



Global Research
Turning **Information** Into **Insight**

Exposure Draft Kaipara District Plan Public Consultation

Summary of submissions and contributions

November 2022

Prepared by Global Research Ltd
for
Kaipara District Council



Kaipara te Orangahui • Two Oceans Two Harbours

Contents

Introduction	3
Draft District Plan background	3
About the engagement.....	3
About this report	4
Summary of points made.....	4
Report structure.....	4
Description of terms	5
Section summaries.....	6
Part 1 Introduction & general provisions	6
Part 2 District-wide matters.....	9
Part 3 Area-specific matters	24
Part 4 Schedules and Appendixes	31

Introduction

Draft District Plan background

Kaipara District Council is reviewing its current District Plan. The District Plan controls where activities and development can be located and how land can be used and developed. The Kaipara District Plan lays the foundation for all land use decisions within the district.

The Operative Kaipara District Plan came into effect in 2013. The district has changed since then and minor revisions made to the operative Plan have not kept pace with the rate of development and change. The new District Plan must also be updated to reflect national policies that have come into effect since 2013, such as the National Policy Statement on Freshwater Management 2020 and the National Planning Standards. Additionally, the Regional Policy Statement (2016) requires multiple changes to the Operative Kaipara District Plan 2013.

The Exposure Draft of the District Plan has been prepared for the public to consider whether we are heading in the right direction. Feedback on the proposed changes and key issues will help shape the plan before it begins the formal notification and consultation process.

About the engagement

The public were offered a range of ways in which to provide feedback on the Exposure Draft District Plan (EDDP).

Submissions were received via two main sources: e-plan responses, where members of the public were able to comment on specific or general parts of the plan, and submissions from individuals, groups, and stakeholders, received by email.

- > **141 e-plan responses** were received via an online District Plan submission tool which enabled submitters to comment on specific provisions of the plan.
- > **136 free-form submissions**, which submitters provided in their own formats, such as letters or longer documents.

During August and September 2022, other opportunities were provided for the public to discuss the EDDP with Kaipara District Council (KDC); these included local drop-in sessions, online webinars, and direct contact with both Council planners and independent planners (over the phone, or online through Microsoft Teams).

About this report

Summary of points made

Rural zones, residential zones, and subdivisions were the most commented on sections of the EDDP, each receiving comments from over 90 submitters or respondents. Strategic direction and Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs) attracted significant comment also, as did Infrastructure, Earthworks, Noise, and Transport chapters.

A large proportion of feedback on the most commented-on sections of the EDDP typically sought amendments that would enable respective organisations to continue to carry out the activities that are part of their operational mandate. Survey respondents and individuals more frequently sought specific amendments to rules and provisions that would alter zoning designations or zone boundaries regarding individual properties, or more broadly (e.g., in the interest of protecting land or a way of life people have come to value).

Submissions and responses convey concerns that residential encroachment will negatively impact on rural areas, in particular on the function of rural areas in regards to primary production, as a location for light industry or commercial operation, and as characterful open or green space.

Note that submitters who provided free-form submissions were most often private companies, industry bodies, or government organisations and were to a lesser extent private individuals, residents' groups, or environmental groups. Survey respondents were more likely to be private individuals.

Report structure

Following the introductory sections, this report provides summaries for each topic and sub-topic within each part of the plan. It is divided into four sections, one for each part of EDDP.

Part 1 Introduction and General Provisions

Part 2 District-wide matters

Part 3 Area-specific matters

Part 4 Schedules and Appendixes

Throughout the report, the total number of respondents who made comments on particular topics within sections has been stated in headings. Each part, topic, and subtopic are indicated in headings, under which discussion and summaries are written to describe to the reader where the balance of sentiment lay on each part and section of the EDDP.

- EDDP topics are indicated in this report using ***This heading***
- EDDP sub-topics are indicated using ***This heading***

Summary boxes include EDDP sup-topic headings where these exist, otherwise the EDDP section is indicated in the heading above the summary box and the comments are divided into the following categories: support, amend, delete, and no opinion.

Description of terms

- > Those who contributed to the public consultation are:
 - **Submitters:** Those who forwarded a submission to KDC in their own formats; note these were typically made on behalf of organisations. Many of these submissions were prepared by contracted third parties with legal or planning expertise.
 - **Survey respondents:** Those who commented on the publicly available KDC website. Survey respondents were able to ‘click’ on whichever parts of the EDDP concerned them and comment specifically. Note that survey respondents’ comments were not always directly relevant to the section of the EDDP that they chose to comment on.
- > Comments, submitters, or survey respondents are quantified using the following key:
 - > A few: 3
 - > A small number: 4 - 7
 - > Several: 8 - 14
 - > A moderate number: 15 - 24
 - > A considerable number: 25 - 49
 - > A substantial number: 50 - 74
 - > A sizeable number: 75 - 99
 - > A large number: 100 - 149
- > The following acronyms are used throughout the report. Note that other acronyms used in the report have their full expanded versions included in nearby text.
 - EDDP The Exposure Draft District Plan (or, the plan);
 - KDC Kaipara District Council;
 - GMO Genetically Modified Organisms;
 - NPS-UD National Policy Statement on Urban Development;
 - NPS-HPL National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land;
 - RMA Resource Management Act.
- > The following phrases are defined to assist readers:
 - **Reverse sensitivity** is the vulnerability of an established land use to complaint from a newly establishing, more sensitive land use (for example, new houses and other noise-sensitive activities).
 - **Highly productive land** is land that is fertile and suited for growing food.
 - **National grid** is the nationwide system of electric power transmission in New Zealand.

Section summaries

Part 1 Introduction & general provisions

Introduction

7 respondents

Topic summary

Feedback received on this topic included the following key points:

Contents

One submitter requested a standalone set of provisions to address matters relating to Energy, Infrastructure and Transport rather than these matters being spread through multiple chapters of the plan.

Description

A submission from another organisation suggested adding the economic outlook of the district as an amendment and felt that Mangawhai's high growth and tourism potential warranted its inclusion in the introduction. Additionally, a submitter suggested mapping marae locations under 'Context and information'.

Purpose

One survey respondent stated the plan was intentionally unclear in its expression of information.

How the plan works

17 respondents

Topic summary

Feedback received on this topic included the following key points:

Cross boundary matters

A group of organisations (through two submissions) sought amendments to ensure marine activities have supporting land-based facilities, cross-boundary consistency considers other strategies in place, and jurisdictional boundaries with adjoining councils are considered in regard to properties, earthworks, GMOs and vegetation clearance.

General approach

One organisation appreciated that the EDDP formatting aligns well with National Planning Standards and felt the e-plan and map viewer functionalities work well. Five submitters and five survey respondents sought amendments to the general approach of the plan; two sought clarity on split zoning and mapped-only locations, and suggested the use of nesting tables for definitions in the EDDP, while another wanted greater simplicity. A submission from a group of organisations sought further clarification on the hierarchy approach to policy positions, more information on how to lodge a resource consent application, and discussion of the

environmental outcome expected by implementing the EDDP (this was also expressed via the online survey). One survey respondent wanted a zoning map to be included in the plan.

Relationship between spatial layers

One organisation sought greater clarity as to the relationship between overlays and district-wide provisions. A second submission noted the EDDP does not consider all district plan spatial layers in the National Planning Standards and sought amendments pertaining to their specific circumstances.

Interpretation

42 respondents

Topic summary

Feedback received on this topic included the following key points:

Abbreviations

A submission from a group of organisations in the same industry supported the abbreviations sub-topic but suggested an amendment to include the full NESTF name in this list (National Environmental Standards for Telecommunication Facilities) in order to make the EDDP consistent with other National Environmental Standard abbreviations.

Definitions

A considerable number of respondents discussed a large number of specific definitions within the EDDP, whether to express support (13 submissions), suggest amendments (23 submissions), or request the removal of certain definitions (3 submissions).

Glossary

One submission from an organisation supported definitions that appropriately include agricultural, pastoral, horticultural, and forestry activities. A second submission opposed the term ‘factory farming’ being included in this definition, arguing that this is an outdated term inconsistent with other definitions within the plan.

National direction instruments

5 respondents

Topic summary

Feedback received on this topic included the following key points:

National Environment Standards

Two submissions called for this sub-topic to be amended; the first from a group of organisations wanted an amendment to give emphasis to the NPS-UD and the new NPS-HPL, while a second submission wanted the sub-topic amended on the basis that it omits the NES Freshwater and Livestock Exclusion Regulations.

National policy statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement

A submission from another called for an amendment on the basis that the second column of this table showing the national policy statements in the EDDP is incomplete, while one survey respondent repeated a call for the document to be amended to give emphasis to the NPS-UD and the new NPS-HPL. A final comment called for this sub-topic to be deleted from the EDDP as it falls outside KDC’s areas of influence.

Topic summary

Feedback received on this topic included the following key points:

Recognition of Tangata Whenua Mana Whenua relationships

One organisation commented supporting the engagement with tangata whenua, while one survey respondent opposed the recognition of tangata whenua mana whenua relationships.

Tangata Whenua Mana Whenua

Three submitters suggested amendments, two suggesting and advocating for tangata whenua values to be integrated across all strategic matters in the plan and another to consider the use of the terms (tangata whenua and mana whenua) and in which instances they are being referred to individually versus combined (they note that terms are inconsistently used throughout the plan). One organisation generally supported the ability of tangata whenua to express rangatiratanga.

Part 2 District-wide matters

Strategic direction

97 respondents

Topic summary

Feedback received on this topic included the following key points:

Climate change

Several submitters sought changes to climate change matters in the EDDP. Two submitters requested more specific wording pertaining to circumstances of their relevant industry, such as requesting that food production be considered as part of the response to climate change. Other points suggested included greater emphasis on climate change and improved transparency as to how the intended outcome and policies of the EDDP reflect the objectives in this section, and greater alignment with the Emissions Reduction Plan. Wording of a more precise nature was requested by one submitter (e.g., the phrase ‘taking climate change into account’ and ‘enabling the community to adapt’ were labeled vague), the same organisation wanted inclusion in the EDDP that renewable energy generation not impact adversely on sites of significance to Māori.

Two submissions supported the EDDP’s current recognition of climate change, while one survey respondent disagreed with the need for climate change to be considered in strategic planning.

Growth

A moderate number of submitters and survey respondents sought amendments, while broadly supporting the EDDP’s existing approach to growth. They called for specific definitions and topics to be included that pertained to the industry relevant to the submitter, such as requesting objectives for transport be included, the importance of food security be considered, and that the significance of the National Grid is recognised. Although growth was broadly supported, amendments were sought to address the need for appropriate infrastructure, conflict with the Urban Form and Development section of the EDDP, and appropriate zoning and strategic development of the Rural Lifestyle Zone.

Two of these submissions discussed the need for growth in Kaipara in further detail, while two other submissions discussed Mangawhai with conflicting perspectives; to promote development opportunities to increase tourism versus the perspective that the EDDP does not provide for incremental growth within the constraints of the locality. A small number of respondents broadly supported the existing growth objectives in the EDDP without amendment. One submitter opposed one section, requesting provision for suitable firefighting water supply.

Natural environment

Two submitters suggested amendments to recognise the need for new infrastructure within the district’s natural environments, while one submitter noted a lack of provision for Significant Natural Areas in the EDDP. One submitter commented that production forestry should not be included in the Outstanding Natural Features and landscapes in the KDC mapping.

Natural hazards

Three submitters sought amendments, these were to: alter the wording of the subsection, to include transport infrastructure, and seeking better alignment with the RMA. Two submitters commented in support for this section regarding minimising the risk of natural hazards to people, communities and the natural and built environment in Kaipara.

Reverse sensitivity

A small number of submitters suggested amendments to make the wording more specific for their relevant industry, and for reverse sensitivity effects to be 'avoided' or 'mitigated' as a first principle rather than be 'minimised'. One organisation reported that a clear policy direction regarding reverse sensitivity is lacking throughout the EDDP, specifically related to large urban areas within the district. One submitter supported the way reverse sensitivity is currently addressed in the EDDP and a final submitter suggested deletion/ relocation of this section of the EDDP to Growth – Growing a better Kaipara, as it relates more closely to character and amenity effects.

Strategic direction

Several submitters sought amendments; of these, a small number sought better recognition of activities relevant to their industry, including: the value and importance of primary production activities, food security within the district, intensive primary production, highly productive land and regionally significant infrastructure. One submitter noted the objectives should be reworded to be more like outcome statements rather than policies or objectives, and that consistency should be maintained with the RMA and relevant National Policy Statements. A few other submitters shared a similar sentiment that objectives in this section need clear policy direction to demonstrate how they are going to be achieved, and that clearer direction should be provided for situations where a conflict of interest arises. A small number of organisations requested that the EDDP strengthen their referencing of the Kaipara District Spatial Plan and give effect to the Mangawhai Spatial Plan.

The small number of comments made in support of this sub-topic of the EDDP refer to a variety of sections generally pertaining to the provision of sufficient infrastructure relevant to the industries of the submitters and for the plan's stated goals to manage and enable integrated land use management and development across Kaipara District.

Tangata Whenua Mana Whenua

Two organisations sought a rewording of this section to provide more clarity around certain words and phrases. This including querying the intent of the objective requiring recognition the principles of Te Tiriti o Waitangi in decision making seeing as is covered under the RMA. One organisation and one survey respondent commended this section, labelling it comprehensive and sufficient in its level of engagement, however, added that it could better highlight areas of importance to Māori.

Urban form and development

Amendments were suggested by a moderate number of submitters/survey respondents and support was expressed to retain parts of this sub-topic by a small number.

The key points under this topic suggested amendments that would better support highly productive land and food security, provide sufficient and diverse housing, and provide sufficient capacity for businesses and industries to exist. A small number of submitters expressed the view that growth should not be assumed to amount simply to high-density

housing, rather it should be promoted in a way that suits a rural, small-town environment, provides for quality open space and promotes the natural environment. A couple of submitters noted issues with the EDDP and stated that parts of this section have been repeated elsewhere in the plan, and the plan itself should align with the National Policy Statement for Urban Development. Clarity was sought around the intent of UFD-P3 to P6. Several submissions were made in support of the EDDP's current approach primarily in regard to telecommunications infrastructure, educational facilities, housing types and densities, and heavy industrial zones.

Energy, Infrastructure & Transport: Infrastructure

30 respondents

Topic summary

Feedback received on this topic included the following key points:

Around half of submitters on this topic sought amendments to Energy, Infrastructure & Transport: Infrastructure section of the EDDP. Around a third supported parts of the topic, and a small number sought deletions.

AMEND

Amendments sought were numerous and pertained to each submitters' organisational remit. The majority of submitters sought amendments to protect the ability of each respective organisation to carry out its operations. This included seeking protection from infrastructure development or maintenance use that adversely impacts their ability to operate, and that provision be made to ensure infrastructure adequately serves the needs of their organisation (such as from one submitter who advocated for provision to be made for sufficient water supply and pressure in subdivisions related to fire safety).

Amendments were sought from one organisation to allow more freedom for stakeholders to retain access to the national grid and to diminish activities by others on land that may compromise access to the national grid (e.g., for maintenance). Another stakeholder called for significant amendments and wishes to work with KDC to action these. Recognition of the concept of Te Mana o te Wai was sought by one submitter in regards stormwater and drainage.

A series of specific comments around wording and additions to the EDDP were suggested by one submitter that would support greater ease for operational matters around poles, antennas, and undergrounding of services.

A couple of individual submitters sought more discretionary control about where and how overlays are set, and a couple of others highlighted areas where duplications may cause confusion. One submitter emphasised that 'additional infrastructure' should be included when 'infrastructure' more broadly is discussed, and that a clause around education facilities be added to recognise the significance of this infrastructure.

A couple of survey respondents advocated for KDC to limit its provision of infrastructure to small scale, and for robust and resilient infrastructure generally.

RETAIN

Submitters most frequently made simple comments supporting various provisions within this topic, and some made mention that support was with the proviso that activities were permitted and/or reasonable or that they were subject to appropriate controls. Where support for retention of sections of the EDDP was expanded on, this was most often on the grounds of the significance of infrastructure to the district. Support for retention of this area of the EDDP came from several submitters and one survey respondent.

DELETE

One submitter opposed (sought deletion of) clauses restricting voltages, height limits, and some clauses which they stated will result in “unnecessary compliance costs and delays”. Redrafting of telecommunications rules were also sought. Additional submitters sought deletion of clauses pertaining to the requirement for written approval from an asset manager, cross-referencing to the (now defunct) Regional Water and Soil Plan, and clauses pertaining to poles and antennas.

No opinion

A single comment was made by one submitter confirming their understanding that KDC's engineering standards will be updated in due course.

Energy, Infrastructure & Transport: Renewable Electricity Generation 9 respondents

Topic summary

Feedback received on this topic included the following key points:

Over half of the submitters on this topic sought amendments, while a couple each noted areas for retention and deletion. Almost all comments supported efforts to increase the generation of renewable energy.

AMEND

Amendments were largely around changing wording or definitions in order to facilitate and accelerate renewable energy generation capacity. One organisation submitted multiple points, suggesting they should have greater discretion to increase footprints or envelopes in the interests of upgrading the network. They also suggested amendments to terminology (to ensure consistent use of terminology throughout the EDDP) and increases to the permitted height of monitoring masts.

RETAIN

One organisation supported two provisions in which managing the effects of generation activities pertained to education and schools while another supported nine provisions around renewable energy generation and opposed gross floor area (GFA) limits on the grounds that renewable electricity generation buildings and structures may need more space allocated than what is currently stated.

DELETE

One survey respondent stated council should not concern itself with renewables.

Energy, Infrastructure & Transport: Transport 27 respondents

Topic summary

Feedback received on this topic included the following key points:

Two thirds of points made on this topic within the EDDP were suggested amendments; a small number of submitters opposed aspects of this topic and a small number of submitters/survey respondents supported the retention of clauses/provisions.

AMEND

Six survey respondents suggested amendments, three of which used the same wording to request clarity on timelines for sealing of gravel roads, with remaining comments seeking amendments to the EDDP that would result in improved roads or road engineering.

Submissions by and large sought amendments that would allow the interests of the stakeholder groups to be carried out more easily/efficiently. This included a request for amendments to reduce barriers to the construction of stock underpasses, and a request that thresholds for total traffic generated from industrial/commercial zones be expanded. Phrasing was questioned on the bases of being either too broad or too specific (e.g., one submitter wanted to see reference to 'road transport network' broadened to 'road network').

RETAIN

Comments supporting retention of aspects of the EDDP largely cited objectives around connectivity of the transport network and were in agreement that a safe, efficient and integrated transport network is ideal.

DELETE

The small number of submitters who sought deletions from the EDDP mostly addressed parking, calling for fewer requirements for provision of parking (and loading spaces) and for such provisions to be brought in line with national directives related to the NPS-UD.

Hazards & Risks: Contaminated land

5 respondents

Topic summary

Feedback received on this topic included the following key points:

RETAIN

Three organisations expressed support for the clear identification of contaminated sites.

AMEND

One organisation made a series of suggestions about amendments they wish to see made to this chapter, including concerns about wording and consistency with other parts of the EDDP.
One survey response

NO OPINION

A submission from one organisation simply noted that they had no comment on this topic.

Hazards & Risks: Hazardous Substances

18 respondents

Topic summary

Feedback received on this topic included the following key points:

Amendments were suggested by several respondents while deletions and retentions were suggested by a small number each.

AMEND

Amendments were sought mainly on the bases of legislative provision already in existence that deals with hazardous substances. Greater leniency for certain submitters was sought on the grounds that compliance with other legislative controls is occurring. The quantity trigger limits outlined in the Activity Status Tables (AST) were objected to on the basis that they are perceived to be complex and overly onerous. Similarly, the permitted activity table and its thresholds were not supported and were described as impractical.

One submitter wanted to see the greater health and safety risks for the disposal of hazardous substances within the national grid yard acknowledged, and another wanted to see the EDDP section on hazardous substances consistent with provisions in the Waikato District Plan.

Consistent with many sections, there was a call for reverse sensitivity impacts to be minimised.

Lastly, one submitter implored that the storage of hazardous substances in natural hazard areas be avoided and that this be added to the EDDP, and one submitter called for a higher threshold for one hazardous substance required for fighting fires.

DELETE

A small number of submitters (5) called for deletion of parts in this section so as to avoid legislative duplication. One submitter wanted references to hazardous facilities deleted, preferring the term “storage of hazardous substances”, and another wanted consistency with Whangārei District Council rules.

RETAIN

Four submitters expressed support either generally, or for reverse sensitivity effects, and for the use, storage, and disposal of hazardous substances as a permitted activity.

Hazards & Risks: Natural hazards

20 respondents

Topic summary

Feedback received on this topic included the following key points:

AMEND

Over half of submitters on this topic sought amendments to the natural hazards section of the EDDP. Broadly speaking, submitters seeking amendments wanted to reduce the impacts of EDDP provisions on their operations. One submitter called for greater clarity around how this section marries with the hazard rules in the infrastructure chapter. Caveats were sought for the placement of new infrastructure in the locale of natural hazard areas, and one submitter expressed concern about insurance impacts for land designation prone to natural hazards (on this matter the submitter sought clarification on KDC's role in mitigating erosion, amongst other aspects). The extent to which marae and whenua Māori may be impacted negatively by natural hazards was an issue for one submitter.

SUPPORT

Support was expressed by seven submitters for the minimisation and management of risks from natural hazards (this included impacts on people, coastal areas, and infrastructure). This section of the EDDP was said to align reasonably well with the RPS on management of natural hazards.

DELETE

Two submitters opposed parts of this section of the EDDP.

Historical & Cultural values: Historical Heritage

12 respondents

Topic summary

Feedback received on this topic included the following key points:

AMEND

The majority of feedback on this section of the plan was suggested amendments, or queries/clarifications about the meanings or intent of provisions.

A small number of submitters and two survey respondents suggested amendments including the following: that ‘historic heritage’ include specific reference to tangata whenua/mana whenua; that a provision recognising infrastructure needs within or near heritage items (pertaining to the national grid) be added; and that more emphasis be placed on the heritage value of assets not traditionally recognised as such.

RETAIN

Two submitters noted their support for retention of provisions in the EDDP, including both general support for various provisions and for the possibility that historic heritage may need to be relocated (note that a different submitter expressed concern for this provision and sought its amendment to ensure historic heritage is not diminished by relocation).

NO OPINION

One submitter neither endorsed nor opposed this section.

Historical & Cultural values: Notable trees

7 respondents

Topic summary

Feedback received on this topic included the following key points:

RETAIN

One organisation expressed support for provisions to prioritise both the protection of notable trees and enabling maintenance and protection of existing infrastructure, while another added that while they support protection of notable trees, it is important that general farming activities are still permitted around any notable trees on a farmer’s property. A third organisation offered general support.

AMEND

Several submissions suggested amendments to various provisions within this chapter of the EDDP. Suggestions included correcting grammatical errors, adding specific activities as ‘permitted activities’ or including detail about how trees will be protected. One submission on behalf of an organisation made several specific suggestions.

NO OPINION

One survey respondent simply stated they wanted trees to be priorities and rarely removed.

Historical & Cultural values: Sites and areas of significance to Māori

7 respondents

Topic summary

Feedback received on this topic included the following key points:

AMEND

Four submitters suggested specific amendments they wanted relating to sites and areas of significance to Māori, some of which made multiple and detailed points. Many suggestions were around ensuring that these areas (including ecosystems) are protected from

inappropriate subdivision and development, but still allowing for infrastructure to be located within if an operational or functional need arises, or to ensure clarity and consistency. One submitter called for sites and areas of significance to Māori to be afforded the same protections as ONFs and ONLs.

RETAIN

One submission supported Rules SASM-R2 and SASM-R3 as both rules provide for grazing and cultivation within areas and sites of significance to Māori.

DELETE

One submitter opposed SASM-01 on the grounds that its purpose is already stated, they suggested referring to the objective around cultural use areas, access, and decision making. The same submitter opposed SASM-P3 on the grounds that it may have the effect of exempting Council from meaningful engagement with mana whenua.

Natural environment values: Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity 8 respondents

Topic summary

Feedback received on this topic included the following key points:

RETAIN

One organisation expressed their support for protecting ONFs and ONLs from inappropriate subdivision, though noted that some flexibility should be available to access a consenting pathway for quarrying.

An online survey respondent expressed support for the council waiting for finalisation of the National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity before providing this chapter for consultation.

AMEND

One online survey respondent wanted amendments made to give more consideration to the needs of the environment and less to the needs of people, while a submission from an organisation wanted to ensure that rules around the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter allow for the development, operation, maintenance, upgrade, and repair of existing infrastructure for the national grid.

A third submission noted the important role of farmers in protecting the country's indigenous biodiversity and called for this to be recognised with a greater level of trust and support for privately owned areas of indigenous biodiversity within the district.

NO OPINION

Two organisations suggested that an exposure draft of the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter be released for consultation before the EDDP goes out for consultation, while another simply stated that they had no comment on this topic.

Natural environment values: Coastal Environment and Natural character areas 18 respondents

Topic summary

Feedback received on this topic included the following key points:

There were slightly more respondents seeking amendments that were in support of retaining parts of this section of the EDDP. However, there were almost double the number of specific suggested amendments than there were provisions that were expressly supported.

AMEND

Amendments were largely on the basis of slight wording changes that submitters felt would better reflect the intent or outcomes of the EDDP, or that would enable the submitting organisation or individual to conduct their business more easily. For example, the need for maintenance of a functional national grid was raised in the context that the EDDP ought to better reflect the need to operate in coastal environments (CEs); the removal of vegetation for the purposes of emergency response or fire reduction was sought; and the provision around exterior colour and reflectivity of structures was questioned on the basis of increased costs of compliance as well as the potential for inadvertent consequences (such as discouraging the use of environmentally friendly building materials said to be subject to shrinking when coated in the less reflective darker colours).

One submitter suggested additional emphasis be included on protection of cultural, heritage, and amenity values specific to Māori and offered several specific wording changes to accommodate this.

RETAIN

Support was mostly general and was often based on the inherent value of CEs and natural character areas (NCAs) and the need to protect these or use these with care. Recognition of the national grid and that farming occurs within CEs and NCAs was supported, as were the discretionary activities listed.

Natural environment values: Natural features and landscapes 21 respondents

Topic summary

Feedback received on this topic included the following key points:

RETAIN

There were more comments in support of provisions in this section of the EDDP than there were suggested amendments or opposition. Several submitters supported several provisions in this section of the EDDP, including the overlays themselves; mining and quarrying as a discretionary activity outside the CE; policies enabling primary production within ONLs and ONFs – note that this point was also opposed, with one submitter suggesting its deletion outright; the protection of prominent landscapes; and the maintenance of infrastructure within these areas (such as national grid infrastructure).

AMEND

Amendments were varied and included submitters seeking: greater discretion over some provisions; clarification around the use of the word wānanga; amendments to reduce the potential for adverse impacts on ONLs; and consideration for including controls on exotic carbon forestry in a number of environmentally significant areas. Numerous amendments and rewordings were also sought to eliminate over-complexity, repetitions and to greater include Māori in this section, such as through cultural impact assessments to identify ONLs

and ONFs relevant to Māori. A survey respondent suggested a more refined approach to permitted colours within ONLs (of buildings, for example).

DELETE

One submitter pointed out repetitions and called for some sections to be deleted (due to them being considered statements rather than objectives).

Natural environment values: Public access

4 respondents

Topic summary

Feedback received on this topic included the following key points:

AMEND

Three amendments were sought requesting additions to the EDDP to provide greater certainty of access for recreationists by way of mapped and planned walkways and cycleways, and greater clarity of the treatment of sensitive environments in regard to public access. One submitter noted this chapter has no recognition of the need for customary access to and along the coastal marine area (CMA) and waterbodies and does not recognise sites of significance to Māori.

RETAIN

One submitter expressed support for the public access provisions, both generally, and with increased support for landowners to retain access and to protect these areas from pest and biodiversity issues associated with increased public access.

Subdivision

95 respondents

Topic summaries

Feedback received on this topic included the following key points:

Commercial and Industrial Zones

One submitter suggested amendments while offering broader support for the subdivisions chapter. They wanted clarification on subdivision being considered a restricted discretionary activity in the Commercial Zone (COMZ) while being listed a controlled activity in a Light Industrial zone (LIZ).

Māori Purpose and Settlement Zone

One submission said there should be opportunity for subdivision in the Māori Purpose and Settlement Zone as a controlled or restricted discretionary (RD) activity.

Medium, Low Density, and Large Lot Residential Zones

Several respondents (8) suggested amendments and three supported parts of this section. Smaller minimum net area (lot) sizes were the most frequent amendment sought, however one submitter called for the minimum of 400sqm size be specified to ensure clarity on the dictate that the 'developer shall avoid undersized' lots. Three storeys rather than two storeys were requested to be permitted within a Medium Density Residential Zone (MDRZ) in the interest of increasing housing stock, while another felt that gated developments should be discouraged in the name of promoting connectivity. Other amendments included calls to remove perceived inconsistencies and duplications within the EDDP, to allow for greater

density around already existing townships, and to add that access to sites for emergency vehicles be added as a discretionary compliance matter.

Support was on the basis that reverse sensitivity effects are considered in Low Density Residential Zone (LDRZ) subdivisions, that MDRZ rules provide development flexibility and a range of housing choice, and support for GRZSUB-R4.

Open Space, Natural Open Space and Sport and Active Recreation Zone

One comment was made on this topic: namely, an amendment was sought by a submitter that the requirement be added that eco-sourced plants be used (in restoration and enhancement planting), and that Table 1 be subject to a slight amendment.

Rural Lifestyle, General Rural, and Rural Production Zones

Respondents who suggested amendments outnumbered those in support by seven to one. A moderate number (23) of respondents suggested amendments, whereas just a small number (4) stated their support for provisions in this section.

A number of amendment points were made by survey respondents which argued that the size of allotments within subdivisions was too large; the majority of commentators supported altering the EDDP to allow smaller minimum lot sizes for subdivisions in rural areas. One survey respondent wanted to see clustered-style residential development permitted.

Submitters' suggested amendments most often pertained to specific inclusions or exclusions, or wording changes. When this was not the case, the most frequent amendment suggestion was to permit smaller lot sizes (particularly when this was carried out with appropriate design and at a scale that would retain or enhance local ecological values and character of the area). Additionally, suggestions were made for KDC to adhere to Conservation Subdivision zoning, or to take other measures to ensure the development of unique and affordable living appropriately provisioned with infrastructure. Rationale was requested for the way in which the zones were selected by one, and others expressed that there may be confusion over provisions or terms that appear to replicate each other (such as 'boundary relocation' and 'boundary adjustment').

Three submitters/respondents supported various provisions within this section, including one that enabled residents to add revegetation to adjoining properties.

Subdivision Objectives and Policies

A considerable number of amendments were sought on the basis of reverse sensitivity concerns associated with subdividing land. Additional concerns were based on the potential for the encroachment of residential land to negatively impact on the following: infrastructure of national significance (such as the national grid); productive and/or fertile land; and land with environmental and recreation value. A few submitters agreed that a small number of zone exclusions should be removed from a section requiring all subdivision and development to be serviced to appropriate levels.

Lastly, submitters requested the following: a greater breadth of lot sizes, access for active modes of transport, and greater certainty around limiting "piecemeal" subdivision.

The small number of submitters were in support of provisions: that protect productive rural land from subdivision; that allow for subdivision in Medium Density Residential Zones (MDRZ); that ensure appropriate provision of infrastructure on subdivided land; that protect significant

infrastructure from reverse sensitivity effects; and that promote spaces for recreation and public access.

Three submitters made statements that were neither in support of nor in opposition to provisions within this section. One submitter wanted the phrase 'more productive forms of primary production' deleted on the grounds that it is ambiguous. One submitter wanted the policy regarding subdivision in the Māori Purpose Zone to be deleted.

Subdivision Standards

Comments suggesting amendments were by far the most prolific under this provision. A moderate number of submitters and survey respondents sought amendments.

Suggestions were varied and ranged from specific wording issues to general statements that the standards appear more permissive than in surrounding areas. A small number of comments were made about the dimensions for platforms, reserves, and frontages. An additional small number of comments were made by survey respondents that smaller section sizes are needed.

The following examples were also noted: a request for the inclusion of an entirely new standard (which addresses subdivision within the Maungaturoto Dairy Factory wastewater pipeline corridor); a request that highly productive land be included in reverse sensitivity considerations; subdivision of a site of significance to Māori should require consent; cultural impact assessments should be provided with all subdivision applications; and that clarification be provided on the way in which subdivisions within an ONL are required to have platforms entirely outside the ONL.

One comment was made suggesting that SUB-S1 be deleted owing to it being a duplication of an infrastructure provision.

General district-wide matters: Earthworks

32 respondents

Topic summary

Feedback received on this topic included the following key points:

AMEND

Amendments were suggested by a moderate number (20) of submitters and survey respondents whose comments called for a variety of changes to this section of the EDDP including broad requests to: increase attention to reverse sensitivity effects; attend to overlaps with regional rules and functions; and that consistent terminology be used. Increased clarity and fewer inconsistencies were also called for throughout the chapter, to ensure clarity of the intent of policies.

Additionally, several specific requests were made, including: that kauri dieback be considered; that explicit provision for earthworks within the Maungaturoto Dairy Factory wastewater pipeline corridor; that a Māori Purpose Zone be included, setbacks from waterbodies be specified, that the earthworks 'trigger' volume be reduced so that adverse environmental impacts be avoided, and conversely, a few others proposed increasing the proposed permitted volume to suit the business needs of specific submitters. The proposed permitted volume and area of earthworks in EW-S1 for residential and commercial properties was considered 'extremely restrictive' by these three submitters. Lastly, a minor suggestion was made to also cover the 'use of land' aspect of earthworks activities in the district (to also include productive use of land).

RETAIN

Support was offered by several (11) respondents and submitters on various provisions within this section of the EDDP; support was mainly offered for the policy intent and recognition of various activities within the sections that align with submitters' organisational remits. Objectives were mainly supported for their intent to manage the worst effects of earthworks, additionally, there was support for setbacks to manage reverse sensitivity, planting, and managing conflict. This support was often conditional.

General district-wide matters: Genetically modified organisms 47 respondents

Topic summary

Feedback received on this topic included the following key points: Three quarters of submitters and survey respondents on this topic made statements in support of the EDDP's current approach to GMOs.

RETAIN

Support was offered by a considerable number of submitters and survey respondents to retain provisions, rules, and objectives in the EDDP. They offered environmental, economic, and cultural reasons for their support. This included issues regarding biodiversity, the organics industry, taonga species and the current perceived lack of accountability in the law related to the use of GMOs.

Submissions were received from a combination of industry body organisations, regional growers, private individuals, and groups representing Māori. Comments were predominantly supportive of the EDDP's precautionary and prohibitive approach to GMOs, highlighting alignment with other regional councils (Whangārei and Far North) and consistency with the Regional Plan Policy and the Northland Regional Policy Statement's approach to GMOs.

AMEND

Amendments were sought by several submitters, these were predominantly to reword objectives to align terminology more closely with the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms GMO classifications, include specific terms such as CRISPR and to give effect to the Northland Regional Policy Statement which requires consideration of the impact of using GMOs on tangata whenua and taonga. Two organisations supported research on GMOs, one of which said the current consenting process is too restrictive. One organisation shared a report which highlighted that the public debate on genetic engineering is lacking, and a greater discussion on research and interpretation of it is required.

General district-wide matters: Light 7 respondents

Topic summary

Feedback received on this topic included the following key points:

Two submissions making multiple relevant points were made supporting the EDDP's approach to light and emphasising the importance of light as a security measure in rural communities and sought an amendment to a definition pertaining to the objective on outdoor lighting.

Two submissions requested minor amendments to wording to include the broader transport network in the objectives and ensure the effects of artificial light and glare on sensitive activities is mitigated.

One submitter suggested solar lights should be adopted for street lighting, while another requested recognition in the provisions of the effects on cultural practices that include visual observation of the night sky.

General district-wide matters: Noise

29 respondents

Topic summary

Feedback received on this topic included the following key points:

RETAIN

Several submissions supported the EDDP's approach to noise matters in the district, primarily the policies ensuring that noise generating activities can continue and that new activities will not create reverse sensitivity issues.

AMEND

Amendments sought were largely received from organisations with commercial interests that are noise-generating and require specific provisions to permit certain activities such as rural airstrips, audible bird scaring devices, dairy factory sites and the rail corridor. One organisation requested to be exempt from the acoustic insulation standards. Several submissions noted ambiguity and errors in the wording of this section and requested specific changes. One of these submitters provided a detailed summary of proposed amendments to improve consistency and clarity within this section.

Two organisations opposed and sought amendments to this section to ensure activities relating to their industry could continue. One survey respondent suggested tighter restrictions should be placed on the number of vehicles and dogs per household to improve noise control.

General district-wide matters: Signs

1 respondent

Topic summary

Feedback received on this topic included the following key points:

Only one submission touched on this topic, calling for the removal of reference to specific guidance that could be subject to change in the future.

General district-wide matters: Temporary activities

2 respondents

Topic summary

Feedback received on this topic included the following key points:

Two comments were received seeking deletions. Both called for Council bylaws to cover this matter.

Part 3 Area-specific matters

Zones: Residential

102 respondents

Topic summary

Feedback received on this topic included the following key points:

All residential zones

A diverse range of amendments were suggested by a considerable number of submitters for this sub-topic within the EDDP. A small number of submissions discussed issues with potential rezoning of personal property holdings, while a similar number called to expand residential zoning in specific locations (such as Ruawai) or improve structure plans prior to rezoning. Conversely, two organisations argued the proposed provision of residential zones is excessive and does not account for a sustainable level of growth for the district's infrastructure, transport network and natural environment. Three submitters stated the objectives should allow for a more diverse range of housing types, sizes and locations and another three discussed potential reverse sensitivity issues, setbacks from industrial activity and infrastructure, and consideration for firefighting activities and facilities across all residential zones. One submitter suggested the overlays tool be applied to better assess development applications in each area.

Regarding support, several submitters wanted current objectives in the EDDP retained. Comments expressed support for the policy direction of the plan, for example regarding more educational facilities in residential zones and capacity for firefighting. Three survey respondents shared approval and general excitement for future development in the area. One survey respondent expressed concern over an increase in rates.

Large lot residential zones

A variety of changes were suggested by several submitters on this topic. A few submissions discussed rezoning of personal property holdings and specific enlargements for large lot zones across Dargaville, Te Kopuru and Mangawhai South West. Two organisations had concerns around additional development of aquifers and suggested minimum on-site water storage per dwelling to ensure sufficient supply for potable use and firefighting. Submissions were also made discussing the need for more diverse subdivision dwelling sizes and densities to allow for a mixed lifestyle in Maungaturoto.

Low density residential zone

The majority of comments on this matter discussed rezoning of specific properties, reclassifying the zoning of large areas of land, increasing setbacks between zones, or adjusting lot sizes applicable to this zone to suit their personal preference. More than half of the comments pertaining to lot sizes argued for decreasing the minimum lot size, primarily to accommodate growth and an increasing population. One submission pointed out that there is no clear progression between rural and residential zones, which was a sentiment shared by a few submitters who requested increased setbacks and reclassification of land.

Two submitters approved of the inclusion of education facilities and minor residential units in low-density residential zones.

Medium density residential zone

A moderate number of submitters commented on this sub-topic, around one third of which touched upon submitters' wishes to rezone specific properties and swathes of land, such as in Baylys Beach, Maungaturoto and Mangawhai. The vast majority were suggested amendments, for example, one organisation suggested increasing the height of housing to accommodate for growth, while other comments suggested lot area should be increased to allow for more diverse subdivision site sizes and dwelling densities. Submissions also discussed the need for appropriate water supply and emergency access for firefighting, setbacks for reverse sensitivity, specific wording of the section and the housing crisis. One organisation sought that the activity status for educational facilities be moved to the infrastructure chapter. While the other objected to the application of a rule regarding 'Height in relation to boundary' in a MDRZ, stating this zone should have exemption.

Zones: Rural

145 respondents

Topic summary

Feedback on this topic was predominantly in the form of suggested amendments, with each subtopic below garnering significantly more suggested amendments than deletions or support. The following key points were included:

General rural zone

The General Rural Zone (GRUZ) attracted a sizeable number of suggested amendments from a considerable number (45) of respondents. The majority of amendments sought to reduce the negative impacts of urban/residential encroachment into rural areas and the activities presently carried out there. A few comments sought greater clarity as to the implications of specific terms such as 'communal community housing' and 'rural commercial activity'.

Submitters described the ways in which they wished the EDDP to better protect the ability of their organisation to carry out its activities, with particular concerns around reverse sensitivity. This included calls for: stronger protection for productive land; stronger protection for infrastructure required to pass over rural land (including national grid and the potential for EV charging infrastructure); retention of green belts or large open spaces; protection of biodiversity; larger setbacks for structures bordering farm or other land; assurance that developers shoulder the cost for fencing land bordering working farms; consideration for the impact of activities on Māori Purpose Zone land and activities; and that plant propagation be included in primary production definitions for the GRUZ. Additionally, it was called for that agricultural aviation activities be added as a permitted activity; that design-led development be provided for; and that indigenous vegetation be better protected.

Support for the retention of various provisions within this sub-topic was provided by several submitters and survey respondents (11). Submitters expressed support for retaining setbacks for reverse sensitivity, expressed broad admiration for the policy direction and the provisions within the EDDP, and supported a range of specific provisions and rules that suited their organisational operations.

Just three submitters suggested deletions; these were to limit retail sales to the sale of produce grown on the site, deletion of Rule 9, the discretionary status of educational facilities (which was proposed to be moved to the infrastructure chapter), and to delete the standard stipulating that a whānau, hapū or iwi development plan is required.

One survey respondent expressed no opinion on this sup-topic in their comment which was to clarify their known address with that visible from the EDDP.

Rural lifestyle zone

This sub-topic attracted a substantial number of amendment suggestions from a considerable number (35) of submitters and survey respondents, while two submitters suggested deletions.

The majority of the moderate number of survey responses indicated preference for boundary change amendments to the rural lifestyle zone, most of which supported enlarging the zone (especially to areas around Dargaville); other comments requested zoning changes specific to certain properties (e.g., from Rural Lifestyle to Light Industrial for a property on Devich Road, and Low Density Residential to Rural Lifestyle for land to the “west and south of BTRA land”).

Submitters offered similar suggestions with some offering detailed arguments as to why their land ought to be rezoned. A range of suggestions and additions were also suggested including entirely new objectives (e.g, one that includes the need for infrastructure); increasing setbacks; the addition of maximum traffic movement numbers as a condition; calls for a larger minimum lot size; and clarification on the extent to which commercial operations can occur within this zone. One submission sought recognition of the relationship of Māori to their ancestral lands and greater clarity regarding the cross-over between this section and the Māori Purpose Zone to dispel any confusion.

Deletions sought included that the activity status for educational facilities in the RLZ be moved to the infrastructure chapter, and that Rule 2 be deleted (in which minor residential units are permitted).

Rural production zone

A moderate number (18) of submitters and survey respondents included suggested amendments to this sub-topic within the EDDP. Just under half this number supported retention of various parts, and three submitters sought deletions.

Amendments sought by survey respondents included calls for the reclassification of various properties – e.g., from Rural Production Zone to Low or Medium Density Residential.

Submissions generally sought amendments to the EDDP that they anticipated would offer them some certainty in being able to continue to carry out their operations as they have been. For example, recognition of agricultural aviation as an ancillary activity for primary production, and recognition of indoor primary production as primary production. A range of wording changes and additions were suggested to this effect. Amendments to protect highly productive soils from dense residential development were supported by a few submitters, as were rules that protect land with high biodiversity from development.

Submitters who supported the retention of parts of this sup-topic within the EDDP advocated for rules which: maintained rural character; protected farming and primary production activity; diminished reverse sensitivity impacts; protected fertile soils for food production; and, allowed for residential development and the creation of new housing stock.

Deletions were sought of the following nature: Rules 5 (pertaining to visitor accommodation), 7 (rural produce sales), and 19 (discretionary activity status for intensive indoor primary production activities) were opposed on the grounds that primary production activities might be negatively affected, and setbacks were deemed inappropriately small by one submitter.

Settlement zone

Several survey respondents and submitters (11) sought amendments to the Settlement Zone sub-topic in the EDDP. Individual rezoning requests were made (such as from Settlement to Natural Open Space, and that more Settlement Zones be applied to areas around Paparoa for example), and allowances for education facilities as a complementary residential/ community asset. As in previous sections, submitters sought specific inclusion of the word ‘infrastructure’ regarding permissions around activities that support settlements.

One deletion was sought; namely, to remove the discretionary activity status of educational facilities.

Zones: Commercial and mixed-use zones

25 respondents

Topic summary

Feedback received on this topic included the following key points:

Amend

Several submissions from various organisations or groups suggested amendments to this chapter, generally seeking changes related to a specific property of interest to the submitting party, such as suggesting a change from fully commercial to split zoned. A couple of the submissions offered broader suggestions, like allowing for increased building heights in certain commercially zoned areas, or the addition of certain activities such as educational facilities or infrastructure-related activities.

Retain

Three other submissions expressed support for provisions within this chapter and sought to have these retained, including the inclusion of residential development opportunities within the main commercial zones of the district, or the zoning of a specific property.

Delete

One online survey respondent wanted no more commercial development around Mangawhai to protect the coastal village feel.

Zones: Industrial

26 respondents

Topic summary

Feedback received on this topic included the following key points:

RETAIN

The majority of comments pertained to the Heavy Industrial Zone (HIZ), with just one expressing support for current provisions regarding the Light Industrial Zone (LIZ). Five organisations noted support for various objectives, policies and rules, primarily on the grounds that they were considered to enable businesses and industry to operate effectively. A couple of survey respondents praised the strategic placement of the heavy industrial zone and the enabling nature of the provisions.

AMEND

Five organisations and one survey respondents offered a range of suggested amendments regarding the HIZ. Three concerned rezoning, with one request to rezone a farm site as HIZ rather than GRUZ, and two submissions regarding the Dargaville Racecourse which respectively advocated for it to be zoned rural production land or for the zoning to align with Private Plan Change 81.

One stakeholder suggested a variety of amendments, primarily to enable more activity and recognise the significance of industry to the region's economy. Another addressed compatibility of activities and the need for some sensitive activities, such as educational training, to be allowed in the HIZ.

Lastly, a private submission recommended areas they considered more appropriate for heavy industrial development.

Three organisations and individual submitters addressed the LIZ. Almost all individual submitters advocated for more land to be zoned Light Industrial to encourage and enable business growth, though one objected to the inclusion of their residential property within this zone. One organisation also suggested various alterations to zoning.

The last two organisations both noted activities which needed to be provided for in the zone, such as critical infrastructure or educational facilities.

DELETE

Two individual submissions objected to the proposed light industrial zoning, one due to their property's inclusion within this, and the other arguing that all industrial zones should be well away from housing.

One organisation was opposed to Heavy Industrial Zoning on the western side of SH14. They recommended rezoning to Light Industrial and suggested other potential areas for the HIZ.

Zones: Open spaces and recreation

16 respondents

Topic summary

Feedback received on this topic included the following key points:

Natural open space zone NOSZ

Seven respondents suggested amendments and three supported provisions in this section. Amendments were sought by submitters around the following aspects: altering a provision to prohibit off-leash dogs and trail bikes in NOSZ; more attention to kauri dieback; more allowances for maintenance of the national grid; and applying exclusions to the setback rules in certain circumstances.

The three respondents supporting retention of provisions, included general support for the protection of Natural Open Spaces (NOS), and one expression of support for the proposed Open Space Zone (OSZ) for a specific property.

Open space zone OSZ

Two amendments from survey respondents suggested increasing the amount of fencing around playgrounds and increased provision of open space for picnics and the like. One comment was made in support of the OSZ provisions, specifically that the provision was deemed to provide more and better areas for children and families to be outdoors.

Sport and active recreation zone SARZ

Two respondents suggested amendments and one supported these provisions. Suggested amendments included a small number from a non-active recreation group that sought greater freedoms for such groups and provision for activities of a non-active nature. Reverse sensitivity effects were a concern for one submitter on the SARZ zoning of land around the Dargaville Speedway.

Support was on the basis of the EDDP providing adequately for open space for recreation.

Special Purposes Zone: Estuary Estates (Mangawhai Central) 6 respondents

Topic summary

Feedback received on this topic included the following key points:

AMEND

Amendments were sought from four stakeholders whose comments suggested variously that additional standards could assist in the protection of water supply, that the area should be zoned medium density residential, and that wastewater remains a concern.

DELETE

Deletions were suggested by two survey respondents who objected to the Mangawhai Central development outright. It was deemed an unnecessary cost and a development that will result in a homogenous and unattractive aesthetic.

Special Purposes Zone: Hospital zone 3 respondents

Topic summary

Feedback received on this topic included the following key points:

RETAIN

One submitter expressed enthusiastic support for upgrading the health system.

AMEND

One stakeholder advocated for the Dargaville Hospital to be recognised as regionally significant infrastructure and for various amendments to ensure development is not unnecessarily restricted while adverse effects are managed.

DELETE

The current description of Dargaville Hospital as "locally significant infrastructure" was objected to, with the stakeholder in favour of it being deemed regionally significant.

Special Purposes Zone: Māori purpose zone

5 respondents

Topic summary

Feedback received on this topic included the following key points:

RETAIN

One organisation expressed their support for multiple objectives and policies regarding the relationship of Māori to their ancestral lands and providing for a range of activities.

AMEND

Four organisations, including the organisation who expressed support above, requested amendments. One requested minor changes to enable development, while another requested a couple of amendments regarding water supply and access. A third requested a change to matters of discretion regarding educational facilities.

One submission noted inconsistencies and ambiguity throughout the EDDP in regard to wording, in particular the use of the term 'Māori purpose zone' and application of standards (across the MPZ versus the rural zones). One such example is when referencing "Māori Purpose Zone Activities"; the submitter noted that it should either be Māori Purpose Activities or Māori Purpose Zone referring to the zone itself.

DELETE

One submitter wanted the requirement to comply with MPZ-S1 for new marae does not need to be addressed in the EDDP as building consent would be obtained under the Building Act.

Designations

10 respondents

Topic summary

Feedback received on this topic included the following key points:

RETAIN

Two organisations expressed their support for various designations in the EDDP.

AMEND

Several organisations requested minor amendments to various designations. One stakeholder noted that conditions had been added without the organisation's approval and requested these be removed.

DELETE

One organisation requested several conditions pertaining to electricity and telecommunications designations be removed.

Another organisation requested the removal of two rules regarding development.

Part 4 Schedules and Appendixes

Schedule 1: Historic Heritage Resources

5 respondents

Topic summary

Feedback received on this topic included the following key points:

AMEND

One respondent made a comprehensive submission detailing a variety of recommendations to clarify/add information in the schedule and achieve greater heritage protection.

One submitter suggested changes to sites included in the schedule.

Schedule 2: Notable Trees

3 respondents

Topic summary

Feedback received on this topic included the following key points:

AMEND

One survey respondent requested greater protection for native trees over 6m, while an organisation suggested that a balance was needed between protecting notable trees and managing infrastructure and network utilities.

DELETE

One respondent contended that trees on private land should not be under the council's remit.

Schedule 3: Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori

3 respondents

Topic summary

Feedback received on this topic included the following key points:

AMEND

One organisation suggested strengthening this section to better reflect the status of Māori as Treaty partner. Another organisation acknowledged the significance of sites to mana whenua but wanted to ensure a balance is struck which allows for necessary infrastructure to be located within these areas.

A survey respondent appeared concerned about the potential inclusion of more areas to this designation.

Schedule 4: Outstanding Natural Features

2 respondents

Topic summary

Feedback received on this topic included the following key points:

AMEND

One organisation highlighted that regionally significant infrastructure needed to be provided for in ONF provisions.

RETAIN

One organisation expressed their full support for the ONFs in the EDDP, considering them to be well aligned with RPS direction. However, they noted concern that there could be potential unintended consequences that should be considered, such as preventing new fencing around waterbodies.

Schedule 5: Outstanding Natural Landscapes

7 respondents

Topic summary

Feedback received on this topic included the following key points:

AMEND

Two organisations called for more limitations around vegetation clearance and earthworks in ONLs, more comprehensive details pertaining to each ONL, and more restrictive provisions regarding various activities in the ONL14 Bream Tail / Brynderwyn Ranges to achieve stronger protection of the environment and landscape.

A private submitter noted that the Coastal Environment seems to be better protected in the EDDP than Outstanding Landscapes and called for them to both be protected well.

A submission from an organisation reiterated the need for ONL provisions to recognise that there may be a need for regionally significant electricity infrastructure in sensitive areas.

One organisation was concerned that the EDDP was basing its designations of ONLs on outdated reports, suggesting these needed to be refreshed to ensure only areas which meet the criteria for naturalness are designated as ONLs. They also requested that Rule 12.10.3C regarding buildings and structures from the Operative Plan be included in the new plan.

DELETE

Two submissions called for the deletion of NFL-P11 'Enable primary production activities' as they felt this is contrary to the stated objectives.

Schedule 6: Natural Character Areas

3 respondents

Topic summary

Feedback received on this topic included the following key points:

AMEND

Three submissions suggested amendments to this sub-topic. One organisation provided specific feedback on this chapter with the aim of achieving an appropriate balance between protection and the provision of necessary infrastructure by ensuring that rules do not inhibit the ability for electricity infrastructure to be installed and maintained in these areas.

A submission from another stakeholder discussed specific instances where they felt there is potential for unintended consequences of the rules in the Coastal Environment.

One online survey respondent noted that while listing Natural Character Areas and considering possible changes through development is acceptable, there is no need to interfere with what already exists.

Schedule 7: Coastal Environment

2 respondents

Topic summary

Feedback received on this topic included the following key points:

AMEND

Two submissions suggested amendments to this sub-topic. One organisation, representing landowners who are affected by the proposed Coastal Erosion zones, sought clarification on a number of issues relating to coastal erosion predictions. Another stakeholder stated they support the recognition of and provision for the functional and operational need of the National Grid and regionally significant infrastructure in the coastal environment, but argued that that this should be extended to electricity infrastructure in general.

This report has been prepared by:
Global Research
150 Office Rd
Merivale
Christchurch 8014
New Zealand
+64 3 355 4562
www.globalresearch.nz

