

# Far North Proposed District Plan

24 June 2025

## Hearing 13

- Hazardous Substances
- Natural Hazards



# Hazardous Substances - Overview of Submissions

---



- 13 original submissions (48 submission points)
- 14 further submitters (74 submission points)

Submissions from:

- The Oil Companies (S335)
- Power Companies
- Primary Sector
- Iwi and Hapū
- Government Agencies

# Hazardous Substances - Key Matters Raised

---



- Clarity around the definition of hazardous substances and the definition of a significant hazardous facility
- Clarity in respect of the Rule framework
- Top Energy opposed the Rule framework seeking FNDC adopt the WDC approach of retaining Objectives and Policies but deleting the Rules
- Top Energy sought the function of controlling the adverse effects of the storage, use disposal and transportation of HS no longer be a function of FNDC but be that as set out in the RMA

# Hazardous Substances - Recommendations

---



- Amendment to the definition of a significant hazardous facility by inserting "relevant WorkSafe" and deleting HSNO code or practice
- An amendment to the title of HS RI to include the words "an alteration"

# Natural Hazards - Overview of Submissions

---



- 321 original submission points
- 514 further submission points

Submissions primarily from:

- A range of private individuals, landowners and businesses with properties affected, or potentially affected, by natural hazards.
- Planning and engineering firms
- Infrastructure providers, including Transpower, Top Energy, Telco Companies, KiwiRail, and NZTA
- Central and local government organisations, including NRC and Ministry Of Education
- Primary sector submitters, including Federated Farmers and HortNZ

# Natural Hazards - Key issues and recommendations

Issues in submissions	Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General support for risk-based approach</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Retain the general risk-based approach, reflects best practice, emerging national direction</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General support for many of the objectives and policies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objectives and policies largely retained with minor amendments (e.g. including “vulnerable activities” in NH-P9, removing reference to “minor upgrade” in NH-P10)</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern certain policies are too specific/directive (e.g. NH-P6, NH-P7)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Retain – policies give effect to specific direction in the RPS (e.g. minimum freeboard requirements)</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns that the PA standards and thresholds for buildings, structures and infrastructure in identified River Flood and Coastal Hazard Areas are overly restrictive and arbitrary</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minor amendments to NH-R1 (existing infrastructure) and CH-R10 (existing buildings) to allow for small increase in existing footprint (10m<sup>2</sup>)</li> <li>Otherwise retain – PA thresholds important as a trigger for more detailed risk assessment, increases in building size general increases risk, no evidence of more appropriate thresholds</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Relationship between rules for new buildings in River Flood Hazard Areas unclear</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minor amendments to NH-R7 to clarify relationship with other rules (and delete NH-R12) – make it clear new buildings for vulnerable activities in high hazard areas non-complying</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Coastal hazard rules duplicate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Delete CE-R18 and CE-R19 (relating to hazardous facility)</li> </ul>

# Natural Hazards - Key issues and recommendations

Issues in submissions	Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Support for the intent of the wildfire risk rules (NH-R5 and NH-R6)</li><li>• Concerns about setback requirement and unnecessary consent requirements</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Minor amendments with intent of improving workability:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 20m setback requirement for vulnerable activities to scrub etc. to apply outside ‘urban’ zones</li><li>• Requirements to provide water supply for firefighting and comply with FENZ Code more specific for reticulated and non-reticulated areas</li></ul></li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Support for the intent of the provisions relating to “<i>land susceptible to land instability</i>” but some concerns about workability</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Retain approach for land stability to assess land instability at subdivision stage (SUB-R8)</li><li>• Minor amendment to definition</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Requests to better recognise existing use rights though the provisions</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• No amendments – not necessary or appropriate to duplicate section 10 of the RMA</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Concerns from landowners that the mapping of natural hazards is inaccurate</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Tonkin and Taylor undertook technical review of submissions (Appendix 3)</li><li>• General conclusion that mapping is appropriate for the PDP and/or insufficient information in submissions to amend hazard mapping</li></ul>



# Natural Hazards – Outstanding issues

---



- Limited pre-circulated evidence and hearing statements received
- General support (Fed Farmers, Fuel Companies, KiwiRail)
- Requests to permit telecommunication facilities not regulated under the NES-TF (Telco Companies)
- Requests for a new objective specific to existing infrastructure (Top Energy)
- Concerns the PA thresholds for existing infrastructure too restrictive (Foodstuffs, Fletcher Buildings)
- Requests to exempt the Heavy Industrial Zone/rely on Building Act (Fletcher Buildings)
- Clarify the information standards (NH-S1, CH-S2) to only apply in mapped areas and remove requirement for engineers to assess objectives and policies (Top Energy)