economic and business opportunities in Commercial and Industrial zones, and in other zones • Unclear what is meant by the term 'compatible' with other uses. This may cause uncertainty for plan users.
253.10	McRobbie Dowling Limited	Transport	Amend	DELETE TRAN-R4.1.c as it is a duplication of TRAN-R4.1.b. AND Any necessary consequential amendments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removes duplication.
253.11	McRobbie Dowling Limited	Transport	Amend	AMEND TRAN-R4.1.f, as follows: f. For new or upgrades to vehicle crossings on to roads controlled by Kaipara District Council compliance with Kaipara District Council Engineering Standards 2011 or alternative engineering standards with the agreement of Council; AND Any necessary consequential amendments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unclear what required standard is for a permitted activity. • Permitted activities should be undertaken without council approval
253.12	McRobbie Dowling Limited	Subdivision	Support	RETAIN SUB-O3.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitter supports the rural subdivision which is enabling of primary production activities to both establish and continue to operate and provides for employment opportunities in the rural environment.
253.13	McRobbie Dowling Limited	Subdivision	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy is too narrow when applied to all zones • Not all vegetation should be incorporated in a subdivision design • Submitter considers the Natural Environment Values provisions afford sufficient protection. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
253.14	McRobbie Dowling Limited	Subdivision	Amend	AMEND SUB-P2.4 as follows: 4. Requiring allotments <u>within an area of benefit</u> to connect to the Council's reticulated systems where practicable, except in the General rural zone; AND Any necessary consequential amendments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy has been framed with a narrow lens and fails to consider practical onsite solutions for servicing.
253.15	McRobbie Dowling Limited	Subdivision	Support	RETAIN SUB-P8.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports the policy direction for subdivision in the general rural zone which avoids reverse sensitivity effects on primary production activities and other activities that have a functional or operational need for a rural location.
253.16	McRobbie Dowling Limited	Subdivision	Amend	AMEND SUB-S5 to include provision for on-site servicing in areas not benefited by public services. AND Any necessary consequential amendments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unclear if the requirement to provide three waters infrastructure enables the use of on-site servicing which is often required for industrial activities located in rural areas.
253.17	McRobbie Dowling Limited	Earthworks	Support	RETAIN EW-O2.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter supports the clear direction that Quarrying activities are explicitly provided for.
253.18	McRobbie Dowling Limited	Earthworks	Amend	AMEND EW-P3 as follows: Provide for quarrying activities and mining activities to meet the District's and region's supply needs, where: 1. Adverse environmental effects generated by the quarrying activity or mining activity are internalised as far as practicable using industry best practice and management plans; 2. The amenity of values of the existing environment, including sensitive activities and cultural values in the surrounding area, are maintained by the quarrying activity or mining activity; 3. New quarrying activities and mining activities and the expansion of existing quarrying activities and mining activities are located in appropriate locations, and do not result in significant adverse effects on cultural or ecological values; and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clause 2 is too narrow when applied to the range of amenity values found across the district. • Quarrying and mining activities should be provided for at scales beyond farm quarrying alone to ensure such activities meet the needs of the district as intended by EW-O2.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
				<p>4. The activity is farm quarrying in the General rural zone or Māori purpose zone.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any necessary consequential amendments.</p>	
253.19	McRobbie Dowling Limited	Earthworks	Amend	<p>ADD a new earthworks rule for new quarrying activities or mining activities or the expansion of existing quarrying or mining activities in the General rural zone as a permitted activity.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>AMEND EW-R4 to apply to all other activities (excluding quarrying).</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any necessary consequential amendments.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New quarrying activities or the expansion of such activities is a dictionary activity. Submitter considers this is inconsistent with the Rural Zone provisions which support rural production activities (including quarrying) as permitted activities.
253.20	McRobbie Dowling Limited	Noise	Support	RETAIN NOISE-O2.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter supports the protection of authorised activities from reverse sensitivity effects.
253.21	McRobbie Dowling Limited	Noise	Amend	<p>AMEND NOISE-P1 to clarify what is meant by the term 'compatible'.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any necessary consequential amendments.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unclear what is meant by the term 'compatible' with the anticipated amenity, function and purpose of the zone and any receiving zone. May cause uncertainty for plan users.
253.22	McRobbie Dowling Limited	Noise	Amend	<p>AMEND NOISE-P2 to clarify what is meant by the term 'high noise locations'.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any necessary consequential amendments.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unclear what is meant by 'high noise locations'. This may cause uncertainty for plan users.
253.23	McRobbie Dowling Limited	Noise	Amend	<p>AMEND NOISE-P3, as follows:</p> <p>Enable higher noise levels within the <u>General rural zone</u>, Commercial zone and Industrial zones, while requiring <u>rural production</u>, industrial and commercial activities to comply with lower noise limits at the interface with any adjacent General residential zone, Rural lifestyle zone, Open space zone, and Natural open space zone.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any necessary consequential amendments.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports enablement of higher noise in areas where industrial activities are provided for. Enablement of higher noise areas should also extend to the General Rural zone, as primary production activities can create higher noise volumes too.
253.24	McRobbie Dowling Limited	Noise	Amend	<p>AMEND NOISE-R1 as follows:</p> <p>1. Activity status: Permitted</p> <p>Where the activity complies with <u>the following standards where applicable</u>:...</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any necessary consequential amendments.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not practical for any one activity to comply with all NOISE standards.
253.25	McRobbie Dowling Limited	General Rural Zone	Support	RETAIN GRUZ-O1.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter supports the purpose of the General rural zone being to enable primary production activities.
253.26	McRobbie Dowling Limited	General Rural Zone	Support	RETAIN GRUZ-O2.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter supports primary production activities being the predominant land use in the general rural zone and the protection from reverse sensitivity effects.
253.27	McRobbie Dowling Limited	General Rural Zone	Support	RETAIN GRUZ-P1.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter supports the enablement of primary production activities as the predominant land use as well as the enablement of supporting ancillary activities.
253.28	McRobbie Dowling Limited	General Rural Zone	Support	RETAIN GRUZ-P2.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter supports the enablement of primary production while recognising their effects should be accepted in the General rural zone.
253.29	McRobbie Dowling Limited	General Rural Zone	Support	RETAIN GRUZ-P3.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter supports the avoidance of reverse sensitivity effects on primary production activities.
253.30	McRobbie Dowling Limited	General Rural Zone	Amend	<p>AMEND GRUZ-R1 to clarify the maximum gross floor area of building size for primary activities in the General rural zone.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is unclear what the maximum gross floor area of any building must be in the general rural zone. While accessory buildings are limited to a gross floor area of 500m² it is unclear if there is a restriction on building size for primary activities.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
253.31	McRobbie Dowling Limited	General Rural Zone	Amend	<p>AMEND GRUZ-R2 as follows:</p> <p>GRUZ-R2 Agricultural, pastoral or horticultural activities, <u>quarrying or mining activities</u>, or forestry activities not regulated by the National Environmental Standards for Commercial Forestry (excluding greenhouses and intensive indoor primary production) ...</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any necessary consequential amendments.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quarrying or mining is defined as a primary production activity. Therefore, clear provision for these activities is sought as a permitted activity to give effect to the General Rural zone objectives and policies.
254.1	Northpoint Ltd	Planning Maps	Amend	<p>AMEND the zoning of 16 Awakino Point North Road, Dargaville (NA22D/1392, Lot 1 DP 65922) from General rural zone to Light industrial zone (Refer to submission for map showing site location).</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Alternative relief with similar effect.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strategic location near transport infrastructure. Provision for infrastructure upgrades. Proximity to existing industrial zoned land. Access to the Dargaville township supports efficient operation of industrial activities at the site. Limited sensitive receivers. Alignment with regional growth objectives. Minimal impact on productive rural land. Manageable environmental effects. Alignment with the objectives and policies of the Strategic Direction chapter. The relief is considered the most effective and efficient way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed District Plan, consistent with Section 32AA of the Resource Management Act.
254.2	Northpoint Ltd	Light Industrial Zone	Amend	<p>AMEND LIZ-R3 as follows:</p> <p>1. Activity status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>a. The activity is not a heavy industrial activity; and</p> <p>b. The activity complies with:</p> <p>i. LIZ-S7 Outdoor storage; and</p> <p>ii. LIZ-S8 Landscaping, <u>and</u></p> <p><u>iii. LIZ-S9 Transport</u></p> <p>OR</p> <p>Alternative relief with similar effect.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Intent is to require that the intersection is addressed as part of any industrial development at the submitter's site. The changes generally align with the transport requirements for land use activities in the 'Light Industrial Area' of the adjoining Trifecta Special purpose zone.
254.3	Northpoint Ltd	Light Industrial Zone	Amend	<p>ADD a new standard to the Light industrial zone as follows:</p> <p><u>LIZ-S9 Transport</u></p> <p><u>1. Prior to the establishment of any new industrial activity on Lot 1 DP 65922, the intersection between State Highway 14 and Awakino Point North Road must be upgraded to the satisfaction of the New Zealand Transport Agency Waka Kotahi.</u></p> <p><u>2. The resource consent proposing the transportation upgrades may be submitted in advance of or together with any subdivision or land use consent application.</u></p> <p><u>3. Activity status where compliance not achieved: Restricted discretionary</u></p> <p><u>4. Matters over which discretion is restricted:</u></p> <p><u>a. Efficient and effective transport network;</u></p> <p><u>b. Traffic safety in relation to site ingress and egress;</u></p> <p><u>c. Pedestrian and cyclist safety and navigability;</u></p> <p><u>d. Consideration of street trees and entrance treatments for the Awakino Point North Road entrance;</u></p> <p><u>e. Provision for emergency response access.</u></p> <p>OR</p> <p>Alternative relief with similar effect.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Intent is to require that the intersection is addressed as part of any industrial development at the submitter's site. The changes generally align with the transport requirements for land use activities in the 'Light Industrial Area' of the adjoining Trifecta Special purpose zone.
254.4	Northpoint Ltd	Subdivision	Amend	<p>AMEND SUB-S6, as follows:</p> <p>1. Each allotment shall have legal access to a formed road.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Intent of proposed change is to require that the intersection is addresses as part of any subdivision of the site, in general alignment with

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
				<p>2. Vehicular access shall be designed and constructed in accordance with the Kaipara District Council Engineering Standards 2011.</p> <p><u>3. For any subdivision of Lot 1 DP 65922, the intersection between State Highway 14 and Awakino Point North Road must be upgraded to the satisfaction of the New Zealand Transport Agency Waka Kotahi.</u></p> <p>4. Activity status when compliance with SUB-S6.1 or SUB-S6.2 not achieved: Discretionary</p> <p><u>5. Activity status when compliance with SUB-S6.3 not achieved: Restricted discretionary</u></p> <p>6. Matters over which discretion is restricted:</p> <p><u>a. Efficient and effective transport network;</u></p> <p><u>b. Traffic safety in relation to site ingress and egress;</u></p> <p><u>c. Pedestrian and cyclist safety and navigability;</u></p> <p><u>d. Whether an intersection upgrade is warranted by the scale of the subdivision and volume of traffic generated;</u></p> <p><u>e. Consideration of street trees and entrance treatments for the Awakino Point North Road entrance(s).</u></p> <p>OR</p> <p>Alternative relief with similar effect.</p>	the transport-related requirements for subdivisions in the 'Light Industrial Area' in the adjoining Trifecta Special purpose zone.
255.1	P McDermott	Natural Hazards	Amend	<p>No specific decision requested but submitter raises concerns with the provisions for Natural Hazards and considers amendments are necessary to recognise the significance of the sea level rise and management of natural hazards (particularly flooding).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adaptive planning means that high-risk areas need to be reviewed regularly. Anticipated increase in flood hazards calls for stringent controls of at risk areas through the conditions attached to discretionary land uses and the design of buildings and infrastructure.
255.2	P McDermott	Natural Hazards and Resilience	Amend	<p>ADD the following new clauses to SD-NH-O1:</p> <p>1. Areas subject to predictable natural hazard risks are identified;</p> <p>2. The risks from natural hazards are taken into account for all new subdivision, use and development;</p> <p>3. The maintenance and upgrading of infrastructure assets that protect communities from natural hazard risks is provided for; and</p> <p><u>4. Require new infrastructure to be capable of withstanding a one in 50-year ARI flood;</u></p> <p><u>5. Provision for works by way of hard and soft engineering to provide protection to communities, activities, and amenities from the direct effects of flooding and its effects; and</u></p> <p>6. Kaipara communities have reduced vulnerability, strengthened resilience, and enhanced capacity to adapt to the impacts of natural hazard events</p> <p>OR</p> <p>ADD the following new clauses to SD-NH-O1:</p> <p>1. Areas subject to predictable natural hazard risks are identified;</p> <p>2. The risks from natural hazards are taken into account for all new subdivision, use and development;</p> <p>3. The maintenance and upgrading of infrastructure assets that protect communities from natural hazard risks is provided for; and</p> <p><u>4. Require new infrastructure to be capable of withstanding a one in 50-year ARI flood;</u></p> <p><u>5. Provision for works by way of hard and soft engineering to provide protection to communities, activities, and amenities from the direct effects from natural hazards and their effects; and</u></p> <p>6. Kaipara communities have reduced vulnerability, strengthened resilience, and enhanced capacity to adapt to the impacts of natural hazard events.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There will be an increased need for defensive structures and for the provision of extensive areas for holding and managing floodwaters in flood prone areas.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
255.3	P McDermott	Natural Hazards	Amend	<p>ADD new policy NH-P4, as follows: <u>NH-P4 Land Use</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Identify areas within and around existing settlements in which development is prohibited because of the high probability of extensive, deep, or repeat flooding from coastal inundation, river flooding, or both.</u> <u>Identify areas in which no further development or redevelopment will be permitted; or in which measures must be taken to remove or protect existing structures from the impact of flooding.</u> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To better manage the risk of natural hazards, particularly flooding.
255.4	P McDermott	Natural Hazards	Amend	<p>AMEND NH-P12 as follows: NH-P12 Limit <u>Encourage</u> new constructed natural hazard protection structures</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Promote</u> Consider new hazard protection structures to protect existing development and existing and new infrastructure where: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Natural systems... <u>Provide for and encourage suitable low-lying areas to be set aside for floodwater retention and management.</u> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To better manage the risk of natural hazards, particularly flooding.
255.5	P McDermott	Infrastructure	Amend	<p>ADD a comment to the infrastructure chapter to recognise the significance of maintaining the capacity of lifeline services and critical infrastructure to expedite recovery from destructive events (storm damage, flooding, landslides, earthquakes).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To better manage the risk of natural hazards, particularly flooding.
255.6	P McDermott	Subdivision	Amend	<p>ADD new clause to SUB-P3 as follows: Provide for recreation and public access by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Encouraging the provision of public open spaces, that provide for various forms of recreation, within residential zones; and Requiring the location, number, and size of open spaces to be proportionate to the anticipated future density of the neighbourhood. <u>Allow for and encourage provision of large-scale flood detention or holding areas as recreational areas.</u> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To better manage the risk of natural hazards, particularly flooding.
255.7	P McDermott	Subdivision	Amend	<p>ADD rules to support submitter's requested additional clause to SUB-P3. Submitter suggests rules for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residential other bonuses to the General residential Zone; Credit against open space and recreational requirements. Credit against financial contributions (for providing a soft engineering benefit as hazard management investment). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To better manage the risk of natural hazards, particularly flooding.
255.8	P McDermott	Earthworks	Amend	<p>ADD enforceable standards for Earthworks that ensure that best practice erosion and sediment controls are adopted and implemented to prevent sediment discharge during and after earthworks. Reference should be made in the Proposed District Plan to best practice, currently recognised as Auckland Council Guidance Document 2016/005.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed District Plan approach to managing earthworks is simple and leaves waterbodies vulnerable to sedimentation. Lack of enforceable erosion and sediment control standards likely to lead to largescale sediment run off under expected future storm conditions. More explicit attention needs to be paid to the water quality of the Kaipara Harbour and Mangawhai Estuary given their significance.
256.1	P Ryan	General	Amend	<p>AMEND the Proposed District Plan to give effect to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development especially as it relates to the Mangawhai/Hakuru Managed Growth Area.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mangawhai clearly meets the threshold to be considered a "urban environment" in accordance with the definition in the National Policy Statement on Urban Development. Despite overwhelming evidence demonstrating this, KDC has essentially made its own decision that the National Policy Statement on Urban Development does not apply to the Kaipara District. Council have assessed the National Policy Statement-Urban Development, and concluded that the Proposed District Plan gives effect to it

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
					<p>without any specific assessment of the relevant provisions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitter considers that the Proposed District Plan has been promulgated in the absence of confirmation of how it gives effect to relevant provisions of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development, especially in relation to the Mangawhai/Hakaru Managed Growth Area.
256.2	P Ryan	General	Amend	<p>AMEND the Proposed District Plan to give effect to the Northland Regional Policy Statement, particularly Objective 3.5 Enabling economic wellbeing, Objective 3.6 Economic activities, and Objective</p> <p>3.11 Regional form and Policy 5.1.1 planned and coordinated development.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Proposed District Plan does not manage Kaipara's resources in a way that is attractive for business and investment. In particular, the Mangawhai/Hakaru Managed Growth Area unnecessarily restricts further growth and development. • The Proposed District Plan zoning framework, particularly the application of the General rural zone is such that the rural environment is not adequately protected from adverse effects of subdivision and development and reverse sensitivity effects. • The zoning framework of the Proposed District Plan is too narrow. The broad and inappropriate application of the General rural zone means rural residential / lifestyle development in existing areas is unnecessarily constrained.
256.3	P Ryan	General	Amend	<p>AMEND the Proposed District Plan to implement and give effect to the Mangawhai Structure Plan that was adopted in 2020, particularly the Black Swamp Area and 35 Black Swamp Road, Mangawhai as future rural residential (lifestyle) areas.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Mangawhai Structure Plan is a strategic planning document.
256.4	P Ryan	Strategic Direction	Amend	<p>AMEND the Strategic Direction chapter to contain policies for all objectives and provide clear direction for the consideration of resource consents where there is conflict between different areas of strategic direction.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>No specific decision requested; however the submission notes a disconnect between the Strategic Directions chapter and the outcomes sought through the provisions within the plan.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any necessary consequential amendments.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The intent of the Strategic Direction chapter is to set an overarching umbrella framework that should guide the remainder of the Proposed District Plan. In its current form, the Strategic Direction chapter fails to give effect to this, and the integration between the chapters is confusing. • If retained as proposed, the Strategic Direction chapter could result in unintended outcomes for the district and a weak policy framework that can be readily eroded. • The Strategic Direction section includes a Vision for Kaipara chapter which includes the only strategic direction for the Rural Area (SD-VK-O3 and SD-VK-O4) with no policy direction. • The Strategic Direction section includes an Urban Form and Development chapter with limited policy direction as to the purpose and criteria of each zone proposed. There is no identification of small, medium or large centres, or rural/coastal settlements versus large towns. Submitter considers that this a flaw in the structure of the Strategic Direction, which flows through to lack of policy direction throughout the Proposed District Plan.
256.5	P Ryan	General	Amend	<p>AMEND the Proposed District Plan to provide for a variety of housing and lifestyle options through intensification of areas adjacent to urban centres that can no longer accommodate rural production type activity. In particular, include a larger range of residential zones in the Proposed District Plan (as per the draft District Plan) to achieve this (e.g., Large Lot Residential, Low Density Residential, Medium Density Residential, Large Format Retail, Rural Lifestyle zones).</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any necessary consequential amendments.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter opposes the zoning of their site as General rural zone but the Proposed District Plan does not provide alternative rural residential or large lot residential zones, providing only a General rural zone. • The National Planning Standards provide a range of zones that could be utilised. • The Section 32 Report evaluation failed to undertake a complete analysis of the efficiency and effectiveness of the zone proposed and does not consider the most appropriate zoning options for the Black Swamp Area. • Zoning is dishonest and sends a confused message to plan users. • Most efficient an effective way to achieve alignment with the Strategic Direction chapter, National Direction and market demand is to protect land that has remaining productive intent.
256.6	P Ryan	Planning Maps	Oppose	<p>DELETE the Mangawhai/Hakaru Managed Growth Area overlay.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Section 32 Report does not clearly state how the managed growth area has been spatially

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
				OR AMEND and refine the Mangawhai/Hakaru Managed Growth Area overlay. AND Any necessary consequential amendments.	identified, and what the purpose or justification is for the managed growth area. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Managed Growth Area severely limits the opportunities to realise the demand for growth and rural lifestyle/residential living surrounding Mangawhai. The provisions are a blunt and unnecessary approach that will detract investment and growth and unfairly restrict the ability of landowners affected to provide for their economic wellbeing.
256.7	P Ryan	Relationship Between Spatial Layers	Amend	AMEND the Relationship Between Spatial Layers section to include reference to Precincts and the proposed Mangawhai/Hakaru Managed Growth Area and any other amendments as necessary to provide clarity to the plan user. AND Any necessary consequential amendments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarity for the plan user.
256.8	P Ryan	Relationship Between Spatial Layers	Amend	AMEND the Relationship Between Spatial Layers to provide clarity that provisions apply only to the extent of the mapped area. AND Any necessary consequential amendments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide clarity for the plan user.
256.9	P Ryan	Vision for Kaipara	Support	RETAIN SD-VK-O1 as notified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter supports the intent of this objective being to promote social, economic and cultural wellbeing through providing for appropriate activities and outcomes in the zones.
256.10	P Ryan	Vision for Kaipara	Support	RETAIN SD-VK-O4 as notified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter supports this objective and the directive to provide for growth in appropriate areas whilst protecting Highly Productive Land and primary production activities.
256.11	P Ryan	Vision for Kaipara	Support	RETAIN SD-VK-O7 as notified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter supports providing for a variety of development opportunities and living/housing options through a range of zones.
256.12	P Ryan	Urban Form and Development	Support	RETAIN SD-UFD-O5 as notified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter supports consolidation and integration of future growth.
256.13	P Ryan	Urban Form and Development	Support	RETAIN SD-UFD-P1.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provision of sufficient development capacity is consistent with the National Policy Statement for Urban Development.
256.14	P Ryan	Urban Form and Development	Oppose	DELETE SD-UFD-P7. AND Any necessary consequential amendments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SD-UFD-P7 is inconsistent with FC-O1. Provision of infrastructure and services can be provided to meet the requirements of urban areas without applying an arbitrary spatial limitation.
256.15	P Ryan	Subdivision	Oppose	DELETE SUB-O2. AND Any necessary consequential amendments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As proposed SUB-O2 urban subdivision applies to all subdivision within urban zones, which include commercial, light and heavy industrial zones. The objective is too narrow to accommodate all types of subdivision in all urban zones.
256.16	P Ryan	Subdivision	Oppose	DELETE SUB-P1. AND Any necessary consequential amendments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As proposed SUB-O2 urban subdivision applies to all subdivision within urban zones, which include commercial, light and heavy industrial zones. The objective is too narrow to accommodate all types of subdivision in all urban zones.
256.17	P Ryan	Subdivision	Amend	AMEND SUB-P2.4 as follows: 4. Requiring allotments <u>within an area of benefit</u> to connect to the Council's reticulated systems where practicable, except in the General rural zone; AND Any necessary consequential amendments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy has been framed with too narrow of a lens, it fails to consider practical onsite solutions for servicing and does not provide for servicing of the Rural living zone.
256.18	P Ryan	Subdivision	Oppose	DELETE SUB-P6 AND ADD new policies that reflect appropriate subdivision within each urban zone.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limitation of development based on the Mangawhai/Hakaru Managed Growth Area is not supported by the submitter. Limitation of subdivision within the General residential zone is not efficient or effective.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
				AND Any necessary consequential amendments.	
256.19	P Ryan	Subdivision	Amend	AMEND SUB-P7 as follows: Provide for subdivision that enables appropriate land use activities to occur in the Rural lifestyle zone by: 1. Maintaining <u>Requiring subdivision to meet the</u> minimum lot sizes and suitable dimensions for lots to achieve the character, amenity values and density anticipated in the Rural lifestyle zone; 2. Avoiding subdivision around minor residential units; and 3. Avoiding the creation of undersized lots in the Rural lifestyle zone to ensure the function and desired outcomes for the zone are not undermined <u>an urban form and uniform development patterns.</u> AND Any necessary consequential amendments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As proposed, the policy is not efficient and effective.
256.20	P Ryan	Subdivision	Oppose	DELETE SUB-P8. AND ADD new policies that reflect appropriate subdivision within each urban zone. AND Any necessary consequential amendments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limitation of development based upon the Mangawhai/Hakaru Managed Growth Area is opposed.
256.21	P Ryan	Subdivision	Oppose	DELETE SUB-P12 AND Any necessary consequential amendments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limitation of development based upon the proposed Mangawhai/Hakaru Managed Growth Area is not supported. SUB-P2 subject to appropriate amendments will manage provision of infrastructure.
256.22	P Ryan	Subdivision	Amend	DELETE SUB-R.3.11 and SUB-R3.12 in relation to the Mangawhai/Hakaru Managed Growth Area. AND Any necessary consequential amendments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limitation of growth based on the proposed Mangawhai/Hakaru Managed Growth Area is not supported.
256.23	P Ryan	Planning Maps	Amend	AMEND the zoning of the properties located along Black Swamp Road, Mangawhai from General rural zone to Large Lot Residential zone similar to the Large Lot Residential Zone proposed in the Draft District Plan. OR AMEND the zoning of the properties located along Black Swamp Road, Mangawhai from General rural zone to a Special Purpose Residential Zone which reflects the current cadastral pattern and land use. AND Any necessary consequential amendments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Properties located in this area are consistent with the intended purpose of the General residential zone and do not fit the intended purpose of the General rural zone. Character and amenity are consistent with a Large Lot Residential zone. The Section 32 Rural Zone report does not provide justification or evaluation of the extent or zone and appears to follow an arbitrary cadastral boundary. The area is rural residential in character. The area is considered materially compromised for rural production activities.
256.24	P Ryan	General	Amend	AMEND the Proposed District Plan to give effect to the National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land. AND AMEND the Proposed District Plan to ensure that any upcoming amendments to the National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land are adequately given effect to.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter considers that the Proposed District Plan does not give effect to the direction of the National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land regarding the protection of highly productive soils. Submitter considers that the General Rural zone has been applied incorrectly to areas of existing or planned rural residential / lifestyle development. Central Government is currently undertaking consultation on future changes to National Policy Statements so any necessary changes need to be made throughout the Proposed District Plan process to ensure that the new direction is adequately given effect to in the Proposed District Plan provisions.
257.1	Piroa Conservation Trust	Natural Features and Landscapes	Support	RETAIN the Natural Features and Landscapes chapter (inferred) with its aim to protect Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The aim of the chapter to protect Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes as a matter of national importance

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
				Natural Landscapes from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development as a matter of national importance under the Resource Management Act s6(b).	under Section 6(b) of the Resource Management Act is supported.
257.2	Piroa Conservation Trust	SCHED5 – Outstanding Natural Landscapes	Support	RETAIN the mapped extent and boundary of ONL14 Bream Tail / Brynderwyn Ranges.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No reasons provided.
257.3	Piroa Conservation Trust	Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	RETAIN the reference to the "NRPS Appendix 1: Mapping Methods" in the Natural Features and Landscapes chapter. AND ADD reference to the Northland Regional Policy Statement Landscape Assessment Worksheets (2014) in the Natural Features and Landscapes chapter.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Northland Regional Policy Statement Landscape Assessment Worksheets (2014) are more detailed and recent than Kaipara's Landscape Technical Report (2010). They contain comprehensive details on each identified Outstanding Natural Landscape and Outstanding Natural Feature.
257.4	Piroa Conservation Trust	Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	AMEND NFL-O2, as follows: The <u>conservation</u> , maintenance and enhancement of the characteristics, qualities and values of Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes is promoted.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conservation should also be a prime objective.
257.5	Piroa Conservation Trust	Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	AMEND NFL-P1, as follows: Enable activities that <u>protect</u> , maintain, restore or enhance the characteristics, qualities and values of Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes as set out in SCHED4 and SCHED5, including conservation activities and the removal of redundant buildings and structures.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addition reflects emphasis on protection as per Section 6(b) Resource Management Act.
257.6	Piroa Conservation Trust	Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	AMEND NFL-P4, as follows: Outside the coastal environment: 1. Avoid significant adverse effects of <u>subdivision</u> , land use and development on the characteristics, qualities and values of Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes as set out in SCHED4 and SCHED5; and 2. Avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects (including cumulative adverse effects) of <u>subdivision</u> , land use and development on the characteristics, qualities and values of Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes including by: a. In Outstanding Natural Features, ensuring requiring that the scale and intensity of earthworks and built development is appropriate taking into account the scale, form and vulnerability to modification of the feature; b. In Outstanding Natural Landscapes, ensuring requiring that the location and intensity of subdivision, use and built development is appropriate having regard to, natural elements, landforms and processes, including vegetation patterns, ridgelines and freshwater bodies and their margins; and Having regard to: i. Integration of development into the Outstanding Natural Feature or Outstanding Natural Landscape, maintenance of low development density, and retention of predominant vegetation cover, <u>particularly indigenous vegetation</u> ; ii. The location, design, scale, prominence and visibility of any buildings, structures, <u>and</u> access, <u>and the extent of</u> earthworks and indigenous vegetation clearance; iii. Methods and timelines for restoring or reinstating earthworks and revegetating land; and iv. The finish of any buildings or structures, including materials, reflectivity and colour; and landscaping and fencing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The additions reflect the inclusion of subdivision in NFL-P4.2.b, and Resource Management Act Section 6(b). The amendments to NFL-P4.2.a and b. are consistent with the Northland Regional Policy Statement Policy 4.6.1 on Outstanding Natural Landscapes.
257.7	Piroa Conservation Trust	Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	AMEND NFL-P6, as follows: Have regard to the following matters when assessing resource consent applications for <u>subdivision</u> , land use and development in	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addition of 'subdivision' reflects Section 6(b) Resource Management Act.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
				<p>Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The physical and visual integrity and any fragmentation of the landscape or feature, and its sensitivity or vulnerability to change; 2. Adverse and positive effects on identified characteristics, qualities and values; 3. The intensity of buildings, structures or infrastructure in the locality and the landscape values of surrounding land and established activities; The extent of the area affected and whether adverse effects are minor, more than minor or transitory; 4. The location, scale and design of proposed development including in relation to ridgelines, skylines and prominent headlands, the values of surrounding land and established activities and visibility from roads and public places; 5. Integration of the building, structure, access or activity into the landscape or feature, including materials, reflectivity, colour, landscaping and fencing; 6. The need for, extent, design, location and visibility of earthworks and vegetation clearance; and The degree of modification, damage, loss or destruction that will result from the activity in terms of vegetation clearance and earthworks; 7. Historical or cultural associations with the feature or landscape.; <u>and</u> 8. <u>The maintenance of established areas and patterns of indigenous vegetation cover.</u> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clause 3 largely repeats clause 4 and the intensity of buildings, structures and infrastructure in the area surrounding an Outstanding Natural Landscape should not determine the density of the same within an Outstanding Natural Landscape. • Regarding Clause 6, the emphasis should be on the effects rather than the need for earthworks and vegetation clearance activities.
257.8	Piroa Conservation Trust	Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	<p>AMEND NFL-R2.3. as follows:</p> <p>3. Activity status where compliance not achieved: Restricted Discretionary <u>Non-Complying</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>AMEND NFL-R2.4 as follows:</p> <p>4. Matters over which discretion is restricted:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The matters in NFL-P6; and b. The positive effects of the activity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amendments requested reflect the need for Council to give full consideration to its obligations under s.6(b) and s.6(c) of the Resource Management Act and apply the activity status which best achieves the levels of protection required for such a significant area. • The positive effects of the activity is not needed as an assessment criteria as NFL-P6 refers to both positive and adverse effects.
257.9	Piroa Conservation Trust	Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	<p>AMEND NFL-R3.1 as follows:</p> <p>1. Activity status: Permitted <u>Discretionary</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>AMEND NFL-R3.2 as follows:</p> <p>2. Activity status when compliance not achieved: Restricted Discretionary <u>Non-Complying</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>AMEND NFL-R3.3 as follows:</p> <p>3. Matters over which discretion is restricted:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The matters in NFL-P6; and b. The positive effects of the activity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-complying status requires effects to be minor and not contrary to the Proposed District Plan's objectives and policies. • This is important given the significance of indigenous vegetation and the requirement for its protection under Section 6(c) Resource Management Act. • The vital contribution of ONL14 to indigenous biodiversity cannot be understated. • The positive effects of the activity is not needed as an assessment criteria as NFL-P6 refers to both positive and adverse effects.
257.10	Piroa Conservation Trust	Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	<p>AMEND NFL-R4.1 as follows:</p> <p>1. Activity Status: Permitted <u>Discretionary</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>AMEND NFL-R4.2 as follows:</p> <p>2. Activity status when compliance not achieved: Restricted Discretionary <u>Non-Complying</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>AMEND NFL-R4.3 as follows:</p> <p>4. Matters over which discretion is restricted:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The matters in NFL-P6; and b. The positive effects of the activity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-Complying status requires adverse effects to be minor and not contrary to the Proposed District Plan's objectives and policies. • Clause 3.b is unnecessary as NFL-P6 refers to both adverse and positive effects.
257.11	Piroa Conservation Trust	Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	<p>AMEND NFL-S2 as follows:</p> <p>1. The gross floor area of any new building or existing building plus addition must not exceed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. 400m² <u>50m²</u> for any accessory building; and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Gross Floor Areas are both excessive, particularly for an accessory building. • Scale and size has potential to generate adverse effects.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
				b. 150m² <u>100m²</u> for any residential unit.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduced sizes considered more appropriate in context of protecting Outstanding Natural Landscapes such as the Piroa Brynderwyn Range, and Outstanding Natural Features.
257.12	Piroa Conservation Trust	Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	AMEND NFL-S4 as follows: 1. The earthworks must not exceed 150m ³ in any 12-month period per site; and 2. The maximum cut height or fill depth must not exceed 2m.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Repeated earthworks at this scale would have a cumulative adverse effect on Outstanding Natural Landscapes and/or Outstanding Natural Features.
257.13	Piroa Conservation Trust	Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	AMEND NFL-S5 as follows: 1. The indigenous vegetation clearance must: <u>a. Maintain established areas and patterns of indigenous vegetation cover.</u> <u>b. Not exceed 150m² in any 12-month period per site.</u> <u>c. Not take place in a continuous area of predominantly indigenous vegetation over 1ha in area.</u> <u>d. Take account of the ecological significance of indigenous vegetation and the presence of rare or endangered flora and fauna</u> <u>e. Not take place in an area identified by the Department of Conservation as having high kiwi density.</u> AND ADD a map showing areas of high kiwi density that should be available from the Department of Conservation as an Appendix in the Proposed District Plan.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clearance or disturbance should not be permitted more than once on a site. Over time repeated annual clearance would result in removal of considerable areas of significant indigenous vegetation, generating cumulative adverse effects. The inclusion of one standard is inadequate.
257.15	Piroa Conservation Trust	Subdivision	Amend	AMEND paragraph two of the Overview of the Subdivision chapter as follows: ...It is important that the design and layout of a subdivision responds to any constraints on the ability of the allotments to be developed. <u>This is particularly so in sensitive environments such as the coastal environment, outstanding natural landscapes and outstanding natural features.</u> Constraints may include significant natural, cultural, historical or ecological features within or adjoining the allotments, the potential impact of development on, or effects of, strategic infrastructure, or risks from natural hazards.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No reasons provided.
257.16	Piroa Conservation Trust	Subdivision	Support	RETAIN SUB-P2.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> These requirements are supported as it is essential that appropriate infrastructure is in place, or provided for, to cope with any future development proposed.
257.17	Piroa Conservation Trust	Subdivision	Support	RETAIN SUB-P12.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the restriction on further subdivision within the identified Mangawhai/Hakaru Managed Growth Area for the reasons given in the chapter.
257.18	Piroa Conservation Trust	Subdivision	Support	RETAIN SUB-R3.11 and SUB-R3.12.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This gives Council full discretion in its decision making.
257.19	Piroa Conservation Trust	Subdivision	Support	RETAIN SUB-R4.1.c and SUB-R4.4.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This will minimise fragmentation within the Growth Area and maintain a more open rural character and amenity and protect ONL 14 Bream Tail / Brynderwyn Ranges.
257.20	Piroa Conservation Trust	Subdivision	Amend	ADD to SUB-R6 that "Environmental benefit lots are not available in Outstanding Natural Landscapes" AND AMEND SUB-R6 so that Environmental benefit lots in Outstanding Natural Landscapes are a Prohibited Activity. AND AMEND SUB-R6.1 as follows: 1. Activity status: Controlled Where:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No justification for granting Environmental benefit lots in Outstanding Natural Landscapes. Enabling the creation of multiple lots will degrade the quality and values of the Outstanding Natural Landscape.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
				<p>Environmental benefit subdivision must comply with the following:</p> <p>a. SUB-S2 to SUB-S16;</p> <p>b. The significant indigenous vegetation or habitat, natural wetland or duneland to be protected must not be subject to an <u>existing</u> conservation covenant pursuant to the Reserves Act 1977; or the Queen Elizabeth II National Trust Act 1977; or consent notices;</p> <p>c. The subdivision will protect all areas of significant indigenous vegetation or habitat, natural wetland or duneland by way of a conservation covenant <u>in perpetuity</u> pursuant to the Reserves Act 1977; or the Queen Elizabeth II National Trust Act 1977; or consent notices;</p> <p>d. Each separate area of significant indigenous vegetation or habitat, natural wetland or duneland proposed to be covenanted must be assessed by a suitably qualified and experienced ecologist as satisfying at least one <u>against the</u> criteria in Appendix 5 of the Northland Regional Policy Statement (Criteria for determining significance of indigenous biodiversity);</p> <p>e. An ecological management plan is prepared to address the ongoing management of the covenanted area(s) to ensure that the values for which the area was covenanted are maintained. The ecological management plan must include:</p> <p>i. Fencing requirements for the covenanted area(s) including how the areas are excluded from stock intrusion;</p> <p>ii. Details of ongoing pest plant and animal control commitments; and</p> <p>iii. A planting plan showing any enhancement or edge planting required within the covenanted area(s) <u>(use of ecosourced plants is preferable)</u>; (inferred change)</p> <p>AND</p> <p>AMEND SUB-R6.4 as follows:</p> <p>Activity status when compliance with SUB-R6.1.b-h not achieved: Discretionary <u>Non-Complying</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>RETAIN 4,000m² net site area for new Environmental Benefit Lots.</p>	
257.21	Piroa Conservation Trust	Subdivision	Amend	<p>ADD a new clause c. to SUB-S4.3 as follows:</p> <p>3. Matters over which discretion is restricted:</p> <p>...</p> <p><u>c. Adverse effects on Outstanding Natural Landscapes and existing areas of indigenous vegetation</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No reasons provided.
257.22	Piroa Conservation Trust	Subdivision	Amend	<p>AMEND SUB-S14.4 as follows:</p> <p>4. Activity status when compliance with SUB-S14.1.c-e not achieved: Discretionary <u>Non-Complying</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>ADD standards of compliance where SUB-S14.1.c-e are not achieved as follows (at the very least):</p> <p>a. The proposed location and design of the subdivision; and</p> <p>b. Integration of potential building platforms into the landscape <u>including</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Siting in relation to ridgelines;</u> <u>Effect on indigenous vegetation;</u> <u>Extent of earthworks and fill material;</u> <u>Accessways and circulation;</u> <u>Mitigation planting; and</u> <u>Effect on landscape and amenity.</u> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If a site contains an area within an Outstanding Natural Landscape or within an Outstanding Natural Feature and the remainder of the site is outside those features, then any building platform should be located entirely outside of an Outstanding Natural Landscape or an Outstanding Natural Feature.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
257.23	Piroa Conservation Trust	Subdivision	Amend	AMEND SUB-S16 Table 1, Column 2, as follows: Maximum number of lots that can be created from an individual Record of Title: <u>53</u> AND AMEND SUB-S16.2, as follows: 2. Activity status where compliance not achieved: <u>Discretionary Non-Complying</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To enable the creation of 5 lots on an individual site seems to contradict the general purpose of the General rural zone. The balance of the site should not be available for further applications for Environmental Benefit Lots. Environmental Benefit Subdivisions have been popular in the past and benefited the applicant but not necessarily the environment.
257.24	Piroa Conservation Trust	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	Amend	AMEND ECO-O2 as follows: Adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity are managed to maintain it's the extent and diversity of <u>indigenous ecosystems and habitats in a way that provides for the social, economic and cultural well-being of people and communities.</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emphasis should be on maintaining indigenous biodiversity for its own intrinsic values as per Section 7(d) Resource Management Act.
257.25	Piroa Conservation Trust	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	Amend	AMEND ECO-O3 as follows: ECO-O3 Restoring <u>and enhancing</u> indigenous biodiversity ecosystems and habitats The restoration <u>and enhancement</u> of indigenous biodiversity is promoted and enabled <u>to reduce the threat status of threatened and at risk species.</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aligns with the Northland Regional Policy Statement and the submitter's own goals.
257.26	Piroa Conservation Trust	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	Support	RETAIN ECO-P2.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No reasons provided.
257.27	Piroa Conservation Trust	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	Amend	ADD a new clause 4 to ECO-P4 as follows: <u>4. Controlling the introduction or keeping of species with recognised pest potential.</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is a method that the Northland Regional Policy Statement states should be included in district plans.
257.28	Piroa Conservation Trust	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	Amend	No specific decision requested but submitter raises concern with the 1000m ² extent for clearance in ECO-R1 and considers it is not small scale if it applies in a zone underlying an Outstanding Natural Landscape such as the Piroa Brynderwyn Range as it would excessive and have significant adverse effects on its ecosystem. The submitter also notes that the rules on such clearance are more stringent in the Coastal Environment, Natural Character, and Natural Features and Landscapes chapters and that priority should be given to applying those rules.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No reasons provided.
257.29	Piroa Conservation Trust	Subdivision		RETAIN SUB-R4.1.c. AND RETAIN SUB-R4.4.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This will minimise fragmentation within the Mangawhai/Hakaru Managed Growth Area and maintain a more open rural character and amenity. It will also serve to protect ONL14 Bream Tail / Brynderwyn Ranges which falls within the Mangawhai/Hakaru Managed Growth Area.
257.30	Piroa Conservation Trust	Subdivision	Amend	AMEND SUB-R6 so that environmental benefit lots in Outstanding Natural Landscapes are a prohibited activity.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no justification for granting environmental benefit lots in an Outstanding Natural Landscape as it has already met the criteria for its classification of being Outstanding. Enabling the creation of multiple lots will degrade the quality and values of the Outstanding Natural Landscape.
257.31	Piroa Conservation Trust	Subdivision	Amend	AMEND SUB-R6.1. as follows: 1. Activity status: Controlled Where: Environmental benefit subdivision must comply with the following: a. SUB-S2 to SUB-S16; b. The significant indigenous vegetation or habitat, natural wetland or duneland to be protected must not be subject to an <u>existing</u> conservation covenant pursuant to the Reserves Act 1977; or the Queen Elizabeth II National Trust Act 1977; or consent notices. c. The subdivision will protect all areas of significant indigenous vegetation or habitat, natural wetland or duneland by way of a conservation covenant in <u>perpetuity</u> pursuant to	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No justification for granting Environmental benefit lots in Outstanding Natural Landscapes. Enabling the creation of multiple lots will degrade the quality and values of the Outstanding Natural Landscape. Under the controlled activity status, an environmental benefit must be granted consent if it complies with clauses SUB-R6.a. to h. If it cannot comply with SUB-S2 to SUB-S15 then it becomes Discretionary. Similarly, if it cannot comply with SUB-R6.1.b. to h, it also becomes Discretionary. This is too liberal. These are vital requirements which will determine the success of the environmental activity in the area to be protected.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
				<p>the Reserves Act 1977; or the Queen Elizabeth II National Trust Act 1977; or consent notices;</p> <p>d. Each separate area of significant indigenous vegetation or habitat, natural wetland or duneland proposed to be covenanted must be assessed by a suitably qualified and experienced ecologist as satisfying at least one against the criteria in Appendix 5 of the Northland Regional Policy Statement (Criteria for determining significance of indigenous biodiversity);</p> <p>e. An ecological management plan is prepared to address the ongoing management of the covenanted area(s) to ensure that the values for which the area was covenanted are maintained. The ecological management plan must include:</p> <p>i. Fencing requirements for the covenanted area(s) including how the areas are excluded from stock intrusion;</p> <p>ii. Details of ongoing pest plant and animal control commitments; and</p> <p>iii. A planting plan showing any enhancement or edge planting required within the covenanted area(s) (<u>use of eco sourced plants is preferable</u>); (inferred change)</p> <p>AND</p> <p>AMEND SUB-R6.4 as follows:</p> <p>Activity status when compliance with SUB-R6.1.b-h not achieved: Discretionary Non-Complying</p> <p>AND</p> <p>RETAIN 4,000m² net site area for new Environmental Benefit Lots.</p>	
258.1	R Alspach	General	Support	<p>RETAIN the rules and provisions of Plan Change 81 and Plan Change 82 as notified.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>ADD to the maps the designated "Light Industrial Area" in Plan Change 81, and link the designated area to the one proposed in the Proposed District Plan stretching along State Highway 14.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given the amount of money spent on planning and guiding the plan changes through Council processes, Plan Changes 81 and 82 should remain intact.
258.2	R Alspach	General		<p>No specific decision requested but submitter considers that given the Council's updated website emphasises the "Wild West" character of the District and its desirability. The submitter cautioned against "stuffing it up". Submitter provides example of Ripiro Beach which is part of that character and any housing along that beachfront, outside of existing settlements should be discreet and well setback.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Being able to walk, run, ride along Ripiro Beach without the intrusion of overlooking housing is one of its charms and attractions and is part of the "Wild West" character of the District.
258.3	R Alspach	General	Amend	<p>Re-gazette Segedin Road as a legal road to protect an access route for Pouto.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the road at Mt Wesley corner becomes impassable, access to Pouto will be cut off. Re-gazetting Segedin Road will enable alternative access to Pouto in the event that access is cut off at Mt Wesley corner.
258.4	R Alspach	General	Amend	<p>No specific decision requested but submitter seeks that the precautionary approach that Council used to have to the field release of Genetically Modified Organisms be retained.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Being GMO free is one of Kaipara's competitive advantages. Submitter cannot see any advantage in KDC "opening itself up" to the field release of GMOs, particularly if neighbouring councils continue with the agreed precautionary approach.
259.1	Rayonier Matariki Forests	Definitions	Amend	<p>ADD definition of "Commercial Forestry" (inferred)</p> <p>AND</p> <p>AMEND all references to "forestry" in the plan to "commercial forestry" (inferred)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The use of the term "forestry" is confusing and should be consistently defined as "commercial forestry".
259.2	Rayonier Matariki Forests	Natural Character	Oppose	<p>AMEND the application and interrelationship of the National Environmental Standards for Commercial Forestry 2017 in the margins of wetlands, lakes and rivers in the Natural Character chapter. The proposed note does allow for some forestry activities, but the full relationship should be expanded.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter opposes the note in relation to the National Environmental Standards for Commercial Forestry 2017. A plan may be more stringent for outstanding natural features and landscapes and significant natural areas. However, the district plan is limited in its ability to be more stringent for commercial forestry activities in the margins of wetlands, lakes and rivers.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
260.1	The Rise Limited	Planning Maps	Support	RETAIN the Cove Road North Precinct. AND Any further necessary consequential amendments required to achieve the relief sought.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter recently completed Private Plan Change 83 which rezoned some 56.9ha of land at Cove Road and Mangawhai Heads Road from Rural Zone to Residential Zone, introducing the Cove Road North Precinct to the ODP. The Plan Change became operative on 26 November 2024 and, since then, the submitter has commenced resource consent processes to realise the Residential Zone potential. The submitter supports the incorporation of the Cove Road North Precinct into the Proposed District Plan but notes that unintended changes to provisions have occurred and require amendment to reflect the approach Plan Change and improve the Proposed District Plan's effectiveness.
260.2	The Rise Limited	Relationship Between Spatial Layers	Amend	AMEND the chapter on How the Plan Works – Relationship Between Spatial Layers to provide clarity for plan users, such as including reference to Precincts and the Mangawhai/Hakaru Managed Growth Area. AND Any further necessary consequential amendments required to achieve the relief sought.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter notes that the listed spatial layers do include reference to Precincts or the proposed Mangawhai/Hakaru Managed Growth Area.
260.3	The Rise Limited	Relationship Between Spatial Layers	Amend	AMEND the chapter on How the Plan Works – Relationship Between Spatial Layer to provide clarity for plan users and be clear that provisions only apply to the extent of the mapped area. AND Any further necessary consequential amendments required to achieve the relief sought.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As notified, the provisions do not provide direction for split zoned sites.
260.4	The Rise Limited	Vision for Kaipara	Support	RETAIN SD-VK-O1 as notified. AND Any further necessary consequential amendments required to achieve the relief sought.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The intent of this objective is supported.
260.5	The Rise Limited	Vision for Kaipara	Support	RETAIN SD-VK-O4 as notified. AND Any further necessary consequential amendments required to achieve the relief sought.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the Objective and its direction to provide for growth in appropriate areas while protecting highly productive land and primary production activities.
260.6	The Rise Limited	Urban Form and Development	Support	RETAIN SD-UD-O1 as notified. AND Any further necessary consequential amendments required to achieve the relief sought.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the objective and the intent to meet current and predicted future demand.
260.7	The Rise Limited	Urban Form and Development	Support	RETAIN SD-UD-O5 as notified. AND Any further necessary consequential amendments required to achieve the relief sought.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support consolidation and integration of future growth.
260.8	The Rise Limited	Urban Form and Development	Support	RETAIN SD-UFD-P1 as notified. AND Any further necessary consequential amendments required to achieve the relief sought.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provision of sufficient development capacity is consistent with the National Policy Statement for Urban Development.
260.9	The Rise Limited	Urban Form and Development	Oppose	DELETE SD-UFD-P7. AND Any further necessary consequential amendments required to achieve the relief sought.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter considers that provision for infrastructure and services to meet urban area requirements can be provided without the application of arbitrary spatial limitations. Moreover, the Policy is inconsistent with Financial Contributions Objective FC-O1.
260.10	The Rise Limited	Subdivision	Amend	ADD a precinct exemption clause to the Subdivision Overview, similar to that in the Transport chapter. AND	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A precinct exemption clause will provide clarity for plan users.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
				Any further necessary consequential amendments required to achieve the relief sought.	
260.11	The Rise Limited	Subdivision	Oppose	DELETE SUB-O2. AND Any further necessary consequential amendments required to achieve the relief sought.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter opposes SUB-O2 and requests its deletion. As proposed, the Objective applies to all subdivision in urban zones (including commercial, light and heavy industrial zones). The submitter considers SUB-O2 to be too narrow to accommodate all types of subdivision in all urban zones. E.g., Clause 1 requires subdivision is sympathetic to the context and characteristics of the site and clause 5 requires the subdivision to contribute to a sense of place. These requirements can be limiting, particularly if a site has been appropriately zoned as Light or Heavy industrial. Moreover, clause 3 is unnecessary.
260.12	The Rise Limited	Subdivision	Oppose	DELETE SUB-P1. AND Any further necessary consequential amendments required to achieve the relief sought.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SUB-P1 is too narrow when applied to all zones, particularly zones with lower levels of amenity where high levels of modification are expected (i.e., commercial, light and heavy industrial zones). Natural environment provisions afford sufficient protection without incorporating vegetation into subdivision designs.
260.13	The Rise Limited	Subdivision	Amend	AMEND SUB-P13 to reflect Operative District Plan Policy PREC2-P1. AND Any further necessary consequential amendments required to achieve the relief sought.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SUB-P13 does not reflect PREC2-P1 - recently approved via Private Plan Change 83 - and is inconsistent with PREC-2 policies. Moreover, the proposed General residential zone chapter includes policies consistent with PREC2-P1.
260.14	The Rise Limited	Subdivision	Amend	ADD an exception to minimum allotment sizes under SUB-PREC2- Cove Road North Precinct – S1 as follows: <u>Except that no minimum net site area requirement applies to any allotment created around an existing or proposed residential unit that forms part of a multi-unit development for which a resource consent or building consent has been granted (excluding minor residential units).</u> AND Any further necessary consequential amendments required to achieve the relief sought.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter requests an exemption to minimum lot sizes is added to SUB-PREC2- Cove Road North Precinct – S1 in order to give effect to policies and achieve consistency with existing Cove Road North Precinct Provisions and the proposed Residential Zone.
260.15	The Rise Limited	Subdivision	Amend	AMEND SUB-PREC2- Cove Road North Precinct - S2 by removing Clause 1(a) reference to Council approval. AND Any further necessary consequential amendments required to achieve the relief sought.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requiring third party approval within a permitted activity is ultra vires.
260.16	The Rise Limited	Subdivision	Amend	AMEND SUB-PREC2- Cove Road North Precinct - S4 by removing Clause 1(a) reference to Council approval. AND Any further necessary consequential amendments required to achieve the relief sought.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requiring third party approval within a permitted activity is ultra vires.
260.17	The Rise Limited	Subdivision	Amend	AMEND SUB-PREC2 - Cove Road North Precinct-S6 Clause 3(a) as follows: a. Adequacy of the extent, location and formation of pedestrian connectivity (footpath connections) along Cove Road and Mangawhai Heads Road, and roads within the Cove Road North Precinct, based on the level of demand generated by the development and <u>need to mitigate potential effect directly associated with the proposal</u> ; and AND Any further necessary consequential amendments required to achieve the relief sought.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter seeks a minor amendment to provide further clarity around scope of works to improve interpretation and implementation.
260.18	The Rise Limited	Subdivision	Amend	AMEND the SUB-PREC2 - Cove Road North Precinct - MAT1 heading as follows:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No specific reasons provided for these amendments sought.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
				<p>Rule: SUB-PREC2 - Cove Road North Precinct- R1-MAT1</p> <p>AND</p> <p>ADD an exemption to 2. Subdivision Design and 4. Northern Sub-Precinct to note the matters of discretion are not applicable where subdivision is to create allotments around an existing or proposed residential unit that forms part of a consented multi-unit development for which a resource consent or building consent has been granted (excluding minor residential units).</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any further necessary consequential amendments required to achieve the relief sought.</p>	
260.19	The Rise Limited	Transport	Amend	<p>AMEND the Overview of the Transport chapter to apply zones to roads.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any further necessary consequential amendments required to achieve the relief sought.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Overview does not have legal effect and, as such, the proposed approach to not zone roads will result in confusion and inconsistent implementation, especially for non-transport activities within the road corridor. particularly for activities
260.20	The Rise Limited	Transport	Support	<p>RETAIN the Transport chapter. In particular, the precinct exemption clause.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any further necessary consequential amendments required to achieve the relief sought.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter supports the precinct exemption clause within the Overview as it provides clarity for the plan user.
260.21	The Rise Limited	Transport	Amend	<p>AMEND TRAN-R1 to remove reference to Council or roading authority approval.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any further necessary consequential amendments required to achieve the relief sought.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requiring third party approval within a permitted activity is ultra vires.
260.22	The Rise Limited	Transport	Amend	<p>AMEND TRAN-R4 to remove reference to Council or roading authority approval.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any further necessary consequential amendments required to achieve the relief sought.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requiring third party approval within a permitted activity is ultra vires.
260.23	The Rise Limited	Transport	Support	<p>RETAIN the exemption for PREC-1-Awakino Precinct TRAN-R2 as notified.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any further necessary consequential amendments required to achieve the relief sought.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The exemption clause provides clarity for plan users.
260.24	The Rise Limited	Transport	Support	<p>RETAIN TRAN-R2(3), (4) and (5) as notified.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any further necessary consequential amendments required to achieve the relief sought.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clauses 3, 4 and 5 are consistent with the recently approved private plan change.
260.25	The Rise Limited	Transport	Oppose	<p>AMEND TRAN-R3 to remove uncertainty and duplication, particularly the broad nature of "land use and development" and duplication in clauses a. and b.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any further necessary consequential amendments required to achieve the relief sought.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The terms 'land use' and 'development' are open and all-encompassing. The nature of these terms could result in the unintended consequence of all activities becoming permitted. Subclauses a and b are duplications and address the same matters.
260.26	The Rise Limited	Transport	Support	<p>RETAIN TRAN-R4 Exemption for PREC1-Awakino Precinct as notified.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any further necessary consequential amendments required to achieve the relief sought.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The clause provides clarity for plan users.
260.27	The Rise Limited	Transport	Support	<p>RETAIN TRAN-R4.4, TRAN-R4.5 and TRAN-R4.6 as notified.</p> <p>AND</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The clauses are consistent with recently approved plan changes.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
				Any further necessary consequential amendments required to achieve the relief sought.	
260.28	The Rise Limited	Transport	Amend	<p>AMEND TRAN Standards to remove all duplication of standards, particularly the standards which are specified in the Proposed District Plan as well as requiring compliance with the Engineering Standards.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any further necessary consequential amendments required to achieve the relief sought.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TRAN Standards change between specifying limits within the district plan and cross-referencing Engineering Standards. This approach is confusing and results in duplication and unnecessary cost.
260.29	The Rise Limited	Transport	Amend	<p>AMEND TRAN-Table 1 by removing reference to car parking spaces required.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any further necessary consequential amendments required to achieve the relief sought.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter notes that the table is titled 'Traffic Intensity Factor', however the righthand column refers to car parking spaces.
260.30	The Rise Limited	Transport	Oppose	<p>DELETE TRAN-Table 2.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any further necessary consequential amendments required to achieve the relief sought.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tier 1, 2 and 3 territorial authorities should not set minimum car parking requirements under Policy 11 of the National Policy Statement for Urban Development.
260.31	The Rise Limited	Definitions	Amend	<p>ADD a definition for "Multi-unit Development" as follows:</p> <p><u>means development of three or more principle residential units on a site.</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any further necessary consequential amendments required to achieve the relief sought.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No definition is provided for 'Multi-unit Development' and groups minor residential units as subsets of a residential unit. The submitter requests a definition is added to avoid interpretation difficulties and aid cross-referencing to Precinct rules.
260.32	The Rise Limited	General Residential Zone	Amend	<p>AMEND PREC2-Cove Road North Precinct – R2 as follows:</p> <p>1. Activity status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>a. No more than two <u>principle</u> residential units occupy the site;</p> <p>b. The minimum net site area associated with each <u>principle</u> residential unit is:</p> <p>i. 600m² for a serviced site in the Cove Road North Precinct; or</p> <p>ii. 1,000m² for a serviced site in Cove Road North - Northern Sub-precinct area.</p> <p><u>Note: Minor Residential Units shall be subject to Rule GRZ-R4 Minor Residential Unit.</u></p> <p><u>Note: More than two principle residential units onsite shall be subject to Rule GRZ-R12 Multi-Unit Development.</u></p> <p>2. Activity status when compliance not achieved: Restricted Discretionary <u>in accordance with rule GRZ-R12.</u></p> <p>3. Matters over which discretion is restricted:</p> <p>a. The privacy, outlook and amenity of adjacent and adjoining sites;</p> <p>b. Sufficient sunlight access to the outdoor living space;</p> <p>c. Building mass, orientation and passive surveillance toward the road/street;</p> <p>d. Bulk, scale and shading effects;</p> <p>e. Effects on any natural features with respect to natural wetlands, water courses, and indigenous vegetation;</p> <p>f. The extent to which the activity is consistent with the purpose, character and amenity values of the Cove Road North Precinct; and</p> <p>g. The ability to accommodate incidental activities anticipated within the Cove Road North Precinct such as parking (if it is to be provided);</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter supports the alternative types of residential development introduced into the Proposed District Plan through the rules for Minor Residential Unit GRZ-R4 and Multi-unit development GRZ-R12. It is recommended that the PREC2-Cove Road North Precinct Rules enable a pathway for Multi-Unit Development that is consistent with GRZ-12.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
				<p>manoeuvring, waste collection and landscaping; and where appropriate:</p> <p>h. The relationship of the development with adjoining streets or public open spaces, including the provision of landscaping;</p> <p>i. Privacy, shading and overlooking within the development and on adjoining site, including the orientation of habitable rooms, balconies, and outdoor living spaces;</p> <p>j. Infrastructure servicing, including private onsite systems;</p> <p>k. The provision of adequate waste and recycling bin storage including the management of amenity effects of these on streets or public open spaces; and</p> <p>l. Where on-site car parking, garaging and vehicle manoeuvring areas are provided, the design and location of car parking (including garaging) as viewed from streets or public open spaces.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any further necessary consequential amendments required to achieve the relief sought.</p>	
260.33	The Rise Limited	General Residential Zone	Amend	<p>AMEND GRZ-PREC-2 Cove Road North Precinct – S4 as follows:</p> <p>1. Within the Cove Road North Precinct, with the exception of the Cove Road North Northern Sub-Precinct:</p> <p>a. The maximum percentage of the net site area covered by buildings and other impervious surfaces is <u>less than 60%</u> 40%;</p> <p>b. The area(s) of any site covered by buildings and other impervious surfaces shall be located outside of the flood extent as mapped within the 10% annual exceedance probability event detailed in Flood map in Figure 1; and</p> <p>c. All stormwater management for the site shall comply with any stormwater management plan approved under standard SUB-PREC2- S5 Stormwater Disposal.</p> <p>2. Within the Cove Road North Precinct - Northern Sub-precinct, <u>any area of site covered by building and other impervious surfaces is less than 40% of the net site area</u> shall comply with GRZ-RXX - Impervious surfaces.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any further necessary consequential amendments required to achieve the relief sought.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amendments are sought to ensure the proposed Standard reflects approved private plan change provisions.
261.1	BRT Land Limited	Planning Maps	Support	<p>RETAIN the Commercial zone of the properties at 16-24 Freyberg Road, Ruawai.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitters note that the Operative District Plan has a mapping error which has seen the site split between Commercial, Residential and Rural. Under the 1997 District Plan, the whole site was zoned Commercial. The entire site is used as part of the Sleep Systems business. The business is committed to the community and provides local employment opportunities. Commercial land use is well-established at the site and there are plans to expand in future. Split zoning under the Operative District Plan has resulted in unnecessary consenting requirements for the business. As such, the proposed zoning is supported.
261.2	BRT Land Limited	Planning Maps	Support	<p>RETAIN the Rural lifestyle zone of the properties at 181, 195A and 195B Pahi Road, Paparoa.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Rural lifestyle zone is a natural transition from the General residential zoned land and other rural areas around Pahi Peninsula. There is access to the proposed Rural lifestyle zoned land from Pahi Road, State Highway 12 and two unformed legal roads. The submitter has noted that the Proposed District Plan mapping indicates that the site features General Rural zoning. However, this does not correspond to the zone map and, as such, is presumed to be an error in the side panel information.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
261.3	BRT Land Limited	Planning Maps	Support	RETAIN the General residential zone of the property at of 1-3 Skelton Crescent, Paparoa.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site, accessed from Skelton Crescent (with the additional options of two unformed roads), is a logical residential extension of Paparoa town. Under the ODP, the site has two Residential Zone boundaries. The site is within walkable proximity to services and amenities and there is a pedestrian bridge across the river which enables access to Paparoa Domain from the site. The submitter considers that provision for residential growth in this location will enhance Paparoa's vibrancy and sustainability.
262.1	Coatestone Limited	Planning Maps	Oppose	<p>AMEND the zoning of the site at Baldrock Road, Kaiwaka from Natural open space zone to a bespoke site-specific zone and/or precinct to enable quarrying activity while protecting the Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape (see submission for a map of the site).</p> <p>OR</p> <p>AMEND the zoning of the site at Baldrock Road, Kaiwaka from Natural open space zone to General rural zone.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any further or consequential amendments necessary to enable quarrying activity in a manner that protects the Outstanding Natural Feature and better reflects the site's operational, legal, and cultural context.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This zoning is inappropriate and does not reflect its longstanding use as a quarry. It is under private ownership and within a strategic location, therefore has potential to contribute to critical regional infrastructure and economic resilience. It does not reflect the purpose and legacy use of the site as a quarry under private ownership (same family since 1886). There is no lawful public recreational access or Reserve Act designation over the site. It appears to ignore the site's economic and strategic importance, providing aggregate supply for infrastructure delivery. It undermines a generational relationship between the submitter and Te Uri o Hau and the wider Ngati Whatua confederation. It appears to be in conflict with Council's infrastructure strategy; and Contradicts Resource Management Act principles, including enabling economic and cultural well-being. Surrounding zoning is mainly General rural zone, apart from publicly owned (either by KDC or Department of Conservation) Open Space zoning.
262.2	Coatestone Limited	Planning Maps	Amend	<p>AMEND the extent of the Outstanding Natural Landscape Overlay for Bald Rock / Pukepohatu ONL15 to only the upper (more visually prominent) parts of Bald Rock such as the western side and above a certain height on the eastern side.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any further or consequential amendments necessary to enable quarrying activity in a manner that protects the Outstanding Natural Feature and better reflects the site's operational, legal, and cultural context.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter opposes the majority of its land being identified as an Outstanding Natural Landscape and requests that the Outstanding Natural Landscape extent is amended to better enable the recommencement of quarrying activities on the eastern part of the land. It is noted that the submitter does support the top (dome) of Bald Rock being identified as an Outstanding Natural Landscape as this area is clear of any likely future quarrying and should be protected. The assessment undertaken to identify the land as an Outstanding Natural Landscape acknowledged that the land contains a quarry and noted the quarry is located in less-prominent parts of the land. As such, the submitter opposes the Outstanding Natural Landscape extent as proposed and requests it is amended by taking a more precise landscape mapping approach, for example, only applying the Outstanding Natural Landscape above a certain contour. This approach would protect the peak's visual prominence while allowing quarrying in the previously disturbed eastern area. As proposed, the Outstanding Natural Landscape extent does not promote the sustainable management of resources, nor will it achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act and is contrary to Part 2 of the Resource Management Act. The submitter requests amendments to better serve the social and economic wellbeing of Kaipara and to ensure Council has regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions.
262.3	Coatestone Limited	Planning Maps		<p>RETAIN the location of the Outstanding Natural Feature ONF2 as it applies to the top area of the main Bald Rock dome.</p> <p>AND</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
				<p>PROVIDE clarification that the Outstanding Natural Feature does not apply to, or constrain, quarrying activity outside its mapped boundary.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any further or consequential amendments necessary to enable quarrying activity in a manner that protects the Outstanding Natural Feature and better reflects the site's operational, legal, and cultural context.</p>	
263.1	Daytona Trust	General Approach	Oppose	<p>DELETE from the General Approach chapter the "Additional matters of control and matters of discretion" section.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The matters summarise Section 108 Resource Management Act matters, but do not replicate the specific details of Section 108. This creates the risk of conditions imposed under the Proposed District Plan being out of step with the requirements of the Resource Management Act. The matters are unnecessary in relation to the specific matters otherwise set out in the Proposed District Plan.
263.2	Daytona Trust	Relationship Between Spatial Layers		<p>AMEND the text from "Determining the relationship between rules for different spatial layers", as follows:</p> <p>Rules for one spatial layer may be stricter than rules in another spatial layer. The strictest rule will apply in these cases. <u>The overall activity status of a proposal will be determined on the basis of all rules which apply to the proposal.</u> ...</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reference to "stricter" may be open to interpretation depending on the circumstances of the proposal. It should be replaced with a reference to the activity status of a proposal being determined on the basis of all rules which apply to the proposal to avoid an evaluation of the strictest rule.
263.3	Daytona Trust	Tangata Whenua / Mana Whenua	Oppose	<p>AMEND the Tangata Whenua/Mana Whenua chapter as follows:</p> <p>Statutory acknowledgements within the Kaipara District can be located <u>are</u> on the planning maps and may be listed as a site or area of significance to Māori ..."</p> <p>AND</p> <p>AMEND the planning maps and spatial layers to ensure these accurately map statutory acknowledgement areas.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given the statutory obligations in respect to these areas, the clause should be clear that they <u>are</u> on the planning maps. The notified wording implies that some may and some may not be.
263.4	Daytona Trust	Vision for Kaipara	Support	<p>RETAIN SD-VK-O2.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The guiding principles to support development are supported.
263.5	Daytona Trust	Vision for Kaipara	Support	<p>RETAIN SD-VK-O3.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The recognition for primary production activities to operate efficiently and effectively is supported.
263.6	Daytona Trust	Vision for Kaipara	Amend	<p>AMEND SD-VK-O4 to acknowledge that rural lifestyle development may be appropriate in a diverse range of locations across the district, particularly where that is achieved through conservation benefits. Without limiting the generality of this, amend SD-VK-O4 as follows:</p> <p>Rural lifestyle development is concentrated <u>located</u> in appropriate locations to contribute to the distribution of population growth in the District without compromising primary production activities, loss of highly productive land whilst recognising the need for urban areas to grow.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> "Concentration" of rural lifestyle development as directed in this objective does not acknowledge that rural lifestyle development may be appropriate in a diverse range of locations across the district, particularly where this is achieved through conservation benefits e.g., at the submitter's land at Bream Tail.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
263.7	Daytona Trust	Natural Environment	Support	RETAIN SD-NE-O1. AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No reasons provided.
263.8	Daytona Trust	Natural Environment	Support	RETAIN SD-NE-O2. AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No reasons provided.
263.9	Daytona Trust	Natural Environment	Support	RETAIN SD-NE-O3. AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No reasons provided.
263.10	Daytona Trust	Financial Contributions	Oppose	DELETE the Financial Contributions chapter and all associated objectives, policies, rules, and standards. AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refer to submission for detailed reasoning. Submitter considers that the proposed Financial Contributions provisions do not meet Section 77 Resource Management Act and there is insufficient section 32 analysis for the scope of matters for which a financial contribution can be taken under the Proposed District Plan.
263.11	Daytona Trust	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	Support	RETAIN ECO-O1. AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The objective appropriately seeks to protect, promote and enable the restoration of indigenous biodiversity.
263.12	Daytona Trust	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	Support	RETAIN ECO-P1. AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The policy appropriately gives effect to the requirements of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement and the Regional Policy Statement and recognises the role of landowners as stewards in the restoration of indigenous biodiversity; enabling the removal or management of pest, plant and animal species and the application also of non-regulatory methods to encourage the protection, maintenance and restoration of indigenous biodiversity.
263.13	Daytona Trust	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	Amend	AMEND ECO-R1.1.f to also allow the construction of buildings ancillary to a single residential unit (including garages and minor dwellings) as a permitted activity with the 1000m ² threshold. AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The rule should also provide for other buildings ancillary to residential buildings within this specified threshold, which can establish without any further impact on the amount of indigenous vegetation cleared than that already provided for.
263.14	Daytona Trust	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	Amend	DELETE from ECO-R2.2. the requirement that a restricted discretionary activity application for indigenous vegetation clearance and any associated land disturbance, includes an assessment, carried out by a suitably qualified ecologist, of whether or not any of the indigenous vegetation proposed to be cleared meets the criteria in Appendix 5 of the Northland Regional Policy Statement 2016 (Areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna) AND DELETE the discretionary activity status at ECO-R2.4. AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ECO-R2.4. imposes an unnecessary and unfair burden on landowners to prove that the indigenous vegetation meets the criteria in Appendix 5. That should be the role of the District Council to undertake on a district-wide basis, rather than on an individual application basis, which risks inconsistent application of the criteria. In any event, the criteria in Appendix 5 of the Regional Policy Statement pre-date the National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity (amended October 2024) and its methods should be adopted, including being managed in an integrated way (policy 5) and identified using a consistent approach (policy 6). The matters of discretion already provided under the rule ECO-R2 provide ample scope for the Council to assess the effects of the clearance on indigenous biodiversity values.
263.15	Daytona Trust	Natural Features and Landscapes	Support	RETAIN NFL-O1. AND	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The objective correctly gives effect to the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement and the Regional Policy Statement.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
				Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	
263.16	Daytona Trust	Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	<p>AMEND NFL-P1 to ensure a cross reference to the accurate inclusion and description of the characteristics, qualities and values of Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes is cross referenced in SCHED4 and SCHED5.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The policy is generally supported but it should be amended to ensure accurate inclusion in SCHED4 or SCHED5 of the descriptions used in the evaluation sheets which informed the Regional Policy Statement mapping, including a full description of the characteristics, qualities and values of the outstanding natural landscapes in each case, as is sought elsewhere in this submission. This information is not included in SCHED4 and SCHED5 as notified.
263.17	Daytona Trust	Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	<p>AMEND NFL-P3 to ensure a cross reference to the accurate inclusion and description of the characteristics, qualities and values of Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes is cross referenced in SCHED4 and SCHED5.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The policy is generally supported but it should be amended to ensure accurate inclusion in SCHED4 or SCHED5 of the descriptions used in the evaluation sheets which informed the Regional Policy Statement mapping, including a full description of the characteristics, qualities and values of the outstanding natural landscapes in each case, as is sought elsewhere in this submission. This information is not included in SCHED4 and SCHED5 as notified.
263.18	Daytona Trust	Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	<p>AMEND NFL-P4 to ensure a cross reference to the accurate inclusion and description of the characteristics, qualities and values of Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes is cross referenced in SCHED4 and SCHED5.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The policy is generally supported but it should be amended to ensure accurate inclusion in SCHED4 or SCHED5 of the descriptions used in the evaluation sheets which informed the Regional Policy Statement mapping, including a full description of the characteristics, qualities and values of the outstanding natural landscapes in each case, as is sought elsewhere in this submission. This information is not included in SCHED4 and SCHED5 as notified.
263.19	Daytona Trust	Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	<p>AMEND NFL-P2, as follows:</p> <p>Policy NFL-P2</p> <p>Existing <u>subdivision</u>, use and development</p> <p>Recognise that lawfully established <u>subdivision</u>, land use and development are located within Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes and allow them to continue without undue restriction.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The policy should also recognise that lawfully established subdivision, with sites as yet unbuilt, are also located within Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes, including the submitter's site at Bream Tail.
263.20	Daytona Trust	Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	<p>AMEND NFL-P6, as follows:</p> <p>Have regard to the following matters when assessing resource consent applications for <u>subdivision</u>, land use and development in Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes:</p> <p>AND</p> <p>AMEND NFL-P6 to have regard to whether land use and development is on a previously approved building platform or necessary to provide access to a previously approved building platform.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NFL-P6 seeks to have regard to a range of matters when considering an application for land use and development, but not subdivision. Specific recognition should be given to the existence of consented building platforms and access to those platforms when considering resource consent applications under NFL-P6. This aligns with the NFL-P2 recognition of existing use and development, which would otherwise not come into play when considering these restricted discretionary activity matters.
263.21	Daytona Trust	Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	<p>AMEND NFL-R1 to delete reference to and requirement to comply with NFL-S2 Gross Floor Area.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> External additions and alterations to existing buildings or structures should not be limited as to gross floor area to achieve permitted activity status. The reference to gross floor area might for example better replaced with a reference to the standard NFL-S6 Minor upgrading.
263.22	Daytona Trust	Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	<p>AMEND NFL-R2 so that the permitted activity status applies to new buildings and structures in the Outstanding Natural Landscapes and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A number of approved defined exclusive use areas and nominated buildable areas on lots at Bream Tail are within the coastal environment

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
				<p>Outstanding Natural Features, irrespective of whether they are inside or outside the Coastal Environment, as follows:</p> <p>NFL-R2 New buildings and structures</p> <p>Outstanding Natural Landscape and Outstanding Natural Feature outside the coastal environment</p> <p>AND</p> <p>DELETE the requirement in NFL-R2.1. to comply with NFL-S2.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>AMEND NFL-R2.1.a.ii. as follows:</p> <p>ii. On a building platform identified in an existing approved subdivision consent and/or land use consent lodged with Council prior to 30 April 2025.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	<p>and within an Outstanding Natural Landscape. The existence of these lots was taken into account and recognised in the Northland Regional Council's evaluation of the applicable Outstanding Natural Landscape.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The default to non-complying activity would require a wholesale reassessment of the appropriateness to build on these already approved exclusive use areas and nominated buildable areas. It imposes considerable unnecessary cost and risk. For these reasons, the rule is sought be amended to apply the same permitted activity provisions whether the building or structure is inside or outside the coastal environment. Permitted activity status is an efficient and effective way of recognising existing expectations to build under the terms of consents and avoids the costs associated with new consent for buildings on locations already confirmed as appropriate by way of previous consents. As set out in the rule, this permitted activity status is dependent on compliance with NFL-S1 Building and Structure Height and NFL-S3 Exterior Colour and Reflectivity (apart from the exception for Bream Tail under rule NFL-R2.2 sought elsewhere in this submission). The requirement to comply with NFL-S2 Gross Floor Area is opposed on the basis that the limitation of 150m² for any residential unit and 100m² for any accessory building is too low to accommodate many residential dwellings including the average size of a dwelling in New Zealand (excluding terrace houses etc). It is unnecessary in terms of managing effects on the characteristics, qualities and values of Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Outstanding Natural Features, having regard to the other rules and standards which apply. The reference to building platforms identified in an existing subdivision consent "approved prior to 1 April 2025 is unnecessary.
263.23	Daytona Trust	Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	<p>AMEND NFL-R3 so that the permitted activity status applies to indigenous vegetation clearance in the Outstanding Natural Landscape, irrespective of whether they are inside or outside of the coastal environment, and to also provide for the Outstanding Natural Feature, as follows:</p> <p>NFL-R3 Indigenous vegetation clearance</p> <p><u>Outstanding Natural Landscape and Outstanding Natural Feature</u> outside the coastal environment</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rule NFL-R3 only applies permitted activity status to indigenous vegetation clearance in Outstanding Natural Landscapes outside the coastal environment, and not for Outstanding Natural Landscapes within the coastal environment. In addition, no provision is made for Indigenous vegetation clearance in the Outstanding Natural Features, leaving the activity status for that uncertain. The only provision for permitted activity Indigenous vegetation clearance in Outstanding Natural Landscapes within the coastal environment is made at NFL-R3.6 for regionally significant infrastructure. The maximum area allowances in standard NFL-S5 and the limited range of permitted activities for indigenous vegetation clearance (as sought to be amended by this submission) provide sufficient protection.
263.24	Daytona Trust	Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	<p>AMEND NFL-R4 so that the permitted activity status applies to earthworks in the Outstanding Natural Landscape and Outstanding Natural Feature, irrespective of whether they are inside or outside of the coastal environment, as follows:</p> <p>NFL-R4 Earthworks</p> <p>Outstanding Natural Landscape and Outstanding Natural Feature outside the coastal environment.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A restricted activity status (as is the effect of the Proposed Plan rule as sought to be amended by this submission) is appropriate for earthworks on approved building platforms and the access driveways to them inside and outside the Outstanding Natural Landscape and Outstanding Natural Feature, noting that the appropriateness of construction on approved building platforms has already been determined at subdivision stage. The maximum volume and cut face allowances in NFL-S4, the limited range of permitted activities and the restricted discretionary activity status for earthworks above these limits provide sufficient protection for the characteristics, qualities and values of the Outstanding Natural Landscape and Outstanding Natural Feature and appropriately give effect to the Regional Policy Statement and the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement in respect to the coastal environment.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
263.25	Daytona Trust	Natural Features and Landscapes	Support	RETAIN NFL-R7. AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The rule is supported, noting the submitter's other relief sought for indigenous vegetation clearance as a permitted activity in particular circumstances.
263.26	Daytona Trust	Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	AMEND NFL-S1 to exempt the following from the maximum height: <u>a. Chimney structures not exceeding 1.2m in width and 1m in height on any elevation.</u> <u>b. Architectural features (e.g., finials, spires) that do not exceed 1m in height.</u> <u>c. Solar and water heating components provided these do not exceed the height by more than 0.5m on any elevation.</u> <u>d. Satellite dishes and aerials that do not exceed 1m in height and/or diameter on any elevation.</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional allowances should be made for roof top projections within specified parameters. Requiring resource consents for the placement of such features where they exceed the height is inefficient and adds costs which do not outweigh the benefits.
263.27	Daytona Trust	Natural Features and Landscapes	Oppose	DELETE NFL-S2. AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The standard unnecessarily limits gross floor area and is considered too low to accommodate many residential dwellings, including the average size of a dwelling in New Zealand. The submitter considers standard is unnecessary in terms of managing effects, having regard to the balance of other rules and standards which apply to Natural Features and Landscapes.
263.28	Daytona Trust	Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	AMEND NFL-S3 to allow for natural materials, as follows: 1. The building and structure exteriors must: a. Not utilise mirror glazing; and b. <u>Be constructed of natural materials or if the exterior surface is coloured or painted with then be a colour with a reflectance value no greater than 35% (provided that 2% of each exterior elevation is exempt) and with a roof colour with a reflectance value no greater than 30%.</u> AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The standard should allow for the use of natural materials as a permitted activity, with such materials being visually suitable in Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Outstanding Natural Features areas, including in the coastal environment.
263.29	Daytona Trust	Coastal Environment	Amend	AMEND CE-O1, as follows: The characteristics, <u>and</u> qualities and values of the natural character of the coastal environment <u>are preserved and are</u> protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development. AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The amendments will better give effects to the Regional Policy Statement Objective 3.14 in respect to the coastal environment, which requires the protection of the qualities and characteristics that make up the natural character of the coastal environment from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.
263.30	Daytona Trust	Coastal Environment	Support	RETAIN CE-O2. AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It properly gives effect to the Regional Policy Statement and the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement.
263.31	Daytona Trust	Coastal Environment	Amend	AMEND CE-P1 to ensure a cross-reference to the accurate inclusion and description of the characteristics, qualities and values that make an area a High or Outstanding Natural Character Area in SCHED6 - Natural Character Areas, as sought elsewhere in this submission. AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The policy is supported, subject to the accurate inclusion and description of the characteristics, qualities and values that make an area a High or Outstanding Natural Character Area in SCHED6.
263.32	Daytona Trust	Coastal Environment	Support	RETAIN CE-P2. AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It properly gives effect to the Regional Policy Statement and the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
263.33	Daytona Trust	Coastal Environment	Support	RETAIN CE-P3. AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It properly gives effect to the Regional Policy Statement and the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement.
263.34	Daytona Trust	Coastal Environment	Amend	AMEND CE-P6 to have regard to whether land use and development is on a previously approved building platform or necessary to provide access to a previously approved building platform. AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specific recognition should be given to the existence of consented building platforms and access to those platforms when considering resource consent applications under CE-P6.
263.35	Daytona Trust	Coastal Environment	Amend	ADD a new policy in the Coastal Environment chapter, as follows: <u>Existing subdivision, use and development</u> <u>Recognise that lawfully established subdivision, land use and development are located within the coastal environment, including High Natural Character Areas and Outstanding Natural Character Areas and allow them to continue without undue restriction.</u> AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To recognise that lawfully established existing subdivision, use and development are located within the coastal environment and allow them to continue without undue restriction. The submitter's site at Bream Tail is an example of this.
263.36	Daytona Trust	Coastal Environment	Amend	DELETE from CE-R1 the requirement to comply with CE-S3. AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gross floor area should not be limited to achieve permitted activity status.
263.37	Daytona Trust	Coastal Environment	Amend	DELETE from CE-R2 the requirement to comply with NFL-S2. AND AMEND CE-R2.1.a.ii.ii. as follows: ii. On a building platform identified in an existing approved subdivision consent and/or land use consent lodged with Council prior to 30 April 2025. AND ADD the following permitted activity to CE-R2: <u>2. Activity Status: Permitted</u> <u>c. Where the building or structure is on a defined exclusive use area as shown on the survey plan for Lots 1-4, 6-8, 10, 12-17, 22-29, 34 and 40-45 DP348513, Lot 1 DP493396, Lots 5 and 9 DP435202, Lots 101 and 102 DP528288, Lots 1 and 2 DP408561, Lots 3 and 4 DP404524, Lots 5 and 6 DP400385, and Lots 7 and 8 DP404525 (Bream Tail), or a nominated buildable area or a building platform otherwise approved on those properties.</u> AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bream Tail is an example where the subdivision has been carefully designed, mitigation planting established and controls imposed through consent notices to manage the effects of buildings. Owners have purchased lots on the understanding that their entitlement to build on them is protected, designed and have detailed controls imposed by way of consent condition and consent notices on the titles. Permitted activity status is an efficient and effective way of recognising these existing expectations to build under the terms of consents and avoids the costs associated with new consent for buildings on locations already confirmed as appropriate by way of previous consents. Gross floor area limitations are opposed on the basis that the limitations are too low to accommodate many residential dwellings. The submitter considers this is out of line with the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement and Regional Policy Statement. Reference to the date in CE-R2.1.a.ii.ii. is unnecessary. Specific provision is sought in the rule for the Bream Tail subdivision to recognise it has defined exclusive use areas and nominated buildable areas.
263.38	Daytona Trust	Coastal Environment	Amend	AMEND CE-R3 to add as permitted activities, indigenous vegetation clearance for the following purposes (without a requirement for these to comply with the area limitation standards under NFL-S5 and in addition to the repair and maintenance allowances in the rule as proposed): <u>a. To address an immediate risk to the public safety or damage to property;</u> <u>b. The formation of walking tracks less than 1.5m wide;</u> <u>c. The construction of a new fence where the purpose of the new fence is to exclude stock and/or pests from the area of indigenous</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Make additional allowances for indigenous vegetation clearance which by its nature will have minor effects on the coastal environment and High Natural Character Areas, is required to enable positive effects, or is required for the health and safety of people. The exclusion is sought only to apply to the High Natural Character Areas and not Outstanding Natural Character Areas.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
				<u>vegetation, provided that the clearance does not exceed 3.5m in width either side of the fence line;</u> <u>d. To remove pest species in accordance with any approved pest management plan or biosecurity operational plan;</u> <u>e. To create or maintain a 20m setback from an area of indigenous vegetation to a residential unit (excluding accessory buildings);</u> <u>f. The removal or clearance of indigenous vegetation from land that was previously cleared and where the indigenous vegetation to be cleared is less than 10 years old; and</u> <u>g. Creation and maintenance of firebreaks to manage fire risk.</u> AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	
263.39	Daytona Trust	Coastal Environment	Support	RETAIN CE-R4. AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CE-R4 is appropriate.
263.40	Daytona Trust	Coastal Environment	Amend	AMEND CE-S1 to exempt the following from maximum height: <u>a. Chimney structures not exceeding 1.2m in width and 1m in height on any elevation; and</u> <u>b. Architectural features (e.g., finials, spires) that do not exceed 1m in height.</u> <u>c. Solar and water heating components provided these do not exceed the height by more than 0.5m on any elevation.</u> <u>d. Satellite dishes and aerials that do not exceed 1m in height and/or diameter on any elevation.</u> AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional allowances should be made for rooftop projections within specified parameters. Within the specified height limits as sought in the submission, these features will have no or negligible impact on the on the characteristics, qualities and values of the Outstanding Natural Landscape or Outstanding Natural Feature.
263.41	Daytona Trust	Coastal Environment	Amend	AMEND CE-S2 to allow for natural materials as follows: 1. The building and structure exteriors must: a. <u>Be constructed of natural materials or if the exterior surface is coloured or painted with then be a colour with a reflectance value no greater than 35% (provided that 2% of each exterior elevation is exempt) and with a roof colour with a reflectance value no greater than 30%; and</u> b. Not utilise mirror glazing. AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural materials are visually suitable in coastal areas.
263.42	Daytona Trust	Coastal Environment	Oppose	DELETE CE-S3. AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gross floor area is opposed because it is too low to accommodate many residential dwellings, including the average size of a dwelling in New Zealand. It is unnecessary in terms of managing effects on the coastal environment, having regard to the balance of other rules and standards which apply.
263.43	Daytona Trust	General Rural Zone	Amend	AMEND GRUZ-O1, as follows: The purpose of the General rural zone is to: 1. Enable primary production activities; 2. Provide for ancillary activities that support primary production; and 3. Restrict activities <u>that are incompatible with primary production activities</u> incompatible activities that do not have a functional or operational need to be in a rural environment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The objective seeks to restrict a functional or operational need test for non-rural activities to locate in the General rural zone. While 'restrict' does not direct 'avoid' as is sought to be implemented by proposed policy GRUZ-P5, it nevertheless applies an inappropriate test for activities that may not necessarily be rural productive activities themselves but are either supportive of such activities or otherwise compatible.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
				AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	
263.44	Daytona Trust	General Rural Zone	Support	RETAIN GRUZ-O2. AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The outcome is supported and gives effect to the Regional Policy Statement.
263.45	Daytona Trust	General Rural Zone	Support	RETAIN GRUZ-O4. AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintenance or rural character and amenity values is supported.
263.46	Daytona Trust	General Rural Zone	Amend	AMEND GRUZ-P3 to refocus to avoidance of reverse sensitivity effects in accordance with the Regional Policy Statement, as follows: Manage the establishment, design and location of new sensitive activities and other non-productive activities in the General rural zone to avoid where practicable, or otherwise mitigate, reverse sensitivity effects on primary production activities, including through methods such as no-complaints covenants, landscaping, screening or siting of buildings. AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Regional Policy Statement directs the avoidance of reverse sensitivity effects on rural production activities and amendments are sought accordingly.
263.47	Daytona Trust	General Rural Zone	Amend	DELETE from GRUZ-P5 the requirement for activities to have a functional or operational need, but retain the requirement for compatibility, as follows: Avoid non-rural activities in the General rural zone unless they: 1. Have a functional or operational need to locate in the General rural zone; 2.1 Are compatible with primary production activities; and 3.2 Do not result in the loss of availability and productive capacity of highly productive land including consideration of the cumulative effects of such losses. AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Functional and operational need is an inappropriate test here for activities that may not necessarily be rural productive activities themselves but are either supportive of such activities or otherwise compatible.
263.48	Daytona Trust	General Rural Zone	Support	RETAIN GRUZ-R2. AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The rule appropriately provides for agricultural, pastoral or horticultural activities as a permitted activity.
263.49	Daytona Trust	General Rural Zone	Support	RETAIN GRUZ-R3. AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The ability to construct one residential unit on a site less than 24 hectares as a permitted activity is supported.
263.50	Daytona Trust	General Rural Zone	Amend	DELETE the requirement under GRUZ-R4.1.c. which requires the separation distance between the minor residential unit and the principal residential unit to be no greater than 50m. AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The requirement for the separation distance is unnecessary and, in some part, runs counter to the benefit created by the rule. There are many varied reasons for minor residential units in the rural environments. These include housing for extended family through to housing for property caretakers (where separation for privacy reasons or in fact just to maintain a degree of independence between occupants is desirable). In addition, on large properties, minor residential units, can sometimes be located at entranceways for security, and not necessarily close to the primary dwelling.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
263.51	Daytona Trust	General Rural Zone	Amend	<p>ADD "Recreation Activity" as a new permitted activity in the General rural zone. The activity is defined in the Proposed District Plan.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Providing for the use of buildings and land for recreation or leisure is an accepted and desirable part of rural life, and as exhibited by the common facilities at the submitter's Bream Tail site, desirable for social and community well-being.
263.52	Daytona Trust	General Rural Zone	Amend	<p>AMEND GRUZ-S1 to also exempt the following from the maximum height:</p> <p><u>a. Solar and water heating components provided these do not exceed the height by more than 0.5m on any elevation.</u></p> <p><u>b. Satellite dishes and aerials that do not exceed 1m in height and/or diameter on any elevation.</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional allowances should be made for roof top projections within specified parameters, specifically, solar and water heating components and satellite dishes above the roof line of the building. Requiring resource consents for the placement of such features where they exceed the height is inefficient and adds costs which do not outweigh the benefits.
263.53	Daytona Trust	General	Amend	<p>ADD a new "Bream Tail Precinct" under Part 3 - Area-specific matters as a standalone section, including an overview, objectives, policies, and rules as set out in the submission (refer pages 61 to 63 for full details).</p> <p>OR</p> <p>AMEND the General rural zone and Subdivision chapters, and any other relevant chapters in the Proposed District Plan to provide for the Bream Tail in a manner that gives full effect to the relief sought in the submission.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bream Tail presents a large landholding with a complex arrangement of land uses and ownership structure not practically managed by simply its General rural zone and overlays alone; Bream Tail is different from other rural-residential lifestyle developments, with its scale, very low density of residential development, land reserved for conservation purposes, and farm operating over the balance of the property. These characteristics warrant an integrated and comprehensive resource management approach for Bream Tail as a whole; and Bespoke planning provisions provide appropriate recognition of the existing and consented environment at Bream Tail, including that established through the previous subdivision consents and conditions to be complied with as required by instruments on the titles. They allow certain Proposed Plan provisions to be tailored to reduce consenting burden and risk.
263.54	Daytona Trust	SCHED5 – Outstanding Natural Landscapes	Amend	<p>AMEND SCHED5 as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Replace the link to the 2010 Landscape Technical Report with the evaluation sheets which informed the maps adopted from the Northland Regional Policy Statement 2016; and Amend descriptions to follow that used in the evaluation sheets which informed the Regional Policy Statement mapping, including a full description of the characteristics, qualities and values of the outstanding natural landscapes in each case. <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SCHED5 – Outstanding Natural Landscapes has the following link: "Access to full report on Outstanding Natural Landscapes". This links to a 2010 Landscape Technical Report which is the incorrect basis for the evaluation and determination of outstanding natural landscapes in the district. The use of the correct descriptions in SCHED5 of outstanding natural landscapes is important because of the requirements of the related policies in the Proposed District Plan.
263.55	Daytona Trust	SCHED6 – Natural Character Areas	Amend	<p>AMEND SCHED6 – Natural Character Areas to include a full description (or link to a full description) of the characteristics, qualities and values of natural character areas mapped in the Proposed Plan.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A link or inclusion of the correct descriptions of characteristics, qualities and values of identified natural character areas in SCHED6 is important because related policies in the Proposed District Plan require an assessment against them.
263.56	Daytona Trust	Natural Character	Amend	<p>DELETE the mapped extent of the High Natural Character overlay from the following properties at Bream Tail so that it is removed from the building platforms and house sites, and their curtilage areas and access driveways:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 15 Tuaraki Road, Mangawhai (LOT 6 DP 400385); 17 Tuaraki Road, Mangawhai (LOT 5 DP 400385) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High Natural Character areas should not apply to building platforms and house sites, their curtilage areas and access driveways, with such areas not exhibiting natural character values. A number of such areas are identified at Bream Tail as being either fully or partly within a High Natural Character area and should properly be excluded.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
				AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Method 4.5.4(2) of the Regional Policy Statement allows for the mapped areas to be changed at any time (using the SCHED1 process).
263.57	Daytona Trust	Coastal Environment	Amend	<p>DELETE the mapped extent of the Coastal Environment overlay from the following properties at Bream Tail so that it accurately follows characteristics and features, including the first prominent ridge line or contour from the coastal marine area:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 15 Tuaraki Road, Mangawhai (LOT 6 DP 400385); and 17 Tuaraki Road, Mangawhai (LOT 5 DP 400385). <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The mapped extent of the coastal environment at Bream Tail Farm follows a simplified straight-line form and an approximation of key features set out in the Coastal Environment Assessment Criteria of the Regional Policy Statement. Method 4.5.4(2) of the Regional Policy Statement allows for the mapped areas to be changed at any time (using the SCHED1 process).
263.58	Daytona Trust	Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	<p>AMEND the mapped extent of the Outstanding Natural Landscape overlay from the following properties at Bream Tail so that it accurately follows characteristics and features according to the Landscape Assessment Criteria of the Regional Policy Statement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 15 Tuaraki Road, Mangawhai (LOT 6 DP 400385); and 17 Tuaraki Road, Mangawhai (LOT 5 DP 400385). <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The mapped extent of the Outstanding Natural Landscape at Bream Tail Farm follows a simplified straight-line form and an approximation of key features set out in the Landscape Assessment Criteria of the Regional Policy Statement. Method 4.5.4(2) of the Regional Policy Statement allows for the mapped areas to be changed at any time (using the SCHED1 process).
263.59	Daytona Trust	Planning Maps	Amend	<p>ADD a new map layer for the Bream Tail Precinct and apply it to all of the land within the Bream Tail Farm. See Attachment 1 of the submission for a map showing the spatial extent.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter is seeking the addition of a Bream Tail Precinct into the Proposed District Plan and associated provisions as shown in Attachment 1 of the submission.
263.60	Daytona Trust	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	Support	<p>RETAIN ECO-O2.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The objective appropriately seeks to protect, promote and enable the restoration of indigenous biodiversity.
263.61	Daytona Trust	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	Support	<p>RETAIN ECO-O3.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The objective appropriately seeks to protect, promote and enable the restoration of indigenous biodiversity.
263.62	Daytona Trust	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	Support	<p>RETAIN ECO-O4.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The objective appropriately seeks to protect, promote and enable the restoration of indigenous biodiversity.
263.63	Daytona Trust	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	Support	<p>RETAIN ECO-P2.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The policy appropriately gives effect to the requirements of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement and the Regional Policy Statement and recognises the role of landowners as stewards in the restoration of indigenous biodiversity; enabling the removal or management of pest, plant and animal species and the application also of non-regulatory methods to encourage the protection, maintenance and restoration of indigenous biodiversity.
263.64	Daytona Trust	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	Support	<p>RETAIN ECO-P3.</p> <p>AND</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The policy appropriately gives effect to the requirements of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement and the Regional Policy Statement and recognises the role of landowners as stewards in the restoration of indigenous

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
				Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	biodiversity; enabling the removal or management of pest, plant and animal species and the application also of non-regulatory methods to encourage the protection, maintenance and restoration of indigenous biodiversity.
263.65	Daytona Trust	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	Support	RETAIN ECO-P4. AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The policy appropriately gives effect to the requirements of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement and the Regional Policy Statement and recognises the role of landowners as stewards in the restoration of indigenous biodiversity; enabling the removal or management of pest, plant and animal species and the application also of non-regulatory methods to encourage the protection, maintenance and restoration of indigenous biodiversity.
263.66	Daytona Trust	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	Support	RETAIN ECO-P5. AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The policy appropriately gives effect to the requirements of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement and the Regional Policy Statement and recognises the role of landowners as stewards in the restoration of indigenous biodiversity; enabling the removal or management of pest, plant and animal species and the application also of non-regulatory methods to encourage the protection, maintenance and restoration of indigenous biodiversity.
263.67	Daytona Trust	Natural Features and Landscapes	Support	RETAIN NFL-O2. AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The objective correctly gives effect to the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement and the Regional Policy Statement.
263.68	Daytona Trust	Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	<p>AMEND NFL-R2.2. to retain the exclusion to defined exclusive use areas at Bream Tail, amended to ensure the permitted activity rules do apply to Bream Tail and without reference to the consent notice, previous consents or Operative District Plan. This can be achieved by the following amendments, or similar:</p> <p><u>2. Activity Status: Permitted</u></p> <p><u>a. Where the building or structure is on a defined exclusive use area as shown on the survey plan for Lots 1- 4, 6-8, 10, 12-17, 22-29, 34 and 40-45 DP348513, Lot 1 DP493396, Lots 5 and 9 DP435202, Lots 101 and 102 DP528288, Lots 1 and 2 DP408561, Lots 3 and 4 DP404524, Lots 5 and 6 DP400385, and Lots 7 and 8 DP404525 (Bream Tail), or a nominated buildable area or a building platform otherwise approved on those properties.</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The drafting of NFL-R2.2. requires improvements to achieve its intended outcome to specifically recognise the particular circumstances of the Bream Tail subdivision, including the detailed requirements of consent notices that exist on the titles as set out in the submission. The header words "This rule does not apply to....." mean that the permitted activity rule NFL-R2 does not apply to Bream Tail. This has the opposite effect of what is intended because it leaves no permitted activity status for new buildings and structures in the Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Outstanding Natural Features outside the coastal environment.
263.69	Daytona Trust	Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	<p>AMEND NFL-R3 Outstanding Natural Landscape outside the coastal environment to add as permitted activities indigenous vegetation clearance for the following purposes (without a requirement for these to comply with the area limitation standards under NFL-S5 and in addition to the repair and maintenance allowances in the rule as proposed):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> To address an immediate risk to the public safety or damage to property; The formation of walking tracks less than 1.5m wide; The construction of a new fence where the purpose of the new fence is to exclude stock and/or pests from the area of indigenous vegetation, provided that the clearance does not exceed 3.5m in width either side of the fence line; To remove pest species in accordance with any approved pest management plan or biosecurity operational plan; To create or maintain a 20m setback from an area of indigenous vegetation to a residential unit (excluding accessory buildings); 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rule NFL-R3 should be amended to make additional allowances for indigenous vegetation clearance which by its nature will have minor effects on the Outstanding Natural Landscape (whether inside or outside the coastal environment), is required to enable positive effects, or is required for the health and safety of people.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
				<p>f. The removal or clearance of indigenous vegetation from land that was previously cleared and where the indigenous vegetation to be cleared is less than 10 years old; and</p> <p>g. Creation and maintenance of firebreaks to manage fire risk.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	
264.1	Ngunguru Community Garden	General	Oppose	<p>ADD precautionary and prohibitive Genetic Engineering/Genetically Modified Organisms provisions, policies and rules into the Proposed District Plan, consistent with the Draft Kaipara District Plan and the plans of Whangarei District Council, Northland Regional Council, Far North District Council and Auckland Council.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Precautionary and prohibitive GE/GMO provisions should be included in the Proposed District Plan to protect the health of Kaipara residents and those in surrounding districts. GE/GMO genetics can disperse into surrounding areas and compromise the DNA of organically grown commercial, community and private crops. Being GMO free enables New Zealand to sell at higher prices within international markets. GE/GMO contamination does not have boundaries and can harm biodiversity, farmers and the environment. Kaipara District Council should respect and support the policies of Tai Tokerau Iwi for their respective rohe. Council should act in accordance with case law, the Northland/Auckland Inter-Council Working Party (ICWP) on GMO Risk Evaluation and Management Options and in the best interests of residents and ratepayers. There is an obligation to act as a formative member of the ICWP, regardless of controversial potential legislative changes.
265.1	Environmental Defence Society Incorporated	General	Amend	<p>AMEND the Proposed District Plan to give effect to national direction and regional planning instruments in a way that is specific to Kaipara.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any similar, consequential or alternative relief as is necessary to address the issues raised.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter opposes the Proposed District Plan in part and considers that the plan requires significant re-drafting to ensure it gives effect to relevant National Policy Statements, National Environmental Standards and National planning Standards, as stated in s75 Resource Management Act: All associated Proposed District Plan objectives, policies, rules and standards need to be worded in way that achieves and gives effects to national direction in a Kaipara-specific way.
265.2	Environmental Defence Society Incorporated	Strategic Direction	Oppose	<p>AMEND the Strategic Direction chapter so interrelationships between the Vision for Kaipara and other sections are clearly identified, the objectives and policies work together to achieve the overall vision for the Kaipara District and environmental values are recognised.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>AMEND the Strategic Direction by making Financial Contributions a separate chapter, i.e., not part of the 'Vision'.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any similar, consequential or alternative relief as is necessary to address the issues raised.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter opposes Proposed District Plan Strategic Direction Objectives as currently drafted. 'Vision for Kaipara' Objectives are not specific to Kaipara communities, nor do they give effect to national direction or regional planning instruments. Provisions within the Strategic Direction chapter are opposed for the following reasons: They are generically worded and fail to reflect on, or respond to, local issues or environmental values. Provisions do not adequately flow through to the zone provisions Objectives within the 'Vision for Kaipara' section do not include environmental values. Though each section is a topic of its own, as a whole the objectives do not represent the Kaipara District, its people or environmental values. There are omissions, including the need for objectives to be supported by policies stating how the objective is intended to be achieved. When read in its entirety, the chapter format is confusing. E.g., some topics only have objectives while others have objectives, policies and rules. This range of provisions is listed below: VK – Vision for Kaipara (SD-VK-O1 to SD-VK-O8) HH – Historic Heritage (SD-HH-O1) NE – Natural Environment (SD-NE-O1 to SD-NE-O3) NH – Natural Hazards and Resilience (SD-NH-O1)

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TW – Tangata Whenua (SD-TW-01) • UFD – Urban Form and Development (SD-UFD-01 to SD-UFD-05), (SD-UFD-P1 to SD-UFD-P7) • FC – Financial Contributions (FC-01 to FC-04), (FC-P2 to FC-P8), (FC-R1), (FC-S1 to FC-S6) • The National Planning Standards chapter 7(2) states that "Rules must not be included under the Strategic direction heading". As listed above, the Financial Contributions section includes rules. Financial Contributions should be separate as this is not part of the 'Vision'. The submitter considers that financial contributions are a mechanism that may be employed to assist with achieving a 'Vision'. • The Strategic Direction chapter needs to be rewritten to improve the legibility and ensure the 'direction' is specific for Kaipara. Interrelationships between the sections listed above need to be identified, and objectives and policies should work together to achieve an overall Vision for Kaipara.
265.3	Environmental Defence Society Incorporated	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	Amend	<p>AMEND the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter to give effect to national direction and regional planning instruments.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>RETAIN the integrity of natural environment mapping Outstanding Natural Landscape, Outstanding Natural Feature, High Natural Character Area and</p> <p>Outstanding Natural Character Area (inferred).</p> <p>AND</p> <p>AMEND relevant objectives, policies, rules and standards to ensure planning outcomes are achieved which will not jeopardise the integrity of Kaipara's natural environment.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any similar, consequential or alternative relief as is necessary to address the issues raised.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter opposes the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter in part as it does not include mapped areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna - contrary to the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity and the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management. It is noted that the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity states that each territorial authority must undertake a district-wide assessment to identify area of significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitat of indigenous fauna that qualify as Significant Natural Areas. This has not been done and, without Significant Natural Area mapping, the submitter does not consider that the Proposed District Plan gives effect to national direction or achieves the purpose of the Resource Management Act. • Relying on future plan changes is not a solution. Rather, National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity requirements should be incorporated into the Proposed District Plan now to enable the drafting of associated objectives, policies, rules and standards to ensure Significant Natural Area's can be identified, protected, managed and restored (as required by National Planning Standards chapter 7, para 19). The same goes in regard to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2020 . • The submitter notes that a series of other natural environment features are mapped within the Proposed District Plan and this is supported. This includes Outstanding Natural Landscape, Outstanding Natural Feature, High Natural Character Area and Outstanding Natural Character Area. However, it is integral that these features should continue to be protected and not be diminished (unless they no longer meet the required threshold). • The submitter requests that the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity, Natural Character, Natural Features and Landscapes chapters are re-drafted to give effect to national direction and the Resource Management Act. Within these chapters, the following issues need to be considered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subdivision needs to be referred to alongside use and development. • Regulatory thresholds should be strengthened. • Activity statuses need to be 'ratcheted up'. • Provision for earthworks and indigenous vegetation clearance should not be annually. • Matters of control and discretion should provide for the protection, management and restoration of indigenous biodiversity and outstanding landscapes and features.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The omissions in Proposed District Plan framework risk the loss of important natural values which require protection for future generations. The submitter suggests that provisions the same or similar to Auckland Council's natural environment mapping are included within the Proposed District Plan (provided in Attachment 1 of the submission).
265.4	Environmental Defence Society Incorporated	Natural Character	Amend	<p>AMEND the Natural Character chapter to give effect to national direction and regional planning instruments.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>RETAIN the integrity of natural environment mapping (inferred).</p> <p>AND</p> <p>AMEND relevant objectives, policies, rules and standards to ensure planning outcomes are achieved which will not jeopardise the integrity of Kaipara's natural environment.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any similar, consequential or alternative relief as is necessary to address the issues raised.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter opposes the Natural Character chapter in part as it does not include mapped areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna - contrary to the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity and the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management. It is noted that the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity states that each territorial authority must undertake a district-wide assessment to identify area of significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitat of indigenous fauna that qualify as Significant Natural Areas. This has not been done, and, without Significant Natural Area mapping, the submitter does not consider that the Proposed District Plan gives effect to national direction or achieves the purpose of the Resource Management Act. Relying on future plan changes is not a solution. Rather, National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity requirements should be incorporated into the Proposed District Plan now to enable the drafting of associated objectives, policies, rules and standards to ensure Significant Natural Area's can be identified, protected, managed and restored (as required by National Planning Standards chapter 7, para 19). The same goes in regard to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2020. The submitter notes that a series of other natural environment features are mapped within the Proposed District Plan and this is supported. This includes Outstanding Natural Landscape, Outstanding Natural Feature, High Natural Character Area and Outstanding Natural Character Area. However, it is integral that these features should continue to be protected and not be diminished (unless they no longer meet the required threshold). The submitter requests that the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity, Natural Character, Natural Features and Landscapes chapters are re-drafted to give effect to national direction and the Resource Management Act. Within these chapters, the following issues need to be considered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Subdivision needs to be referred to alongside use and development. Regulatory thresholds should be strengthened. Activity statuses need to be 'ratcheted up'. Provision for earthworks and indigenous vegetation clearance should not be annually. Matters of control and discretion should provide for the protection, management and restoration of indigenous biodiversity and outstanding landscapes and features. The omissions in Proposed District Plan framework risk the loss of important natural values which require protection for future generations. The submitter suggests that provisions the same or similar to Auckland Council's natural environment mapping are included within the Proposed District Plan (provided in Attachment 1 of the submission).
265.5	Environmental Defence Society Incorporated	Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	<p>AMEND the Natural Features and Landscapes chapter to give effect to national direction and regional planning instruments.</p> <p>AND</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter opposes the Natural Features and Landscapes chapter in part as it does not include mapped areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna - contrary to the National Policy Statement

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
				<p>RETAIN the integrity of natural environment mapping (inferred).</p> <p>AND</p> <p>AMEND relevant objectives, policies, rules and standards to ensure planning outcomes are achieved which will not jeopardise the integrity of Kaipara's natural environment.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any similar, consequential or alternative relief as is necessary to address the issues raised.</p>	<p>for Indigenous Biodiversity and the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management. It is noted that the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity states that each territorial authority must undertake a district-wide assessment to identify area of significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitat of indigenous fauna that qualify as Significant Natural Areas. This has not been done, and, without Significant Natural Area mapping, the submitter does not consider that the Proposed District Plan gives effect to national direction or achieves the purpose of the Resource Management Act.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relying on future plan changes is not a solution. Rather, National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity requirements should be incorporated into the Proposed District Plan now to enable the drafting of associated objectives, policies, rules and standards to ensure Significant Natural Area's can be identified, protected, managed and restored (as required by National Planning Standards chapter 7, para 19). The same goes in regard to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2020. The submitter notes that a series of other natural environment features are mapped within the Proposed District Plan and this is supported. This includes Outstanding Natural Landscape, Outstanding Natural Feature, High Natural Character Area and Outstanding Natural Character Area. However, it is integral that these features should continue to be protected and not be diminished (unless they no longer meet the required threshold). The submitter requests that the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity, Natural Character, Natural Features and Landscapes chapters are re-drafted to give effect to national direction and the Resource Management Act. Within these chapters, the following issues need to be considered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Subdivision needs to be referred to alongside use and development Regulatory thresholds should be strengthened. Activity statuses need to be 'ratcheted up' Provision for earthworks and indigenous vegetation clearance should not be annually. Matters of control and discretion should provide for the protection, management and restoration of indigenous biodiversity and outstanding landscapes and features. The omissions in Proposed District Plan framework risk the loss of important natural values which require protection for future generations. The submitter suggests that provisions the same or similar to Auckland Council's natural environment mapping are included within the Proposed District Plan (provided in Attachment 1 of the submission).
265.6	Environmental Defence Society Incorporated	Public Access	Amend	<p>AMEND the Public Access chapter to give effect to national direction and regional planning instruments.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>RETAIN the integrity of natural environment mapping (inferred).</p> <p>AND</p> <p>AMEND relevant objectives, policies, rules and standards to ensure planning outcomes are achieved which will not jeopardise the integrity of Kaipara's natural environment.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any similar, consequential or alternative relief as is necessary to address the issues raised.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter opposes the Public Access chapter in part as it does not include mapped areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna - contrary to the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity and the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management. It is noted that the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity states that each territorial authority must undertake a district-wide assessment to identify area of significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitat of indigenous fauna that qualify as Significant Natural Areas. This has not been done, and, without Significant Natural Area mapping, the submitter does not consider it is possible to determine whether the Proposed District Plan gives effect to national direction or achieves the purpose of the Resource Management Act.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relying on future plan changes is not a solution. Rather, National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity requirements should be incorporated into the Proposed District Plan now to enable the drafting of associated objectives, policies, rules and standards to ensure Significant Natural Area's can be identified, protected, managed and restored (as required by National Planning Standards chapter 7, para 19). The same goes in regard to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2020. The submitter notes that a series of other natural environment features are mapped within the Proposed District Plan and this is supported. This includes Outstanding Natural Landscape, Outstanding Natural Feature, High Natural Character Area and Outstanding Natural Character Area. However, it is integral that these features should continue to be protected and not be diminished (unless they no longer meet the required threshold). The submitter requests that the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity, Natural Character, Natural Features and Landscapes chapters are re-drafted to give effect to national direction and the Resource Management Act. Within these chapters, the following issues need to be considered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Subdivision needs to be referred to alongside use and development. Regulatory thresholds should be strengthened. Activity statuses need to be 'ratcheted up'. Provision for earthworks and indigenous vegetation clearance should not be annually. Matters of control and discretion should provide for the protection, management and restoration of indigenous biodiversity and outstanding landscapes and features. The omissions in Proposed District Plan framework risk the loss of important natural values which require protection for future generations. The submitter suggests that provisions the same or similar to Auckland Council's natural environment mapping are included within the Proposed District Plan (provided in Attachment 1 of the submission).
265.7	Environmental Defence Society Incorporated	Coastal Environment	Amend	<p>AMEND the entire Coastal Environment chapter to give effect to national direction.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any similar, consequential or alternative relief as is necessary to address the issues raised.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter opposes the Coastal Environment chapter in part. chapter 7, paragraph 28 of the National Policy Statement requires that cross-referencing to other specific coastal provisions within other chapters is provided. Though the Natural Features and Landscapes chapter is referred to, other chapters such as Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity are not referred to, even though ECO-P1 refers to biodiversity within the Coastal Environment. The submitter requests that the chapter is reviewed in line with the National Policy Statement and s75 Resource Management Act requirements.
265.8	Environmental Defence Society Incorporated	Planning Maps	Support	<p>RETAIN mapped areas of Outstanding Natural Landscape.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any similar, consequential or alternative relief as necessary to address the issues raised.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter supports mapped Outstanding Natural Landscapes as they appear to reflect PC1 of the Operative District Plan.
265.9	Environmental Defence Society Incorporated	Planning Maps	Support	<p>RETAIN the proposed extent of High Natural Character areas.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any similar, consequential or alternative relief as necessary to address the issues raised.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter supports the mapping of High Natural Character areas and considers these areas should continue to be protected unless the feature no longer exists or has diminished values.
265.10	Environmental Defence Society Incorporated	Planning Maps	Support	<p>RETAIN the Coastal Environment mapping insofar as it is aligned with the Northland Regional Policy Statement (inferred).</p> <p>AND</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Coastal Environment extent shown on the Proposed District Plan maps appears to reflect the operative coastal environment within the Northland Regional Policy Statement. The

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
				Any similar, consequential or alternative relief as necessary to address the issues raised.	submitter supports the incorporation of Northland Regional Policy Statement mapping.
266.1	Baylys Beach Holiday Park	Commercial Zone	Oppose	DELETE COMZ-R3 insofar as the rule applies to Baylys Beach.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> COMZ-R3 does not serve the Baylys Beach community. Baylys Beach does not need office space when Dargaville is only 10 minutes away. The submitter questions whether any community surveying has been undertaken to see if office space is necessary.
266.2	Baylys Beach Holiday Park	Commercial Zone	Oppose	DELETE COMZ-R5 insofar as the rule applies to Baylys Beach.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> COMZ-R5 does not serve the Baylys Beach community. There are enough schools in Dargaville and other surrounding areas. Some schools do not have enough pupils as it is. Baylys Beach is not a town centre and travelling ten minutes to Dargaville is not far.
266.3	Baylys Beach Holiday Park	Commercial Zone	Oppose	DELETE COMZ-R6 insofar as the rule applies to Baylys Beach.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> COMZ-R6 does not serve the Baylys Beach community. The Proposed District Plan talks of improving the community, but a community corrections activity would be detrimental to the community. The submitter requests that Council explain how enabling a corrections activity at Baylys Beach would serve the community.
266.4	Baylys Beach Holiday Park	Commercial Zone	Oppose	DELETE COMZ-R12 insofar as the rule applies to Baylys Beach.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> COMZ-R12 does not serve the Baylys Beach community. Such activities would result in excess noise and air pollution. The submission questions how Council plans to monitor such effects? The submission questions whether research has been undertaken to assess what might occur, should such businesses operate within a small community with existing infrastructural capacity and environmental concerns.
266.5	Baylys Beach Holiday Park	Commercial Zone	Oppose	No specific decision is requested; however, the submission opposes COMZ-S3 as it is likely to take away so much light and space.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The maximum height in COMZ-S3 is opposed as it does not serve the Baylys Beach community. Buildings up to 12m will reduce light and space. Baylys Beach is not in high demand, and this Standard will only result in empty buildings.
266.6	Baylys Beach Holiday Park	Planning Maps	Amend	AMEND the proposed Commercial zone at Baylys Beach by reducing its extent.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposes the extent of Commercial zoning at Baylys Beach and considers it to be too large and many of the Commercial zone provisions are not suitable. The submitters wish to clarify they are not opposed to growth within Baylys Beach but request that growth is considered and of an appropriate scale. Baylys Beach does not need to grow to the size of Dargaville. What the submitter describes as 'modest development' (i.e., small-scale retail targeted at holidaymakers, a local grocery store, cafes/restaurants and a petrol station) would add value to the area. However, larger infrastructure such as education premises, offices, trade or yard operations will not align with the character of Baylys Beach - being that of a small, coastal community. The submitter's major concern is environmental pressure caused from commercial development. Baylys Beach already faces challenges, especially during storm events and increasing density through rezoning as proposed has potential to worsen these issues. Adequate consideration needs to be given to the environmental impact and management of increased waste and stormwater runoff. Existing infrastructure is under strain and residents are already subject to frequent water restrictions over the summer. As such, any further development should require a review and upgrade of infrastructure. There is a need for considered and sustainable growth throughout Kaipara. However, the submitter requests that Council consider the character, environmental and infrastructural sensitivities at Baylys Beach and ensure future development is appropriate.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

VOLUME 5

(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
267.1	Northland Fish and Game Council	Definitions	Amend	ADD a definition for 'Maimai' as follows: <u>game bird shooting shelter structures.</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter requests that a definition for 'Maimai' consistent with the Building Act is provided. Parts of the Proposed District Plan relate to controls on buildings and structures that may have unintended consequences for maimai used for hunting. Maimai are located in or near the edges of waterbodies. The right to build, tag (i.e., claim) and use maimai is a fundamental part of duck hunting. The Wildlife Act, 1953 and Wildlife Regulations 1955 regulates maimai use. Maimai need to be of adequate size to maintain shooting zones without compromising safety. A range of structures are used as maimai and are permitted activities around much of New Zealand (both permanent and temporary structures).
267.2	Northland Fish and Game Council	Definitions	Amend	ADD a definition for 'Biosecurity reasons and biosecurity works' as follows: <u>means activities to eliminate or manage pests and unwanted organisms (as those terms are defined in the Biosecurity Act 1993).</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Proposed District Plan does not contain a definition for 'Biosecurity'. It is requested that a definition be included to provide context for ECO-P4.
267.3	Northland Fish and Game Council	Definitions	Amend	ADD a definition for 'Official Sign' as follows: <u>means all signs required or provided for under any statute or regulation, or are otherwise related to aspects of public safety.</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter seeks that a definition be provided for 'Official sign' to avoid any ambiguity/confusion regarding what an official sign is. The Proposed District Plan does not make it clear which signage category Northland Fish and Game-related signage will fall under (i.e., 'Official signs' or 'Information signs'). As there are different conditions associated with each rule, the submitter seeks clarity by way of a definition for 'Official signs'. The submission provides further information on typical fish and game-related signage.
267.4	Northland Fish and Game Council	Definitions	Amend	AMEND the definition for 'Information Sign' as follows: means a sign that provides information or direction to public, including: a. education, safety and public awareness; b. relating to a place of historic or environmental significance c. regulatory signs erected by, or on behalf of the relevant authority d. signs erected by the Crown, the Council or any other statutory administering body, for the purposes of marking the boundaries of or conveying the name of, or information about: i. marine reserves; ii. coastal protection areas; iii. cultural heritage sites; iv. a scheduled heritage building or item; v. reserves, parks and public places; <u>vi. hunter or angler access.</u> or to advise of activities which may or may not be undertaken in such areas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Proposed District Plan does not make it clear which signage category Northland Fish and Game-related signage will fall under (i.e., 'Official signs' or 'Information signs'). As there are different conditions associated with each rule, the submitter seeks clarity by way of including 'hunter and angler access points' within the definition for 'Information Signs'. The submission provides further information on typical fish and game-related signage and its informative nature.
267.5	Northland Fish and Game Council	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	Support	RETAIN ECO-P4 as notified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No reasons provided.
267.6	Northland Fish and Game Council	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity		RETAIN ECO-P5 as notified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No reasons provided.
267.7	Northland Fish and Game Council	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	Amend	AMEND ECO-R1.1. as follows: d. To remove pest species in accordance with any approved pest management plan or biosecurity operational plan <u>approved by the relevant local authority;</u> i. The removal or clearance of indigenous vegetation from land that was previously cleared, <u>and where the indigenous vegetation to be cleared is less than 10 years old, the removal is no more than 250m² per holding per calendar year and is not within 5 m of a waterbody;</u> and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The rule ECO R1.d. should have a qualifier with regards to who specifically approves a pest management plan i.e. the District or Regional Council, the Department of Conservation etc. The rule ECO-R1.i. does not include a spatial parameter, limiting clearing to a specific amount. 10 year old indigenous regeneration vegetation can provide valuable habitat and should not be able to be removed without an area limit as a permitted activity. The rule ECO-R1 j. is broad and open to interpretation; It refers to maintenance of

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
				j. Creation and maintenance of firebreaks to manage fire risk <u>which complies with section 43 and 64 of the Fire and Emergency Act 2017.</u>	firebreaks but does not define these. Also 'manage fire risk' can mean different things to different people. The lack of clarity may provide a loophole and frustrate Council's enforcement work. We strongly recommend providing specific criteria for this rule, for example, limiting this to work which complies with section 43 or 64 of the Fire and Emergency Act 2017
267.8	Northland Fish and Game Council	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	Amend	AMEND ECO-R2.1. as follows: Where: a. It does not exceed 1,000m² per site in any calendar year in the Māori purpose zone, General rural zone, and Rural lifestyle zone; or b. It does not exceed 500m² per site in any calendar year in all other zones. <u>a. It does not exceed 100m² per site in any calendar year.</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter considers that 1,000m² a year is too large an area to enable indigenous vegetation clearance as a permitted activity for the general rural zone and rural lifestyle zone. The submitter seeks the rule be amended to 100m² per site per calendar year unless other qualifiers are included similar to the Proposed Far North District Plan.
267.9	Northland Fish and Game Council	Natural Character	Amend	ADD a clause to NATC-P2 as follows: Enable indigenous vegetation clearance and earthworks within wetland, lake and river margins where it is for: 1. The repair or maintenance of lawfully established activities; 2. Safe clearance for existing overhead powerlines; 3. Health and safety of the public; 4. Biosecurity reasons; and 5. The sustainable non-commercial harvest for customary activities; <u>and</u> <u>6. Conservation activities</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conservation activities should be provided for as part of this policy so that they are enabled.
267.10	Northland Fish and Game Council	Natural Character	Support	RETAIN NATC-P4 as notified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No reasons provided.
267.11	Northland Fish and Game Council	Natural Character	Support	RETAIN NATC-P5 as notified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No reasons provided.
267.12	Northland Fish and Game Council	Natural Character	Amend	ADD a new clause to NATC-R2.1. as follows: b. The building or structure is required for: <u>vi. A maimai, no greater than 10m².</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter seeks that rule NACT-R2 that provides for new buildings or structures in wetland, lake and river margins as a permitted activity, be amended to include maimai because these areas are often also valued for gamebird hunting, as such it is appropriate to clarify that the provision covers maimai.
267.13	Northland Fish and Game Council	Natural Character	Amend	AMEND NATC-R3.1.as follows: a. The earthworks complies with NATC-S2-Earthworks; and b. The earthworks is for the maintenance of lawfully established roads, fences, utility connections, driveways, parking areas, effluent disposal systems, swimming pools, walking or cycling tracks, or farm and forestry tracks.; <u>or</u> <u>c. the earthworks are for conservation activities or biosecurity activities.</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No reasons provided.
267.14	Northland Fish and Game Council	Natural Character	Amend	AMEND NATC-R4.1. as follows: a. The activity complies with NATC-S3-Indigenous vegetation clearance; or b. The indigenous vegetation clearance is for the maintenance of lawfully established roads, fences, utility connections, driveways, parking areas, effluent disposal systems, swimming pools, walking or cycling tracks, or farm and forestry tracks. ; <u>or</u> <u>c. The indigenous vegetation clearance is for conservation activities or biosecurity activities/reasons.</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NATC-R4 should include earthworks for conservation activities and biosecurity activities/reasons.
267.15	Northland Fish and Game Council	Public Access	Support	RETAIN PA-O1 as notified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports this policy directive and associated rules.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
267.16	Northland Fish and Game Council	Subdivision	Support	RETAIN SUB-O5 as notified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No reasons provided.
267.17	Northland Fish and Game Council	Subdivision	Support	RETAIN SUB-R5 as notified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No reasons provided.
267.18	Northland Fish and Game Council	Subdivision	Support	RETAIN SUB-R6 as notified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No reasons provided.
267.19	Northland Fish and Game Council	Subdivision	Support	RETAIN SUB-R7 as notified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expanding the roles of Benefit Lots is a straightforward way for the Council to meet its obligations under the Northland Regional Policy Statement using existing tools.
267.20	Northland Fish and Game Council	Subdivision	Support	RETAIN SUB-S16 as notified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No reasons provided.
267.21	Northland Fish and Game Council	Earthworks	Amend	AMEND EW-P1 as follows: Enable earthworks where they provide for: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Urban land uses and development within urban zones; Rural land uses and development within the rural zones; Conservation, biosecurity and recreation activities; Land drainage and flood control works; and The construction, maintenance, operation and upgrading of infrastructure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter supports earthworks for conservation activities and requests that 'biosecurity' is also added. Notably, enabling earthworks where they provide for land drainage is not supported.
267.22	Northland Fish and Game Council	Definitions	Amend	ADD a definition for 'Land disturbance'.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter is concerned that land disturbance is not defined, especially within the context of Rule EW-R2.
267.23	Northland Fish and Game Council	Noise	Support	RETAIN NOISE-O2.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Proposed District Plan's framework enables various noise emitting activities to operate as permitted activities outside of the general rule.
267.24	Northland Fish and Game Council	Noise	Support	RETAIN NOISE-P1.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Proposed District Plan's framework enables various noise emitting activities to operate as permitted activities, outside of the general rule.
267.25	Northland Fish and Game Council	Noise	Support	RETAIN NOISE-P6.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Proposed District Plan's framework enables various noise emitting activities to operate as permitted activities, outside of the general rule.
267.26	Northland Fish and Game Council	Noise	Amend	ADD a new NOISE Rule as follows: <u>NOISE-R13 Emission of noise from hunting activities</u> <u>General rural zone and Rural lifestyle zone</u> 1. <u>Activity status: Permitted</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter seeks a permitted activity rule for noise generated by hunting activities.
267.27	Northland Fish and Game Council	Signs	Support	RETAIN SIGN-P1 as notified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is important that the organisation can operate under a single and clear rule.
267.28	Northland Fish and Game Council	Signs	Support	RETAIN SIGN-R3 as notified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is important that the submitter can operate under a single and clear rule.
267.29	Northland Fish and Game Council	General Rural Zone	Amend	ADD a new permitted activity rule to the General rural zone as follows: <u>GRUZ-R11 Recreational hunting</u> 1. <u>Activity status: Permitted</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter requests that a new General rural zone rule permitting recreational hunting is added.
267.30	Northland Fish and Game Council	General Rural Zone	Support	RETAIN GRUZ-R7 as notified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter supports conservation activities as permitted activities.
267.31	Northland Fish and Game Council	Rural Lifestyle Zone	Support	RETAIN RLZ-R7 as notified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter supports conservation activities as permitted activities.
267.32	Northland Fish and Game Council	Natural Open Space Zone	Support	RETAIN NOSZ-O1 as notified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enable noise emitted by hunting activities as a permitted activity.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
267.33	Northland Fish and Game Council	Natural Open Space Zone	Support	RETAIN NOSZ-O2 as notified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enable noise emitted by hunting activities as a permitted activity.
267.34	Northland Fish and Game Council	Natural Open Space Zone	Support	RETAIN NOSZ-P4 as notified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enable noise emitted by hunting activities as a permitted activity.
267.35	Northland Fish and Game Council	Natural Open Space Zone	Support	RETAIN NOSZ-P5 as notified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enable noise emitted by hunting activities to be a permitted activity.
267.36	Northland Fish and Game Council	Natural Open Space Zone	Support	RETAIN NOSZ-R1 as notified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enable noise emitted by hunting activities to be a permitted activity.
267.37	Northland Fish and Game Council	Natural Open Space Zone	Support	RETAIN NOSZ-R2 as notified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enable noise emitted by hunting activities to be a permitted activity.
267.38	Northland Fish and Game Council	Natural Open Space Zone	Support	RETAIN NOSZ-R3 as notified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter seeks that noise generated by hunting be a permitted activity.
267.39	Northland Fish and Game Council	Definitions	Support	ADD a definition for "Recreation activity" in the context of NOSZ-R4.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter is concerned that recreation activities are not defined, especially within the context of rule NOSZ-R4.
267.40	Northland Fish and Game Council	Open Space Zone	Support	RETAIN Open space zone policies and rules as notified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter supports the policies and rules in this chapter.
267.41	Northland Fish and Game Council	General Rural Zone	Amend	AMEND GRUZ-P3 as follows: Manage the establishment, design and location of new sensitive activities and other non-productive activities in the General rural zone to avoid where practicable, or otherwise mitigate, reverse sensitivity effects on primary production activities <u>and recreational hunting, including</u> through methods such as no-complaints covenants, landscaping, screening or siting of buildings.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend GRUZ-P3 so that it includes the situations where hunting could have reverse sensitivity effects.
267.42	Northland Fish and Game Council	Rural Lifestyle Zone	Amend	AMEND RLZ-P4 as follows: Avoid where possible, or otherwise mitigate, reverse sensitivity on primary production activities, <u>and recreational activities such as game bird hunting</u> in the General rural zone through: 1. The use of setbacks; and 2. The design of land use development and subdivision.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rural lifestyle zone is often where reverse sensitivity issues occur for recreational hunting, as such the submitter seeks that RLZ-P4 be amended to have this consideration added.
268.1	Fuzen Entertainment Limited	National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	AMEND the Proposed District Plan to properly reflect National Policy Statements, National Environmental Standards and National Planning Standards in a way specific to Kaipara.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Proposed District Plan must give effect to relevant National Policy Statements, National Environment Standards and the National Planning Standards as per s75 Resource Management Act. The submitter requests that all associated objectives, policies, rules and standards should be amended to give effect to relevant national policy within the context of Kaipara's strategic direction.
268.2	Fuzen Entertainment Limited	Strategic Direction	Oppose	AMEND the entire Strategic Direction chapter to improve legibility and provide a coherent strategic direction reflective of the Kaipara District. AND AMEND the Strategic Direction chapter so it is in accordance with National Planning Standards chapter 7(2) by removing Financial Contribution Rules and Standards (inferred).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter opposes all Strategic Direction provisions, including: VK – Vision for Kaipara (SD-VK-O1 to SD-VK-O8) HH – Historic Heritage (SD-HH-O1) NE – Natural Environment (SD-NE-O1 to SD-NE-O3) NH – Natural Hazards and Resilience (SD-NH-O1) TW – Tangata Whenua (SD-TW-O1) UFD – Urban Form and Development (SD-UFD-O1 to SD-UFD-O5), (SD-UFD-P1 to SD-UFD-P7) FC – Financial Contributions (FC-O1 to FC-O4), (FC-P2 to FC-P8), (FC-R1), (FC-S1 to FC-S6) As drafted, Vision for Kaipara provisions are not specific to the local area or communities. Provisions are generically worded, insufficiently

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
					<p>directive and do not reflect or respond to specific local issues or characteristics. Moreover, the Strategic Direction does not adequately flow into zone provisions. The submitter recognises that each objective and its topic are of value, when combined, the objectives do not represent Kaipara or its communities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some Strategic Direction topics only have objectives, whereas others have objectives, policies and rules. The National Planning Standards chapter 7(2) states that rules must not be included within the strategic direction. However, the Proposed District Plan includes objectives, policies, rules and standards for Financial Matters under Strategic Direction. It is requested that the Strategic Direction chapter be rewritten in order to improve legibility provide a more bold and innovative direction for Kaipara.
268.3	Fuzen Entertainment Limited	Definitions	Support	<p>RETAIN the definition for Temporary Activities as notified.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Ensure that any changes to the definition of "Temporary Activities" do not limit the extent to which Temporary Activities can occur.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the definition for Temporary Activities as it reflects the fact that activities are limited in duration and incidence.
268.4	Fuzen Entertainment Limited	General	Amend	<p>ADD a site-specific 'Worsfold Farm Events Precinct' for the festival site at Worsfold Farm at 433 Settlement Road, Kaiwaka (refer to Attachments A and B of the submission for the proposed land area and provisions).</p> <p>AND</p> <p>ADD an associated Noise Overlay to apply to sites adjacent to Worsfold Farm at 433 Settlement Road, Kaiwaka (refer to Attachment A of the submission for the proposed noise overlay map and details).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter is a boutique event promotions and productions company established in 1999 and is dedicated to bringing unique and exciting artists and musicians to New Zealand Audiences. Its flagship festival, Northern Bass, has been held in the Kaipara District for over ten years at 433 Settlement Road, Kaiwaka. The submitter seeks to solidify its interests as a festival and events organizer in a robust and transparent manner. As such, the addition of a site-specific Precinct and associated Noise Overlay are requested to secure future festival operations. Northern Bass is a unique festival with a strong track record that contributes to the social, economic and cultural wellbeing within Kaipara. Specific provision for the festival will achieve certainty for the submitter and community. The submitter requests that Precinct provisions reflect granted resource consents or enable a direct consenting pathway for the festival. Attachment A shows the land area subject to this submission and a draft Precinct is provided in Attachment B. Proposed provisions address environmental matters such as noise, transport and traffic, attendance numbers and the number of days/hours annually for operations to align with relevant resource consents. A Noise Control Overlay which would extend around the Precinct is sought to enable a greater level of noise for a specified number of days/hours annually to align with Precinct standards and relevant resource consents. Greater specificity for the future operation of Northern Bass would bring about social, economic and cultural benefits.
268.5	Fuzen Entertainment Limited	Temporary Activities	Support	<p>RETAIN TEMP-O1 as notified.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Ensure any changes to the definition of "Temporary Activities" do not limit the extent to which temporary activities can occur.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the objective as it highlights that temporary activities contribute to the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of communities in Kaipara. Northern Bass festival has clear social, economic and cultural benefits, contributing to Kaipara annually.
268.6	Fuzen Entertainment Limited	Temporary Activities	Amend	<p>AMEND TEMP-O2 to be more specific regarding the extent of effects considered. e.g., functional and operational site management.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Proposed District Plan should manage relevant adverse effects. Temporary Activities Rules and Standards should be aligned directly to potential adverse effects listed in Policy TEMP-P2 including the functional and operational needs of an activity.
268.7	Fuzen Entertainment Limited	Temporary Activities	Support	<p>RETAIN TEMP-P1 as notified.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Ensure any changes to the definition of "Temporary activities" do not limit the extent to which temporary activities can occur.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the recognition of temporary activities that contribute to social, economic and cultural wellbeing within Kaipara. Northern Bass festival makes such contributions on an annual basis.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
268.8	Fuzen Entertainment Limited	Temporary Activities	Amend	AMEND the specificity of the adverse effects to be considered in TEMP-P2.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter acknowledges that adverse effects must be managed to enable temporary activities. However, as per the submission on TEMP-O2, TEMP-P2 should be more specific regarding the effects for consideration. It is accepted that noise effects will contribute to amenity and character value within the area. Landscape, however, though not expressly referred to it could be implied, should not be considered as all structures and operations are temporary in nature.
268.9	Fuzen Entertainment Limited	Temporary Activities	Oppose	AMEND the Notes to the Temporary Activity rules to incorporate or cross-reference relevant Transport rules and standards. OR ADD specific transport provisions for temporary activities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter opposes the lack of transport-related provisions for temporary activities as excluded by Note 1 of the Temporary Activities Rules. The submitter considers this needs to be formally consulted upon as provisions of the whole cannot be assessed as drafted.
268.10	Fuzen Entertainment Limited	Temporary Activities	Amend	AMEND TEMP-R1 to give greater flexibility to larger events.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the requested Precinct and Noise Overlay are not accepted, the submitter requests that provisions for temporary activities are amended to better enable the continuation of important activities such as the Northern Bass festival. As drafted, TEMP-R1 is too restrictive and does not enable the operation of Northern Bass as a permitted activity. In particular, duration, hours of operation and timeframes for temporary structures / to return the site to its original condition are too restrictive. If the proposed Precinct and Noise Overlay are not inserted into the Proposed District Plan, amendments to timeframe provisions are sought to reflect the time it takes to arrange a festival of Northern Bass' scale in Kaipara.
268.11	Fuzen Entertainment Limited	Noise	Amend	AMEND NOISE-P6 to provide greater flexibility and specificity.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the request for a site-specific Precinct and Noise Overlay is not accepted, Temporary Activities provisions require amendment to better enable the continuation of activities such as Northern Bass. The opportunity for temporary activities to be enabled within Kaipara is supported. However, as drafted, the level of exceedance within a zone appears subjective.
268.12	Fuzen Entertainment Limited	Noise	Oppose	AMEND NOISE-R4 to better reflect and offer flexibility for larger events.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the requested Precinct and Noise Overlay are not added into the Proposed District Plan, Temporary Activity provisions require amendment to better enable the continuation of activities like the Northern Bass festival. Directly referencing noise limits for the receiving zone means the festival would be restricted in terms of noise levels and subject to a cumulative 6-hour duration. The submitter requests this is reviewed within the context of larger events such as Northern Bass. This could be remedied by inserting the requested Precinct and Noise Overlay for Northern Bass.
268.13	Fuzen Entertainment Limited	Noise	Oppose	AMEND the wording of TEMP-S3 as they are inhibitive to the operation of the Northern Bass Festival. OR ADD a Northern Bass Precinct and Noise Overlay.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noise Standards for the General rural zone inhibit the operation of Northern Bass. The addition of a site-specific Precinct and Noise Overlay (as proposed by the submitter) could prescribe noise provisions for a festival at 433 Settlement Road (the site of Northern Base), which is otherwise within the General rural zone.
269.1	Health New Zealand - Te Whatu Ora	General	Oppose	No specific decision requested; however the submission opposes all aspects of the Proposed District Plan that unreasonably control and/or limit public health service operation, maintenance, delivery and development.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amendments are necessary to deliver on the proposed intent, to adequately provide for public health services in Kaipara and to be consistent with the regional planning policy framework.
269.2	Health New Zealand - Te Whatu Ora	Definitions	Amend	AMEND the definition for "Functional Need" as follows: Means the need for a proposal or activity to traverse, locate or operate in a particular environment because the activity can only occur in that environment. <u>Furthermore, in the case of Hospital and Hospital Related Activity functional need is constrained and often there are no viable alternatives.</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Health New Zealand is supportive of the definition but considers there is some risk in the proposed drafting as it limits its application to the extent that an activity "can only occur in that environment" (emphasis added). Modifying this definition provides enhanced certainty in its applicability as it relates to the public health sector.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
				<p>AND</p> <p>Any necessary proposed/alternative/consequential relief to address matters raised in this submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Functional need in the public health sector is not static, it is driven by a complex and changing series of factors that include remoteness of a locality, urgency of a medical event, and the specific community needs and distance to / capacity of hospital facilities at a particular point in time. Therefore, in the public health sector what may be theoretically possible in a location at one point in time can vary – therefore this definition needs flexibility to address the public health system.
269.3	Health New Zealand - Te Whatu Ora	Definitions	Amend	<p>AMEND the definition for "Healthcare Activities" as follows:</p> <p>...but excludes hospitals <u>and Hospital Related Activity</u>.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any necessary proposed/alternative/consequential relief to address matters raised in this submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Without modification, the proposed Hospital zone (and contemporaneous general and district-wide) provisions could result in some uncertainty during plan interpretation. The proposed amendment would improve plan legibility and administration. There is concern that this definition could inadvertently create uncertainty (or conflict) with the "Hospital Related Activity" definition. Without modification it could be possible for an activity to meet both the definition of "Healthcare Activities" and "Hospital Related Activity" thereby creating uncertainty.
269.4	Health New Zealand - Te Whatu Ora	Definitions	Amend	<p>AMEND the definition for "Hospital" as follows:</p> <p>means <u>any significant infrastructure a facility that provides for the medical, surgical or psychiatric / mental health care, treatment and rehabilitation of people.</u></p> <p>OR</p> <p>AMEND the definition for "Hospital" as follows:</p> <p><u>means regionally significant infrastructure that provides for the medical, surgical or psychiatric/mental health care, treatment and rehabilitation of people.</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any necessary proposed/alternative/consequential relief to address matters raised in this submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Without modification, the proposed Hospital zone (and contemporaneous general and district-wide) provisions are undermined and will not adequately recognise, protect, and enable the Dargaville Hospital. The definition needs to be amended to encapsulate Dargaville Hospital and to match the scope of the companion "Hospital Related Activity" definition. This could be achieved with or without any reference to "infrastructure" (regional or otherwise). The proposed definition appears to have intended to replicate other definitions in the region that refer to Regionally Significant Infrastructure – albeit it refers to "significant infrastructure". Regardless, as noted elsewhere in this submission the Proposed District Plan's infrastructure definition is problematic in that it does not include Dargaville Hospital. Accordingly, the Hospital zone provisions are undermined by this error.
269.5	Health New Zealand - Te Whatu Ora	Definitions	Amend	<p>AMEND the definition for "Hospital Related Activity" as follows:</p> <p>means activities <u>associated with the provision of that utilise land and buildings for the primary purpose of providing medical, surgical, psychiatric / mental health, oral health, maternity, pharmacy, geriatric and convalescent or hospice services care, treatment, and rehabilitation of people within a hospital, to the community. This includes including:</u></p> <p>a. <u>hospital;</u></p> <p>b. assessment, diagnosis, treatment, rehabilitation, and in-patient care services;</p> <p>c. outpatient <u>services departments and clinics;</u></p> <p>d. medical training and education;</p> <p>e. ancillary commercial activity including <u>pharmacies banks, childcare, dry cleaners, food and beverage activities, bookstores, gift stores and florists;</u></p> <p>f. helicopter <u>landing and ambulance facilities;</u></p> <p>g. <u>conference facilities;</u></p> <p>h. <u>ancillary</u> places of worship;</p> <p>i. hospices;</p> <p>j. <u>hospital</u> maintenance, operational and service facilities, including offices and administration facilities, kitchens, storage <u>and security</u> facilities, <u>infrastructure</u>, waste processing, workshops, and laundries;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed definition is problematic as it has gaps and is unnecessarily complicated and expansive in places. Without modification, the proposed Hospital zone (and contemporaneous general and district-wide) provisions are undermined and will not adequately recognise, protect and enable the Dargaville Hospital.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
				<p>k. <u>diagnostic laboratories</u>, medical research and testing;</p> <p>l. mortuaries;</p> <p>m. <u>ancillary specialist and general medical facilities, services and practices</u> alternative health providers including acupuncture, herbalist, spiritual providers;</p> <p>n. <u>ancillary residential accommodation for staff, patients or whanau support activity, limited to staff accommodation, and visitor accommodation for contractors, patients, or family for which a tariff may not be required;</u> and</p> <p>o. emergency Services and civil defence.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any necessary proposed/alternative/consequential relief to address matters raised in this submission.</p>	
269.6	Health New Zealand - Te Whatu Ora	Definitions	Amend	<p>AMEND the following clause to the definition for "Infrastructure" as a minimum:</p> <p><u>m. Dargaville Hospital and Dargaville Hospital Campus and its component parts.</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any necessary proposed/alternative/consequential relief to address matters raised in this submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The s.2 definition of Infrastructure in the Resource Management Act – and therefore the Proposed District Plan - is problematic as it does not include social infrastructure like the public health system and hospitals. Relying on the s.2 definition of Infrastructure in the Proposed District Plan undermines the intended purpose, scope, and function of the Hospital zone and related provisions such as the Infrastructure provisions elsewhere in the Proposed District Plan. Therefore, this puts the Proposed District Plan at odds with Regional Policy Statement and recently resolved PRP in relation to Regionally Significant Infrastructure. Following the resolution of appeals to the Proposed Regional Plan (H.9), Northland Regional Council includes an expansive definition of Regionally Significant Infrastructure that includes public hospitals.
269.7	Health New Zealand - Te Whatu Ora	Definitions	Amend	<p>AMEND the definition of "Regionally Significant Infrastructure" as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p><u>j. Dargaville Hospital.</u></p> <p><u>Regionally Significant</u> Infrastructure extends also to mean the site related components that enable the asset to function.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any necessary proposed/alternative/consequential relief to address matters raised in this submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed Regionally Significant Infrastructure definition is incomplete (and does not extend to include Dargaville Hospital) and inconsistent with higher order regional planning documents (that, amongst other things, recognise public hospitals as Regionally Significant Infrastructure). It is also potentially at odds with the proposed definition of "infrastructure". Following the resolution of appeals to the Proposed Regional Plan (H.9), Northland Regional Council includes an expansive definition of Regionally Significant Infrastructure that includes public hospitals. Without necessary modifications, the proposed Hospital zone (and contemporaneous general and district-wide) provisions are undermined and will not adequately recognise, protect and enable the Dargaville Hospital. The provisions will also be inconsistent with higher order regionally planning documents.
269.8	Health New Zealand - Te Whatu Ora	Definitions	Oppose	<p>UNDERTAKE further testing of the practical implementation of the definition of "Sensitive Activity" as it relates to relevant provisions to ensure there are no unintended consequences that could undermine operation of the Dargaville Hospital priority.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any necessary proposed/alternative/consequential relief to address matters raised in this submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Without considering this definition and its interrelationship with other provisions further, it is conceivable that provisions in the Proposed District Plan intended to protect and enable infrastructure and regionally significant infrastructure like Dargaville Hospital could be inadvertently problematic at implementation. For example, infrastructure proximate to the long-established hospital could result in a policy tension where the hospital (which is also Regionally Significant Infrastructure and afforded protection) could be considered a sensitive activity. Further work is required to ensure that this definition is not problematic in relation to the ongoing operation of the Dargaville Hospital.
269.9	Health New Zealand - Te Whatu Ora	Definitions	Amend	<p>AMEND the definition for "Operational Need" as follows:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operational need in the public health sector is not static – particularly as it relates to hospitals and hospitals in regional New Zealand – it is driven by a complex and changing series of

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
				<p>means the need for a proposal or activity to traverse, locate or operate in a particular environment because of technical, logistical or operational characteristics or constraints. <u>Furthermore, in the case of Hospital and Hospital Related Activity operational need is evolving, constrained and often there are no viable alternatives.</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any necessary proposed/alternative/consequential relief to address matters raised in this submission.</p>	<p>factors that include remoteness of a locality, urgency of a medical event, and the specific community needs and distance to / capacity of hospital facilities at a particular point in time. Therefore in the public health sector operational needs are always evolving. This definition needs flexibility to address the public health system.</p>
269.10	Health New Zealand - Te Whatu Ora	Strategic Direction	Amend	<p>AMEND Strategic Direction chapter to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriately reflect the important role of infrastructure – particularly Regionally Significant Infrastructure – like the Dargaville Hospital plays in the success, prosperity, health, and wellbeing of the community in Kaipara. Provide strategic direction and context for the policy framework and methods in the Proposed District Plan – particularly why it is both necessary and appropriate to establish a generally permissive policy framework as it applies to the Hospital zone and the Dargaville Hospital. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Without this modification, the proposed Hospital zone (and contemporaneous general and district-wide) provisions are undermined by not providing a cohesive framework within which Regionally Significant Infrastructure like the Dargaville Hospital are appropriately recognised, protected and enabled for the benefit of the community. Various parts of the Council's section 32 analysis recognise the infrastructure deficit in the district, importance of protection and enablement of infrastructure in the Proposed District Plan and benefits that can accrue in the economy, environment, and community because of infrastructure investment / operation. However, the Strategic Direction of the Proposed District Plan – including the "Vision for Kaipara" is silent on the relationship between population, socio-economic and environmental challenges and opportunities facing the district and aspirations for the district. For example, there is no mention of infrastructure capacity or condition in the district – nor the vital role that Regionally Significant Infrastructure (like the Dargaville Hospital) plays in the wellbeing of the community or the district's economy.
269.11	Health New Zealand - Te Whatu Ora	Infrastructure	Support	<p>No specific decision requested; however the submission refers to the Overview of the Infrastructure chapter and considers that there may be a National Policy Statement for Infrastructure that is released before the decisions on the Proposed District Plan are made.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any necessary proposed/alternative/consequential relief to address matters raised in this submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> National directions on infrastructure may be proposed before decisions are made on the Proposed District Plan.
269.12	Health New Zealand - Te Whatu Ora	Infrastructure	Amend	<p>AMEND the objectives in the Infrastructure chapter to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Recognise the benefits of all infrastructure and regionally significant infrastructure – not just the national grid such as the Dargaville Hospital which is a life-saving public health service that is also a lifeline that must operate during an emergency and it is appropriate that the policy framework afford it a level of priority that reflects its management within a special purpose Hospital zone. Relate to definitions that appropriately include the Dargaville Hospital. Include recognition that the public health system is both a critical service and is nationally and regionally significant. Recognise that Regionally Significant Infrastructure involves adverse effects – some of which cannot be avoided, remedied, or mitigated e.g., emergency helicopter noise. Provide an appropriately permissive framework for infrastructure – particularly regionally significant infrastructure that operates in a Special purpose zone e.g., Dargaville Hospital. Removing references in the policy framework that limit the applicability of policy to network utilities (as not all infrastructure is a network utility e.g., Dargaville Hospital). <p>AND</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The lack of comprehensive context regarding infrastructure in the Strategic Directions chapter follows through the cascading framework to the infrastructure objectives and policies. Without this modification, the proposed Hospital zone (and contemporaneous general and district-wide) provisions are undermined by not providing a cohesive framework within which Regionally Significant Infrastructure like the Dargaville Hospital are appropriately recognised, protected and enabled for the benefit of the community. (Refer also to submission 296.13)

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
				Any necessary proposed/alternative/consequential relief to address matters raised in this submission.	
269.13	Health New Zealand - Te Whatu Ora	Infrastructure	Amend	<p>AMEND all policies in the Infrastructure chapter (excluding INF-P9, INF-P10, INF-P15 to INF-P18) to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Recognise the benefits of all infrastructure and regionally significant infrastructure – not just the national grid such as the Dargaville Hospital which is a life-saving public health service that is also a lifeline that must operate during an emergency and it is appropriate that the policy framework afford it a level of priority that reflects its management within a Special Purpose Hospital Zone. Relate to definitions that appropriately include the Dargaville Hospital. Include recognition that the public health system is both a critical service and is nationally and regionally significant. Recognise that Regionally Significant Infrastructure involves adverse effects – some of which cannot be avoided, remedied, or mitigated e.g., emergency helicopter noise. Provide an appropriately permissive framework for infrastructure – particularly regionally significant infrastructure that operates in a Special purpose zone e.g., Dargaville Hospital. Removing references in the policy framework that limit the applicability of policy to network utilities (as not all infrastructure is a network utility e.g., Dargaville Hospital). <p>AND</p> <p>Any necessary proposed/alternative/consequential relief to address matters raised in this submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The lack of comprehensive context regarding infrastructure in the Strategic Directions chapter follows through the cascading framework to the infrastructure objectives and policies. Without modifying objectives as noted the proposed Hospital zone (and contemporaneous general and district-wide) provisions are undermined by not providing a cohesive framework within which Regionally Significant Infrastructure like the Dargaville Hospital are appropriately recognised, protected and enabled for the benefit of the community.
269.14	Health New Zealand - Te Whatu Ora	Infrastructure	Oppose	<p>AMEND Note 2 in the Infrastructure chapter to the make it clear that where there is a conflict between these and the Hospital zone provisions – the more enabling will apply.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any necessary proposed/alternative/consequential relief to address matters raised in this submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter opposes Note 2 as it relates to the Hospital zone which provides a targeted set of provisions specific to hospital and hospital related infrastructure. Without this modification, the proposed Hospital zone (and contemporaneous general and district-wide) provisions are undermined by not providing a cohesive framework within which Regionally Significant Infrastructure like the Dargaville Hospital are appropriately recognised, protected and enabled for the benefit of the community.
269.15	Health New Zealand - Te Whatu Ora	Infrastructure	Support	<p>RETAIN INF-R9 as notified.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any necessary proposed/alternative/consequential relief to address matters raised in this submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This rule supports the provision of an appropriately enabling policy framework for infrastructure.
269.16	Health New Zealand - Te Whatu Ora	Transport	Amend	<p>AMEND the Transport provisions to exclude public health service activity in the Hospital zone.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any necessary proposed/alternative/consequential relief to address matters raised in this submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If implemented as drafted the transport provisions contain both onerous provisions for activity in the Hospital zone and transport provisions that contain inconsistencies. There is inconsistency and conflict within the transport provisions as they apply to activities within the Hospital zone. The submitter opposes all aspects of the transport provisions that unreasonably control, restrict and/or impose unjustified requirements on public health service activity. The Council's section 32 provides no material justification for the purpose, reasoning and evidence base for these provisions as they relate to the Hospital zone. Furthermore, as drafted the provisions are at odds with the Hospital zone and the associated evidence base in the Council's section 32.
269.17	Health New Zealand - Te Whatu Ora	Transport	Amend	<p>AMEND the Overview in the Transport chapter (along with the cascading transport provisions) to reflect:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The critical importance and role of Dargaville Hospital as part of the nationwide Health Estate and as regionally significant 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The overview does not adequately address the role that Dargaville Hospital plays in the district; address the fundamental matter of public health service demand and operational requirements of the Health Estate or Dargaville Hospital.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
				<p>infrastructure and in service of the community in Kaipara;</p> <p>2. Recognition that demand for public health services – including Hospital and Hospital Related Services in the Hospital zone is complex and not controlled by Health New Zealand; and</p> <p>3. That transport provisions as they relate to Hospital and Hospital Related Activity in the Hospital zone are managed by additional (new) provisions that exclude unnecessarily onerous transport provisions – particularly the imposition of minimum carparking and traffic generation provisions [an option is to create an Hospital zone specific set of provisions akin to those that apply to PREC1 and PREC2].</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any necessary proposed/alternative/consequential relief to address matters raised in this submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As drafted the provisions impose control over transport matters that Health New Zealand does not control. The provisions are not supported in evidence in the Council's section 32. The submitter is willing to work with Council on developing workable provisions. See submission for further details and explanation.
269.18	Health New Zealand - Te Whatu Ora	Transport	Amend	<p>AMEND the objectives in the Transport chapter to:</p> <p>a. Recognise the benefits of all infrastructure and regionally significant infrastructure – not just the road network. For example, the Dargaville Hospital is a life-saving public health service that is also a lifeline that must operate during an emergency and it is</p> <p>b. fundamentally reliant on a well-functioning road network it is appropriate that the policy framework afford it a level of priority that reflects its management within a Hospital zone;</p> <p>c. Relate to definitions that appropriately include the Dargaville Hospital;</p> <p>d. Include recognition that the public health system is both a critical service and is nationally and regionally significant – it relies heavily on the road network (and helicopter flights) and reverse sensitivity provisions may extend to affording protections from an unacceptably compromised roading network; and</p> <p>e. Provide an appropriately permissive framework for infrastructure – particularly regionally significant infrastructure that operates in a Special purpose zone e.g., Dargaville Hospital.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any necessary proposed/alternative/consequential relief to address matters raised in this submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The lack of comprehensive context regarding infrastructure in the Strategic Direction chapter follows through the cascading framework to the transport objectives and policies. As drafted the provisions impose control over transport matters that Health New Zealand does not control. The provisions are not supported in evidence in the Council's section 32.
269.19	Health New Zealand - Te Whatu Ora	Transport	Amend	<p>AMEND the policies in the Transport chapter to:</p> <p>a. Recognise the benefits of all infrastructure and regionally significant infrastructure – not just the road network. For example, the Dargaville Hospital is a life-saving public health service that is also a lifeline that must operate during an emergency and it is fundamentally reliant on a well-functioning road network it is appropriate that the policy framework afford it a level of priority that reflects its management within a Hospital zone;</p> <p>b. Relate to definitions that appropriately include the Dargaville Hospital;</p> <p>c. Include recognition that the public health system is both a critical service and is nationally and regionally significant – it relies heavily on the road network (and helicopter flights) and reverse sensitivity provisions may extend to affording protections from an unacceptably compromised roading network; and</p> <p>d. Provide an appropriately permissive framework for infrastructure – particularly regionally significant infrastructure that operates in a Special purpose zone e.g., Dargaville Hospital.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The lack of comprehensive context regarding infrastructure in the Strategic Direction chapter follows through the cascading framework to the transport objectives and policies. As drafted the provisions impose control over transport matters that Health New Zealand does not control. The provisions are not supported in evidence in the Council's section 32.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
				<p>AND</p> <p>Any necessary proposed/alternative/consequential relief to address matters raised in this submission.</p>	
269.20	Health New Zealand - Te Whatu Ora	Transport	Support	<p>RETAIN the Notes in the Transport chapter as drafted or do not alter the relationship to the Hospital zone provisions where they are currently excluded.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter conditionally supports the notes as drafted to the extent that they do not undermine the functional purpose and operation of the Hospital zone which provides a targeted set of provisions specific to hospital and hospital related activity. As identified later (below) in submission points there are transport provisions that, appropriately, do not apply in the Hospital zone, the submitter would oppose any modifications that would alter this.
269.21	Health New Zealand - Te Whatu Ora	Transport	Oppose	<p>AMEND all rules in the Transport chapter for Hospital and Hospital Related Activity in the Hospital zone to exclude unnecessarily onerous transport provisions from applying – particularly the imposition of minimum carparking and traffic generation controls.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>ADD new Hospital zone specific provisions that are mechanically like the approach taken to those that apply to PREC1 and PREC2.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any necessary proposed/alternative/consequential relief to address matters raised in this submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The transport provisions as they relate to the Hospital zone contain requirements that are onerous, unnecessary and/or impose control over matters that Health New Zealand does not control. This is unreasonable and unjustified. The provisions are not supported in evidence in the Council's section 32. The submitter is willing to work with Council on jointly drafting provisions that achieve the relief sought.
269.22	Health New Zealand - Te Whatu Ora	Transport	Oppose	<p>AMEND all standards in the Transport chapter including TRAN-S1 and TRAN-S2 ensure they do not apply to Hospital and Hospital Related Activity in the Hospital zone.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>ADD new Hospital zone specific provisions that are mechanically like the approach taken to those that apply to PREC1 and PREC2.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any necessary proposed/alternative/consequential relief to address matters raised in this submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The transport rules appear to intend that these provisions would apply to activity in the Hospital zone. However, as drafted the proposed Trip Generation provisions at TRAN-S1 (and therefore TRAN Table 1) may not apply in the Hospital zone. This may be a drafting error. The submitter opposes any changes that would result apply these provisions to Hospital and Hospital Related Activity in the Hospital zone. As drafted the provisions impose control over transport matters that Health New Zealand does not control. This is unreasonable and unjustified. The provisions are not supported in evidence in the Council's section 32.
269.25	Health New Zealand - Te Whatu Ora	Transport	Oppose	<p>AMEND TRAN-Table 1 to not apply to Hospital and Hospital Related Activity in the Hospital zone.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>AMEND the thresholds in TRAN-Table 1 to be less conservative for public Hospital and Hospital Related Activity should the provision remain.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any necessary proposed/alternative/consequential relief to address matters raised in this submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As noted at TRAN-S1 the traffic intensity factor provisions at TRAN Table 1 may not apply to activities within the Hospital zone. However, the relevant provisions appear to indirectly (via Note 1) apply to public health service activities located in another zone in the district. The submitter opposes the imposition of the traffic intensity factor provisions applying to Hospital and Hospital Related Activity in the Hospital zone for the reasons listed earlier in this submission. As drafted the provisions impose control over transport matters that Health New Zealand does not control. This is unreasonable and unjustified. The provisions are not supported in evidence in the Council's section 32. For the avoidance of doubt, if this provision were to remain, but the relief sought by the submitter is addressed by way of exclusion at the rules, the submitter has not assessed the appropriateness or reasonableness of the 50 per 100m² gross floor area traffic intensity factor threshold. The submitter instead just notes that this threshold may be unreasonably conservative and without sufficient evidence. However, the submitter's position remains that the imposition of traffic intensity factor (and traffic generation) provisions on public Hospital and Hospital Related Activity is unreasonable and unjustified as the public health system does not control the complex socio-economic drivers (source) of demand (need) for services.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
269.26	Health New Zealand - Te Whatu Ora	Transport	Oppose	AMEND TRAN-Table 2 to not apply to Hospital and Hospital Related Activity in the Hospital zone. AND Any necessary proposed/alternative/consequential relief to address matters raised in this submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter seeks that only necessary plan provisions that are supported by sufficient evidence are imposed in relation to Hospital and Hospital Related Activity in the Hospital zone. Moreover, where hospital operations already manage potential effects (positive and adverse) these do not need to be duplicated in the Proposed District Plan. The submitter considers that the appropriate relief is managed most effectively earlier in the policy framework – at the transport overview, objectives and policies and rules (enabling this provision to potentially remain unaltered as it would then apply outside the Hospital zone). See submission for further details of reasons.
269.27	Health New Zealand - Te Whatu Ora	Transport	Support	RETAIN TRAN Table 3 provisions as they do not apply to Hospital and Hospital Related Activity in the Hospital zone.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter supports TRAN-Table 3 provisions in so far as not applying to Hospital and Hospital Related Activity in the Hospital zone and the submitter would oppose amendments to the contrary. As drafted these provisions would not apply to the Hospital zone and Hospital and Hospital Related Activity. Loading is a critical element of public Hospital and Hospital Related Activity service provision and is already managed by Health New Zealand. Adequate loading will always be necessary for Hospital and Hospital Related Activity in the Hospital zone therefore the Proposed District Plan does not need to duplicate loading which is already appropriately managed.
269.28	Health New Zealand - Te Whatu Ora	Transport	Support	RETAIN TRAN-S6 and TRAN Table 4 as they do not apply to the Hospital zone and Hospital and Hospital Related Activity. AND Any necessary proposed/alternative/consequential relief to address matters raised in this submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As drafted these provisions would not apply to the Hospital zone and Hospital and Hospital Related Activity. These activities (including Hospital Related Activities) are neither commercial nor industrial activities. The submitter supports the exclusion of these provisions applying to Hospital and Hospital Related Activity in the Hospital zone as accessible carparks are already managed operationally by Health New Zealand.
269.29	Health New Zealand - Te Whatu Ora	Subdivision	Amend	AMEND SUB-O4 to enable infrastructure/regionally significant infrastructure. OR ADD a new objective and a new companion policy to the Subdivision chapter that recognises subdivision is necessary to enable infrastructure (as opposed to just subdivision that impacts demand for infrastructure). AND Any necessary proposed/alternative/consequential relief to address matters raised in this submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The overview and objectives and policies either do not or adequately account for subdivision that is necessary to enable infrastructure / regionally significant infrastructure. Subdivision is sometimes necessary to protect / enable infrastructure and/or support efficient operational delivery. This gap in the policy framework cascades through the subdivision rules but also fails to provide a policy framework within which the assessment of related subdivision can be guided. The submitter seeks relief to address this omission in the policy framework.
269.30	Health New Zealand - Te Whatu Ora	Subdivision	Amend	AMEND the subdivision rules to address subdivision for regionally significant infrastructure in the Hospital zone. AND Any necessary proposed/alternative/consequential relief to address matters raised in this submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The subdivision rule set is incomplete and conflicting. The Council's section 32 identifies protection and enablement of regionally significant infrastructure and in the case of Dargaville Hospital, establishing a Hospital zone. The section 32 also identifies discouragement of subdivision where it could undermine regionally significant infrastructure. As identified above in relation to the subdivision overview and policy framework – the subdivision provisions do not recognise that subdivision is not only related to infrastructure demand but also supply. As drafted the provisions only provide for controlled activity subdivision in the Hospital zone in relation to boundary adjustments (SUB-R1) and alteration of cross leases or conversion of tenure (SUB-R2). Confusingly controlled activity rule SUB-R3 (for new allotments) does not apply in the Hospital zone but also includes a condition “this rule does not apply to the Special purpose zones”. There is no other subdivision rule applying to the Hospital zone.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter opposes the gap in subdivision provisions in relation to the Hospital zone and seeks relief in the form of an amendment to the subdivision rules to address this. The submitter would be willing to work with Council officers to jointly draft provisions particular to the Hospital zone (and that amongst other things address the matters raised earlier in this submission in relation to subdivision also enabling infrastructure).
269.31	Health New Zealand - Te Whatu Ora	General	Oppose	<p>No specific relief sought; however the submitter reserves its position in relation to the remaining District-Wide Matters provisions – to the extent that they do not undermine the operation of the Hospital zone provisions and/or they seek to unreasonably control or constrain Hospital and Hospital Related Activity in the Hospital zone.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any necessary proposed/alternative/consequential relief to address matters raised in this submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter reserves its position in relation to the remaining District-Wide Matters provisions – to the extent that they do not undermine the operation of the Hospital zone provisions and/or they seek to unreasonably control or constrain Hospital and Hospital Related Activity in the Hospital zone.
269.32	Health New Zealand - Te Whatu Ora	Earthworks	Amend	<p>AMEND all earthworks provisions so that they explicitly recognise in the policy framework that earthworks are necessary for Hospital and Hospital Related Activity in the Hospital zone (as regionally significant infrastructure).</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any necessary proposed/alternative/consequential relief to address matters raised in this submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The rationale for the earthworks policy and rule frameworks as they relate to the Hospital zone is unclear. As identified above in relation to the subdivision provisions – the earthworks provisions do not adequately recognise and provide for earthworks that are related to infrastructure supply (not just infrastructure demand). Refer also to submission points 269.33 and 269.34
269.33	Health New Zealand - Te Whatu Ora	Earthworks	Support	<p>RETAIN EW-R2 as drafted as it relates to the Hospital zone.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any necessary proposed/alternative/consequential relief to address matters raised in this submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The rationale for the earthworks policy and rule frameworks as they relate to the Hospital zone is unclear. As identified above in relation to the subdivision provisions – the earthworks provisions do not adequately recognise and provide for earthworks that are related to infrastructure supply (not just infrastructure demand). Refer also to submission points 269.32 and 269.34
269.34	Health New Zealand - Te Whatu Ora	Earthworks	Amend	<p>REVIEW the appropriateness of the maximum earthworks limits at EW-S1 in the Hospital zone.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any necessary proposed/alternative/consequential relief to address matters raised in this submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The rationale for the earthworks policy and rule frameworks as they relate to the Hospital zone is unclear. As identified above in relation to the subdivision provisions – the earthworks provisions do not adequately recognise and provide for earthworks that are related to infrastructure supply (not just infrastructure demand). In particular, the annual earthworks area and volume limits (EW-S1) do not appear to have considered that the Dargaville Hospital is regionally significant infrastructure and the size of the Hospital zone hospital campus landholdings and development / renewal activities that should be appropriately provided for. Refer also to submission points 269.32 and 269.33
269.36	Health New Zealand - Te Whatu Ora	Noise	Oppose	<p>No specific decision sought, however the submission seeks relief that Council further tests the practical implementation of these provisions to ensure the continued operation of Hospital and Hospital Related Activity in the SPHZ (Dargaville Hospital) remains prioritised, protected, and enabled.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is inconsistency, potential conflict and unreasonable control within the noise provisions and relevant definitions as they apply to activities within the Hospital zone. The submitter opposes all aspects of the noise provisions and related definitions that unreasonably control, restrict and/or impose unjustified requirements on public health service activity. The submitter considers that further work is required by Council to ensure that these provisions and related definitions are appropriate (and without unintended consequences) in relation to the ongoing operation of the Dargaville Hospital. Without careful further consideration of the mechanics and interrelationship between the noise, Hospital zone and relevant definitions, Proposed District Plan provisions intended to

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
					<p>protect and enable regionally significant infrastructure like Dargaville Hospital will be undermined (and in conflict with higher order regional planning documents).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refer submission for further details.
269.37	Health New Zealand - Te Whatu Ora	Signs	Oppose	<p>No specific decision requested; however the submission reserves its position in relation to the remaining signs provisions (refer incorrect wording in the submission) – to the extent that they do not undermine the operation of the Hospital zone provisions and/or they seek to unreasonably control or constrain Hospital and Hospital Related Activity in the Hospital zone.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any necessary proposed/alternative/consequential relief to address matters raised in this submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter reserves their position in relation to the remaining signs provisions – to the extent that they do not undermine the operation of the Hospital zone provisions and/or they seek to unreasonably control or constrain Hospital and Hospital Related Activity in the Hospital zone.
269.38	Health New Zealand - Te Whatu Ora	Hospital Zone	Support	<p>RETAIN the application of a special purpose Hospital zone to the Dargaville Hospital Campus landholdings at Awakino Road.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any necessary proposed/alternative/consequential relief to address matters raised in this submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Subject to the relief sought (or further, alternative, and/or consequential relief, as is necessary), the submission supports the application of a Hospital zone to the Dargaville Hospital Campus landholdings at Awakino Road. The Council's section 32 is unequivocal in its recognition of the importance of Dargaville Hospital to both Kaipara and the wider region. The section 32 is also assertive about the purpose of the Hospital zone to be – amongst other things – appropriately protective, flexible, and enabling (albeit the submission provides a wider perspective and reasoning for this and sets out clearly where parts of the Proposed District Plan undermine the intent of the Hospital zone). As set out in other points – a protecting, flexible and enabling Hospital zone for the Dargaville Hospital Campus is the appropriate policy approach. The submission supports this. Refer submission point 269.39 for further details.
269.39	Health New Zealand - Te Whatu Ora	Hospital Zone	Oppose	<p>AMEND the Special Purpose - Hospital Zone and related definitions (and other inter-related parts of the Proposed District Plan) that unreasonably control, restrict and/or impose unjustified requirements on the Dargaville Hospital Campus landholdings.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any necessary/alternative/consequential relief to address matters raised in this submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> While the submission supports the Hospital zone, they consider there needs to be significant amendments as shown in a number of submissions. Without these modifications, the proposed Hospital zone (and inter-related definitions and district-wide) provisions are undermined by not providing a cohesive framework within which regionally significant infrastructure like the Dargaville Hospital is appropriately recognised, protected and enabled for the benefit of the community. If implemented as drafted the Hospital zone provisions will not provide the necessary level of protection and enablement as set out in the Council's section 32.
269.40	Health New Zealand - Te Whatu Ora	Hospital Zone	Amend	<p>AMEND the Overview in the Hospital zone chapter to achieve the following (or further, alternative and/or consequential) relief (including inter-related provisions):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Clarify the reference, intent, and scope of the Hospital zone provisions are not just the hospital buildings and Hospital activity but also encapsulates the campus landholdings and the adaptive range of Hospital Related Activities; Correct the Nga Tai Ora reference to "Health New Zealand"; Reflect that flexibility for the hospital to evolve with community needs is not just 'important' but is 'critical' and needs to be 'adaptive'; Replace the general reference to 'special' operational needs with brief but more specific information on operational needs (reflecting much of the information and themes in this submission). The use of the word 'special' may contribute confusion given defined terms 'operational need' in the Proposed District Plan; Include the missing introduction about reverse sensitivity protection for the benefit of Dargaville Hospital and the community; and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amendments are necessary to provide an appropriately protective and enabling framework to manage the use and development of Hospital zone land for the benefit of the public health system. The submitter seeks to work with Council officers to jointly modify these provisions.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
				<p>6. Modify the subdivision provisions (considering the broader submission points on this).</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any necessary proposed/alternative/consequential relief to address matters raised in this submission.</p>	
269.41	Health New Zealand - Te Whatu Ora	Hospital Zone	Amend	<p>AMEND the objectives in the Hospital zone chapter to achieve the following (or further, alternative and/or consequential) relief (including inter-related provisions):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Consistency of defined terminology in the policy framework and elsewhere in the Proposed District Plan e.g., Regionally Significant Infrastructure, Sensitive Activity, Operational Need, Functional Need. Matching the intent of the policy framework to the section 32 and cascading provisions e.g., not just 'recognising' the importance of Dargaville Hospital – but protection and enablement. This extends to the reverse sensitivity protections for the benefit of the Dargaville Hospital and community while accepting that some adverse effects (or 'impacts' as drafted) are a reality of Regionally Significant Infrastructure (therefore it is appropriate to limit management to only significant adverse effects). Reflecting the 'critical' importance of the Dargaville Hospital. <p>AND</p> <p>Any necessary proposed/alternative/consequential relief to address matters raised in this submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter seeks to work with Council officers to jointly modify these provisions. Amendments are necessary to provide an appropriately protective and enabling framework to manage the use and development of Hospital zone land for the benefit of the public health system. Refer submissions 269.42 to 269.49 for further context.
269.42	Health New Zealand - Te Whatu Ora	Hospital Zone	Amend	<p>AMEND HOSZ-O1 to resolve unusual phrasing and to include flexibility with changing needs.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any necessary proposed/alternative/consequential relief to address matters raised in this submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amendments are necessary to provide an appropriately protective and enabling framework to manage the use and development of Hospital zone land for the benefit of the public health system. Refer submissions 269.41 to 269.49 for further context.
269.43	Health New Zealand - Te Whatu Ora	Hospital Zone	Amend	<p>AMEND HOSZ-P1 to resolve unusual phrasing and to include flexibility with changing needs.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any necessary proposed/alternative/consequential relief to address matters raised in this submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amendments are necessary to provide an appropriately protective and enabling framework to manage the use and development of Hospital zone land for the benefit of the public health system. Refer submissions 269.41 to 269.49 for further context.
269.44	Health New Zealand - Te Whatu Ora	Hospital Zone	Amend	<p>AMEND HOSZ-O4 to address:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Inclusion of the operational characteristics and effects (including benefits) are recognised as a necessity for the public health system, and they will change over time with community needs. Prioritisation of function and operational needs. Only significant adverse effects will be managed where practical (because this is regionally significant infrastructure). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amendments are necessary to provide an appropriately protective and enabling framework to manage the use and development of Hospital zone land for the benefit of the public health system. Refer submissions 269.41 to 269.49 for further context.
269.45	Health New Zealand - Te Whatu Ora	Hospital Zone	Amend	<p>AMEND HOSZ-P2 to have consistent 'Hospital' and 'Hospital Related Activity' terminology and better reflection of reverse sensitivity protection.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any necessary proposed/alternative/consequential relief to address matters raised in this submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amendments are necessary to provide an appropriately protective and enabling framework to manage the use and development of Hospital zone land for the benefit of the public health system. Refer submissions 269.41 to 269.49 for further context.
269.46	Health New Zealand - Te Whatu Ora	Hospital Zone	Amend	<p>AMEND HOSZ-P3 to enable anything that does not meet the specified laboratory activity but that is appropriately co-located with the Dargaville Hospital to not be subject to an 'avoid policy' (consequential relief may be necessary in the definitions).</p> <p>AND</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter is not opposed to the intent of the policy (protection against an inappropriately located industrial activity) but suggests a change is necessary in respect of specified laboratory activity. Amendments are necessary to provide an appropriately protective and enabling framework to manage the use and development of Hospital

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
				Any necessary proposed/alternative/consequential relief to address matters raised in this submission.	<p>zone land for the benefit of the public health system.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refer submissions 269.41 to 269.49 for further context.
269.47	Health New Zealand - Te Whatu Ora	Hospital Zone	Amend	<p>AMEND HOSZ-P4 to reflect changes at HOSZ-O4 and the philosophical approach of constraining management to only significant adverse effects.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any necessary proposed/alternative/consequential relief to address matters raised in this submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amendments are necessary to provide an appropriately protective and enabling framework to manage the use and development of Hospital zone land for the benefit of the public health system. Refer submissions 269.41 to 269.49 for further context.
269.48	Health New Zealand - Te Whatu Ora	Hospital Zone	Amend	<p>DELETE the word "may" from HOSZ-P5.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>AMEND HOSZ-P5 to reflect reality of age of building stock and change as well as car-parking and infrastructure.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any necessary proposed/alternative/consequential relief to address matters raised in this submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amendments are necessary to provide an appropriately protective and enabling framework to manage the use and development of Hospital zone land for the benefit of the public health system. Refer submissions 269.41 to 269.49 for further context.
269.49	Health New Zealand - Te Whatu Ora	Hospital Zone	Amend	<p>AMEND HOSZ-P6 to reflect the modified policy framework and submission points on subdivision and delete the "avoid" policy.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any necessary proposed/alternative/consequential relief to address matters raised in this submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An 'avoid policy' is a heavy-handed approach to subdivision – particularly when the intent set out in section 32 is about discouragement. The submitter would not consider subdivision that undermined the function of the Health Estate. Amendments are necessary to provide an appropriately protective and enabling framework to manage the use and development of Hospital zone land for the benefit of the public health system. Refer submissions 269.41 to 269.49 for further context.
269.50	Health New Zealand - Te Whatu Ora	Hospital Zone	Amend	<p>AMEND the rules in the Hospital zone chapter to achieve the following (or further, alternative and/or consequential) relief (including inter-related provisions):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Improve the functional mechanics of the SPHZ rules and how they relate to other plan provisions - particularly where the protective and enabling intent of the SPHZ provisions is undermined or encumbered with unreasonable / unjustified requirements. For example: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Noise. Infrastructure. Transport. Ensure that the rule framework sets appropriate and simple provision for ancillary structures that may meet the Proposed District Plan definitions of buildings and structures but where control or very limited control is necessary such as fences, security structures, ancillary minor footprint building / storage structures. Such features are appropriately managed by way of clear exemption of control. Subject construction works that are controlled by the rule framework to reasonable permitted activity standards. Consistency of defined terminology in the rule framework and elsewhere in the Proposed District Plan e.g., relationship between the Supported Residential Care Activities and Hospital and Hospital Related Activity definitions – to ensure there are no unintended consequences of HOSZ-R4. Refer submissions 269.52 to 269.52. <p>AND</p> <p>Any necessary proposed/alternative/consequential relief to address matters raised in this submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amendments are necessary to provide an appropriately protective and enabling framework to manage the use and development of Hospital zone land for the benefit of the public health system.
269.51	Health New Zealand - Te Whatu Ora	Hospital Zone	Amend	<p>AMEND HOSZ-R6 to separately enable two subdivision pathways as follows:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amendments are necessary to provide an appropriately protective and enabling framework to manage the use and development of Hospital

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
				<p>a. One that enables the efficient and effective delivery of Hospital and Hospital Related Activity as a Controlled Activity (with matters of control necessarily reserved for these matters); and</p> <p>b. All other forms of subdivision as either Discretionary or Non-Complying Activity.</p> <p>Refer submissions 269.50 to 269.52 for further context.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any necessary proposed/alternative/consequential relief to address matters raised in this submission.</p>	zone land for the benefit of the public health system.
269.52	Health New Zealand - Te Whatu Ora	Hospital Zone	Amend	<p>AMEND HOSZ-R5 to correct the drafting error ('discretionary' is listed twice – the second reference should be 'non-complying activity')</p> <p>Refer submission points 269.50 to 269.52.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any necessary proposed/alternative/consequential relief to address matters raised in this submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Drafting error in rule to be corrected.
269.53	Health New Zealand - Te Whatu Ora	Hospital Zone	Amend	<p>AMEND HOSZ-S1 to HOSZ-S7 to achieve the appropriate settings in the standards as it relates to Hospital and Hospital Related Activity v other activities.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any necessary proposed/alternative/consequential relief to address matters raised in this submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amendments are necessary to provide an appropriately protective and enabling framework to manage the use and development of Hospital zone land for the benefit of the public health system. The submitter seeks to work with Council officers to jointly modify these provisions.
269.54	Health New Zealand - Te Whatu Ora	Subdivision	Amend	<p>No specific decision requested; however the submission notes a gap in the policy framework in that it does not recognise that subdivision is sometimes necessary to protect/enable infrastructure and/or support efficient operational delivery. This gap in the policy framework cascades through the subdivision rules but also fails to provide a policy framework within which the assessment of related subdivision can be guided.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The policy framework does not recognise that subdivision is also necessary to enable infrastructure i.e. address infrastructure supply as well as demand.
270.1	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Definitions	Support	<p>ADD a new definition for "Adaption" as follows:</p> <p><u>Adaptation - means the process of modifying a place for a compatible use while retaining the heritage values for which it has being scheduled. Adaptation includes alteration, addition or adaptive reuse.</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter considers that adding a definition for "Adaptation" in relation to the use of Heritage buildings and sites would be useful as this term is used in the Proposed District Plan.
270.2	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Definitions	Support	<p>RETAIN the definition for "Alteration (Historic Heritage)" as notified.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HNZPT supports an Alteration definition explicitly referring to historic heritage due to the unique natures of any proposed works.
270.3	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Definitions	Support	<p>RETAIN the definition of "Archaeological Site" as notified.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HNZPT supports the proposed definition of Archaeological site as it taken directly from the HNZPT Act 2014.
270.4	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Definitions	Support	<p>AMEND the definition of "Demolition" as follows:</p> <p>means the complete destruction of a site, building, feature, memorial, structure, precinct or sites and areas of significance to Māori. It includes the removal of intact buildings from the site. [See also Partial demolition]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HNZPT seek the definition of Demolition to be amended to include areas of significance to Māori to reflect section 6(e) of the Resource Management Act.
270.5	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Definitions	Support	<p>RETAIN the definition of "Heritage fabric" as notified.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HNZPT supports the Heritage Fabric definition explicitly referring to historic heritage due to the unique natures of any proposed works.
270.6	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Definitions	Support	<p>RETAIN the definition of "Heritage Setting" as notified.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HNZPT supports the Heritage setting definition explicitly referring to historic heritage due to the unique natures of any proposed works.
270.7	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Definitions	Support	<p>RETAIN the definition of "Historic Heritage" as notified.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HNZPT supports this definition Historic Heritage as it is taken from Section 2 of the Resource Management Act.
270.8	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Definitions	Support	<p>AMEND the definition of "Maintenance and repair (Historic Heritage)" as follows:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Due to the unique nature of any proposed maintenance and repair activities required for historic heritage items HNZPT supports a

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
				<p>in relation to historic heritage items listed in SCHED1– <u>maintenance and repair (Historic Heritage)</u>, means:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Regular and ongoing protective care of a place to prevent deterioration and to maintain its heritage values;</u> Work for the purpose of weatherproofing; Plumbing and electrical work restoration; and <u>Work making good decayed or damaged fabric using identical, closely similar or otherwise appropriate methods</u> <p>It does not include <u>earthquake strengthening</u>.</p>	<p>specific definition of Maintenance and Repair for these works.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relace seismic upgrading with earthquake strengthening as this is the term used in Rule HH-R3.
270.9	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Definitions	Support	<p>AMEND the definition of "Relocated Building" as follows:</p> <p>means the removal, relocation or re-siting of an existing <u>building within a site (in relation to Historic Heritage Buildings only) and from any site to another site, excluding the movement of a non-heritage building within the same title or a new building built off-site that has not been used and is for the express purpose of being located to the subject site.</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HNZPT supports the Relocated Building definition explicitly referring to historic heritage buildings due to the unique nature of any proposed relocation works on heritage values. Support in part
270.10	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Definitions	Support	<p>RETAIN the definition of "Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori" as notified.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HNZPT supports the definition relating the Sites and areas of Significance to Māori to those sites listed in SCHED3. This provides for s6(e) of the Resource Management Act.
270.11	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Definitions	Support	<p>RETAIN the definition of "Sites of Interest to Māori" as notified.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HNZPT supports the definition relating a site of interest to Māori as it provides flexibility for Māori to state an interest, where relevant. This provides for s6(e) of the Resource Management Act.
270.12	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Definitions	Amend	<p>ADD a new definition for "Heritage Restoration" as follows:</p> <p><u>means to return a place to a known earlier form by reassembly or reinstatement and/ or by the removal of elements that detract from the heritage values for which it has been scheduled.</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Due to the unique natures of any proposed Heritage restoration activities required for historic heritage items, HNZPT supports a specific definition of Heritage Restoration for these works.
270.13	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Vision for Kaipara	Support	<p>ADD a new objective to the Vision for Kaipara as follows:</p> <p><u>SD-VK-O9 Cultural Heritage Development</u> <u>The district's diverse cultures and communities are celebrated and heritage values recognised and protected.</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support in part. HNZPT considers that the Proposed Plan should provide for the rich cultural diverseness and related heritage values bought to the district by the many cultures, including Māori.
270.14	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Historic Heritage	Amend	<p>AMEND SD-HH-O1 as follows:</p> <p>The contribution of historic heritage to the District's character and identity is recognised <u>and protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HNZPT notes the Proposed Plan is required to recognise and provide for the matters of national importance, in particular 6(f) of the Resource Management Act "the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use and development". It is important that historic heritage is protected from activities that will compromise heritage values. Maintaining the District's important heritage sites and buildings can help teach people about their past, foster a sense of identity and community, and provide economic opportunities in heritage, tourism, recreation, restoration and marketing.
270.15	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Historic Heritage	Amend	<p>ADD a new objective to Strategic Direction chapter as follows:</p> <p>SD-HH-O2</p> <p><u>Historic Heritage, which includes sites and areas of significance to Māori and cultural resources, is managed with tangata whenua/mana whenua active participation in the resource management processes to ensure its long-term protection for future generations.</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HNZPT notes the Proposed District Plan is required to recognise and provide for the matters of national importance, in particular 6(f) "the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use and development" and s6(e) "the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, wahi tapu, and other taonga.
270.16	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Infrastructure	Support	<p>ADD the following note to the Overview of the Infrastructure chapter as follows:</p> <p><u>Note: In addition to the requirements of the District Plan, it should be noted that the Heritage</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HNZPT is concerned that unrecorded archaeology can be accidentally destroyed when undertaking activities within sensitive environments. HNZPT therefore request that a reminder note be added to each relevant

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
				<u>New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 ("HNZPTA") requires all applicants to obtain an archaeology authority from the HNZPTA before any archaeological site is modified or destroyed. This is the case regardless of whether the land on which the site is located is designated, or the activity is permitted under the District Plan or a resource or building consent has been granted."</u>	overview section of the Proposed District Plan to raise awareness of responsibilities for landowners and developers under the HNZPT Act 2014.
270.17	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Infrastructure	Support	ADD a new clause to INF-P6 as follows: <u>6. the possibility of unrecorded archaeology, any onsite or nearby heritage sites and sites and areas of significance to Māori.</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HNZPT considers it important to specifically highlight the need to be aware of any possible unrecorded archaeology, heritage or sites and areas of significant to Māori when undertaking infrastructure works.
270.18	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Transport	Support	ADD the following note to the Overview of the Transport chapter: <u>Note: In addition to the requirements of the District Plan, it should be noted that the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 ("HNZPTA") requires all applicants to obtain an archaeology authority from the HNZPTA before any archaeological site is modified or destroyed. This is the case regardless of whether the land on which the site is located is designated, or the activity is permitted under the District Plan or a resource or building consent has been granted."</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HNZPT is concerned that unrecorded archaeology can be accidentally destroyed when undertaking activities within sensitive environments. HNZPT therefore request that a reminder note be added to each relevant section of the Proposed District Plan to raise awareness of responsibilities for landowners and developers under the HNZPT Act 2014.
270.19	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Transport	Amend	AMEND Matters over which discretion is restricted in TRAN-R1 as follows: c. Adverse effects arising from construction including amenity, vibration, noise <u>and any impacts on unrecorded archaeology, heritage sites and sites and areas of significance to Māori.</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HNZPT considers it important to specifically highlight the need to be aware of any unrecorded archaeology, heritage or sites and areas of significant to Māori when undertaking transport network activities.
270.20	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Natural Hazards	Amend	ADD the following note to the Overview of the Natural Hazards chapter: <u>Note: In addition to the requirements of the District Plan, it should be noted that the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 ("HNZPTA") requires all applicants to obtain an archaeology authority from the HNZPTA before any archaeological site is modified or destroyed. This is the case regardless of whether the land on which the site is located is designated, or the activity is permitted under the District Plan or a resource or building consent has been granted."</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HNZPT is concerned that unrecorded archaeology can be accidentally destroyed when undertaking activities within sensitive environments. HNZPT therefore request that a reminder note be added to each relevant section of the Proposed District Plan to raise awareness of responsibilities for landowners and developers under the HNZPT Act 2014.
270.21	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Natural Hazards	Support	ADD the following clause to NH-P9 as follows: <u>3. Ensuring that earthworks in Coastal Hazard Areas and Flood Hazard Areas are undertaken to avoid or mitigate any adverse impacts on archaeological values.</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HNZPT advises that significant past settlement in the District followed coastlines and rivers. As such earthworks in coastal area hazard areas and river flood hazard areas have a high potential to damage archaeological sites. Any significant earthworks in these locations should require archaeological advice and assessment.
270.22	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Historic Heritage		RETAIN the Overview in the Historic Heritage chapter as notified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HNZPT supports the discussion on Archaeological sites, and the Archaeological Authority process, within the Historic Heritage overview. In HNZPT's view this is raising awareness of the legal processes required under the HNZPT Act that run in parallel with the Resource Management Act processes.
270.23	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Historic Heritage	Support	DELETE HH-P1 and replace with the following: <u>Identification and protection of historic heritage in SCHED1 is undertaken in consultation with statutory organisations with heritage interests, affected landowners, local communities and tangata whenua/mana whenua while recognising Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga's advisory functions and overarching responsibility for the protection of:</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>1. Archaeological sites within New Zealand and for identifying historic heritage for entry on the New Zealand Heritage List / Rārangī Kōrero.</u> <u>2. Northland Regional Council policies and procedures relating to historic heritage in the coastal environment.</u> <u>3. The role, obligations and contributions of owners of historic heritage.</u> <u>4. Mana whenua, as guardians (or kaitiaki) of the past, and relevant iwi planning documents.</u> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HNZPT seeks the replacement of HH-P1 to provide a clearer policy on how SCHED1 is determined and managed. HNZPT find it helpful in other locations to make it explicit that landowners and tangata whenua/mana whenua are included in the development of the schedule.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
270.24	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Historic Heritage	Support	AMEND HH-P4 as follows: Only allow Avoid removal or relocation of a heritage item <u>within and beyond</u> its identified heritage setting if <u>unless</u> : ...	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HNZPT considers any relocation of a heritage item to be an action of last resort. Therefore, HNZPT seeks an amendment to HH-P4 to provide clear policy direction that avoidance of any relocation is the first consideration. Also, Policy HH-P4 does not cover relocation within its heritage setting. The rules in the proposed plan refer to relocation of heritage items both within and beyond its heritage setting. For consistency purposes and to avoid confusion, HNZPT recommends amending the policy.
270.25	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Historic Heritage	Support	RETAIN HH-R1 as notified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HNZPT confirms that these rules are appropriate to manage these activities in relation to heritage items.
270.26	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Historic Heritage	Support	RETAIN HH-R2 as notified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HNZPT confirms that these rules are appropriate to manage these activities in relation to heritage items.
270.27	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Historic Heritage	Support	RETAIN HH-R4 as notified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HNZPT confirms that these rules are appropriate to manage these activities in relation to heritage items.
270.28	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Historic Heritage	Support	RETAIN HH-R5 as notified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HNZPT confirms that these rules are appropriate to manage these activities in relation to heritage items.
270.29	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Historic Heritage	Amend	AMEND HH-R32.e. as follows: e. Where the item is listed with <u>HNZPT</u> NZHTP .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is correction to the reference used for HNZPT required in the rule. Otherwise HNZPT supports the rule.
270.30	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Historic Heritage	Support	AMEND HH-R6 as follows: 1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic Heritage is matter of national importance (s6(f) Resource Management Act) and the activity status should reflect this importance. HNZPT recommends partial demolition a Category B heritage item should have heritage discretionary activity status. Otherwise HNZPT supports Rule HH-R6.
270.31	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Historic Heritage	Support	AMEND HH-R7 by adding a new matters over which discretion is restricted as follows: <u>f. The outcome of any assessment or consultation with a suitably qualified and experienced heritage professional.</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HNZPT recommends that an assessment is undertaken by a heritage professional prior to the relocation of a heritage item within its setting.
270.32	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Historic Heritage	Support	RETAIN HH-R8 as notified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HNZPT confirms that these rules are appropriate to manage these activities in relation to heritage items.
270.33	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Historic Heritage	Support	RETAIN HH-R9 as notified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HNZPT confirms that these rules are appropriate to manage these activities in relation to heritage items.
270.34	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Historic Heritage	Support	RETAIN HH-R11 as notified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HNZPT confirms that these rules are appropriate to manage these activities in relation to heritage items.
270.35	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Historic Heritage	Support	RETAIN HH-R12 as notified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HNZPT confirms that these rules are appropriate to manage these activities in relation to heritage items.
270.36	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Historic Heritage	Support	RETAIN HH-R13 as notified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HNZPT confirms that these rules are appropriate to manage these activities in relation to heritage items.
270.37	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Historic Heritage	Amend	AMEND HH-R10 as follows: 1. Activity status: Discretionary <u>Non-complying</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HNZPT seeks Non- Complying Activity status for demolition of category A heritage item because Historic Heritage is matter of national importance (s6(f) Resource Management Act). Category A heritage items make important contributions to an understanding of Kaipara District's historic development. They also have a high degree of authenticity and integrity, therefore should have a higher threshold for protection.
270.38	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori	Amend	ADD to the Overview of the Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori chapter the following: <u>Note: In addition to the requirements of the District Plan, it should be noted that the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 requires all applicants to obtain an archaeology authority from the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 before any archaeological site is</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HNZPT is concerned that unrecorded archaeology can be accidentally destroyed when undertaking activities within sensitive environments. HNZPT therefore request that a reminder note be added to each relevant section of the Proposed District Plan to raise awareness of responsibilities for landowners and developers under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
				<u>modified or destroyed. This is the case regardless of whether the land on which the site is located is designated, or the activity is permitted under the District Plan or a resource or building consent has been granted.</u>	
270.39	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori	Support	RETAIN SASM-O1 as notified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HNZPT supports the identification, recognition, and protection of sites of significance to Māori, including ancestral lands, waterways, wāhi tapu, and other taonga as stated in Objectives SASM-01.
270.40	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori	Support	RETAIN SASM-O2 as notified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HNZPT supports the identification, recognition, and protection of sites of significance to Māori, including ancestral lands, waterways, wāhi tapu, and other taonga as stated in Objectives SASM-02 SASM-02 affirms the importance of upholding the relationship of Māori with these sites, and advocates for their protection from activities that may compromise their cultural, spiritual, or historical values. These sites are integral to the identity and wellbeing of tangata whenua and are recognised as a vital component of Te Tiriti o Waitangi and must be considered under Sections 6, 7 and 8 of the Resource Management Act.
270.41	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori	Support	RETAIN SASM-P1 as notified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HNZPT supports the identification and scheduling of sites of significance to Māori in consultation and collaboration with tangata whenua / mana whenua.
270.42	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori	Support	RETAIN SASM-P2 as notified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HNZPT supports the empowerment of Mana Whenua to exercise kaitiakitanga in relation to sites and areas of significance. This includes the acknowledgment of iwi authorities identified in each relevant schedule and allowing Mana Whenua to undertake cultural practices on these sites in accordance with appropriate tikanga. HNZPT supports the active participation of Mana Whenua in resource management processes relating to these sites, thereby ensuring their role as kaitiaki is upheld and integrated into decision making.
270.43	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori	Support	RETAIN SASM-P3 as notified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where activities are permitted to occur on scheduled sites of significance to Māori, HNZPT believes this should only occur when the associated cultural, spiritual and historical Māori values are protected and that activities should only be carried out with appropriate tikanga Māori.
270.44	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori	Support	RETAIN SASM-P4 as notified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HNZPT only supports development on sites and areas of significance to Māori where the cultural, spiritual and historical Māori values will not be compromised.
270.45	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori	Support	RETAIN SASM-P5 as notified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HNZPT agree that the destruction or demolition of sites of significance should be avoided wherever possible and only occur when there is a serious threat to people or property. When destruction or demolition is not avoidable, it should occur only after significant consultation with appropriate Mana Whenua representatives. HNZPT acknowledge that there are occasions where, due to the spiritual, cultural, historical or economic well-being of Mana Whenua there may be some impacts to sites of significance to Māori.
270.46	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori	Amend	AMEND SASM-P6 as follows: Avoid the following activities within a site or area of significance to Māori: 1. Mining and quarrying, except <u>including</u> farm quarries;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HNZPT supports avoiding the following activities of quarrying (including farm quarries) within a site and area of significance to Māori. Farm quarries have the same potential adverse effects as any form of quarrying and therefore should also be avoided in accordance with Section 6(f) of the Resource Management Act.
270.47	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori	Amend	AMEND SASM-P7 as follows: When considering an activity within <u>or near to</u> a scheduled site or area of significance to Māori, have regard to the following matters:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HNZPT believe that when activities are considered within or near to sites of significance to Māori, consideration should be given to any effects to the cultural, spiritual and historical Māori values to these sites, and the views that Mana Whenua have provided

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> during consultation. HNZPT recommend here that the wording is changed from “within a scheduled site of significance to Māori to within or near to a scheduled site of significance to Māori.
270.48	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Natural Character	Support	<p>ADD to the Overview of the Natural character chapter as follows:</p> <p><u>Note: In addition to the requirements of the District Plan, it should be noted that the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 (“HNZPTA”) requires all applicants to obtain an archaeology authority from the HNZPTA before any archaeological site is modified or destroyed. This is the case regardless of whether the land on which the site is located is designated, or the activity is permitted under the District Plan or a resource or building consent has been granted.</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HNZPT is concerned that unrecorded archaeology can be accidentally destroyed when undertaking activities within sensitive environments. HNZPT therefore request that a reminder note be added to each relevant section of the Proposed District Plan to raise awareness of responsibilities for landowners and developers under the HNZPT Act 2014.
270.49	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Subdivision	Support	<p>ADD to the Overview of the Subdivision chapter the following:</p> <p><u>Note: In addition to the requirements of the District Plan, it should be noted that the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 (“HNZPTA”) requires all applicants to obtain an archaeology authority from the HNZPTA before any archaeological site is modified or destroyed. This is the case regardless of whether the land on which the site is located is designated, or the activity is permitted under the District Plan or a resource or building consent has been granted.</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HNZPT is concerned that unrecorded archaeology can be accidentally destroyed when undertaking activities within sensitive environments. HNZPT therefore request that a reminder note be added to each relevant section of the Proposed District Plan to raise awareness of responsibilities for landowners and developers under the HNZPT Act 2014.
270.50	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Subdivision	Amend	<p>ADD to the following clause to SUB-P1:</p> <p><u>6. Ensure any adverse effects on heritage, archaeological and sites and areas of significance to Māori are identified and minimised, in consultation with Tangata Whenua and/or a suitably qualified and experienced heritage/archaeologist professional, as appropriate.</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HNZPT considers it to be important the any subdivision activity is required to consider any adverse effects on sites and areas of significance to Māori and historic heritage. These are matter of national importance under the Resource Management Act.
270.51	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Coastal Environment	Support	<p>AMEND the Overview of the Coastal Environment chapter as follows:</p> <p>...Much of the coastline in the Kaipara District is relatively undeveloped in the sense that there is limited built development and supporting infrastructure. <u>The coastal environment is also where sites of early human settlement are common. As such, sites and areas of significance to Māori and examples of historic heritage can be found throughout the coastal environment...</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Many archaeological and heritage sites are located within the Coastal Environment. HNZPT consider it important that this is recognised in the overview statement.
270.52	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Coastal Environment	Support	<p>ADD to the Overview of the Coastal Environment chapter the following note:</p> <p><u>Note: In addition to the requirements of the District Plan, it should be noted that the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 (“HNZPTA”) requires all applicants to obtain an archaeology authority from the HNZPTA before any archaeological site is modified or destroyed. This is the case regardless of whether the land on which the site is located is designated, or the activity is permitted under the District Plan or a resource or building consent has been granted.</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HNZPT is concerned that unrecorded archaeology can be accidentally destroyed when undertaking activities within sensitive environments. HNZPT therefore request that a reminder note be added to each relevant section of the Proposed District Plan to raise awareness of responsibilities for landowners and developers under the HNZPT Act 2014.
270.53	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Earthworks	Support	<p>ADD to the Overview of the Earthworks chapter the following note:</p> <p><u>Note: In addition to the requirements of the District Plan, it should be noted that the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 (“HNZPTA”) requires all applicants to obtain an archaeology authority from the HNZPTA before any archaeological site is modified or destroyed. This is the case regardless of whether the land on which the site is located is designated, or the activity is permitted under the District Plan or a resource or building consent has been granted.</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HNZPT is concerned that unrecorded archaeology can be accidentally destroyed when undertaking activities when undertaking earthwork activities. HNZPT therefore request that a reminder note be added to each relevant section of the Proposed District Plan to raise awareness of responsibilities for landowners and developers under the HNZPT Act 2014.
270.54	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Earthworks	Support	<p>AMEND EW-O1 as follows:</p> <p>Earthworks are enabled where they are required to facilitate the efficient subdivision, use and development of land, while managing adverse effects, including effects on public safety,</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HNZPT is concerned that unrecorded archaeology, historic heritage and site and areas of significance to Māori can be compromised or accidentally destroyed when undertaking earthwork activities. HNZPT seek an amendment

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
				surrounding land, infrastructure, <u>any archaeology, historic heritage and sites and areas of significance to Māori.</u>	to the earthwork objectives to reflect the need to consider adverse effects on these values.
270.55	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Earthworks	Amend	AMEND the Matters over which discretion is restricted in EW-R1 as follows: ... g) Any adverse effects on cultural and on <u>heritage, archaeology, sites and areas of significance to Māori and</u> or ecological values; ...	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HNZPT is concerned that unrecorded archaeology, historic heritage and site and areas of significance to Māori can be compromised or accidentally destroyed when undertaking earthwork activities. HNZPT seek an amendment to EW-R1 Matters of Discretion to reflect the need to consider adverse effects on these values.
270.56	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Earthworks	Support	AMEND the following clause to EW-R3.1. as follows: ... <u>(e) That an archaeological assessment is undertaken for any proposed farm quarry site prior to earthworks commencing.</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HNZPT consider that farm quarrying activities have the potential to create adverse effects in relation to recorded and unrecorded archaeology. HNZPT suggest proposed sites should be required to carrying out an archaeological assessment before any earthworks commence.
270.57	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Earthworks	Support	RETAIN EW-S7 as notified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HNZPT supports EW-S7 Accidental Discovery Protocol which outlines the landowners or consent holders responsibilities should any discovery be made when carrying out earthworks.
270.58	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	SCHED1 – Historic Heritage Resources	Support	RETAIN SCHED1 Historic Heritage Resources as notified subject to the additions, modifications and corrections identified by HNZPT.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other than the matters raised in other submissions, HNZT supports the balance of SCHED1.
270.59	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	SCHED1 – Historic Heritage Resources	Support	DELETE from SCHED1 Historic Heritage Resources the following: Heritage Covenants The following listings are for information purposes only, as the district plan rules do not apply to these items.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HNZPT supports the scheduling of sites with Heritage covenants within SCHED1. These sites have recognised heritage values which are protected under the HNZPT Act. HNZPT is also of the view that the additional protection provided by the Proposed District Plan rules would be of benefit for these sites. • As such SCHED1 should be amended to remove the statement that the heritage covenants sites are excluded from the district plan rules.
270.60	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	SCHED1 – Historic Heritage Resources	Support	AMEND the street addresses and/or legal descriptions for DAR-18 Central Hotel as per Attachment 2 of the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HNZPT advises that the street address for the scheduled site as shown in Attachment 2 of the submission requires correction or updating.
270.61	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	SCHED1 – Historic Heritage Resources	Support	ADD to SCHED1- Historic Heritage Resources the Matakohē School (Former) as noted in Attachment 3 Relocated Buildings of the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HNZPT seeks those heritage buildings that have been relocated, with updated listings for the new locations, be added to SCHED1. The updated HNZPT listing process has still recognised the historic heritage of these buildings, despite their relocation from their original site. • Further the buildings still meet the criteria for assessing, identifying and recording historic heritage contained in Policy 4.5.3 of the Regional Policy Statement for Northland in relation to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Architecture • Representativeness • Integrity • People and events
270.62	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	SCHED1 – Historic Heritage Resources	Support	ADD to SCHED1 Historic Heritage Resources: North Auckland Farmers Cooperative Stores (Former) as identified in Attachment 4 Buildings to be Reinstated attached to the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While some of the building's historic heritage integrity may have been compromised, the majority of the original values identified for each listing remain intact. • HNZPT consider the buildings still meet the criteria for assessing, identifying and recording historic heritage contained in Policy 4.5.3 of the Regional Policy Statement for Northland Policy 4.5.3 of the Regional Policy Statement for Northland in relation to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Architecture • Representativeness • Integrity • People and events • Therefore, in HNZPT's view, scheduling of these buildings in the Proposed District Plan is still appropriate. HNZPT seeks those buildings

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
					<p>identified in Attachment 4 be reinstated into SCHED1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The façade of the building has been modified but the balance of the building remains generally intact.
270.63	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	SCHED1 – Historic Heritage Resources	Support	ADD to SCHED1 Historic Heritage Resources the Māori heritage site HNZ List No. 5949 Midden/Pits/Terraces as identified in Attachment 5 (Māori Heritage Sites) of the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HNZPT seeks that the heritage items identified in Attachment 5 be added to SCHED1. These are Māori heritage sites recorded in the 1980's in the south of the Waipoua Forest. The sites are unlikely to be currently included in Sites and Areas of significance to Māori. Further the Māori heritage sites meet the criteria for assessing, identifying and recording historic heritage contained in Policy 4.5.3 of the Regional Policy Statement for Northland in relation to: Archaeological importance Identity Likely Tangata whenua important.
270.64	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	SCHED1 – Historic Heritage Resources	Support	ADD to SCHED1 Historic Heritage Resources: HZNPT List No. 3853 Cottage (143 River Road, Dargaville) as identified in Attachment 4 - Buildings to be Reinstated attached to the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> While some of the building's historic heritage integrity may have been compromised, the majority of the original values identified for each listing remain intact. HNZPT consider the buildings still meet the criteria for assessing, identifying and recording historic heritage contained in Policy 4.5.3 of the Regional Policy Statement for Northland Policy 4.5.3 of the Regional Policy Statement for Northland in relation to: Architecture Representativeness Integrity People and events Therefore, in HNZPT's view, scheduling of these buildings in the Proposed District Plan is still appropriate. HNZPT seeks those buildings identified in Attachment 4 be reinstated into SCHED1.
270.65	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	SCHED1 – Historic Heritage Resources	Support	ADD to SCHED1 Historic Heritage Resources: HZNPT List No. 3854 Cottage (145 River Road, Dargaville) as identified in Attachment 4 - Buildings to be Reinstated attached to the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> While some of the building's historic heritage integrity may have been compromised, the majority of the original values identified for each listing remain intact. HNZPT consider the buildings still meet the criteria for assessing, identifying and recording historic heritage contained in Policy 4.5.3 of the Regional Policy Statement for Northland Policy 4.5.3 of the Regional Policy Statement for Northland in relation to: Architecture Representativeness Integrity People and events Therefore, in HNZPT's view, scheduling of these buildings in the Proposed District Plan is still appropriate. HNZPT seeks those buildings identified in Attachment 4 be reinstated into SCHED1.
270.66	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	SCHED1 – Historic Heritage Resources	Support	ADD to SCHED1 Historic Heritage Resources: HZNPT List No. 3942, Pouto Post Office (Former) as identified in Attachment 4 - Buildings to be Reinstated attached to the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> While some of the building's historic heritage integrity may have been compromised, the majority of the original values identified for each listing remain intact. HNZPT consider the buildings still meet the criteria for assessing, identifying and recording historic heritage contained in Policy 4.5.3 of the Regional Policy Statement for Northland Policy 4.5.3 of the Regional Policy Statement for Northland in relation to: Architecture Representativeness Integrity People and events

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Therefore, in HNZPT's view, scheduling of these buildings in the Proposed District Plan is still appropriate. HNZPT seeks those buildings identified in Attachment 4 be reinstated into SCHED1.
270.67	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	SCHED1 – Historic Heritage Resources	Support	ADD to SCHED1 Historic Heritage Resources: HZNPT List No. 97002001, House (7 River Road, Dargaville) as identified in Attachment 4 - Buildings to be Reinstated attached to the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> While some of the building's historic heritage integrity may have been compromised, the majority of the original values identified for each listing remain intact. HNZPT consider the buildings still meet the criteria for assessing, identifying and recording historic heritage contained in Policy 4.5.3 of the Regional Policy Statement for Northland Policy 4.5.3 of the Regional Policy Statement for Northland in relation to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Architecture Representativeness Integrity People and events Therefore, in HNZPT's view, scheduling of these buildings in the Proposed District Plan is still appropriate. HNZPT seeks those buildings identified in Attachment 4 be reinstated into SCHED1.
270.68	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	SCHED1 – Historic Heritage Resources	Support	ADD to SCHED1 Historic Heritage Resources: HZNPT List No. 97002008, House (25 River Road, Dargaville) as identified in Attachment 4 - Buildings to be Reinstated attached to the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> While some of the building's historic heritage integrity may have been compromised, the majority of the original values identified for each listing remain intact. HNZPT consider the buildings still meet the criteria for assessing, identifying and recording historic heritage contained in Policy 4.5.3 of the Regional Policy Statement for Northland Policy 4.5.3 of the Regional Policy Statement for Northland in relation to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Architecture Representativeness Integrity People and events Therefore, in HNZPT's view, scheduling of these buildings in the Proposed District Plan is still appropriate. HNZPT seeks those buildings identified in Attachment 4 be reinstated into SCHED1.
270.69	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	SCHED1 – Historic Heritage Resources	Support	ADD to SCHED1 Historic Heritage Resources: HZNPT List No. 97002009, House (27 River Road, Dargaville) as identified in Attachment 4 - Buildings to be Reinstated attached to the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> While some of the building's historic heritage integrity may have been compromised, the majority of the original values identified for each listing remain intact. HNZPT consider the buildings still meet the criteria for assessing, identifying and recording historic heritage contained in Policy 4.5.3 of the Regional Policy Statement for Northland Policy 4.5.3 of the Regional Policy Statement for Northland in relation to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Architecture Representativeness Integrity People and events Therefore, in HNZPT's view, scheduling of these buildings in the Proposed District Plan is still appropriate. HNZPT seeks those buildings identified in Attachment 4 be reinstated into SCHED1.
270.70	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	SCHED1 – Historic Heritage Resources	Support	ADD to SCHED1 Historic Heritage Resources the Māori heritage site HNZ List No. 5928 Pits as identified in Attachment 5 (Māori Heritage Sites) of the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HNZPT seeks that the heritage items identified in Attachment 5 be added to SCHED1. These are Māori heritage sites recorded in the 1980's in the south of the Waipoua Forest. The sites are unlikely to be currently included in Sites and Areas of significance to Māori. Further the Māori heritage sites meet the criteria for assessing, identifying and recording historic heritage contained in Policy 4.5.3 of the Regional Policy Statement for Northland in relation to:

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Archaeological importance Identity Likely Tangata whenua important.
270.71	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	SCHED1 – Historic Heritage Resources	Support	ADD to SCHED1 Historic Heritage Resources the Māori heritage site HNZ List No. 5927 Pits/Stone Heaps as identified in Attachment 5 (Māori Heritage Sites) of the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HNZPT seeks that the heritage items identified in Attachment 5 be added to SCHED1. These are Māori heritage sites recorded in the 1980's in the south of the Waipoua Forest. The sites are unlikely to be currently included in Sites and Areas of significance to Māori. Further the Māori heritage sites meet the criteria for assessing, identifying and recording historic heritage contained in Policy 4.5.3 of the Regional Policy Statement for Northland in relation to: Archaeological importance Identity Likely Tangata whenua important.
270.72	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	SCHED1 – Historic Heritage Resources	Support	ADD to SCHED1 Historic Heritage Resources the Māori heritage site HNZ List No. 5926 Stone Facing as identified in Attachment 5 (Māori Heritage Sites) of the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HNZPT seeks that the heritage items identified in Attachment 5 be added to SCHED1. These are Māori heritage sites recorded in the 1980's in the south of the Waipoua Forest. The sites are unlikely to be currently included in Sites and Areas of significance to Māori. Further the Māori heritage sites meet the criteria for assessing, identifying and recording historic heritage contained in Policy 4.5.3 of the Regional Policy Statement for Northland in relation to: Archaeological importance Identity Likely Tangata whenua important.
270.73	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	SCHED1 – Historic Heritage Resources	Support	ADD to SCHED1 Historic Heritage Resources the Māori heritage site HNZ List No. 5925 Pits & Terraces as identified in Attachment 5 (Māori Heritage Sites) of the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HNZPT seeks that the heritage items identified in Attachment 5 be added to SCHED1. These are Māori heritage sites recorded in the 1980's in the south of the Waipoua Forest. The sites are unlikely to be currently included in Sites and Areas of significance to Māori. Further the Māori heritage sites meet the criteria for assessing, identifying and recording historic heritage contained in Policy 4.5.3 of the Regional Policy Statement for Northland in relation to: Archaeological importance Identity Likely Tangata whenua important.
270.74	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	SCHED1 – Historic Heritage Resources	Support	ADD to SCHED1 Historic Heritage Resources the Māori heritage site HNZ List No. 5924 Pit as identified in Attachment 5 (Māori Heritage Sites) of the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HNZPT seeks that the heritage items identified in Attachment 5 be added to SCHED1. These are Māori heritage sites recorded in the 1980's in the south of the Waipoua Forest. The sites are unlikely to be currently included in Sites and Areas of significance to Māori. Further the Māori heritage sites meet the criteria for assessing, identifying and recording historic heritage contained in Policy 4.5.3 of the Regional Policy Statement for Northland in relation to: Archaeological importance Identity Likely Tangata whenua important.
270.75	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	SCHED1 – Historic Heritage Resources	Support	ADD to SCHED1 Historic Heritage Resources the Māori heritage site HNZ List No. 5923 Stone Structures as identified in Attachment 5 (Māori Heritage Sites) of the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HNZPT seeks that the heritage items identified in Attachment 5 be added to SCHED1. These are Māori heritage sites recorded in the 1980's in the south of the Waipoua Forest. The sites are unlikely to be currently included in Sites and Areas of significance to Māori. Further the Māori heritage sites meet the criteria for assessing, identifying and recording historic heritage contained in Policy 4.5.3 of the Regional Policy Statement for Northland in relation to: Archaeological importance Identity Likely Tangata whenua important.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
270.76	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	SCHED1 – Historic Heritage Resources	Support	ADD to SCHED1 Historic Heritage Resources the Māori heritage site HNZ List No. 5922 Pits as identified in Attachment 5 (Māori Heritage Sites) of the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HNZPT seeks that the heritage items identified in Attachment 5 be added to SCHED1. These are Māori heritage sites recorded in the 1980's in the south of the Waipoua Forest. The sites are unlikely to be currently included in Sites and Areas of significance to Māori. • Further the Māori heritage sites meet the criteria for assessing, identifying and recording historic heritage contained in Policy 4.5.3 of the Regional Policy Statement for Northland in relation to: • Archaeological importance • Identity • Likely Tangata whenua important.
270.77	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	SCHED1 – Historic Heritage Resources	Support	ADD to SCHED1 Historic Heritage Resources the Māori heritage site HNZ List No. 5921 Pits as identified in Attachment 5 (Māori Heritage Sites) of the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HNZPT seeks that the heritage items identified in Attachment 5 be added to SCHED1. These are Māori heritage sites recorded in the 1980's in the south of the Waipoua Forest. The sites are unlikely to be currently included in Sites and Areas of significance to Māori. • Further the Māori heritage sites meet the criteria for assessing, identifying and recording historic heritage contained in Policy 4.5.3 of the Regional Policy Statement for Northland in relation to: • Archaeological importance • Identity • Likely Tangata whenua important.
270.78	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	SCHED1 – Historic Heritage Resources	Support	ADD to SCHED1 Historic Heritage Resources the Māori heritage site HNZ List No. 5920 Stone Heaps as identified in Attachment 5 (Māori Heritage Sites) of the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HNZPT seeks that the heritage items identified in Attachment 5 be added to SCHED1. These are Māori heritage sites recorded in the 1980's in the south of the Waipoua Forest. The sites are unlikely to be currently included in Sites and Areas of significance to Māori. • Further the Māori heritage sites meet the criteria for assessing, identifying and recording historic heritage contained in Policy 4.5.3 of the Regional Policy Statement for Northland in relation to: • Archaeological importance • Identity • Likely Tangata whenua important.
270.79	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	SCHED1 – Historic Heritage Resources	Support	ADD to SCHED1 Historic Heritage Resources the Māori heritage site HNZ List No. 5919 Pits as identified in Attachment 5 (Māori Heritage Sites) of the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HNZPT seeks that the heritage items identified in Attachment 5 be added to SCHED1. These are Māori heritage sites recorded in the 1980's in the south of the Waipoua Forest. The sites are unlikely to be currently included in Sites and Areas of significance to Māori. • Further the Māori heritage sites meet the criteria for assessing, identifying and recording historic heritage contained in Policy 4.5.3 of the Regional Policy Statement for Northland in relation to: • Archaeological importance • Identity • Likely Tangata whenua important.
270.80	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	SCHED1 – Historic Heritage Resources	Support	ADD to SCHED1 Historic Heritage Resources the Māori heritage site HNZ List No. 5918 Stone Structures as identified in Attachment 5 (Māori Heritage Sites) of the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HNZPT seeks that the heritage items identified in Attachment 5 be added to SCHED1. These are Māori heritage sites recorded in the 1980's in the south of the Waipoua Forest. The sites are unlikely to be currently included in Sites and Areas of significance to Māori. • Further the Māori heritage sites meet the criteria for assessing, identifying and recording historic heritage contained in Policy 4.5.3 of the Regional Policy Statement for Northland in relation to: • Archaeological importance • Identity • Likely Tangata whenua important.
270.81	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	SCHED1 – Historic Heritage Resources	Support	ADD to SCHED1 Historic Heritage Resources the Māori heritage site HNZ List No. 5917 Pits as identified in Attachment 5 (Māori Heritage Sites) of the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HNZPT seeks that the heritage items identified in Attachment 5 be added to SCHED1. These are Māori heritage sites recorded in the 1980's in the south of the Waipoua Forest. The sites are

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
					<p>unlikely to be currently included in Sites and Areas of significance to Māori.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further the Māori heritage sites meet the criteria for assessing, identifying and recording historic heritage contained in Policy 4.5.3 of the Regional Policy Statement for Northland in relation to: Archaeological importance Identity Likely Tangata whenua important.
270.82	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	SCHED1 – Historic Heritage Resources	Support	ADD to SCHED1 Historic Heritage Resources the Māori heritage site HNZ List No. 5916 Pits as identified in Attachment 5 (Māori Heritage Sites) of the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HNZPT seeks that the heritage items identified in Attachment 5 be added to SCHED1. These are Māori heritage sites recorded in the 1980's in the south of the Waipoua Forest. The sites are unlikely to be currently included in Sites and Areas of significance to Māori. Further the Māori heritage sites meet the criteria for assessing, identifying and recording historic heritage contained in Policy 4.5.3 of the Regional Policy Statement for Northland in relation to: Archaeological importance Identity Likely Tangata whenua important.
270.83	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	SCHED1 – Historic Heritage Resources	Support	ADD to SCHED1 Historic Heritage Resources the Māori heritage site HNZ List No. 5915 Pits as identified in Attachment 5 (Māori Heritage Sites) of the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HNZPT seeks that the heritage items identified in Attachment 5 be added to SCHED1. These are Māori heritage sites recorded in the 1980's in the south of the Waipoua Forest. The sites are unlikely to be currently included in Sites and Areas of significance to Māori. Further the Māori heritage sites meet the criteria for assessing, identifying and recording historic heritage contained in Policy 4.5.3 of the Regional Policy Statement for Northland in relation to: Archaeological importance Identity Likely Tangata whenua important.
270.84	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	SCHED1 – Historic Heritage Resources	Support	ADD to SCHED1 Historic Heritage Resources the Māori heritage site HNZ List No. 5901 Pits/Stone Heaps as identified in Attachment 5 (Māori Heritage Sites) of the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HNZPT seeks that the heritage items identified in Attachment 5 be added to SCHED1. These are Māori heritage sites recorded in the 1980's in the south of the Waipoua Forest. The sites are unlikely to be currently included in Sites and Areas of significance to Māori. Further the Māori heritage sites meet the criteria for assessing, identifying and recording historic heritage contained in Policy 4.5.3 of the Regional Policy Statement for Northland in relation to: Archaeological importance Identity Likely Tangata whenua important.
270.85	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	SCHED1 – Historic Heritage Resources	Support	ADD to SCHED1 Historic Heritage Resources the Māori heritage site HNZ List No. 5899 Ridge Pā as identified in Attachment 5 (Māori Heritage Sites) of the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HNZPT seeks that the heritage items identified in Attachment 5 be added to SCHED1. These are Māori heritage sites recorded in the 1980's in the south of the Waipoua Forest. The sites are unlikely to be currently included in Sites and Areas of significance to Māori. Further the Māori heritage sites meet the criteria for assessing, identifying and recording historic heritage contained in Policy 4.5.3 of the Regional Policy Statement for Northland in relation to: Archaeological importance Identity Likely Tangata whenua important.
270.86	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	SCHED1 – Historic Heritage Resources	Support	AMEND the street addresses and/or legal descriptions for PAP-05 Methodist Church as per Attachment 2 of the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HNZPT advises that the street address for the scheduled site as shown in Attachment 2 of the submission requires correction or updating.
270.87	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	SCHED1 – Historic Heritage Resources	Support	AMEND the street addresses and/or legal descriptions for TIN-02 St Michael on the Hill Church (Anglican) as per Attachment 2 of the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HNZPT advises that the street address for the scheduled site as shown in Attachment 2 of the submission requires correction or updating.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
270.88	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	SCHED1 – Historic Heritage Resources	Support	AMEND the street addresses and/or legal descriptions for DAR-02 Mt Pleasant Hospital (Former) as per Attachment 2 of the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HNZPT advises that the street address for the scheduled site as shown in Attachment 2 of the submission requires correction or updating.
270.89	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	SCHED1 – Historic Heritage Resources	Support	AMEND the street addresses and/or legal descriptions for DAR-09 Wansbone House (Former) as per Attachment 2 of the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HNZPT advises that the street address for the scheduled site as shown in Attachment 2 of the submission requires correction or updating.
270.90	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	SCHED1 – Historic Heritage Resources	Support	AMEND the street addresses and/or legal descriptions for DAR-12 Former Natives' Association/Northern Wairoa Old Residents' Association Clubrooms/Lions Centre as per Attachment 2 of the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HNZPT advises that the street address for the scheduled site as shown in Attachment 2 of the submission requires correction or updating.
270.91	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	SCHED1 – Historic Heritage Resources	Support	ADD to SCHED1- Historic Heritage Resources the Police Station (Former) as noted in Attachment 3 Relocated Buildings of the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HNZPT seeks those heritage buildings that have been relocated, with updated listings for the new locations, be added to SCHED1. The updated HNZPT listing process has still recognised the historic heritage of these buildings, despite their relocation from their original site. • Further the buildings still meet the criteria for assessing, identifying and recording historic heritage contained in Policy 4.5.3 of the Regional Policy Statement for Northland in relation to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Architecture • Representativeness • Integrity • People and events
270.92	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	SCHED1 – Historic Heritage Resources	Support	ADD to SCHED1- Historic Heritage Resources the Gum Diggers Hut as noted in Attachment 3 Relocated Buildings of the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HNZPT seeks those heritage buildings that have been relocated, with updated listings for the new locations, be added to SCHED1. The updated HNZPT listing process has still recognised the historic heritage of these buildings, despite their relocation from their original site. • Further the buildings still meet the criteria for assessing, identifying and recording historic heritage contained in Policy 4.5.3 of the Regional Policy Statement for Northland in relation to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Architecture • Representativeness • Integrity • People and events
270.93	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	SCHED1 – Historic Heritage Resources	Support	ADD to SCHED1- Historic Heritage Resources the Post Office (Former) as noted in Attachment 3 Relocated Buildings of the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HNZPT seeks those heritage buildings that have been relocated, with updated listings for the new locations, be added to SCHED1. The updated HNZPT listing process has still recognised the historic heritage of these buildings, despite their relocation from their original site. • Further the buildings still meet the criteria for assessing, identifying and recording historic heritage contained in Policy 4.5.3 of the Regional Policy Statement for Northland in relation to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Architecture • Representativeness • Integrity • People and events
270.94	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	SCHED1 – Historic Heritage Resources	Support	ADD to SCHED1- Historic Heritage Resources the Aratapu Public Library (Former) as noted in Attachment 3 Relocated Buildings of the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HNZPT seeks those heritage buildings that have been relocated, with updated listings for the new locations, be added to SCHED1. The updated HNZPT listing process has still recognised the historic heritage of these buildings, despite their relocation from their original site. • Further the buildings still meet the criteria for assessing, identifying and recording historic heritage contained in Policy 4.5.3 of the Regional Policy Statement for Northland in relation to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Architecture • Representativeness • Integrity • People and events

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
270.95	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	SCHED1 – Historic Heritage Resources		ADD to SCHED1 - Historic Heritage Resources - Heritage Covenants: HNZPT List No. 3827 Post Office (Former) as per Attachment 1 of the submission.	•
271.1	Holyoake Construction Limited	Rural Lifestyle Zone	Amend	<p>ADD a new policy to the Rural lifestyle zone equivalent to GRUZ-P6 'Limited Communal Housing Opportunities' as follows:</p> <p><u>RLZ-P5 – Limited communal housing opportunities</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Provide for limited housing opportunities in the Rural lifestyle zone to enable people to live communally where:</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. <u>There is a clear relationship between Māori and their ancestral land where Papakainga housing is proposed; or</u> b. <u>Reverse sensitivity effects on primary production activities are avoided.</u> <p>AND</p> <p><u>Any further necessary consequential amendments required.</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no recognition or provision for Papakainga housing within Rural lifestyle zone provisions. The submitter seeks inclusion of a policy equivalent to GRUZ-P6 to ensure there is provision for Papakainga housing within the Rural lifestyle zone.
271.2	Holyoake Construction Limited	Rural Lifestyle Zone	Amend	<p>ADD a new rule to the Rural lifestyle zone equivalent to GRUZ- R11 "Papakainga Housing" as follows:</p> <p><u>RLZ-RX – Papakainga housing</u></p> <p><u>Activity status: Restricted Discretionary</u></p> <p><u>Where:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>The activity is undertaken on either:</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. <u>General title land owned by Māori as defined in Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993; or</u> b. <u>Land transferred to an Iwi Trust or Authority under Treaty Settlement Legislation; or</u> c. <u>Land that has been converted to Māori freehold land.</u> 2. <u>Activity status when compliance not achieved: Discretionary</u> 3. <u>Matters over which discretion is restricted:</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. <u>Demonstration of appropriate</u> b. <u>legal mechanism(s) to ensure that the land is maintained in Whānau ownership;</u> c. <u>Impacts on the transport network and the safe design of site entry and exit;</u> d. <u>Measures to manage adverse effects on the amenity values of other sites including shading, dominance, privacy and access to sunlight/daylight;</u> e. <u>Landscaping to mitigate impacts on visual amenity values; and</u> f. <u>Scale, design and location of buildings within the site to mitigate potential reverse sensitivity effects.</u> <p>AND</p> <p><u>Any further necessary consequential amendments required</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Rural lifestyle zone does not recognise or provide for Papakainga housing. Please note that the submitter has not carried over matters of discretion a) and b) as neither is considered relevant, appropriate or necessary in order to manage effects or give effect to the policy.
271.3	Holyoake Construction Limited	Planning Maps	Amend	<p>AMEND the zoning of 6443 and 6453 Pouto Road, Pouto Peninsula from General rural zone to Rural lifestyle zone.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any further necessary consequential amendments required.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter requests that 9.42ha of land at 6443 and 6453 Pouto Road (legally described as Lots 1 and 2 DP 374339) is rezoned from General rural zone to Rural lifestyle zone. This area of land is shown clearly within the submission (see Figures 1,2 and 3). Rezoning is sought for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pouto is approximately 1 hour southeast of Dargaville. The subject site's surrounds feature a mix of Rural, Rural Lifestyle, Māori Purpose and General Residential zoned land, with pockets of Natural Open Space and Open Space zones. The existing cadastral pattern on the eastern side of Pouto Road reflects smaller allotment sizes, ranging from some 1,000m² to 20ha and development in the area includes rural lifestyle and general residential properties. Removal of LUC-3 land from the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land and thus the definition of highly productive land seeks to free up land equivalent to the area of the Waikato Region for greenfield housing development. The

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
					<p>subject site is comprised of LUC-3 and, as such, the Rural lifestyle zone is appropriate and would reflect future development aims.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rezoning would result in coherent and coordinated development within Pouto and establish a logical zoning pattern. In this case, the submitter considers rezoning of the site as being an efficient and effective way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act.
272.1	J & C Hawley	Natural Features and Landscapes	Support	RETAIN the Natural Features and Landscapes chapter.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The aim of the chapter to protect Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes as a matter of national importance under Section 6(b) of the Resource Management Act is supported.
272.2	J & C Hawley	SCHED5 – Outstanding Natural Landscapes	Support	RETAIN the boundary of ONL14 Bream Tail/Brynderwyn Ranges as shown on the planning map.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No reasons provided.
272.3	J & C Hawley	Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	<p>RETAIN the reference to the "Northland Regional Policy Statement Appendix 1: Mapping Methods".</p> <p>AND</p> <p>ADD reference to the Northland Regional Policy Statement Landscape Assessment Worksheets (2014) in the Overview of the Natural Features and Landscapes chapter.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Northland Regional Policy Statement Landscape Assessment Worksheets (2014) are more detailed and recent than Kaipara's Landscape Technical Report (2010).
272.4	J & C Hawley	Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	<p>AMEND NFL-O2 as follows:</p> <p>The <u>conservation</u>, maintenance and enhancement of the characteristics, qualities and values of Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes is promoted</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conservation should be a key objective.
272.5	J & C Hawley	Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	<p>AMEND NFL-P1 as follows:</p> <p>"Enable activities that <u>protect</u>, maintain, restore or enhance the characteristics,"</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The addition reflects emphasis on protection as per Section 6(b) of the Resource Management Act.
272.6	J & C Hawley	Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	<p>AMEND NFL-P4 as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Avoid significant adverse effects of <u>subdivision</u>, land use and development on the characteristics, qualities and values of Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes as set out in SCHED4 and SCHED5; and Avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects (including cumulative adverse effects) of <u>subdivision</u>, land use and development on the characteristics, qualities and values of Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes including by: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> In Outstanding Natural Features, <u>ensuring requiring</u> that the scale and intensity of earthworks and built development is appropriate taking into account the scale, form and vulnerability to modification of the feature; In Outstanding Natural Landscapes, <u>ensuring requiring</u> that the location and intensity of subdivision, use and built development is appropriate having regard to, natural elements, landforms and processes, including vegetation patterns, ridgelines and freshwater bodies and their margins; and Having regard to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Integration of development into the Outstanding Natural Feature or Outstanding Natural Landscape, maintenance of low development density, and retention of predominant vegetation cover, <u>particularly indigenous vegetation</u>; The location, design, scale, prominence and visibility of any buildings, structures, and access, <u>and the extent of</u> earthworks and indigenous vegetation clearance; Methods and timelines for restoring or reinstating earthworks and revegetating land; and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The sought relief above reflects the inclusion of subdivision in NFL-P4.2.b. and Resource Management Act Section 6(b). The amendments to NFL-P4.2.a. and b. are consistent with the Northland Regional Policy Statement Policy 4.6.1 on Outstanding Natural Landscapes.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
				iv. The finish of any buildings or structures, including materials, reflectivity and colour; and landscaping and fencing.	
272.7	J & C Hawley	Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	<p>AMEND NFL-P6 as follows:</p> <p>Have regard to the following matters when assessing resource consent applications for <u>subdivision</u>, land use and development in Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The physical and visual integrity and any fragmentation of the landscape or feature, and its sensitivity or vulnerability to change; 2. Adverse and positive effects on identified characteristics, qualities and values; 3. The intensity of buildings, structures or infrastructure in the locality and the landscape values of surrounding land and established activities <u>The extent of the area affected and whether adverse effects are minor, more than minor or transitory;</u> 4. The location, scale and design of proposed development including in relation to ridgelines, skylines and prominent headlands, the values of surrounding land and established activities and visibility from roads and public places; 5. Integration of the building, structure, access or activity into the landscape or feature, including materials, reflectivity, colour, landscaping and fencing; 6. The need for, extent, design, location and visibility of earthworks and vegetation clearance; and <u>The degree of modification, damage, loss or destruction that will result from the activity in terms of vegetation clearance and earthworks;</u> 7. Historical or cultural associations with the feature or landscape; <u>and</u> 8. <u>The maintenance of established areas and patterns of indigenous vegetation cover.</u> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addition of 'subdivision' reflects Section 6(b) Resource Management Act. • Clause 3 largely repeats clause 4 and the intensity of buildings, structures and infrastructure in the area surrounding an Outstanding Natural Landscape should not determine the density of the same within an Outstanding Natural Landscape. • Regarding Clause 6, the emphases should be on the effects rather than the need for earthworks and vegetation clearance activities.
272.8	J & C Hawley	Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	<p>AMEND the activity status in NFL-R2.3. as follows:</p> <p>3. Activity status where compliance not achieved: Restricted Discretionary <u>Non-Complying</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>AMEND NFL-R2.4. as follows:</p> <p>4. Matters over which discretion is restricted:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The matters in NFL-P6; and b. The positive effects of the activity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amendments requested reflect the need for Council to give full consideration to its obligations under s.6(b) and s.6(c) of the Resource Management Act and apply the activity status which best achieves the levels of protection required for such a significant area. • Reference to the positive effects is not necessary as NFL-P6.2. refers to both adverse and positive effects.
272.9	J & C Hawley	Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	<p>DELETE any reference to RM090103 for Lot 2 DP 316176 (inferred)</p> <p>OR</p> <p>PROVIDE clarity that the Restricted Discretionary Activity Status is an exception as a result of the Environment Court Decision No [2015] NZEnvC 069.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is unclear why reference to RM090103 for Lot 2 DP 316176 is included in the Proposed District Plan.
272.10	J & C Hawley	Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	<p>AMEND the activity status of NFL-R3.1. as follows:</p> <p>1. Activity status: Permitted <u>Discretionary</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>AMEND the activity status of NFL-R3.2. as follows:</p> <p>2. Activity status when compliance not achieved: Restricted Discretionary <u>Non-Complying</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>AMEND NFL-R3.3. as follows:</p> <p>3. Matters over which discretion is restricted:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The matters in NFL-P6; and b. The positive effects of the activity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-complying status requires effects to be minor and not contrary to the Proposed District Plan's objectives and policies. • This is important given the significance of indigenous vegetation and the requirement for its protection under Section 6(c) Resource Management Act. • The vital contribution of ONL14 to indigenous biodiversity cannot be understated. • NFL-R3.3.b. is unnecessary as NFL-P6, assessment criteria 2 refers to both adverse and positive effects.
272.11	J & C Hawley	Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	<p>AMEND the activity status of NFL-R4.1. as follows:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This status requires adverse effects to be minor and not contrary to the Proposed District Plan's objectives and policies.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
				<p>1. Activity Status: Permitted <u>Discretionary</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>AMEND the activity status of NFL-R4.2. as follows:</p> <p>2. Activity status when compliance not achieved: Restricted-Discretionary <u>Non-Complying</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>AMEND NFL-R4.3 as follows:</p> <p>3. Matters over which discretion is restricted:</p> <p>a. The matters in NFL-P6; and</p> <p>b. The positive effects of the activity.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The reference to positive effects is unnecessary as NFL-P6.2. refers to both adverse and positive effects.
272.12	J & C Hawley	Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	<p>AMEND NFL-S2.1 as follows:</p> <p>1. The gross floor area of any new building or existing building plus addition must not exceed:</p> <p>a. 400m² <u>50m²</u> for any accessory building; and</p> <p>b. 450m² <u>100m²</u> for any residential unit.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The gross floor areas are both excessive, particularly or an accessory building. Scale and size have potential to generate adverse effects. Reduced sizes are considered more appropriate in the context of protecting Outstanding Natural Landscapes.
272.13	J & C Hawley	Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	<p>AMEND NFL-S4 as follows:</p> <p>1. The earthworks must not exceed 150m³ in any 12-month period per site; and</p> <p>2. The maximum cut height or fill depth must not exceed 2m.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Repeated earthworks at this scale would have a cumulative adverse effect on Outstanding Natural Landscapes, and/or Outstanding Natural Features.
272.14	J & C Hawley	Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	<p>AMEND NFL-S5 as follows:</p> <p>1. The indigenous vegetation clearance must:</p> <p>a. <u>Maintain established areas and patterns of indigenous vegetation cover.</u></p> <p>b. <u>Not exceed 150m² in any 12-month period per site.</u></p> <p>c. <u>Not take place in a continuous area of predominantly indigenous vegetation over 1ha in area.</u></p> <p>d. <u>Take account of the ecological significance of indigenous vegetation and the presence of rare or endangered flora and fauna</u></p> <p>e. <u>Not take place in an area identified by the Department of Conservation as having high kiwi density.</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>ADD a map showing areas of high kiwi density that should be available from the Department of Conservation as an Appendix in the Proposed District Plan.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clearance or disturbance should not be permitted more than once on a site. Over time repeated annual clearance would result in removal of considerable areas of significant indigenous vegetation, generating cumulative adverse effects. Standards are required that reflect the significance of indigenous vegetation, the habitat it provides for flora and fauna, and afford it sufficient and appropriate protection. The inclusion of just one standard is inadequate.
272.16	J & C Hawley	Subdivision	Amend	<p>AMEND paragraph two of the Overview of the Subdivision chapter as follows:</p> <p>... It is important that the design and layout of a subdivision responds to any constraints on the ability of the allotments to be developed. <u>This is particularly so in sensitive environments such as the coastal environment, outstanding natural landscapes and outstanding natural features.</u> Constraints may include significant natural, cultural, historical or ecological features within or adjoining the allotments, the potential impact of development on, or effects of, strategic infrastructure, or risks from natural hazards.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No reasons provided.
272.17	J & C Hawley	Subdivision	Support	RETAIN SUB-P2 as notified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is essential that appropriate infrastructure is in place or is provided for to cope with any future development.
272.18	J & C Hawley	Subdivision	Support	RETAIN SUB-P12 as notified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The policy provides for small-scale opportunities. The submitter fully supports the restriction on further subdivision, including urban infill subdivision, within the identified Mangawhai/Hakaru Managed Growth Area for the reasons given in the Subdivision chapter.
272.19	J & C Hawley	Subdivision	Support	RETAIN SUB-R3.1.b. and SUB-R3.1.c. as notified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is important to protect highly productive land while maintaining the existing rural character.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
272.20	J & C Hawley	Subdivision	Support	RETAIN SUB-R3.11 and SUB-R3.12. as notified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This status gives Council full discretion in its decision making.
272.21	J & C Hawley	Subdivision	Support	RETAIN SUB-R4.1.c. as notified. AND RETAIN SUB-R4.4 as notified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To minimise fragmentation within the growth area and maintain a more open rural character and amenity. It will serve to protect ONL 14 bream Tail / Brynderwyn Ranges which falls within the Mangawhai/Hakaru Managed Growth Area.
272.22	J & C Hawley	Subdivision	Amend	AMEND SUB-R6 so that Environmental benefit lots in Outstanding Natural Landscapes are a prohibited activity.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no justification for granting Environmental benefit lots in an Outstanding Natural Landscape as it has already met the criteria for its classification as being Outstanding. Enabling the creation of multiple lots will degrade the quality and values of the Outstanding Natural Landscape
272.23	J & C Hawley	Subdivision	Amend	AMEND the activity status of SUB-R7.1. from a Restricted Discretionary to a <u>Discretionary</u> activity status. AND AMEND the activity status of SUB-R7.3 from Discretionary to <u>Non-Complying</u> .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Apart from requiring proof that planting has been undertaken and has survived for at least 12 months before an application can be made there seems to be no requirement for ongoing monitoring or reporting thereafter.
272.24	J & C Hawley	Subdivision	Support	RETAIN SUB-S1.7. as notified. AND RETAIN SUB-S1.8. as notified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The minimum net site areas are appropriate.
272.25	J & C Hawley	Subdivision	Amend	ADD a new clause c. to SUB-S4.3 as follows: 3. Matters over which discretion is restricted: <u>c. Adverse effects on Outstanding Natural Landscapes and existing areas of indigenous vegetation.</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No reasons provided.
272.26	J & C Hawley	Subdivision	Amend	AMEND the activity status of SUB-S14.4. as follows: 4. Activity status when compliance with SUB-S14.1.c-e not achieved: Discretionary <u>Non-Complying</u> AND ADD standards of compliance where SUB-S14.1.c to e. are not achieved as follows (at the very least): a. The proposed location and design of the subdivision; and b. Integration of potential building platforms into the landscape <u>including</u> : i. <u>Siting in relation to ridgelines</u> ii. <u>Effect on indigenous vegetation</u> iii. <u>Extent of earthworks and fill material</u> iv. <u>Accessways and circulation.</u> v. <u>Mitigation planting</u> vi. <u>Effect on landscape and amenity.</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If a site contains an area within an Outstanding Natural Landscape or within an Outstanding Natural Feature and the remainder of the site is outside those features then any building platform should be located entirely outside of an Outstanding Natural Landscape or an Outstanding Natural Feature.
272.27	J & C Hawley	Subdivision	Amend	AMEND SUB-S16 Table 1, Column 2 as follows: Maximum number of lots that can be created from an individual Record of Title:53 AND AMEND SUB-S16.2, as follows: 2. Activity status where compliance not achieved: Discretionary <u>Non-Complying</u> AND AMEND SUB-S16 so that in the case of Environmental Benefit Lots achieved through restoration or enhancement planting, the number of Environmental Benefit Lots per title should be reduced to a maximum of 2 given the level of uncertainty.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To enable the creation of 5 lots on an individual site seems to contradict the general purpose of the General rural zone. Environmental Benefit Subdivisions have been popular in the past and benefited the applicant but not necessarily the environment. The balance of the site should not be available for further applications for Environmental Benefit Lots.
272.28	J & C Hawley	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	Amend	AMEND ECO-O2 as follows: Adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity are managed to maintain its <u>the</u> extent and diversity of indigenous ecosystems and habitats in a way	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emphasis should be on maintaining indigenous biodiversity for its own intrinsic values as per Section 7(d) Resource Management Act.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
				that provides for the social, economic and cultural well-being of people and communities.	
272.29	J & C Hawley	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	Amend	<p>AMEND ECO-O3 as follows:</p> <p>ECO-O3 Restoring <u>and enhancing</u> indigenous biodiversity <u>ecosystems and habitats</u></p> <p>The restoration <u>and enhancement</u> of indigenous biodiversity is promoted and enabled <u>to reduce the threat status of threatened and at risk species.</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aligns with the Northland Regional Policy Statement and the submitter's own goals.
272.30	J & C Hawley	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	Support	RETAIN ECO-P2 as notified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No reasons provided.
272.31	J & C Hawley	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	Amend	<p>ADD a new clause 4 to ECO-P4 as follows:</p> <p><u>4. Controlling the introduction or keeping of species with recognised pest potential.</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is a method that the Northland Regional Policy Statement states should be included in district plans.
272.32	J & C Hawley	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	Amend	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No specific decision requested but submitter raises concern with the 1000m² extent for clearance in ECO-R1 and considers it is not small scale if it applies in a zone underlying an Outstanding Natural Landscape such as the Piroa Brynderwyn Range it would be excessive and have significant adverse effects on its ecosystem. The submitter also notes that the rules on such clearance are more stringent in the Coastal Environment, Natural Character, and Natural Features and Landscapes chapters and that priority should be given to applying those rules. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No reasons provided.
272.33	J & C Hawley	Definitions	Amend	ADD a definition for "Conservation covenant".	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It would be useful to include a definition for this term.
272.34	J & C Hawley	Subdivision	Amend	<p>AMEND SUB-R6.1 as follows:</p> <p>1. Activity status: Controlled</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>Environmental benefit subdivision must comply with the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> SUB-S2 to SUB-S16; The significant indigenous vegetation or habitat, natural wetland or duneland to be protected must not be subject to <u>an existing</u> conservation covenant pursuant to the Reserves Act 1977; or the Queen Elizabeth II National Trust Act 1977; or consent notices; The subdivision will protect all areas of significant indigenous vegetation or habitat, natural wetland or duneland by way of a conservation covenant <u>in perpetuity</u> pursuant to the Reserves Act 1977; or the Queen Elizabeth II National Trust Act 1977; or consent notices; Each separate area of significant indigenous vegetation or habitat, natural wetland or duneland proposed to be covenanted must be assessed by a suitably qualified and experienced ecologist <u>as satisfying at least one against the criteria</u> in Appendix 5 of the Northland Regional Policy Statement (Criteria for determining significance of indigenous biodiversity); An ecological management plan is prepared to address the ongoing management of the covenanted area(s) to ensure that the values for which the area was covenanted are maintained. The ecological management plan must include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Fencing requirements for the covenanted area(s) including how the areas are excluded from stock intrusion; Details of ongoing pest plant and animal control commitments; and A planting plan showing any enhancement or edge planting required within the covenanted area(s) <u>(use of ecosourced plants is preferable);</u> (inferred change) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No justification for granting Environmental Benefit Lots in Outstanding Natural Landscapes. Enabling the creation of multiple lots will degrade the quality and values of the Outstanding Natural Landscape.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
				<p>AND</p> <p>AMEND SUB-R6.4. as follows:</p> <p>Activity status when compliance with SUB-R6.1.b-h not achieved: <u>Discretionary Non-Complying</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>RETAIN 4,000m² net site area for new Environmental Benefit Lots</p>	
272.35	J & C Hawley	Definitions	Amend	ADD a definition for "Ecosystem".	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It would be useful to include a definition for this term.
272.36	J & C Hawley	Definitions	Amend	ADD a definition for "Environmental Benefit Lot".	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It would be useful to include a definition for this term.
272.37	J & C Hawley	Definitions	Amend	ADD a definition for "Ecosourcing".	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It would be useful to include a definition for this term.
272.38	J & C Hawley	Definitions	Amend	ADD a definition for "Outstanding Natural Feature".	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It would be useful to include a definition for this term.
272.39	J & C Hawley	Definitions	Amend	ADD a definition for "Outstanding Natural Landscape".	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It would be useful to include a definition for this term.
273.1	J Grigg	Planning Maps	Amend	<p>AMEND the zoning of the area between Garbolino Road and Tara Road, Mangawhai from General rural zone to Rural lifestyle zone.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any other relief that is consistent with and/or consequential to the submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To create a rural lifestyle buffer and avoid risk of reverse sensitivity between Residential and Rural Land. The land does not have highly productive soils, and is already fragmented, reducing productivity. Roading infrastructure supports the zoning change, and on-site servicing can be provided.
273.2	J Grigg	Planning Maps	Amend	<p>DELETE the Mangawhai/Hakaru Growth Area Overlay from the area between Garbolino Road, and Tara Road, Mangawhai (see submission for map showing the area).</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any other relief that is consistent with and/or consequential to the submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The justification for the Mangawhai/Hakaru Growth Area Overlay in the subdivision section 32 report is weak. There is no specific timeframe for the Mangawhai/Hakaru Growth Area Overlay to remain in place, and therefore hard to treat as an interim measure. The scope of effects on traffic and social infrastructure are broad and do not appear to be based on modelled data. Rural lifestyle subdivision places little constraint on infrastructure, with on-site servicing being available. The 'blanket' nature of the Mangawhai/Hakaru Growth Area Overlay is inefficient under s7(b) of the Resource Management Act. The adverse effects of growth need to be managed in the District Plan, and the proposed district plan (currently) does not appropriately respond to development pressure in the Mangawhai area.
273.3	J Grigg	Vision for Kaipara	Support	<p>RETAIN SD-VK-O1 as notified.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any other relief that is consistent with and/or consequential to the submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The District Plan should provide for the wellbeing of the community, and zones should provide for development.
273.4	J Grigg	Vision for Kaipara	Amend	<p>PROVIDE a supplementary, peer-reviewed section 32AA evaluation (including economic and risk assessment) of the Mangawhai/Hakaru Growth Area Overlay prior to a decision being finalised to confirm alignment with SD-VK-O2.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>PROVIDE clarification on what SD-VK-O2.3 means, and how it may be implemented.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any other relief that is consistent with and/or consequential to the submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Mangawhai/Hakaru Growth Area Overlay does not readily facilitate growth and does not align with SD-VK-O2.
273.5	J Grigg	Vision for Kaipara	Support	<p>RETAIN SD-VK-O3.as notified.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any other relief that is consistent with and/or consequential to the submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The District Plan should support primary production activities and manage reverse sensitivity effects.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
273.6	J Grigg	Vision for Kaipara	Support	RETAIN SD-VK-O4 as notified. AND Any other relief that is consistent with and/or consequential to the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No particular relief has been sought; however, the submitter supports this objective in part.
273.7	J Grigg	Vision for Kaipara	Support	RETAIN VK-SD-O6 as notified. AND Any other relief that is consistent with and/or consequential to the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No particular relief has been sought; however, the submitter supports this objective.
273.8	J Grigg	Planning Maps	Amend	ADD a Rural lifestyle zone beside Mangawhai (between Garbolino Road, and Tara Road) to align with SD-VK-O7, provide a clear transition and support a wider range of living options. AND Any other relief that is consistent with and/or consequential to the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To provide a clear transition and support a wider range of living options. One residential Zone does not align with VK-SD-O7. The absence of a Rural lifestyle zone area beside Mangawhai does not support VK-SD-O7.
273.9	J Grigg	Planning Maps	Amend	ADD the Rural lifestyle zone at the urban fringe consistent with the Harbour Overlay in the Operative District Plan. AND AMEND OR DELETE the Mangawhai/Hakaru Growth Area Overlay where it contradicts the intentions of the Operative District Plan and structure/spatial Plans. AND PROVIDE recognition of Mangawhai/Hakaru as a growth node in the Proposed District Plan with criteria for infrastructure-triggered staging and collaborative funding models. AND PROVIDE an expanded section 32 analysis to assess alternative growth-management mechanisms under the Resource Management Act. AND Any other relief that is consistent with and/or consequential to the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not recognising the Mangawhai/Hakaru area in the Proposed District Plan as a growth node is misaligned with the objectives under Part 2 – District-wide matters / Strategic Direction's Vision for Kaipara, Natural Environment, Natural Hazards and Resilience as well as parts of Urban Form and Development. The boundary follows cadastral parcels rather than natural catchments. Limiting development in the Mangawhai/Hakaru Growth Area Overlay is not the most appropriate way to manage current and future infrastructure and servicing requirements.
273.10	J Grigg	Subdivision	Amend	PROVIDE a stronger evidence-based infrastructure limitation policy framework (including thresholds tied to infrastructure capacity). AND ADD reference or provisions within the Proposed District Plan for critical servicing and design elements. AND Any other relief that is consistent with and/or consequential to the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Proposed District Plan proposes a 'more limited subdivision opportunity' but does not include spatial modelling or capacity thresholds which creates ambiguity about when subdivision becomes 'too much'. The Proposed District Plan frequently defers to the Engineering standards which may be amended outside of the plan process which creates uncertainty and disconnect between planning and infrastructure outcomes.
273.11	J Grigg	Subdivision	Amend	No particular relief has been sought; however, the submitter supports SUB-O4 in part. AND Any other relief that is consistent with and/or consequential to the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Mangawhai/Hakaru area is stated to be subject to constrained infrastructure, however the MHMGA does not support subdivision where infrastructure is available or not significantly constrained.
273.12	J Grigg	Subdivision	Amend	AMEND SUB-P2.4 to include an exception for the Rural lifestyle zone as follows. Requiring allotments to connect to the Council's reticulated systems where practicable, except in the General rural zone, <u>and the Rural lifestyle zone.</u> AND Any other relief that is consistent with and/or consequential to the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is inappropriate to require rural subdivision to connect to Council's reticulated systems.
273.13	J Grigg	Planning Maps	Amend	AMEND the area inside the Mangawhai/Hakaru Managed Growth Area to exclude the area between Garbolino Road, and Tara Road. OR DELETE the Mangawhai/Hakaru Managed Growth Area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The areas inside the Mangawhai/Hakaru Managed Growth Area are not well considered. The policy does not take into account other measures/mechanisms that can ensure consolidated infrastructure, to sustainably manage future growth.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
				<p>AND</p> <p>PROVIDE other measures/mechanisms to ensure consolidated infrastructure (including transport and social infrastructure) to sustainably manage growth.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any other relief that is consistent with and/or consequential to the submission.</p>	
273.14	J Grigg	Subdivision	Amend	<p>PROVIDE a policy framework that provides for interim subdivision where infrastructure capacity is proven, alternatives are offered, or development/financial contributions can resolve effects.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>PROVIDE identification of staging or triggers for releasing subdivision capacity.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SUB-R3.11 and SUB-R3.12 tries to freeze subdivision capacity pending structure planning or infrastructure upgrades by does not commit to a timeline, or 'sunset' trigger to resume eligibility to subdivide.
273.15	J Grigg	Subdivision	Amend	<p>PROVIDE policy framework that provides for interim subdivision in the Mangawhai/Haraku Managed Growth Area where infrastructure capacity is proven, alternatives are offered, or development/financial contributions can resolve effects. This is in the context of SUB-R4.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>No specific decision requested; however the submission opposes SUB-R4.1.c which "freezes" subdivision capacity in the Mangawhai/Hakaru Managed Growth Area pending structure planning or infrastructure upgrades but does not commit to a timeline.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>RETAIN SUB-R4.1.e that provides the option to provide a site specific assessment LUC Classification.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any other relief that is consistent with and/or consequential to the submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter opposes SUB-R4.1(c) which freezes subdivision capacity in the Mangawhai/Haraku Managed Growth Area pending structure planning or infrastructure upgrades but does not commit to a timeline. The submitter supports SUB-R4.1(e) that provides the option to provide a site specific assessment LUC classification.
274.1	Fernlea Developments (LGMJ Trustees Ltd)	Planning Maps	Amend	<p>DELETE the proposed re-zoning.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>PROVIDE a detailed infrastructure and services strategy which includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An improved waste management system, A transparent and fair plan for construction and funding roads and infrastructure, The imposition of proper safety standards for road construction, particularly on private roads. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter has requested the relief above for the following reasons: - The proposed rezoning accommodates a growing population but does not provide for investment and infrastructure to support the growing population. - The increase in revenue provided to Council through subdivision has not resulted in residents or landowners benefitting from Council upgrades to infrastructure and services. - Although developers will upgrade private upgrades, there is no ongoing maintenance plan. - Road condition (on Tawa Road) and emergency access is unreliable, with conflict over private road conditions and substandard maintenance occurring. - The existing waste management service provided is inadequate, particularly as illegal dumping and scattered rubbish occurs frequently. - The submitter objects to further development which increases the population density without improvements to services and infrastructure.
275.1	L & M Adams	General	Oppose	<p>No specific decision sought, however the submission objects to the Proposed District Plan on the basis that the submitter does not know how it will affect them and requests further clarification.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No reasons provided.
276.1	Mangawhai Heads Holdings Limited	Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	<p>AMEND (inferred) NFL-R2.5, and Notes 1, 2, and 3, to read as follows:</p> <p>5. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>a. For <u>The</u> erection of a dwelling, exceeding 50m² but not exceeding 350m² <u>gross floor area</u>, on Lots 1-4 and 6-14 as shown on the Survey Plan</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The subdivision consent (RM090103) provides approval to create rural residential Lots within an Outstanding Natural Landscape and included a number of approved design controls imposed as part of the recommendations of the Landscape and Visual expert provided with the subdivision application which are required to be registered as consent notices on the new Lots. The submitter considers it reasonable that Council's

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
				<p>consented by RM090103 (and any subsequent s127 variations) for Lot 2 DP 316176 (Mangawhai Heads Holdings Limited)</p> <p>b. A dwelling on a relevant lot exceeds the 50m² gross floor area limit specified in Rule 12.10.3c(1)(b)(i) in chapter 12 of the Kaipara Operative District Plan (but does not exceed 350m² gross floor area). Council has restricted its discretion to the matter specified in Condition 1(p) of consent RM090103, dated 17 April 2015.</p> <p><u>Matters over which discretion is restricted:</u></p> <p><u>The matters listed in Condition 1(p) of consent RM090103, dated 17 April 2015.</u></p> <p>Note 1:</p> <p>The restricted discretionary activity opportunity provided by this Rule applies subject to the following provisions:</p> <p>a. It expressly applies only to the 13 identified building locations within Lots 1-4 and 6-14 shown on a Survey Plan consent by RM090103 for Lot 2 DP 316176 (or as shown on any subsequent DP replacing 316176); or to one dwelling on the existing Lot 2 DP 316176 (or any subsequent DP replacing 316176) providing that the dwelling is in one of the 13 identified building locations and is designed in accordance with the controls specified in condition 1(p) <u>of RM090103. Note that a number of s127 variations have been approved to RM090103 and this condition reference (i.e. 1(p)) is to the original consent numbering under RM090103, dated 17 April 2015.</u></p> <p>b. A certificate of title must have been issued for the lot concerned, subject to a consent notice relating to the continuing requirements of condition 1(p) of consent RM090103.</p> <p>c. If consent RM090103 lapses without being implemented, then this rule shall cease to apply, (Rule 12.10.3c would then apply as normal), except as provided in respect of one dwelling in (a.) above.</p> <p>Note 2:</p> <p>An application for restricted discretionary activity resource consent pursuant to this Rule will be considered on a non-notified basis.</p> <p>Note 3:</p> <p>Standards NFL-S1 – 3 do not apply to dwellings utilising this provision. The restricted discretionary activity opportunity provided by this Rule applies only to the performance standard in Rule 12.10.3c(1)(b)(i) of the Operative Kaipara District Plan. The remaining performance standards specified in Rule 12.10.3c(1) of the Operative Kaipara District Plan continue to apply to any dwelling on the relevant lots as normal. In addition, Any dwelling exceeding 350m² gross floor area is a discretionary activity.</p>	discretion is limited to these matters given they have been tested through the resource consent process.
277.1	Mangawhai Hills Limited	Relationship Between Spatial Layers	Amend	<p>AMEND the Spatial Layers section to include Development Areas and provide clarity for the plan user.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments and alternative relief to address the concerns raised.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter notes that the spatial layers listed does not include reference to Development Areas.
277.2	Mangawhai Hills Limited	Relationship Between Spatial Layers	Amend	<p>AMEND the Spatial Layers section to provide direction for split zoned sites, clarity for the plan users and be clear that provisions apply only to the extent of the mapped area.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments and alternative relief to address the concerns raised.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The provisions do not provide any direction for split zoned sites.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
277.3	Mangawhai Hills Limited	Vision for Kaipara	Support	RETAIN SD-VK-O1 as notified. AND Any consequential amendments and alternative relief to address the concerns raised.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter supports the intent of this objective being to promote social, economic and cultural wellbeing through providing for appropriate activities and outcomes in the zones.
277.4	Mangawhai Hills Limited	Vision for Kaipara	Support	RETAIN SD-VK-O4 as notified. AND Any consequential amendments and alternative relief to address the concerns raised.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter supports this objective and the directive to provide for growth in appropriate areas whilst protecting highly productive land and primary production activities.
277.5	Mangawhai Hills Limited	Urban Form and Development	Support	RETAIN SD-UFD-O1 as notified. AND Any consequential amendments and alternative relief to address the concerns raised.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of residential, commercial and industrial land to meet current and predicted future demand is supported.
277.6	Mangawhai Hills Limited	Urban Form and Development	Support	RETAIN SD-UFD-O5 as notified. AND Any consequential amendments and alternative relief to address the concerns raised.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter supports consolidation and integration of future growth.
277.7	Mangawhai Hills Limited	Urban Form and Development	Support	RETAIN SD-UFD-P1 as notified. AND Any consequential amendments and alternative relief to address the concerns raised.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The provision of sufficient development capacity is consistent with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development.
277.8	Mangawhai Hills Limited	Urban Form and Development	Oppose	DELETE SD-UFD-P7 AND Any consequential amendments and alternative relief to address the concerns raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Infrastructure and services can be provided to meet the requirements of urban areas without applying an arbitrary spatial limitation. SD-UFD-O1 is inconsistent with FC-O1.
277.9	Mangawhai Hills Limited	Subdivision	Amend	ADD an exemption clause for Precincts in the Overview of the Subdivision chapter similar to that in the Transport chapter. AND Any consequential amendments and alternative relief to address the concerns raised.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The precinct exemption clause provides clarity for the plan user.
277.10	Mangawhai Hills Limited	Subdivision	Oppose	DELETE SUB-O2. AND Any consequential amendments and alternative relief to address the concerns raised.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The objective as proposed is too narrow to accommodate all types of subdivision in all urban zones.
277.11	Mangawhai Hills Limited	Subdivision	Oppose	DELETE SUB-P1. AND Any consequential amendments and alternative relief to address the concerns raised.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This policy is too narrow when applied to all zones, particularly those which have a lower level of amenity and are expected to have a high level of modification (commercial, light and heavy industrial). No all vegetation should be incorporated in a subdivision design. The Natural Environmental Values provisions afford sufficient protection.
277.12	Mangawhai Hills Limited	Subdivision	Amend	DELETE SUB-R3.11. AND Any consequential amendments and alternative relief to address the concerns raised.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter does not support the limitation of development based upon the proposed Mangawhai/Hakaru Growth Area Overlay. The Mangawhai/Hakaru Growth Area Overlay is an arbitrary area with no section 32 justification. Limitation of subdivision is not efficient and/or effective.
277.13	Mangawhai Hills Limited	Transport	Amend	AMEND the Proposed District Plan to apply zones to roads. AND Any consequential amendments and alternative relief to address the concerns raised.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An overview section does not have legal effect. The approach to not zone roads will result in confusion and inconsistent plan implementation, particularly for activities undertaken within a road corridor which are not transport activities.
277.14	Mangawhai Hills Limited	Transport	Amend	AMEND the Overview in the Transport chapter to apply an exemption to Mangawhai Hills Special purpose zone.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Precinct exemption clause provides clarity for plan user.
277.15	Mangawhai Hills Limited	Transport	Amend	AMEND TRAN-R1 to remove reference to Council or Road Authority approval. AND	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Third party approval within a permitted activity is ultra vires.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
				Any consequential amendments and alternative relief to address the concerns raised	
277.16	Mangawhai Hills Limited	Transport	Amend	AMEND TRAN-R4 to remove reference to Council or roading authority approval. AND Any consequential amendments and alternative relief to address the concerns raised.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Third party approval within a permitted activity is ultra vires.
277.17	Mangawhai Hills Limited	Transport	Amend	AMEND TRAN-R2 to apply an exemption to Mangawhai Hills Special purpose zone. AND Any consequential amendments and alternative relief to address the concerns raised.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clause provides clarity for plan users, and should apply to Mangawhai Hills Special purpose zone.
277.18	Mangawhai Hills Limited	Transport	Amend	AMEND TRAN-R3 to apply an exemption to Mangawhai Hills Special Purposes Zone. AND Any consequential amendments and alternative relief to address the concerns raised.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To remove uncertainty and unnecessary duplication. Land use and development are open and all-encompassing terms, which could result in unintended consequences of all activities being permitted. Transport Rules specific to the Mangawhai Hills Development Area (Special purpose zone) are included within the Proposed Special purpose zone and do not require additional rules in order to be efficient and effective.
277.19	Mangawhai Hills Limited	Transport	Amend	AMEND TRAN-R4 to apply an exemption to Mangawhai Hills Special purpose zone. AND Any consequential amendments and alternative relief to address the concerns raised.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The clause provides clarity for plan users, however, should still apply to Mangawhai Hills Special purpose zone.
277.20	Mangawhai Hills Limited	Transport	Amend	AMEND the Transport standards to remove all duplication of standards. AND AMEND the Transport standards to apply an exemption to Mangawhai Hills Special purpose zone. AND Any consequential amendments and alternative relief to address the concerns raised.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To remove uncertainty and unnecessary duplication. The standards interchange between specifying limits within the district plan, and cross referencing to compliance with the Engineering Standards which is confusing for plan users, and will result in duplication and unnecessary cost.
277.21	Mangawhai Hills Limited	Mangawhai Hills Special Purpose Zone	Amend	AMEND MHSPZ-R2 to read as follows: <u>MHSPZ-R2 Residential unit – permitted where:</u> <u>a. Each residential unit has a minimum net site area of 1,000m² per residential unit, where the site is connected to a public or private reticulated wastewater network; or</u> <u>b. Each residential unit has a minimum net site area of 600m² per residential unit, where the site is connected to a public or private reticulated wastewater network; and is</u> <u>ii. adjoining a shared open space area; or</u> <u>iii. within 300m of Community Hub Areas A, B or C on the Mangawhai Hills Structure Plan.</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Proposed District Plan seeks to introduce a 600m² minimum site area for residential units. Consistency with the minimum 600m² lot size is appropriate within the residential area of the Mangawhai Hills Special purpose zone, where the sites are within 300m of the Commercial Hub to be efficient and effective.
277.22	Mangawhai Hills Limited	Mangawhai Hills Special Purpose Zone	Amend	AMEND MHSPZ-R5 as follows: 1. Activity status: <u>Restricted Discretionary Permitted</u> Where: a. The activity is located within Community Hub Areas A – B shown on the Mangawhai Hills Structure Plan. b. The activity operates within a building with a maximum GFA of 250m ² or within a maximum site area of 500m ² . c. The cumulative total of commercial activities and community facilities within each hub does not exceed 1000m ² net floor area. 2. Activity status when compliance not achieved: <u>Restricted Discretionary</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The rule as notified is overly restrictive and a change to the activity status will achieve better efficiency and effectiveness.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
				3. Matters over which discretion is restricted: a. Character and amenity. b. Design and layout. c. Effects on the role and function of Commercial zones and Community Hubs. d. Scale of activity and hours of operation. AND Any consequential amendments and alternative relief to address the concerns raised.	
277.23	Mangawhai Hills Limited	Mangawhai Hills Special Purpose Zone	Amend	AMEND the activity status of MHSPZ-SUB-R1.1 from Permitted to Restricted Discretionary. AND Any consequential amendments and alternative relief to address the concerns raised.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Typographical error.
277.24	Mangawhai Hills Limited	Mangawhai Hills Special Purpose Zone	Amend	AMEND MHSPZ-EW-R1.1.a. as follows: 1. Where: a. The excavation and fill comply with the Standard within the Earthworks chapter regarding Excavation and Fill. <u>MHSPZ-EW-S1 Earthworks.</u> AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the concerns raised.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As notified, this rule does not cross reference the standard, and the amendment will improve the effectiveness of the plan.
277.25	Mangawhai Hills Limited	Mangawhai Hills Special Purpose Zone	Amend	AMEND MHSPZ-EW-S1.1 as follows: 1. The total volume of excavation or fill (excluding excavation associated with the undergrounding of water storage tanks) shall not exceed 400m3 per 1000m3 of net site area in any 12-month period; and AND Any consequential amendments and alternative relief to address the concerns raised.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 100m² limit is overly restrictive and does not enable efficient use of the land. The Development Area has to be comprehensively designed, resulting in bulk earthworks being addressed during subdivision design.
277.26	Mangawhai Hills Limited	Mangawhai Hills Special Purpose Zone	Amend	AMEND MHSPZ-S4 to read as follows: 1. Buildings, accessory buildings, and structures except within the Landscape Protection Area shall be setback a minimum of 3m from any boundary other than a road boundary, except: a. No setback is required for fences adjacent to boundaries. b. No setback is required for uncovered decks or swimming pools that are less than 0.5m in height above ground level. 2. Within the Landscape Protection Area, Buildings, accessory buildings, and structures shall be setback a minimum of 5m from any boundary other than a road boundary, except: a. No setback is required for fences adjacent to boundaries. b. No setback is required for uncovered decks or swimming pools that are less than 0.5m in height above ground level. AND Any consequential amendments and alternative relief to address the concerns raised.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A 5m setback from side boundaries is overly restrictive and does not enable efficient use of the land. The Development Area has to be comprehensively designed, with consideration of Landscape Values at subdivision stage, therefore additional setbacks in this location are considered to be ineffective.
277.27	Mangawhai Hills Limited	Mangawhai Hills Special Purpose Zone	Amend	DELETE MHSPZ-TRAN-S1. AND ADD Standard MHDA-S10 - Traffic Intensity from the Operative District Plan to replace the deleted content. (see submission for the wording sought). AND Any consequential amendments and alternative relief to address the concerns raised.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The rule does not reference the correct standard as notified. The Traffic Intensity Standard in the Operative MHDA-S10 version is effective and efficient. The sought amendment will remove unnecessary duplication and improve the effectiveness of the plan.
277.28	Mangawhai Hills Limited	Mangawhai Hills Special Purpose Zone	Amend	AMEND MHSPZ-SUB-S1 as follows: 1. Proposed allotments have a minimum net site area of 1,000m ² , except where the proposed allotment is an access allotment, utility allotment or road to vest in Council; or	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Proposed District Plan seeks to introduce a 600m² minimum lot size and consistency with this minimum lot size is appropriate within the Residential Area of the Mangawhai Hills Special purpose zone, where the sites adjoin Shared Open Space, or where the sites are within 300m

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
				<p><u>2. Proposed allotments have a minimum net site area of 600m² except where the proposed allotment is an access allotment, utility allotment or road to vest in Council, where the lot:</u></p> <p><u>i. adjoins a shared open space area; or</u></p> <p><u>ii. is within 300m of Community Hub Areas A, B or C on the Mangawhai Hills Structure Plan; or</u></p> <p>3. Proposed allotments have a minimum net site area of 3,000m², where no connection to reticulated wastewater infrastructure or community wastewater system is available; or</p> <p><u>4. Except that no minimum net site area requirement applies to any allotment created around an existing or proposed residential unit that forms part of a development under rule MHSPZ-R2 for which a resource consent or building consent has been granted (excluding minor residential units)";</u></p> <p>5. Activity status when compliance not achieved: Discretionary</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments and alternative relief to address concerns raised.</p>	of the Commercial Hub to be efficient and effective.
277.29	Mangawhai Hills Limited	Mangawhai Hills Special Purpose Zone	Amend	<p>AMEND MHSPZ-SUB-REQ4 to read as follows:</p> <p>1. Any subdivision consent application that is on a site that contains areas identified as moderate to high risk instability shown on the Mangawhai Hills Structure Plan shall be supported by a Soil Assessment, Retirement and Rehabilitation Management Plan, prepared by a suitably qualified soil scientist or engineer with input from a suitably qualified ecologist or landscape architect, which shall include:</p> <p>a. An assessment of the suitability of the existing conditions of the site and land to be retired and rehabilitated including the following:</p> <p>i. Topography and slope analysis;</p> <p>ii. Existing vegetation;</p> <p>iii. Hydrology;</p> <p>iv. Soil analysis; and</p> <p>v. Any factors that will influence the successful implementation of the area to be retired and rehabilitated.</p> <p>b. An Enhancement and Management Plan setting out (to the extent relevant to the proposal):</p> <p>i. The key protection and enhancement objectives and outcomes to be met, including the qualities and characteristics of the environmental protection area that are to remain protected in perpetuity; and</p> <p>ii. The protection and ongoing management methods required to achieve the objectives and outcomes, including but not limited to:</p> <p>1. Weed control.</p> <p>2. Pest animal control.</p> <p>3. Pest organism control, including kauri dieback disease and myrtle rust.</p> <p>4. Re-vegetation and restoration opportunities.</p> <p>5. Fencing plan.</p> <p>6. Fire risk management.</p> <p>7. Access limitations.</p> <p>8. Nutrient and sediment control.</p> <p>iii. The on-going monitoring methods to measure the success or otherwise of the implementation of the management methods, including feedback to Council and provision for review of the management plan.</p> <p>iv. The mechanisms to ensure that the management plan applies to and binds future owners as responsible for the costs of implementing the management plan.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The requirement for a Soil Assessment, Retirement and Rehabilitation Management Plan coincides with the requirement for an Ecological Planting, Restoration and Management Plan (MHSPZ-SUB- REQ5) within the same area. Amendment will remove unnecessary duplication and improve the effectiveness of the plan.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
				AND Any consequential amendments and alternative relief to address the concerns raised.	
277.30	Mangawhai Hills Limited	Mangawhai Hills Special Purpose Zone	Amend	AMEND row 2, column 4 of MHSPZ-TRAN-Table 1 to read as follows: Road Hierarchy / Minimum cycleway/footway width Private access serving up to 6 units/lots and less than 50m in length———0.5m (one side only where footpath is not provided separately) AND Any consequential amendments and alternative relief to address the concerns raised.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The requirement for private access serving up to 6 units/lots to include a 0.m footpath is not efficient or effective.
277.31	Mangawhai Hills Limited	Transport	Amend	AMEND TRAN-R5 to apply an exemption to Mangawhai Hills Special purpose zone. AND Any consequential amendments and alternative relief to address the concerns raised.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The clause provides for plan users, however, should still apply to Mangawhai Hills Special purpose zone.
278.1	Marunui Conservation Ltd	Natural Features and Landscapes	Support	RETAIN the Natural Features and Landscapes chapter (inferred).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The aim of the chapter to protect Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes as a matter of national importance under Section 6(b) of the Resource Management Act is supported.
278.2	Marunui Conservation Ltd	SCHED5 – Outstanding Natural Landscapes	Support	RETAIN the boundary of ONL14 Bream Tail/Brynderwyn Ranges as shown on the planning map.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No reasons provided.
278.3	Marunui Conservation Ltd	Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	RETAIN the reference to the Northland Regional Policy Statement - Appendix 1: Mapping Methods in the Overview of the Natural Features and Landscapes chapter. AND ADD reference to the Northland Regional Policy Statement Landscape Assessment Worksheets (2014).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Northland Regional Policy Statement Landscape Assessment Worksheets (2014) are more detailed and recent than Kaipara's Landscape Technical Report (2010).
278.4	Marunui Conservation Ltd	Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	AMEND NFL-O2, as follows: The <u>conservation</u> , maintenance and enhancement of the characteristics, qualities and values of Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes is promoted.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conservation should also be a key objective.
278.5	Marunui Conservation Ltd	Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	AMEND NFL-P1 as follows: "Enable activities that <u>protect</u> , maintain, restore or enhance the characteristics,"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The addition reflects emphasis on protection as per Section 6(b) of the Resource Management Act.
278.6	Marunui Conservation Ltd	Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	AMEND NFL-P4 as follows: 1. Avoid significant adverse effects of <u>subdivision</u> , land use and development on the characteristics, qualities and values of Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes as set out in SCHED4 and SCHED5; and 2. Avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects (including cumulative adverse effects) of <u>subdivision</u> , land use and development on the characteristics, qualities and values of Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes including by: a. In Outstanding Natural Features, <u>ensuring requiring</u> that the scale and intensity of earthworks and built development is appropriate taking into account the scale, form and vulnerability to modification of the feature; b. In Outstanding Natural Landscapes, <u>ensuring requiring</u> that the location and intensity of subdivision, use and built development is appropriate having regard to, natural elements, landforms and processes, including vegetation patterns, ridgelines and freshwater bodies and their margins; and c. Having regard to:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The sought relief above reflects the inclusion of subdivision in NFL-P4.2.b., and Resource Management Act Section 6(b). The amendments to NFL-P4.2.a. and b. are consistent with the Northland Regional Policy Statement Policy 4.6.1 on Outstanding Natural Landscapes.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
				iv. Integration of development into the Outstanding Natural Feature or Outstanding Natural Landscape, maintenance of low development density, and retention of predominant vegetation cover; particularly indigenous vegetation; v. The location, design, scale, prominence and visibility of any buildings, structures, and access, and the extent of earthworks and indigenous vegetation clearance;	
278.7	Marunui Conservation Ltd	Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	<p>AMEND NFL-P6 as follows:</p> <p>Have regard to the following matters when assessing resource consent applications for <u>subdivision</u>, land use and development in Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The physical and visual integrity and any fragmentation of the landscape or feature, and its sensitivity or vulnerability to change; 2. Adverse and positive effects on identified characteristics, qualities and values; 3. The intensity of buildings, structures or infrastructure in the locality and the landscape values of surrounding land and established activities;<u>The extent of the area affected and whether adverse effects are minor, more than minor or transitory;</u> 4. The location, scale and design of proposed development including in relation to ridgelines, skylines and prominent headlands, the values of surrounding land and established activities and visibility from roads and public places; 5. Integration of the building, structure, access or activity into the landscape or feature, including materials, reflectivity, colour, landscaping and fencing; 6. The need for, extent, design, location and visibility of earthworks and vegetation clearance; and The degree of modification, damage, loss or destruction that will result from the activity in terms of vegetation clearance and earthworks; 7. Historical or cultural associations with the feature or landscape.; <u>and</u> 8. <u>The maintenance of established areas and patterns of indigenous vegetation cover.</u> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addition of 'subdivision' reflects Section 6(b) Resource Management Act. • Clause 3 largely repeats clause 4 and the intensity of buildings, structures and infrastructure in the area surrounding an Outstanding Natural Landscape should not determine the density of the same within an Outstanding Natural Landscape. • Regarding Clause 6, the emphases should be on the effects rather than the need for earthworks and vegetation clearance activities.
278.8	Marunui Conservation Ltd	Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	<p>AMEND clause 3 of NFL-R2 as follows:</p> <p>3. Activity status where compliance not achieved: Restricted-Discretionary Non-Complying</p> <p>AND</p> <p>AMEND NFL-R2 clause 4, as follows:</p> <p>4. Matters over which discretion is restricted:</p> <p>a. The matters in NFL-P6; and</p> <p>b. The positive effects of the activity.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amendments requested reflect the need for Council to give full consideration to its obligations under s.6(b) and s.6(c) of the Resource Management Act and apply the activity status which best achieves the levels of protection required for such a significant area.
278.9	Marunui Conservation Ltd	Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	<p>AMEND the activity status of NFL-R3.1. as follows:</p> <p>1. Activity status: Permitted <u>Discretionary</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>AMEND the activity status of NFL-R3.2. as follows:</p> <p>2. Activity status when compliance not achieved: Restricted-Discretionary Non-Complying</p> <p>AND</p> <p>AMEND NFL-R3.3 as follows:</p> <p>3. Matters over which discretion is restricted:</p> <p>a. The matters in NFL-P6; and</p> <p>b. The positive effects of the activity.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-complying status requires effects to be minor and not contrary to the Proposed District Plan's objectives and policies. • This is important given the significance of indigenous vegetation and the requirement for its protection under Section 6(c) Resource Management Act. • The vital contribution of ONL14 to indigenous biodiversity cannot be understated.
278.10	Marunui Conservation Ltd	Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	<p>AMEND the activity status of NFL-R4.1. as follows:</p> <p>1. Activity Status: <u>Permitted Discretionary</u></p> <p>AND</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-Complying status requires adverse effects to be minor and not contrary to the Proposed District Plan's objectives and policies. • Clause 3.b. is unnecessary as NFL-P6 refers to both adverse and positive effects.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
				<p>AMEND the activity status of NFL-R4.2. as follows:</p> <p>2. Activity status when compliance not achieved: Restricted-Discretionary <u>Non-Complying</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>AMEND NFL-R4.3 as follows:</p> <p>4. Matters over which discretion is restricted:</p> <p>a. The matters in NFL-P6; and</p> <p>b. The positive effects of the activity.</p>	
278.11	Marunui Conservation Ltd	Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	<p>AMEND NFL-S2 as follows:</p> <p>1. The gross floor area of any new building or existing building plus addition must not exceed:</p> <p>a. 400m² <u>50m²</u> for any accessory building; and</p> <p>b. 450m² <u>100m²</u> for any residential unit.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The gross floor areas are both excessive, particularly or an accessory building. Scale and size have potential to generate adverse effects. Reduced sizes are considered more appropriate in the context of protecting Outstanding Natural Landscapes.
278.12	Marunui Conservation Ltd	Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	<p>AMEND NFL-S4 as follows:</p> <p>1. The earthworks must not exceed 150m³ in any 12-month period per site; and</p> <p>2. The maximum cut height or fill depth must not exceed 2m.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Repeated earthworks at this scale would have a cumulative adverse effect on Outstanding Natural Landscapes, and/or Outstanding Natural Features.
278.13	Marunui Conservation Ltd	Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	<p>AMEND NFL-S5 as follows:</p> <p>1. The indigenous vegetation clearance must:</p> <p>a. <u>Maintain established areas and patterns of indigenous vegetation cover.</u></p> <p>b. <u>Not exceed 150m² in any 12-month period per site.</u></p> <p>c. <u>Not take place in a continuous area of predominantly indigenous vegetation over 1ha in area.</u></p> <p>d. <u>Take account of the ecological significance of indigenous vegetation and the presence of rare or endangered flora and fauna</u></p> <p>e. <u>Not take place in an area identified by the Department of Conservation as having high kiwi density.</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>ADD a map showing areas of high kiwi density that should be available from the Department of Conservation as an Appendix in the Proposed District Plan.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clearance or disturbance should not be permitted more than once on a site. Over time repeated annual clearance would result in removal of considerable areas of significant indigenous vegetation, generating cumulative adverse effects. Standards are required that reflect the significance of indigenous vegetation, the habitat is provided for flora and fauna and afford it sufficient and appropriate protection. The inclusion of just one standard is inadequate.
278.15	Marunui Conservation Ltd	Subdivision	Amend	<p>AMEND paragraph two of the Overview of the Subdivision chapter as follows:</p> <p>... It is important that the design and layout of a subdivision responds to any constraints on the ability of the allotments to be developed. <u>This is particularly so in sensitive environments such as the coastal environment, outstanding natural landscapes and outstanding natural features.</u> Constraints may include significant natural, cultural, historical or ecological features within or adjoining the allotments, the potential impact of development on, or effects of, strategic infrastructure, or risks from natural hazards.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No reasons provided.
278.16	Marunui Conservation Ltd	Subdivision	Support	RETAIN SUB-P2.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is essential that appropriate infrastructure is in place or is provided for to cope with any future development.
278.17	Marunui Conservation Ltd	Subdivision	Support	RETAIN SUB-P12.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The policy provides for small-scale opportunities. The submitter fully supports the restriction on further subdivision, including urban infill subdivision, within the identified Mangawhai/Hakaru Managed Growth Area for the reasons given in the Subdivision chapter.
278.18	Marunui Conservation Ltd	Subdivision	Support	RETAIN SUB-R3.1.b. and SUB-R3.1.c.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is important to protect highly productive land while maintaining the existing rural character.
278.19	Marunui Conservation Ltd	Subdivision	Support	RETAIN SUB-R3.11 and SUB-R3.12.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This status gives Council full discretion in its decision making.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
278.20	Marunui Conservation Ltd	Subdivision	Support	RETAIN SUB-R4.1.c. and SUB-R4.4.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To minimise fragmentation within the growth area and maintain a more open rural character and amenity. It will serve to protect ONL 14 bream Tail / Brynderwyn Ranges which falls within the Mangawhai/Hakaru Managed Growth Area.
278.21	Marunui Conservation Ltd	Subdivision	Amend	AMEND SUB-R6 so that Environmental benefit lots in Outstanding Natural Landscapes are a prohibited activity.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no justification for granting Environmental benefit lots in Outstanding Natural Landscapes as it has already met the criteria for its classification as being Outstanding. Enabling the creation of multiple lots will degrade the quality and values of the Outstanding Natural Landscape
278.22	Marunui Conservation Ltd	Subdivision	Amend	AMEND the activity status of SUB-R7.1 from a Restricted Discretionary to Discretionary activity status. AND AMEND the activity status of SUB-R7.3 from Discretionary to Non-Complying.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Apart from requiring proof that planting has been undertaken and has survived for at least 12 months before an application can be made there seems to be no requirement for ongoing monitoring or reporting thereafter
278.23	Marunui Conservation Ltd	Subdivision	Support	RETAIN SUB-S1.7. AND RETAIN SUB-S1.8.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The minimum net site areas are appropriate.
278.24	Marunui Conservation Ltd	Subdivision	Amend	ADD a new clause c. to SUB-S4.3 as follows: 3. Matters over which discretion is restricted: ... <u>c. Adverse effects on Outstanding Natural Landscapes and existing areas of indigenous vegetation.</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No reasons provided.
278.25	Marunui Conservation Ltd	Subdivision	Amend	AMEND the activity status of SUB-S14.4. as follows: 4. Activity status when compliance with SUB-S14.1.c.-e. not achieved: Discretionary <u>Non-Complying</u> AND ADD standards of compliance where SUB-S14.1.c. to e. are not achieved as follows (at the very least): <u>a. The proposed location and design of the subdivision; and</u> <u>b. Integration of potential building platforms into the landscape including;</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Siting in relation to ridgelines; Effect on indigenous vegetation; Extent of earthworks and fill material; Accessways and circulation; Mitigation planting; and Effect on landscape and amenity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If a site contains an area within an Outstanding Natural Landscape or within an Outstanding Natural Feature and the remainder of the site is outside those features then any building platform should be located entirely outside of an Outstanding Natural Landscape or an Outstanding Natural Feature.
278.26	Marunui Conservation Ltd	Subdivision	Amend	AMEND SUB-S16 Table 1 Column 2, as follows: Maximum number of lots that can be created from an individual Record of Title:53 AND AMEND SUB-S16.2. as follows: 2. Activity status where compliance not achieved: Discretionary <u>Non-Complying</u> AND AMEND SUB-S16 so that in the case of Environmental Benefit Lots achieved through restoration or enhancement planting, the number of Environmental Benefit Lots per title should be reduced to a maximum of 2 given the level of uncertainty.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To enable the creation of 5 lots on an individual site seems to contradict the general purpose of the General rural zone. Environmental Benefit Subdivisions have been popular in the past and benefited the applicant but not necessarily the environment. The balance of the site should not be available for further applications for Environmental Benefit Lots.
278.27	Marunui Conservation Ltd	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	Amend	AMEND ECO-O2 as follows: Adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity are managed to maintain its <u>the</u> extent and diversity of indigenous ecosystems and habitats. <u>in a way</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emphasis should be on maintaining indigenous biodiversity for its own intrinsic values as per Section 7(d) Resource Management Act.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
				that provides for the social, economic and cultural well-being of people and communities.	
278.28	Marunui Conservation Ltd	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	Amend	AMEND ECO-O3 as follows: ECO-O3 Restoring <u>and enhancing</u> indigenous biodiversity ecosystems and habitats The restoration <u>and enhancement</u> of indigenous biodiversity is promoted and enabled <u>to reduce the threat status of threatened and at risk species.</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aligns with the Northland Regional Policy Statement and the submitter's own goals.
278.29	Marunui Conservation Ltd	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	Support	RETAIN ECO-P2.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No reasons provided.
278.30	Marunui Conservation Ltd	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	Amend	ADD a new clause 4 to ECO-P4, as follows: <u>4. Controlling the introduction or keeping of species with recognised pest potential.</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is a method that the Northland Regional Policy Statement states should be included in district plans.
278.31	Marunui Conservation Ltd	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	Amend	No specific decision requested; but the submitter raises concern with the 1000m ² extent for clearance in ECO-R1 and considers it is not small scale if it applies in a zone underlying an Outstanding Natural Landscape such as the Brynderwyn Range - it would be excessive and have significant effects on its ecosystem. The submitter also notes that the rules on such clearance are more stringent in the Coastal Environment, Natural Character, and Natural Features and Landscapes chapters and that priority should be given to applying those rules.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No reasons provided.
278.32	Marunui Conservation Ltd	Definitions	Amend	ADD a new definition for "Conservation covenant".	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It would be useful to include definitions for these terms.
278.33	Marunui Conservation Ltd	Subdivision	Amend	AMEND SUB-R6.1 as follows: 1. Activity status: Controlled Where: Environmental benefit subdivision must comply with the following: a. SUB-S2 to SUB-S16; b. The significant indigenous vegetation or habitat, natural wetland or duneland to be protected must not be subject to <u>an existing</u> conservation covenant pursuant to the Reserves Act 1977; or the Queen Elizabeth II National Trust Act 1977; or consent notices; c. The subdivision will protect all areas of significant indigenous vegetation or habitat, natural wetland or duneland by way of a conservation covenant <u>in perpetuity</u> pursuant to the Reserves Act 1977; or the Queen Elizabeth II National Trust Act 1977; or consent notices; d. Each separate area of significant indigenous vegetation or habitat, natural wetland or duneland proposed to be covenanted must be assessed by a suitably qualified and experienced ecologist as <u>satisfying at least one</u> <u>against the</u> criteria in Appendix 5 of the Northland Regional Policy Statement (Criteria for determining significance of indigenous biodiversity); e. An ecological management plan is prepared to address the ongoing management of the covenanted area(s) to ensure that the values for which the area was covenanted are maintained. The ecological management plan must include: i. Fencing requirements for the covenanted area(s) including how the areas are excluded from stock intrusion; ii. Details of ongoing pest plant and animal control commitments; and iii. A planting plan showing any enhancement or edge planting required within the covenanted area(s) <u>(use of ecosourced plants is preferable)</u> ; (inferred change) AND AMEND the activity status of SUB-R6.4 as follows:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No justification for granting Environmental benefit lots in Outstanding Natural Landscapes. Enabling the creation of multiple lots will degrade the quality and values of the Outstanding Natural Landscape.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
				Activity status when compliance with SUB-R6.1.b.-h. not achieved: <u>Discretionary Non-Complying</u> AND RETAIN 4,000m ² net site area for new Environmental Benefit Lots.	
278.34	Marunui Conservation Ltd	Definitions	Amend	ADD a new definition for "Ecosystem".	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It would be useful to include definitions for these terms.
278.35	Marunui Conservation Ltd	Definitions	Amend	ADD a new definition for "Environmental Benefit Lot".	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It would be useful to include definitions for these terms.
278.36	Marunui Conservation Ltd	Definitions	Amend	ADD a new definition for "Ecosourcing".	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It would be useful to include definitions for these terms.
278.37	Marunui Conservation Ltd	Definitions	Amend	ADD a new definition for "Outstanding Natural Feature".	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It would be useful to include definitions for these terms.
278.38	Marunui Conservation Ltd	Definitions	Amend	ADD a new definition for "Outstanding Natural Landscape".	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It would be useful to include definitions for these terms.
279.1	Maungatūroto Gospel Trust	Planning Maps	Support	RETAIN the Commercial zone for the submitter's property on Hurdall Street West, Maungatūroto (Lot 1 DP 379438). OR Alternative relief with similar effect.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter supports the proposed rezoning of the property to commercial is the most effective and efficient zoning for the site. It also provides for the existing activity while recognising the proximity of the site to the Maungatūroto town centre and the associated commercial and community activities.
279.2	Maungatūroto Gospel Trust	Definitions	Support	RETAIN the definition of 'Community Facility' as notified. OR Alternative relief with similar effect.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No reasons provided.
279.3	Maungatūroto Gospel Trust	Commercial Zone	Support	RETAIN the permitted activity status for a 'Community Facility' under Rule COMZ-R4 (note referencing error in the submission). OR Alternative relief with similar effect.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No reasoning for the proposed relief has been provided; however, the submitter supports the proposed activity status.
279.4	Maungatūroto Gospel Trust	Commercial Zone	Support	RETAIN the objectives and policies in the Commercial zone chapter that support the development of Community Facilities (including but not limited to COMZ-O1, COMZ-P1, and COMZ-P2). OR Alternative relief with similar effect.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowing 'Community Facilities' to be established as a permitted activity in the Commercial zone ensures that they are in an appropriate location surrounded by other commercial and community activities. It also provides a degree of separation from residential activities.
279.5	Maungatūroto Gospel Trust	General Residential Zone	Support	RETAIN the restricted discretionary activity status for a Community Facility in GRZ-R15. AND RETAIN the matters of discretion in GRZ-MAT2. OR Alternative relief with similar effect.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> They are of the opinion that it is the most effective and efficient way to manage this type of activity. It recognises that some Community Facilities can be undertaken without resulting in adverse effects on residential activities. provides a pathway for non-residential activities to be declined if they are not compatible with residential activities.
279.6	Maungatūroto Gospel Trust	General Residential Zone	Support	RETAIN the objectives and policies of the General residential zone that support the development of Community Facilities where they are compatible with residential activities (including GRZ-O1, GRZ-O5, and GRZ-P5). OR Alternative relief with similar effect.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter is supportive of providing for Community Facilities to be established in the General residential zone for the following reasons: They are of the opinion that it is the most effective and efficient way to manage this type of activity. It recognises that some Community Facilities can be undertaken without resulting in adverse effects on residential activities.
280.1	Moir Point Park Developments	General	Amend	AMEND the Proposed District Plan to properly reflect the National Policy Statements, National Environmental Standards, and National Planning Standards in a way that is specific to Kaipara.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter has requested the above relief for the following reasons: - Consultation is currently taking place on the national direction for a number of National Policy Statements and National Environmental Standards.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Proposed District Plan must give effect to the relevant national order documents as per s75 of the Resource Management Act. - All associated objectives, policies, rules and standards need to be worded in a way that achieves and gives effect to the relevant national policy documents. - the provisions need to give effect to these national documents and be specific to Kaipara and the Strategic Direction.
280.2	Moir Point Park Developments	General	Oppose	AMEND the provisions Strategic Direction into a coherent strategic direction in a context which is more fitting and reflective of the Kaipara District.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter has requested the above relief for the following reasons: - The objectives of the 'Vision for Kaipara' are not specific to the local area or communities as currently presented. - The provisions are generically worded and do not reflect or respond to specific local issues or characteristics. - The objectives and policies proposed do not flow through adequately to the zone provisions, and the wording of the objectives is too generic and insufficiently directive. - When combined, the objectives as a whole do not represent Kaipara as a District or its communities that live here. - There are some clear omissions within this vision including for greater specificity regarding each topic and the need for all objectives to be supported by policies stating how the objective is intended to be achieved. - When the strategic direction is read in its entirety, including its objectives relating to Historic Heritage, Natural Environment, Natural Hazard and Resilience, Tangata Whenua, Urban Form and Development and Financial Matters the overall format is confusing with some topics only stating objectives, and others additionally relaying both policies and rules. - As defined within the National Planning Standards (last updated 2022), chapter 7, (2) states that '2. Rules must not be included under the Strategic direction heading'. This is clearly not the case currently, with Financial Matters currently listing Objectives, Policies, Rules and Standards. - The chapter needs to be rewritten to improve the legibility and strategic direction for Kaipara in a more bold and innovative way.
280.3	Moir Point Park Developments	Urban Form and Development	Oppose	DELETE Policy SD-UFD-P7 and the Mangawhai/Hakuru Managed Growth Area. OR AMEND the mapped extent of the Mangawhai/Hakuru Managed Growth Area to reduce it to apply to a much small land area where growth actually needs to be managed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter has requested the above relief as there is no clear description of the Mangawhai/Hakuru Managed Growth Area and its intended purpose other than SD UFD P7 which states: <i>'Limit new subdivision development within the Mangawhai/Hakuru Managed Growth Area to ensure infrastructure and servicing requirements can be appropriately directed to meet the demand of existing urban areas and future urban growth.'</i> SUB-P2 Infrastructure Servicing Requirements covers this matter and Standard SUB-S5 sets out servicing requirements.
280.5	Moir Point Park Developments	Subdivision	Oppose	DELETE SUB-P12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter has requested the above relief for the following reasons: - The policy restricts growth in the Mangawhai area completely, including within the Residential Zone. - With the limitations to growth, the policy as written will not achieve the intended outcome and will hinder infrastructure coming forward without the anticipated population attached to it - Contradicting the Proposed District Plan.

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
VOLUME 5
(includes Submissions 251 - 280)

Submission Point No.	Submitter	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decisions Requested	Reasons
280.6	Moir Point Park Developments	Subdivision	Oppose	DELETE SUB-R3.11. and AMEND the maps to correct the extent of the Mangawhai/Hakuru Managed Growth Area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This activity should not be applicable to General Residential Zoning. This activity results in Discretionary or Non-Complying activity status which limits residential subdivision Lots coming forward which would otherwise be controlled, or discretionary in the General residential zone.
280.7	Moir Point Park Developments	General Residential Zone	Amend	RETAIN the General residential zone provisions, or that any changes to these provisions do not limit the extent to which residential development can occur.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site falls within the Mangawhai/Hakuru Managed Growth Area where there are clear contradictions between chapters, policies, objectives, rules and standards. Given the contradictions between zoning and site-specific control, the Mangawhai/Hakuru Managed Growth Area should be deleted from existing residential zones. Residential densities standards and opportunities for subdivision within the General residential zone are otherwise generally supported
280.8	Moir Point Park Developments	General	Amend	AMEND the Financial Contributions section in Strategic Directions to comply with the National Planning Standards.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As defined within the National Planning Standards (last updated 2022), chapter 7, (2) states that '2. Rules must not be included under the Strategic direction heading'. This is clearly not the case currently, with Financial Matters currently listing Objectives, Policies, Rules and Standards.