

## Appendix 2 – Officer's Recommended Decisions on Submissions (Natural Hazards)

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>S194.001</b>	Thomson Survey Ltd	General / Process	Support in part	Support the need to manage development within coastal hazard areas, I believe all hazard provisions should be located in the Natural Hazards chapter. A cross reference in the Coastal Environment back to the Natural Hazards chapter can be included.	Amend the location of the Coastal Hazard rules by transferring them along with the Standards out of the Coastal Environment chapter and into the Natural Hazards chapter. Insert a cross reference in the Coastal Environment chapter to this effect.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter
<b>FS446.002</b>	Omata Estate		Support	Support request to locate coastal hazard rules in Natural Hazards Chapter as this will achieve a clearer framework in the Plan.	Allow	Amend the location of the Coastal Hazard rules by transferring them along with the Standards out of the Coastal Environment chapter and into the Natural Hazards chapter. Insert a cross reference in the Coastal Environment chapter to this effect.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter
<b>FS547.003</b>	Heron Point Limited		Support	Support request to locate coastal hazard rules in Natural Hazards Chapter. This will assist future users with easily locating all natural hazards provisions	Allow	Allow the submission, subject to appropriate drafting	Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter
<b>FS305.003</b>	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	Support request to locate coastal hazard rules in Natural Hazards Chapter. This will assist future users with easily locating all natural hazards provisions	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter
<b>S391.001</b>	Phill Grimshaw	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	Provisions should enable the ability for people to exercise their existing use rights, where rebuilding a house 'like for like' and which result in effects	Insert additional provisions which allow residents within the district to develop a house/building/activity in accordance with Section 10 of the RMA 1991 (certain existing		Reject	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				which are the same or similar in character, intensity, and scale	uses in relation to land protected) despite the hazard overlays which may apply to their properties			the Natural Hazards Chapter
<b>S477.013</b>	Te Waka Pupuri Putea Trust	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	As Kaitiaki, we are and have been acutely aware of the degradation of Papatuanuku (Earth mother) and all living things between her and Ranginui (Sky Father) and the unavoidable consequences that can be generally categorised as Climate Change issues since pre-colonial times until present.	Amend the Plan as required to be forward-thinking regarding climate-related issues as the geography of our rohe makes us more susceptible to these issues and their potentially dire consequences		Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter
<b>S359.009</b>	Northland Regional Council	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	Recent updates from the Ministry for the Environment indicate that sea level is rising faster than anticipated. The Proposed Plan should therefore consider the potential for updating of NRC hazard maps and working with NRC to reflect new understanding of the issue.	Amend the planning maps to align with updated NRC hazard maps (inferred)		Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter
<b>FS24.66</b>	Lynley Newport		Support in part	Whilst the most up to date hazard mapping is essential, there is a process issue to be considered. the Council cannot simply change maps - the issue is district wide and any updates or changes to hazard mapping would need to go through the full Schedule 1 plan change process every time there is a change. If there are immediate changes sought by the NRC, then the hazards section of the PDP and associated maps would have to be re-notified.	Disallow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter
<b>FS67.11</b>	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The submission by the NRC seeks to introduce new Hazards Mapping without showing the specific effect of that relief on properties, or providing proper justification, including under section 32 of the RMA.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>FS68.12</b>	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The submission by the NRC seeks to introduce new Hazards Mapping without showing the specific effect of that relief on properties, or providing proper justification, including under section 32 of the RMA.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter
<b>FS143.67</b>	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Oppose	The submission by the NRC seeks to introduce new Hazards Mapping without showing the specific effect of that relief on properties, or providing proper justification, including under section 32 of the RMA.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter
<b>FS69.11</b>	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	The submission by the NRC seeks to introduce new Hazards Mapping without showing the specific effect of that relief on properties, or providing proper justification, including under section 32 of the RMA.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter
<b>FS25.053</b>	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Support	Supports the intent of providing direction that provides a clear statement of how communities will respond to climate change.	Allow	Allow the original submission, subject to appropriate wording.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter
<b>FS446.005</b>	Omata Estate		Oppose	Any mapping that has potentially greater impacts on property needs to be fully tested and a full analysis and planning process is required to determine the best methods to address updated information. A further hazards mapping plan change may be required to ensure a clear and consistent approach to hazard management throughout the region and Far North District.	Disallow	retain	Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter
<b>FS66.11</b>	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The submission by the NRC seeks to introduce new Hazards Mapping without showing the specific effect of that relief on properties, or providing	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				proper justification, including under section 32 of the RMA.				
<b>FS23.099</b>	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	With the introduction of the Climate Change and National Adaption Plans last year it is appropriate to include provisions relating to climate change, and to ensure other provisions take into account climate change to the extent relevant.	Allow	Allow the relief sought by making changes to make appropriate provision for climate change.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter
<b>FS243.002</b>	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Support in part	Kainga Ora original submission sought the River Flood Hazard Area maps be removed from the FNPDP and placed in a non-statutory layer available via a GIS viewer. This is a consistent approach to identify such hazards countrywide and provides for regular updates to hazard information without the requirement to go through Plan Changes to update the planning maps.	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter
<b>FS547.006</b>	Heron Point Limited		Oppose	Reject Submission. Any mapping that has potentially greater impacts on property needs to be fully tested and a full analysis and planning process is required to determine the best methods to address updated information. A further hazards mapping plan change may be required to ensure a clear and consistent approach to hazard management throughout the region and Far North District.	Disallow	Amend	Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter
<b>FS305.006</b>	Dempsey Family Trust		Oppose	Any mapping that has potentially greater impacts on property needs to be fully tested and a full analysis and planning process is required to determine the best methods to address updated information. A further hazards mapping plan change may be required to ensure a clear and consistent approach to hazard management	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				throughout the region and Far North District.				
<b>FS325.033</b>	Turnstone Trust Limited		Support	TT supports the intent of providing direction that provides a clear statement of how communities will respond to climate change.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate wording.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter
<b>FS570.1045</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter
<b>FS346.470</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS and Part 2 of the RMA and the NPS IB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter
<b>FS566.1059</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter
<b>FS569.1081</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter
<b>S559.027</b>	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rēhia	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support	Many of our Māori land blocks and marae are coastal or in low lying areas (Takou, Tapuaetahi, Te Tii) impacted by the new coastal hazard zones. The impacts of strict rules could have major consequences on our ability to live on our whenua and generate wealth.	Amend to align with submission #407 by Tapuaetahi Incorporation regarding the natural hazards and coastal environment chapters (inferred).		Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter
<b>FS151.335</b>	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
								Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter
FS570.2217	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter
FS348.054	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter
FS566.2231	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter
FS569.2253	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter
S521.006	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	A pop-out window in the PDP map, entitled News Feed - How to use the Eplan, points out that the coastal and flooding hazard maps in the draft plan are out of date, and asks users to check the updated NRC Natural Hazards Maps on NRC website. However, the sections of the PDP that refer to flooding and natural hazards do not provide the above warning to users. As a result, people may use out-of-date mapping information. The PDP section should refer specifically to the most recent NRC Natural Hazards maps, and PDP maps should be updated regularly, as soon as possible.	Amend PDP to apply the <i>precautionary approach</i> with regard to mapped inland flood and coastal hazards, areas to take account of longer-term changes expected from climate change, as well as the limitations in mapping.		Reject	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>FS243.009</b>	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Support in part	Kāinga Ora seeks to support the delivery of market, affordable, papakāinga and other types of housing developments that are resilient to climate change impacts. Kāinga Ora original submission sought the River Flood Hazard Area maps be removed from the FNPDP and placed in a non-statutory layer available via a GIS viewer. This is a consistent approach to identify such hazards countrywide and provides for regular updates to hazard information without the requirement to go through Plan Changes to update the planning maps. Kāinga Ora supports the use of the most updated data through GIS mapping. At the same time, further investigation is necessary to understand the hazard risk and mitigation measures planned or in place	Allow in part	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter
<b>FS566.1716</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter
<b>S529.052</b>	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	A pop-out window in the PDP map, entitled News Feed - How to use the Eplan, points out that the coastal and flooding hazard maps in the draft plan are out of date, and asks users to check the updated NRC Natural Hazards Maps on NRC website. However, the sections of the PDP that refer to flooding and natural hazards do not provide the above warning to users. As a result, people may use out-of-date mapping information. The PDP section should refer specifically to the most recent NRC Natural Hazards maps,	Amend PDP to apply precautionary approach with regard to mapped inland flood and coastal hazard areas, to take account of longer-term changes expected from climate change, as well as the limitations in mapping.		Reject	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				and PDP maps should be updated regularly, as soon as possible.				
<b>FS243.017</b>	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Support in part	Kāinga Ora seeks to support the delivery of market, affordable, papakāinga and other types of housing developments that are resilient to climate change impacts. Kāinga Ora original submission sought the River Flood Hazard Area maps be removed from the FNPDP and placed in a non-statutory layer available via a GIS viewer. This is a consistent approach to identify such hazards countrywide and provides for regular updates to hazard information without the requirement to go through Plan Changes to update the planning maps. Kāinga Ora supports the use of the most updated data through GIS mapping. At the same time, further investigation is necessary to understand the hazard risk and mitigation measures planned or in place.	Allow in part	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter
<b>FS570.1941</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter
<b>FS566.1955</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter
<b>FS569.1977</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter



## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>S483.109</b>	Top Energy Limited	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support	Top Energy supports the creation of resilient communities, responding to and managing risk from natural hazards to ensure the health, safety and wellbeing of Northland residents, and highlights the critical contribution which connection to electricity provides in terms of enabling this. Top Energy seeks a number of amendments to provisions in this chapter to facilitate this.	Amend wording to ensure adequate enablement of electricity infrastructure as set out in submission.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter
<b>FS345.160</b>	Ngawha Generation Limited		Support	NGL is a subsidiary of Top Energy Limited. NGL supports all submission points made by Top Energy.	Allow	Allow all of the relief sought by Top Energy Limited in its submission (S483).	Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter
<b>S601.004</b>	Kingheim Limited	COASTAL HAZARD AREA	Oppose	Reference to Coastal Flood Hazard Zones 2 and 3 includes errors in the event horizon (it includes reference to water levels at 2080 including sea level rise, which should be corrected to refer to 2130 including sea level rise), for consistency with the T&T report as the origin document - Coastal Flood Hazard Assessment for Northland Region 2019-2020.	Amend definition of 'Coastal Hazard Area' so that the Coastal Flood HazardZone 2 and 3 relate to the <b>2130 timeline (as opposed to the 2080 timeline)</b> as follows:  means areas of coastal erosion hazard and coastal flooding hazard mapped by the Northland Regional Council and included in the District Plan maps as follows: 1. Coastal Flood Hazard Zone 1 (CFHZ1) - extent of the 50-year ARI static water level at 2080 including 0.6 m sea level rise (RCP8.5M)). 2. Coastal Flood Hazard Zone 2 (CFHZ2) - extent of the 100-year ARI static water level at <b>2130</b> <del>2080</del> including 1.2 m sea level rise		Accept	Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: Definitions

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					(RCP8.5M). 3. Coastal Flood Hazard Zone 3 (CFHZ3) - extent of the 100-year ARI static water level at <b>2130 2080</b> including 1.5 m sea level rise (RCP8.5H+).		
<b>S502.005</b>	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	LAND SUSCEPTIBLE TO INSTABILITY	Support in part	Clarification is needed in regards to point 7. Does this mean if earthworks have occurred within 20m of a development area that the land automatically falls into this category? In the event this is captured we seek relief that this be further clarified as rule EW-S7 requires that earthworks must not result in any instability of land at or beyond the boundary of the property where the earthworks occur. This means that if you are undertaking earthworks within 20m of a site boundary which now includes digging a trench, putting in place a pile etc. that you cannot comply with this standard.	Amend the definition of Land Susceptible to Instability point 7 to clarify relationship with rule EW-S7	Accept in part	Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: Definitions
<b>S561.007</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	RIVER FLOOD HAZARD AREA	Support in part	Kāinga Ora seeks amendments to this definition. While it is understood that the Council wish to clearly identify this natural hazard, Kāinga Ora seeks the removal of this hazard from the District Plan maps and its placement in a non-statutory layer available via a GIS viewer. This is a consistent approach to identify such hazards countrywide and provides for regular updates to hazard information without the requirement to go through Plan Changes to update the planning maps.	Amend the definition as follows: River Flood Hazard Area: means areas of river flooding <del>mapped by the Northland Regional Council and included in the District Plan maps</del> <b>shown in the Council's publicly available online GIS viewer</b> as follows: [remainder of definition to be retained as notified] Include the following Note beneath the definition: <b>Note: The Council holds publicly available</b>	Reject	Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: Definitions

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					information showing the modelled extent of river flood hazard areas affecting specific properties in its GIS viewer. The river flood hazard area map is indicative only although Council accepts its accuracy with regard to land shown on the floodplain map as being outside the floodplain. A party may provide the Council with a site specific technical report prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced person to establish the extent, depth and flow characteristics of the floodplain. When taking account of impervious areas that would arise from changes in land use enabled by the policies and zonings of the Plan, recognition should be given to any existing or planned flood attenuation works either existing or planned in an integrated catchment management plan. Council will continually update the floodplain map to reflect the best information available.		

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS32.061	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	<p>The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes.</p> <p>The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts.</p> <p>The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.</p>	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept	Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: Definitions
FS23.279	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Reject	Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: Definitions
FS47.021	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: Definitions

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document				
<b>FS348.094</b>	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept	Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: Definitions
<b>S407.007</b>	Tapuaetahi Incorporation	Overview	Support in part	The proposed approach will allow for more certainty for landowners within the coastal hazard zones on the site when rebuilding structures which meet the requirements of s10 and s20 of the Act [inferred].	Amend Natural Harzard overview to: ..... <b>Existing Use RightsLandowners have the ability to exercise existing use rights under s10 and s20 of the RMA in relation to re-building structures which meet the requirements of these parts of the Act.</b>		Reject	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Overview to the Natural Hazards Chapter
<b>S512.019</b>	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Overview	Support in part	Wildfire can pose significant risk to property and life. Fire and Emergency support the mitigation measures FNDC have noted. However, we consider that this should not apply solely to new subdivisions but all development.	amend Overview Ensuring adequate water supplies are available for firefighting purposes, appropriate setbacks from vegetation and suitable access for firefighting <del>in new subdivisions.</del> Include reference to the Fire Plan		Accept	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Overview to the Natural Hazards Chapter

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					for Northland, Te Hiku in the overview of the chapter.		
S561.028	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Overview	Support in part	These definitions are more appropriate to be included in the Definitions chapter of the Plan, therefore it is sought that these are deleted from the Overview section of the Natural Hazards chapter. These should be included in the Definitions section of the Plan.	Amend the Overview section of the Natural Hazards chapter as follows: <del>River Flooding Hazards</del> <del>Within areas of flooding, coastal erosion and coastal inundation mapped by the Northland Regional Council and included in the District Plan maps as follows:</del> <del>Flood Hazard Areas 1 in 10 Year River Flood Hazard Area – the area potentially susceptible to river flooding in a 10% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) / 10Yr Average Return Interval (ARI) storm event. 1 in 100 Year River Flood Hazard Area – the area potentially susceptible to river flooding in a 1% AEP / 100Yr ARI storm event plus climate change.</del> <del>Coastal Hazard Areas (including High Risk Coastal Hazard Area comprising of CFZ1 and CEZ1) Coastal Flood Zone 1 (CFHZ1) – extent of the 50-year ARI static water level at 2080 including 0.6 m sea level rise (RCP8.5M).</del> <del>Coastal Flood Zone 2 (CFHZ2) – extent of the 100-year ARI static water level at 2080 including 1.2 m</del>	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Overview to the Natural Hazards Chapter

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					sea level rise (RCP8.5M). Coastal Flood Zone 3 (CFHZ3) – extent of the 100-year ARI static water level at 2080 including 1.5 m sea level rise (RCP8.5H+). Coastal Erosion Zone 1 (CEHZ1) – an area potentially susceptible to coastal erosion (66% probability) by 2080 with 0.33 m sea level rise from 2019 – (RCP 8.5M). Coastal Erosion Zone 2 (CEHZ2) – an area potentially susceptible to coastal erosion (5% probability) by 2130 with 0.85 m sea level rise from 2019 – (RCP 8.5M). Coastal Erosion Zone 3 (CEHZ3) – an area potentially susceptible to coastal erosion (5% probability) by 2130 with 1.17 m sea level rise from 2019 – (RCP 8.5H+). Land InstabilityLand that is susceptible to instability hazards. Land is identified at subdivision through the application of geological information, slope and other criteria as defined in Definitions.WildfireEnsuring adequate water supplies are available for firefighting purposes, appropriate setbacks from		

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					<del>vegetation and suitable access for firefighting in new subdivisions.</del>			
FS32.082	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	<p>The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes.</p> <p>The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts.</p> <p>The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.</p>	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Overview to the Natural Hazards Chapter
FS349.008	Northland Regional Council		Oppose	Removal of River Flood Hazard Maps from the Proposed District Plan would lead to land subject to hazards not being identified within the Plan. This could weaken the ability to appropriately manage development within flood affected areas. It would also be	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Overview to the Natural Hazards Chapter



## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				inconsistent with direction in the Regional Policy Statement.				
<b>FS23.300</b>	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Overview to the Natural Hazards Chapter
<b>FS47.042</b>	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Overview to the Natural Hazards Chapter
<b>FS348.115</b>	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Overview to the Natural Hazards Chapter
<b>S421.064</b>	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Overview	Support	Federated Farmers supports the accurate mapping of the flood and coastal hazard areas and would expect engagement to occur to the relevant impacted landowners who are located within those areas.	Retain the Overview or wording with similar effect		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Overview to the Natural Hazards Chapter

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>We support the use of the precautionary approach in respect of natural hazards. The approach taken by the Council is consistent with regional and national policy documents as well as what is being done internationally. Federated Farmers also supports the approach proposed by the Council that the focus will be placed on vulnerable activities (e.g., liveable dwellings) and it will be these activities that will have the more stringent plan controls placed on them.</p> <p>Federated Farmers supports enabling non-liveable farm ancillary buildings as permitted activities within the natural hazard areas as along this has been clearly communicated to the landowners along with the associated risks of doing so. This means the landowner is fully informed when they make the decision to locate ancillary buildings that have a functional need to be located in or around coastal and flood hazard areas.</p>				
<b>FS570.1296</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Overview to the Natural Hazards Chapter
<b>FS346.298</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Overview to the Natural Hazards Chapter
<b>FS566.1310</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Overview to the Natural Hazards Chapter

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS569.1332	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Overview to the Natural Hazards Chapter
S601.002	Kingheim Limited	Overview	Support in part	The 'River Flooding Hazards' section of the Natural Hazard Chapter Overview would be more relevantly named 'Flooding Hazards' since its 'definitions' cover both fluvial and coastal flooding. (inferred)	Amend 'River Flooding Hazards' section of the overview of the Natural Hazards Chapter to be more relevantly named ' <b>Flooding Hazards</b> ' in the Natural Hazard Chapter Overview. (inferred)		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Overview to the Natural Hazards Chapter
S601.003	Kingheim Limited	Overview	Oppose	Reference to Coastal Flood Hazard Zones 2 and 3 includes errors in the event horizon (it includes reference to water levels at 2080 including sea level rise, which should be corrected to refer to 2130 including sea level rise), for consistency with the T&T report as the origin document - Coastal Flood Hazard Assessment for Northland Region 2019-2020.	Amend the 'overview' section of the Natural Hazards chapter so that the Coastal Flood Hazard Zones 2 and 3 to relate to the <b>2130 timeline</b> (as opposed to the 2080 timeline) as follows: <i>Coastal Hazard Areas (including High Risk Coastal Hazard Area comprising of CFZ1 and CEZ1</i>		Accept	Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Overview to the Natural Hazards Chapter
S512.020	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Objectives	Support	Fire and Emergency have an interest in the natural hazards chapter insofar as to ensure that the District Plan adopts a risk-based approach to hazard management and manages land use in areas subject to natural hazard. Managing land use in relation to hazards and the consequences of climate change will reduce the incidence of, and associated risk to life and property, and prevent or limit injury, damage to property, land and the environment. This will enable Fire and Emergency to carry out its requirements under the Fire and Emergency Act more effectively	retain objectives		Accept in part	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Objectives

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>S516.004</b>	Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland	Objectives	Support	Ngā Tai Ora support the creation of resilient communities, responding to and managing risk from natural hazards to ensure the health, safety and wellbeing of Northland residents. Ngā Tai Ora is generally supportive of the objectives and policies of the Natural Hazards chapter to the extent that they give effect to the Northland Regional Policy Statement (RPS) and take into account the long-term effects of climate change.	Retain the Objectives to the extent that they give effect to the Northland Regional Policy Statement and take into account the long-term effects of climate change	Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter
<b>S516.043</b>	Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland	Objectives	Not Stated	Ngā Tai Ora support the creation of resilient communities, responding to and managing risk from natural hazards to ensure the health, safety and wellbeing of Northland residents. Ngā Tai Ora is generally supportive of the Natural Hazards chapter to the extent that they give effect to the Northland Regional Policy Statement and take into account the long-term effects of climate change, including the influence of climate change on people. The PDP must acknowledge and minimise the risks and impacts of natural hazards, including the influence of climate change, on people, property and infrastructure, consistent with objective 3.13 Natural hazard risk of the Northland Regional Policy Statement.	Amend Natural Hazards objectives, policies and rules to appropriately give effect to the Northland Regional Policy Statement which seeks to manage subdivision, use and development to minimise the risk from natural hazards.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter
<b>S483.110</b>	Top Energy Limited	Objectives	Support	Top Energy supports the acknowledgement of the functional and operational need for infrastructure to be located in areas subject to natural hazards. However, Top Energy also seeks acknowledgment through an objective for the operation, maintenance, repair and upgrade requirements on existing infrastructure within hazard mapped areas to	Insert new objective as follows (or to the same effect): <b>Operation, maintenance, repair and upgrade of existing infrastructure is enabled to ensure a resilient and reliable network.</b>	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Objectives

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				specifically acknowledge the need to provide for existing infrastructure within hazard mapped areas. Inclusion of such a policy will align with/provide a direct link to NH-P10				
<b>FS196.199</b>	Joe Carr		Support		Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Objectives
<b>FS36.051</b>	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency		Support	Supports the need for a new objective to provide for the operation, maintenance, repair and upgrade of existing infrastructure to ensure a resilient and reliable State Highway network.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Objectives
<b>FS345.161</b>	Ngawha Generation Limited		Support	NGL is a subsidiary of Top Energy Limited. NGL supports all submission points made by Top Energy.	Allow	Allow all of the relief sought by Top Energy Limited in its submission (S483).	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Objectives
<b>S407.008</b>	Tapuaetahi Incorporation	NH-01	Support in part	The proposed approach will allow for more certainty for landowners within the coastal hazard zones on the site when rebuilding structures which meet the requirements of s10 and s20 of the Act [inferred].	Amend NH-O1 to: The risks from natural hazards to people, infrastructure and property are managed, including taking into account the likely long-term effects of climate change, to ensure the health, safety and resilience of communities, <b>noting that existing use rights may apply in certain situations.</b>		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Objectives
<b>S356.043</b>	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	NH-01	Support	not stated	Retain NH-O1 as notified		Accept in part	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Objectives
<b>S454.070</b>	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	NH-01	Support	Transpower supports the inclusion of this policy in the FNPDP.	Retain NH-O1		Accept in part	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Objectives
<b>S399.037</b>	Te Hiku Iwi Development Trust	NH-01	Not Stated	Cultural and heritage sites are also at risk from natural hazards (for example coastal urupā or particular coastal trees). The maintenance of these sites	Amend Objective NH-O1 as follows: The risks from natural hazards to people, infrastructure and property <b>and cultural and heritage resources are</b>		Accept in part	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Objectives

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				is important to tangata whenua because they are seen as a physical connection to tūpuna.	managed, including taking into account the likely long-term effects of climate change, to ensure the health, safety and resilience of communities.			
<b>FS51.274</b>	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support	HNZPT fully supports the need to highlight that cultural and heritage places are also at risk and should be recognised and addressed.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Objectives
<b>S561.029</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	NH-01	Support	The objective acknowledges the real impacts both natural hazards and climate change can have on any urban growth and development, enabling management tools to be put in place.	Retain NH-01 as notified.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Objectives
<b>FS32.083</b>	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	<p>The original submission seeks to amend the FNDP in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes.</p> <p>The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts.</p>	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Objectives

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.				
<b>FS23.301</b>	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Objectives
<b>FS47.043</b>	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Objectives
<b>FS348.116</b>	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Objectives
<b>S421.065</b>	Northland Federated	NH-01	Support	Federated Farmers supports objectives NH-01 to NH-04 as currently drafted.	Retain Objective NH-01 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent		Accept in part	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Objectives

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
	Farmers of New Zealand							
<b>FS534.012</b>	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited		Support	WBFL agrees with retention of this objective, particularly the focus on "managing" natural hazard risk, rather than an outright avoidance approach.	Allow	Retain Objective NH-O1	Accept in part	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Objectives
<b>FS570.1297</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Objectives
<b>FS346.299</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Objectives
<b>FS566.1311</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Objectives
<b>FS569.1333</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Objectives
<b>S407.009</b>	Tapuaetahi Incorporation	NH-02	Support in part	The proposed approach will allow for more certainty for landowners within the coastal hazard zones on the site when rebuilding structures which meet the requirements of s10 and s20 of the Act [inferred].	Amend NH-O2 to: Land use and subdivision does not increase the risk from natural hazards or risks are mitigated, and existing risks are reduced where there are practicable opportunities to do so, <b>noting that existing use rights may apply in certain situations.</b>		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Objectives
<b>S561.030</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	NH-02	Support	This new approach by FNDC to address risks from natural hazards is supported. The increasing risk from natural hazards due to climate change must be managed and this objective	Retain NH-O2 as notified.		Accept	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Objectives



## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				provides the framework for new provisions within the plan to address this risk.				
FS32.084	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	<p>The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes.</p> <p>The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts.</p> <p>The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.</p>	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Objectives
FS23.302	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	<p>Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.</p>	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Accept	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Objectives

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>FS47.044</b>	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Objectives
<b>FS348.117</b>	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Objectives
<b>S421.066</b>	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	NH-02	Support	Federated Farmers supports objectives NH-O1 to NH-O4 as currently drafted.	Retain Objective NH-O2 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent		Accept	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Objectives
<b>FS534.013</b>	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited		Support	WBFL agrees with retention of this objective, particularly the focus on "mitigating" natural hazard risk and reducing risk where practicable. These qualified directives are superior to an outright avoidance approach towards risk.	Allow	Retain Objective NH-O1	Accept	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Objectives
<b>FS570.1298</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Objectives

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>FS346.300</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Objectives
<b>FS566.1312</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Objectives
<b>FS569.1334</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Objectives
<b>S561.031</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	NH-03	Support	This objective provides the framework to enable necessary infrastructure while balancing this need with the risk of natural hazards.	Retain NH-03 as notified.		Accept	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Objectives
<b>FS32.085</b>	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	<p>The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes.</p> <p>The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning</p>	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Objectives

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts.</p> <p>The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.</p>				
<b>FS369.316</b>	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy supports the retention of this objective and seeks the inclusion of a new objective to provide for existing infrastructure	Allow in part	Amend	Accept in part	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Objectives
<b>FS23.303</b>	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Accept	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Objectives
<b>FS47.045</b>	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	<p>The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan.</p> <p>Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into</p>	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Objectives

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				resource consent applications..... etc see FS document				
<b>FS348.118</b>	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Objectives
<b>S356.044</b>	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	NH-03	Support	not stated	Retain NH-03 as notified		Accept	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Objectives
<b>FS369.312</b>	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy supports the retention of this objective and seeks the inclusion of a new objective to provide for existing infrastructure	Allow in part	Amend	Accept in part	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Objectives
<b>S416.030</b>	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	NH-03	Support	Recognition that in some instances there are operational and functional needs for activities to locate within hazard areas, is supported. The rail network has been in place for many years and for various operational reasons, is unable to be easily relocated to avoid such hazard areas.	Retain Objective NH-03		Accept	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Objectives
<b>FS369.313</b>	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy supports the retention of this objective and seeks the inclusion of a new objective to provide for existing infrastructure	Allow in part	Amend	Accept in part	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Objectives
<b>S421.067</b>	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	NH-03	Support	Federated Farmers supports objectives NH-01 to NH-04 as currently drafted. In particular, we support objective NH-03 which recognises that there may be a functional need for new infrastructure to be located within identified hazard areas.	Retain Objective NH-03 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent		Accept	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Objectives
<b>FS369.314</b>	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy supports the retention of this objective and seeks the inclusion of a new	Allow in part	Amend	Accept in part	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Objectives

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				objective to provide for existing infrastructure				
<b>FS570.1299</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Objectives
<b>FS346.301</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Objectives
<b>FS566.1313</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Objectives
<b>FS569.1335</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Objectives
<b>S454.071</b>	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	NH-03	Support	Transpower supports the inclusion of this objective in the FNPDP.	Retain NH-03		Accept	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Objectives
<b>FS369.315</b>	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy supports the retention of this objective and seeks the inclusion of a new objective to provide for existing infrastructure	Allow in part	Amend	Accept in part	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Objectives
<b>S561.032</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	NH-04	Support	Kāinga Ora support this objective which provides the framework for policies and rules supporting natural defenses above man-made defenses against hazard risks.	Retain NH-04 as notified.		Accept	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Objectives
<b>FS32.086</b>	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	The original submission seeks to amend the FNDP in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Objectives

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes.</p> <p>The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts.</p> <p>The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.</p>				
<b>FS23.304</b>	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Accept	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Objectives
<b>FS47.046</b>	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Objectives

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document				
<b>FS348.119</b>	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Objectives
<b>S421.068</b>	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	NH-04	Support	Federated Farmers supports objectives NH-01 to NH-04 as currently drafted.	Retain Objective NH-04 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent		Accept	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Objectives
<b>FS570.1300</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Objectives
<b>FS346.302</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Objectives
<b>FS566.1314</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Objectives
<b>FS569.1336</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Objectives



## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>S512.021</b>	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Policies	Support	Fire and Emergency have an interest in the natural hazards chapter insofar as to ensure that the District Plan adopts a risk-based approach to hazard management and manages land use in areas subject to natural hazard. Managing land use in relation to hazards and the consequences of climate change will reduce the incidence of, and associated risk to life and property, and prevent or limit injury, damage to property, land and the environment. This will enable Fire and Emergency to carry out its requirements under the Fire and Emergency Act more effectively	retain policies	Accept in part	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>S516.005</b>	Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland	Policies	Support	Ngā Tai Ora support the creation of resilient communities, responding to and managing risk from natural hazards to ensure the health, safety and wellbeing of Northland residents. Ngā Tai Ora is generally supportive of the objectives and policies of the Natural Hazards chapter to the extent that they give effect to the Northland Regional Policy Statement (RPS) and take into account the long-term effects of climate change.	Retain the Policies to the extent that they give effect to the Northland Regional Policy Statement and take into account the long-term effects of climate change	Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter
<b>S516.044</b>	Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland	Policies	Not Stated	Ngā Tai Ora support the creation of resilient communities, responding to and managing risk from natural hazards to ensure the health, safety and wellbeing of Northland residents. Ngā Tai Ora is generally supportive of the Natural Hazards chapter to the extent that they give effect to the Northland Regional Policy Statement and take into account the long-term effects of climate change, including the influence of climate change on people. The PDP must acknowledge and minimise the risks and impacts of	Amend Natural Hazards objectives, policies and rules to appropriately give effect to the Northland Regional Policy Statement which seeks to manage subdivision, use and development to minimise the risk from natural hazards.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				natural hazards, including the influence of climate change, on people, property and infrastructure, consistent with objective 3.13 Natural hazard risk of the Northland Regional Policy Statement.			
<b>S486.088</b>	Te Rūnanga o Whaingaroa	Policies	Support	Te Rūnanga o Whaingaroa would like to highlight that community adaptation to the effects of climate change, which should be part of the planning response to RMA s7(i). Possible methods of adaptation, such as managed retreat from hazard risk areas, are not addressed in the PDP. This new policy is intended to introduce those issues, and needs to be supported by methods of implementation, including an allocation of funding by council.	Insert a new policy as follows: <b>5 Adaptation to climate change. Increase the ability of the community to adapt to the effects of climate change by ensuring the potential environmental and social costs of climate change, including effects on indigenous biodiversity, historic heritage, mahinga kai, public health and safety, public access to the coast and waterway margins, and the built environment are known and addressed.</b>	Reject	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>S390.074</b>	Te Runanga o Ngai Takoto Trust	Policies	Support	The submitter supports the inclusion of a new policy as community adaptation to the effects of climate change, should be part of the planning response to RMA s7(i). Possible methods of adaptation, such as managed retreat from hazard risk areas, are not addressed in the PDP. This new policy is intended to introduce those issues, and needs to be supported by methods of implementation, including an allocation of funding by council.	Inserts a new policy to read as follows: NH-P15 Adaptation to climate change. Increase the ability of the community to adapt to the effects of climate change by ensuring the potential environmental and social costs of climate change, including effects on indigenous biodiversity, historic heritage, mahinga kai, public health and safety, public access to the coast and waterway margins, and the built environment are known and addressed.	Reject	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>S498.075</b>	Te Rūnanga Ā Iwi O Ngapuhi	Policies	Support	The submitter supports the inclusion of a new policy as community adaptation to the effects of climate change, should	Inserts a new policy to read as follows: NH-P15 Adaptation to climate change. Increase the ability of the community to	Reject	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				be part of the planning response to RMA s7(i). Possible methods of adaptation, such as managed retreat from hazard risk areas, are not addressed in the PDP. This new policy is intended to introduce those issues, and needs to be supported by methods of implementation, including an allocation of funding by council.	adapt to the effects of climate change by ensuring the potential environmental and social costs of climate change, including effects on indigenous biodiversity, historic heritage, mahinga kai, public health and safety, public access to the coast and waterway margins, and the built environment are known and addressed.			
<b>FS151.121</b>	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>FS151.122</b>	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>FS23.243</b>	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	It is important that provisions are consistent with Treaty principles and recognise and provide for Māori interests, including (but not limited to) appropriate economic development of their land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Reject	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>S559.052</b>	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rēhia	Policies	Support in part	The amendment is to ensure recharge is maintained.	Insert a policy into the PDP which requires low impact stormwater design for new development.		Reject	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>FS151.361</b>	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>FS570.2242</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>FS348.079</b>	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept in part	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>FS566.2256</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS569.2278	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
S45.013	Puketona Business Park Limited	General	Support	Generally support the provisions of the Hazards chapter of the PDP as notified.	Retain the provisions of the Natural hazards chapter.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter
S94.004	Lynley Newport	General	Oppose	It is confusing when reading the Natural hazards chapter. At the end of the policies, one of which relates solely to Coastal Hazards (NH-P7), there is the statement that 'Coastal Hazard Rules are located in the Coastal Environment Chapter'. I am of the opinion that all natural hazard objectives, policies and rules should be in one place - in this instance the Natural Hazards Chapter.	Amend the Natural hazards chapter to transfer any provisions from the Coastal Environment section relating to hazards to the Natural Hazards chapter		Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter
FS446.014	Omata Estate		Support	Support the change sought.	Allow	Amend the Natural hazards chapter to transfer any provisions from the Coastal Environment section relating to hazards to the Natural Hazards chapter	Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter
FS547.002	Heron Point Limited		Support	Support request to locate coastal hazard rules in Natural Hazards Chapter. This will assist future users with easily locating all natural hazards provisions	Allow	Allow the Submission, subject to appropriate drafting	Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter
FS305.002	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	Support request to locate coastal hazard rules in Natural Hazards Chapter. This will assist future users with easily locating all natural hazards provisions	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>S561.033</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	NH-P1	Support in part	Kāinga Ora support this policy however seek that hazard maps are removed from the FNPD and placed in a non-statutory layer. At the same time, further investigation into flood risk particularly given the significant extent experienced in parts of the District. This review should address the depth of flood waters, velocity, timing of flooding to identify locations of high risk and low risk and amend zoning in those locations accordingly.	Retain NH-P1 as notified. Wording is general - Map or define areas that are known to be subject to the following natural hazards, taking into account accepted estimates of climate change and sea level rise: a. flooding; b. coastal erosion; c. coastal inundation; and d. land instability.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>FS32.087</b>	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	<p>The original submission seeks to amend the FNPD in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes.</p> <p>The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts.</p> <p>The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.</p>	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>FS23.305</b>	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>FS47.047</b>	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>FS348.120</b>	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept in part	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>S407.010</b>	Tapuaetahi Incorporation	NH-P2	Support in part	The proposed approach will allow for more certainty for landowners within the coastal hazard zones on the site when rebuilding structures which meet the requirements of s10 and s20 of the Act [inferred].	Amend NH-P2 to: Manage land use and subdivision so that natural hazard risk is not increased or is mitigated, giving consideration to the following: <b>.....I. consideration of existing use rights.</b>		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Objectives Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S331.033	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	NH-P2	Support in part	The submitter supports in part the policy NH-P2 and acknowledges the risk which natural hazards can pose on people, property and the environment. However, at times the Ministry also have an operational need to provide educational facilities to existing communities in environments susceptible to the growing pressures of natural hazard risk and climate change.	<p>Amend policy NH-P2 as follows: Manage land use and subdivision so that natural hazard risk is not increased or is mitigated, giving consideration to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. the nature, frequency and scale of the natural hazard;</li> <li>b. not increasing natural hazard risk to other people, property, infrastructure and the environment beyond the site;</li> <li>c. the location of building platforms and vehicle access;</li> <li>d. the use of the site, including by vulnerable activities;</li> <li>e. the location and types of buildings or structures, their design to mitigate the effects and risks of natural hazards, and the ability to adapt to long term changes in natural hazards;</li> <li>f. earthworks, including excavation and fill;</li> <li>g. location and design of infrastructure;</li> <li>h. activities that involve the use and storage of hazardous substances;</li> <li>i. aligning with emergency management approaches and requirements;</li> <li>j. whether mitigation results in transference of natural hazard risk to other locations or exacerbates the natural hazard;</li> </ul> <p><del>and</del></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>k. reduction of risk relating to existing activities; <b>and l. the operational need for the activity to be located near or within, an area identified as being affected by a natural hazard.</b></li> </ul>	Accept in part	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>FS36.052</b>	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency		Support	Waka Kotahi also has an operational need to provide access to communities through areas affected by natural hazards and transport network. Therefore, supports the recognition of the operational need for infrastructure to be located near or within, an area identified as being affected by a natural hazard.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>FS78.013</b>	Transpower New Zealand Limited		Support	The submitter considers this addition to the policy gives effect to Policy 3 of the NPSET.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>FS243.065</b>	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports provisions that will contribute to Te Tai Tokerau being more responsive and resilient to natural hazards, including as these hazards evolve because of climate change. Kāinga Ora recognises the operational need for infrastructure to be located near or within, an area identified as being affected by a natural hazard and that such infrastructure may be necessary to service housing.	Allow	Amend policy NH-P2 as follows:	Accept in part	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>FS369.317</b>	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy supports the provision for the functional and operational need of infrastructure.	Allow in part	Allow	Accept in part	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>S561.034</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	NH-P2	Support	This policy provides the framework for new provisions within the plan to address the risks from natural hazards.	Retain NH-P2 as notified.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>FS32.088</b>	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies



## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes.</p> <p>The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts.</p> <p>The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.</p>				
<b>FS23.306</b>	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>FS47.048</b>	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document				
<b>FS348.121</b>	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept in part	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>S561.035</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	NH-P3	Support	This new approach by FNDC to address risks from natural hazards is supported. This policy sets up the framework for rules to manage land use and subdivision in locations of natural hazards more appropriately than under the Operative Plan.	Retain NH-P3 as notified.		Accept	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>FS32.089</b>	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	<p>The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes.</p> <p>The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning</p>	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Reject	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts.</p> <p>The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.</p>				
<b>FS23.307</b>	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Accept	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>FS47.049</b>	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	<p>The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan.</p> <p>Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document</p>	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>FS348.122</b>	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Reject	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>S561.036</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	NH-P5	Support	This new approach by FNDC to address risks from natural hazards is supported. This policy sets up the framework for rules to manage land use and subdivision in locations of natural hazards more appropriately than under the Operative Plan.	Retain NH-P5 as notified.		Accept	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>FS32.090</b>	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	<p>The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes.</p> <p>The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts.</p> <p>The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.</p>	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Reject	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>FS23.308</b>	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Accept	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.				
<b>FS47.050</b>	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>FS348.123</b>	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Reject	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>S159.042</b>	Horticulture New Zealand	NH-P6	Support in part	Non-habitable buildings are less of a risk and should be provided for, e.g. farm sheds and artificial crop protection structures	Amend Policy NH-P6 to include provisions for non-habitable buildings		Reject	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>FS151.202</b>	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>FS570.204</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS566.218	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
FS569.240	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
S561.037	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	NH-P6	Support	Policy NH-P6 is consistent with Objectives NH-O1 and NH-O2 and supports rules to appropriately address river flood hazards.	Retain NH-P6 as notified.		Accept	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
FS32.091	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	<p>The original submission seeks to amend the FNDP in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes.</p> <p>The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts.</p> <p>The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.</p>	Disallow	disallow the original submission.	Reject	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS23.309	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Accept	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
FS47.051	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
FS348.124	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Reject	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
S94.001	Lynley Newport	NH-P6	Oppose	Policy NH-P6 reads as a rule, not a policy. A policy cannot "require" anything because it is not a rule. Parroting the Regional Policy Statement is not valid. That document is not a rules document in the first instance. It is far too specific and directive as a	Amend Policy NH-P6 - <i>Manage land use and subdivision in river flood hazard areas to avoid, remedy or mitigate the risk from flood hazard to protect</i> the subject site and its		Reject	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>policy.</p> <p>The Council should be placing reliance on rules to achieve compliance and where compliance is not possible or practicable, then to achieve remedy and/or mitigation.</p>	<p>development, and other property, by requiring:</p> <p>a. subdivision applications to identify building platforms that will not be subject to inundation and material damage (including erosion) in a 1 in 100 year flood event;</p> <p>b. a minimum freeboard for all buildings designed to accommodate vulnerable activities of at least 500mm above the 1 in 100 year flood event and at least 300mm above the 1 in 100 year flood event for other new buildings;</p> <p>c. commercial and industrial buildings to be constructed so they will not be subject to material damage in a 1 in 100 year flood event;</p> <p>d. buildings within a 1 in 10 Year River Flood Hazard Area to be designed to avoid material damage in a 1 in 100 year flood event;</p> <p>e. storage and containment of hazardous substances so that the integrity of the storage method will not be compromised in a 1 in 100 year flood event;</p> <p>f. earthworks (other than earthworks associated with flood control works) do not divert flood flow onto surrounding</p>		



## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					<del>properties and do not reduce flood plain storage capacity within a 1 in 10 Year River Flood Hazard area;g. — the capacity and function of overland flow paths to convey stormwater flows safely and without causing damage to property or the environment is retained, unless sufficient capacity is provided by an alternative method; and h. the provision of safe vehicle access within the site.</del>			
<b>FS547.017</b>	Heron Point Limited		Support		Allow	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>FS305.032</b>	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	Inappropriate plan drafting.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>S94.003</b>	Lynley Newport	NH-P7	Oppose	Policy NH-P7 includes typographical error in the heading	Amend heading to Policy NH-P7 - Coastal hazard		Accept	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>S407.011</b>	Tapuaetahi Incorporation	NH-P7	Support in part	The proposed approach will allow for more certainty for landowners within the coastal hazard zones on the site when rebuilding structures which meet the requirements of s10 and s20 of the Act [inferred].	Amend NH-P7 to: Manage new land use and subdivision in coastal hazard areas so that: ..... <b>h. Existing use rights are appropriately considered.</b>		Reject	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>S561.038</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	NH-P7	Support	This policy supports rules to address Coastal Hazard risk management and is supported.	Retain NH-P7 as notified.		Accept	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>FS32.092</b>	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Reject	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes.</p> <p>The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts.</p> <p>The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.</p>				
<b>FS23.310</b>	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Accept	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>FS47.052</b>	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan.	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document				
FS348.125	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Reject	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
S94.002	Lynley Newport	NH-P7	Oppose	Policy NH-P7 reads as a rule or standard, not a policy. It is far too specific and directive as a policy. The Council should be placing reliance on rules to achieve compliance and where compliance is not possible or practicable, then to achieve remedy and/or mitigation.	Amend Policy NH-P7 - <i>Manage new land use and subdivision in coastal hazard areas to avoid, remedy or mitigate the risk from coastal hazard to the subject site and its development and other property so that:</i> a. <del>new subdivision avoids locating building platforms within High Risk Coastal Hazard areas and building platforms should be located outside other coastal hazard areas where alternative locations are available and it is practicable to do so;</del> b. <del>new buildings containing vulnerable activities are not located within High Risk Coastal Hazard areas unless:</del> i. <del>there is no other</del>		Reject	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					<p>suitable location available on the existing site;ii. hazard risks can be mitigated without the need for hard protection structures.c. ——— where a building or building platform is located with a coastal hazard area, it should be designed and constructed such that:i. the building platform will not be subject to inundation and/or material damage (including erosion) over a 100-year timeframe; and eitherii.the finished floor level of any building accommodating a vulnerable activity must be at least 500mm above the maximum water level in a 1 percent AEP flood event plus 1m sea level rise; oriii. the finished floor level of any other building must be at least 300mm above the maximum water level in a 1 percent AEP flood event plus 1m sea level rise.d. ——— hazard risk is not transferred to, or increased on, other properties;e. buildings, building platforms, access and services are located and designed to minimise the need for hard protection structures;f. safe vehicle</p>		

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					<del>access within the site is provided; and, services are located and designed to minimise the risk of natural hazards.</del>			
FS547.018	Heron Point Limited		Support		Allow	Amend	Accept	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
FS305.033	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	Rules relating to Natural Hazards should only apply to the portion of the site over which the overlay applies.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
S364.028	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	NH-P7	Support in part	The heading of this policy has a spelling error.	Amend Policy NH-P7 to correct " <del>costal</del> hazard" to " <b>coastal</b> hazard".		Accept	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
FS570.1109	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
FS346.168	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission of the Director General for Conservation other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Bird's submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
FS566.1123	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
FS569.1145	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
S333.008	P S Yates Family Trust	NH-P9	Support in part	The policy on wildfire protection should be targeted towards vulnerable activities only, consistent with the	Amend Policy NH-P9 as follows: Manage land use and subdivision that may be susceptible to wildfire risk by requiring		Accept	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				methods that implement the policy (ie rules NH-R5 and NH-R6).	<b>the following for vulnerable activities:</b> a. setbacks from any contiguous scrub or shrubland, woodlot or forestry; b. access for emergency vehicles; and c. sufficient accessible water supply for firefighting purposes		
<b>S168.015</b>	Setar Thirty Six Limited	NH-P9	Oppose	The policy on wildfire protection should be targeted towards vulnerable activities only, consistent with the methods that implement the policy (i.e. rules NH-R5 and NH-R6)	Amend Policy NH-P9 as follows: Manage land use and subdivision that may be susceptible to wildfire risk by requiring <b>the following for vulnerable activities:</b> a. setbacks from any contiguous scrub or shrubland, woodlot or forestry; b. access for emergency vehicles; and c. sufficient accessible water supply for firefighting purposes	Accept	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>S222.007</b>	Wendover Two Limited	NH-P9	Oppose	The policy on wildfire protection should be targeted towards vulnerable activities only, consistent with the methods that implement the policy (ie rules NH-R5 and NH-R6).	Amend Policy NH-P9 as follows: Manage land use and subdivision that may be susceptible to wildfire risk by requiring <b>the following for vulnerable activities:</b> a. setbacks from any contiguous scrub or shrubland, woodlot or forestry; b. access for emergency vehicles; and	Accept	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					c. sufficient accessible water supply for firefighting purposes			
<b>S167.008</b>	Bentzen Farm Limited	NH-P9	Oppose	The policy on wildfire protection should be targeted towards vulnerable activities only, consistent with the methods that implement the policy (ie rules NH-R5 and NH-R6).	Amend Policy NH-P9 as follows: Manage land use and subdivision that may be susceptible to wildfire risk by requiring <b>the following for vulnerable activities:</b> a. setbacks from any contiguous scrub or shrubland, woodlot or forestry; b. access for emergency vehicles; and c. sufficient accessible water supply for firefighting purposes		Accept	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>FS176.17</b>	Summit Forests New Zealand Limited		Oppose	It is not clear what is meant by vulnerable activities making the relief sought uncertain. As a manager of large areas of plantation forests, SFNZ is concerned about changes in climate increasing the risk of wildfire and NZ's history of large wildfires being started outside of and spreading into afforested areas.	Disallow		Reject	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>FS354.087</b>	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	The focus of the policy on wildfire should be on vulnerable activities.	Allow	Allow S167.008	Accept	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>FS566.370</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow		Reject	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>S187.008</b>	The Shooting Box Limited	NH-P9	Oppose	The policy on wildfire protection should be targeted towards vulnerable activities only, consistent with the methods that implement the policy (ie rules NH-R5 and NH-R6).	Amend Policy NH-P9 as follows: Manage land use and subdivision that may be susceptible to wildfire risk by requiring <b>the following for vulnerable activities:</b>		Accept	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					a. setbacks from any contiguous scrub or shrubland, <b>woodlot or forestry;</b> b. <b>access for emergency vehicles;</b> <b>and</b> c. sufficient accessible water supply for firefighting purposes			
<b>FS547.121</b>	Heron Point Limited		Support	The submitter supports the proposed amendments to Policy 3 subject to drafting.	Allow	Amend	Accept	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>S243.017</b>	Matauri Trustee Limited	NH-P9	Oppose	The policy on wildfire protection should be targeted towards vulnerable activities only, consistent with the methods that implement the policy (i.e. rules NH-R5 and NH-R6).	Amend Policy NH-P9 as follows: Manage land use and subdivision that may be susceptible to wildfire risk by requiring <b>the following for vulnerable activities:</b> a. setbacks from any contiguous scrub or shrubland, woodlot or forestry; b. access for emergency vehicles; and c. sufficient accessible water supply for firefighting purposes		Accept	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>FS570.575</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>FS566.589</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies



## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS569.611	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
S483.111	Top Energy Limited	NH-P10	Support	Top Energy supports this policy but notes that 'minor upgrade' is not a term defined in the Proposed Plan, and considers that this term should be removed from the policy and the threshold in the chapter relied on instead to establish what scale is deemed appropriate.	Amend Policy NH-P10 as follows: Provide for the operation, maintenance, and <del>minor</del> upgrading of existing infrastructure in identified natural hazard areas.		Accept	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
FS196.200	Joe Carr		Support		Allow		Accept	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
FS36.053	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency		Support	Waka Kotahi has a responsibility to maintain safe and reliable access to communities which includes upgrading existing highway infrastructure. Waka Kotahi concurs that the term minor should be removed from the policy and threshold in the chapter should be relied upon to determine what scale is appropriate.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
FS345.162	Ngawha Generation Limited		Support	NGL is a subsidiary of Top Energy Limited. NGL supports all submission points made by Top Energy.	Allow	Allow all of the relief sought by Top Energy Limited in its submission (S483).	Accept	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
S561.039	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	NH-P10	Support	This policy is consistent with objective NH-O3 and provides the framework for rules to enable necessary infrastructure while balancing this need with the risk of natural hazards.	Retain NH-P10 as notified.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
FS32.093	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes.</p> <p>The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts.</p> <p>The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.</p>				
<b>FS369.319</b>	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy seeks to amend the policy to remove the limitation of "minor" upgrading	Allow in part	Amend	Accept	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>FS23.311</b>	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>FS47.053</b>	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document				
<b>FS348.126</b>	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept in part	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>S356.045</b>	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	NH-P10	Support	not stated	Retain NH-P10 as notified		Accept in part	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>FS369.318</b>	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy seeks to amend the policy to remove the limitation of "minor" upgrading	Allow in part	Amend	Accept	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>S561.040</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	NH-P11	Support	This policy is consistent with objective NH-O3 as discussed above.	Retain NH-P11 as notified.		Accept	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>FS32.094</b>	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Reject	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts.</p> <p>The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.</p>				
<b>FS369.322</b>	Top Energy		Support	Top Energy seeks to retain this policy as notified	Allow	Retain	Accept	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>FS23.312</b>	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Accept	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>FS47.054</b>	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	<p>The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan.</p> <p>Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character,</p>	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document				
<b>FS348.127</b>	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Reject	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>S483.112</b>	Top Energy Limited	NH-P11	Support	Top Energy supports this policy	Retain Policy NH-P11		Accept	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>FS351.023</b>	A.W and D.M Simpson		Oppose	Top Energy appears to be seeking discretion to override existing constrains the PDP endeavours to use to protect Notable trees	Disallow	Status Quo. No change to wording or PDP.	Reject	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>FS371.023</b>	Oromahoe 18R2B2B2 Trust and its associated Hapu, Ngati Kawa, Te Ngare Hauata, Te Matarahurahu, Te Whanaurara, Ngati Kaihoru, Ngati Rahiri		Oppose	Top Energy appears to be seeking discretion to override existing constrains the PDP endeavours to use to protect Notable trees.	Disallow	Status Quo. No change to wording or PDP.	Reject	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>FS449.022</b>	The Proprietors of Tapuaetahi Incorporation		Oppose	Top Energy appears to be seeking discretion to override existing constrains the PDP endeavours to use to protect Notable trees.	Disallow	Status Quo. No change to wording or PDP	Reject	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>FS345.163</b>	Ngawha Generation Limited		Support	NGL is a subsidiary of Top Energy Limited. NGL supports all submission points made by Top Energy.	Allow	Allow all of the relief sought by Top Energy Limited in its submission (S483).	Accept	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>S356.046</b>	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	NH-P11	Support	not stated	Retain NH-P11 as notified		Accept	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>FS369.320</b>	Top Energy		Support	Top Energy seeks to retain this policy as notified	Allow	Retain	Accept	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>S454.072</b>	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	NH-P11	Support	Transpower supports the inclusion of NH-P11 (inferred) in the FNPDP.	Retain NH-P11 (inferred)		Accept	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>FS369.321</b>	Top Energy		Support	Top Energy seeks to retain this policy as notified	Allow	Retain	Accept	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>S364.029</b>	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	NH-P12	Support	The Director-General supports Policy NH-P12	Retain Policy NH-P12		Accept	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>FS570.1110</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>FS346.169</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission of the Director General for Conservation other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Bird's submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>FS566.1124</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>FS569.1146</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>S356.047</b>	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	NH-P13	Support	not stated	Retain NH-P13 as notified		Accept	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>S364.030</b>	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	NH-P13	Support	The Director-General supports Policy NH-P13 as it gives effect to Policy 25 of the NZCPS which seeks to discourage hard protection surfaces and promote the use of alternatives (including natural defences).	Retain Policy NH-P13		Accept	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>FS225.6</b>	Pacific Eco-Logic		Support	The policy assists with implementing NZCPS Policy 25, which seeks to discourage hard protection surfaces and promotes alternatives.	Allow		Accept	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>FS570.1111</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>FS346.170</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission of the Director General for Conservation other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Bird's submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>FS566.1125</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>FS569.1147</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>S561.041</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	NH-P13	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the use of natural systems and features to protect from natural hazards where practicable over hard protection structures.	Retain NH-P13 as notified.		Accept	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS32.095	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	<p>The original submission seeks to amend the FNDP in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes.</p> <p>The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts.</p> <p>The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.</p>	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Reject	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
FS23.313	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Accept	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
FS47.055	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies



## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document				
<b>FS348.128</b>	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Reject	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>S561.042</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	NH-P14	Support	This policy is supported as it will provide for necessary ongoing maintenance and upgrading of flood management schemes.	Retain NH-P14 as notified.		Accept	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>FS32.096</b>	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes.  The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Reject	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts.</p> <p>The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.</p>				
<b>FS23.314</b>	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Accept	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
<b>FS47.056</b>	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	<p>The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan.</p> <p>Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document</p>	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS348.129	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Reject	Section 5.2.4 Key Issue 4: Policies
S484.001	James Phillips	Rules	Support in part	The PDP nor any of its supporting documents refer to Section 10 or Section 20 of the RMA as they relate to existing use rights. A provision should therefore be provided to allow for people to exercise their existing use rights.	Insert an additional permitted activity provision which allows for development of a house, building or activity in accordance with Section 10 of the RMA where effects are the same or similar in character, intensity and scale despite the application of a hazard overlay.		Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
S428.005	Kapiro Residents Association	Rules	Support in part	Inland flooding: Climate change is expected to make Northland drier overall, however heavy downpours are likely to become more extreme. This will increase the risk of inland flooding in areas near rivers/waterways. Flooding and rising groundwater are likely to affect houses, domestic wastewater tanks and disposal fields, roads and access ways to houses, and other structures built on former flood plains or land that has been drained. Coastal inundation: The average global sea level is expected to continue rising for several centuries in future as a result of long-lived emissions from past decades alone (irrespective of sea level rise due to future emissions). A report by the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment in 2015 estimated that 1 in 100-year high water level events would occur very frequently in future - for example, every 4 years at the port of Auckland and once a year at Wellington and Christchurch ports. Furthermore, storm surges can add several tens of centimetres to high tides.	Amend the PDP to include stronger rules, including 'no build' areas, to prevent new buildings, wastewater systems, accessways, roads and other infrastructure in areas that are likely to be impacted by sea level rise, storm surges, flooding.		Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>S480.001</b>	Debbie and Chris Fewtrell	Rules	Oppose	The PDP nor any of its supporting documents refer to Section 10 or Section 20 the RMA (as they relate to existing use rights).	Amend to enable, as a permitted activity, the ability for people to exercise their existing use rights, where rebuilding a house 'like for like' and which result in effects which are the same or similar in character, intensity, and scale.	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S385.016</b>	McDonalds Restaurants (NZ) Limited	Rules	Not Stated	McDonald's understand the importance of ensuring community safety when it comes to natural hazards. However, McDonald's considers that appropriate consideration needs to be given to existing development in both the 1 in 100 and 1 in 10 River Flood Hazard Areas.	Amend Natural Hazards chapter to provide more flexibility to additions and alterations of an appropriate scale for existing infrastructure within River Flood Hazard areas.	Accept	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S516.045</b>	Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland	Rules	Not Stated	Ngā Tai Ora support the creation of resilient communities, responding to and managing risk from natural hazards to ensure the health, safety and wellbeing of Northland residents. Ngā Tai Ora is generally supportive of the Natural Hazards chapter to the extent that they give effect to the Northland Regional Policy Statement and take into account the long-term effects of climate change, including the influence of climate change on people. The PDP must acknowledge and minimise the risks and impacts of natural hazards, including the influence of climate change, on people, property and infrastructure, consistent with objective 3.13 Natural hazard risk of the Northland Regional Policy Statement.	Amend Natural Hazards objectives, policies and rules to appropriately give effect to the Northland Regional Policy Statement which seeks to manage subdivision, use and development to minimise the risk from natural hazards.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter
<b>S93.013</b>	Lynley Newport	Rules	Support in part	Support the need to manage development within coastal hazard areas but believe all hazard provisions should be located in the Natural Hazards chapter. A cross reference in the Coastal Environment back to the	Transfer the rules from the Coastal Environment chapter (rules section addressing coastal hazards) into the Natural Hazards chapter. Consequently, insert a cross reference within the Coastal Environment chapter to this effect.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				Natural hazards chapter can be included.				
<b>FS446.015</b>	Omata Estate		Support	Support the change sought.	Allow	Transfer the rules from the Coastal Environment chapter (rules section addressing coastal hazards) into the Natural Hazards chapter. Consequently, insert a cross reference within the Coastal Environment chapter to this effect	Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS547.001</b>	Heron Point Limited		Support	Support request to locate coastal hazard rules in Natural Hazards Chapter. This will assist future users with easily locating all natural hazards provisions Allow the submission, subject to appropriate drafting	Allow	Allow	Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS305.001</b>	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	Support request to locate coastal hazard rules in Natural Hazards Chapter. This will assist future users with easily locating all natural hazards provisions	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S516.046</b>	Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland	Rules	Not Stated	Ngā Tai Ora support the creation of resilient communities, responding to and managing risk from natural hazards to ensure the health, safety and wellbeing of Northland residents. Policy NH-P8 seeks to avoid the use of land that is susceptible to land instability, without any rule to give effect to this policy. Ngā Tai Ora consider this to be a significant gap in the Natural Hazards chapter and could lead to risk to people and property.	Amend the Natural Hazards chapter to include appropriate rules to give effect to Policy NH-P8.		Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS534.014</b>	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited		Support in part	WBFL agrees with retention of NH-P8 as notified and supports the provision in the policy for effects to be mitigated where they cannot be avoided.	Allow in part	Retain NH-P8 and supports the provision in the policy for effects to	Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
						be mitigated where they cannot be avoided.		
<b>S215.024</b>	Haigh Workman Limited	Rules	Support	<p>There are two sides to managing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- avoiding or controlling land use and subdivision in areas of identified natural hazard risk (including increased risks resulting from climate change);</li> <li>- avoiding or controlling activities that may cause or exacerbate a natural hazard on another property.</li> </ul> <p>the risk posed by natural hazards: These are addressed by objectives and policies in the Regional Policy Statement and District Plan, and rules in the District and Regional Plans. The Natural Hazard section of the District Plan controls buildings and access routes within natural hazard areas, addressing the first bullet point. The Subdivision rules control subdivision within Natural Hazard areas. For completeness, the Natural Hazards section should also refer to rules for earthworks and stormwater management elsewhere in the District and Regional Plans that control activities that may cause or exacerbate a natural hazard on another property</p>	Retain controls on buildings and access routes in natural hazard areas		Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS570.513</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS566.527</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS569.549</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is	Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
						inconsistent with our original submission		
<b>S529.051</b>	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	Rules	Support in part	<p>Inland flooding: Climate change is expected to make Northland drier overall, however heavy downpours are likely to become more extreme. This will increase the risk of inland flooding in areas near rivers/waterways. Flooding and rising groundwater are likely to affect houses, domestic wastewater tanks and disposal fields, roads and access ways to houses, and other structures built on former flood plains or land that has been drained.</p> <p>Coastal inundation: The average global sea level is expected to continue rising for several centuries in future as a result of long-lived emissions from past decades alone (irrespective of sea level rise due to future emissions). A report by the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment in 2015 estimated that 1 in 100-year high water level events would occur very frequently in future - for example, every 4 years at the port of Auckland and once a year at Wellington and Christchurch ports. Furthermore, storm surges can add several tens of centimetres to high tides</p>	Amend the PDP to include stronger rules, including 'no build' areas, to prevent new buildings, wastewater systems, accessways, roads and other infrastructure in areas that are likely to be impacted by sea level rise, storm surges, flooding.		Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS570.1940</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS566.1954</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS569.1976</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>S529.239</b>	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	Rules	Not Stated	Stormwater and wastewater should be fully managed to avoid sediment/pollutants being carried to waterways and wetlands, especially during high rainfall events which are expected to become more extreme due to climate change. Under s7(i) of the RMA, councils must have particular regard to the effects of climate change. In general, water sensitive and low impact designs should be a standard requirement, not just encouraged. For example, stormwater and water from wastewater disposal fields can carry pollutants and silt into waterways during high rainfall events. They should not be discharged directly into waterways but be retained in constructed wetlands (vegetated retention ponds) or other water sensitive and low impacts features.	Amend the plan so that water sensitive and low impact designs are a standard requirement		Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS570.2126</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS566.2140</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS569.2162</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S521.005</b>	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	Rules	Support in part	Inland flooding: Climate change is expected to make Northland drier overall, however heavy downpours are likely to become more extreme. This will increase the risk of inland flooding in areas near rivers/waterways. Flooding and rising groundwater are likely to affect houses, domestic wastewater tanks and disposal fields, roads and access ways to houses, and	Amend the PDP to include stronger rules, including 'no build' areas, to prevent new buildings, wastewater systems, accessways, roads and other infrastructure in areas that are likely to be impacted by sea level rise, storm surges, flooding.		Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules



## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>other structures built on former flood plains or land that has been drained.</p> <p>Coastal inundation: The average global sea level is expected to continue rising for several centuries in future as a result of long-lived emissions from past decades alone (irrespective of sea level rise due to future emissions). A report by the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment in 2015 estimated that 1 in 100-year high water level events would occur very frequently in future - for example, every 4 years at the port of Auckland and once a year at Wellington and Christchurch ports. Furthermore, storm surges can add several tens of centimetres to high tides.</p>				
<b>FS566.1715</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S521.012</b>	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	Rules	Support in part	<p>The PDP should require all new buildings to store/use roof water wherever possible, to avoid the need for expensive reticulation systems and reduce the need for water top-ups via water tankers. New buildings connected to a public water supply should be required to collect roof water in storage vessels to use for gardens and flushing toilets (at minimum) and contribute to other household water uses such as laundry connections. Water storage vessels do not need to be a traditional round tank - other useful shapes exist, such as rectangular upright vessels that are easy to install against the side of a house or garage, or short flat vessels designed to be completely buried underground or placed under the</p>	Amend PDP to require best practice water-sensitive, low-impact designs and measures for all stormwater and wastewater engineering, infrastructure and related development, to prevent problems associated with more extreme rainfall events in future, including provision to implement relevant parts of NPS-		Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				foundations of new builds. Greywater harvesting and re-use should also be required for new buildings. These types of water-saving measures would also reduce future Council infrastructure costs for additional water supplies and wastewater.				
<b>FS566.1722</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S443.005</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust	Rules	Support in part	<p>Inland flooding: Climate change is expected to make Northland drier overall, however heavy downpours are likely to become more extreme. This will increase the risk of inland flooding in areas near rivers/waterways. Flooding and rising groundwater are likely to affect houses, domestic wastewater tanks and disposal fields, roads and access ways to houses, and other structures built on former flood plains or land that has been drained.</p> <p>Coastal inundation: The average global sea level is expected to continue rising for several centuries in future as a result of long-lived emissions from past decades alone (irrespective of sea level rise due to future emissions). A report by the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment in 2015 estimated that 1 in 100-year high water level events would occur very frequently in future - for example, every 4 years at the port of Auckland and once a year at Wellington and Christchurch ports. Furthermore, storm surges can add several tens of centimetres to high tides.</p>	Amend the PDP to include stronger rules, including 'no build' areas, to prevent new buildings, wastewater systems, accessways, roads and other infrastructure in areas that are likely to be impacted by sea level rise, storm surges, flooding.		Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS569.1750	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
FS570.1730	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
S187.009	The Shooting Box Limited	Notes	Oppose	Note 2 to the rule applies the requirement for a report prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced engineer/instability assessment to activities and subdivision on the site as a whole, rather than just that part impacted by the identified natural hazard, imposing unnecessary cost. The amendments sought target the requirements just to the mapped hazard area.	Amend note 2 as follows: 2. Any application for a land use resource consent in relation to a <b>site location</b> that is potentially affected by natural hazards must be accompanied by a report prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced engineer that addresses the matters identified in the relevant objectives, policies, performance standards and matters of control/discretion. Any application for a subdivision consent must additionally include an assessment of whether <del>the site</del> <b>any new site to be created</b> includes an area of land susceptible to instability.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Advice Notes
S222.008	Wendover Two Limited	Notes	Support in part	Note 2 to the rule applies the requirement for a report prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced engineer/instability assessment to activities and subdivision on the site as a whole, rather than just that part impacted by the identified natural hazard, imposing unnecessary cost. The amendments sought target the requirements just to the mapped hazard area.	Amend note 2 as follows: 2. any application for a land use resource consent in relation to a <b>site location</b> that is potentially affected by natural hazards must be accompanied by a report prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced engineer that addresses the matters		Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Advice Notes

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					identified in the relevant objectives, policies, performance standards and matters of control/discretion. Any application for a subdivision consent must additionally include an assessment of whether <del>the site</del> <b>any new site to be created</b> includes an area of land susceptible to instability.			
<b>S167.009</b>	Bentzen Farm Limited	Notes	Oppose	Note 2 to the rule applies the requirement for a report prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced engineer/instability assessment to activities and subdivision on the site as a whole, rather than just that part impacted by the identified natural hazard, imposing unnecessary cost. The amendments sought target the requirements just to the mapped hazard area.	Amend note 2 as follows 2. Any application for a land use resource consent in relation to a <b>site location</b> that is potentially affected by natural hazards must be accompanied by a report prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced engineer that addresses the matters identified in the relevant objectives, policies, performance standards and matters of control/discretion. Any application for a subdivision consent must additionally include an assessment of whether <del>the site</del> <b>any new site to be created</b> includes an area of land susceptible to instability.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Advice Notes
<b>FS143.4</b>	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support	The further submitter agrees that Note 2 to this rule should only apply to just that part impacted by the identified natural hazard, otherwise the rule will impose unnecessary cost. The	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Advice Notes

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				amendments sought by the submitter target the requirements just to the mapped hazard area.				
<b>FS566.371</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Advice Notes
<b>S215.025</b>	Haigh Workman Limited	Notes	Not Stated	For completeness, the Natural Hazards section should also refer to rules for earthworks and stormwater management elsewhere in the District and Regional Plans that control activities that may cause or exacerbate a natural hazard on another property	Insert reference to rules for earthworks and stormwater management elsewhere in the District and Regional Plans that control activities that may cause or exacerbate a natural hazard on another property		Reject	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Advice Notes
<b>FS196.21</b>	Joe Carr		Support	This matter is currently a gaping hole in the District and Regional Plans	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Advice Notes
<b>FS570.514</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Advice Notes
<b>FS566.528</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Advice Notes
<b>FS569.550</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Advice Notes
<b>S333.009</b>	P S Yates Family Trust	Notes	Support in part	Note 2 to the rule applies the requirement for a report prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced engineer/instability assessment to activities and subdivision on the site as a whole, rather than just that part impacted by the identified natural hazard, imposing unnecessary cost. The amendments sought target the	Amend note 2 as follows 2. Any application for a land use resource consent in relation to a <b>site location</b> that is potentially affected by natural hazards must be accompanied by a report prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced engineer		Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Advice Notes

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				requirements just to the mapped hazard area.	that addresses the matters identified in the relevant objectives, policies, performance standards and matters of control/discretion. Any application for a subdivision consent must additionally include an assessment of whether the site <b>any new site to be created</b> includes an area of land susceptible to instability.			
FS446.016	Omata Estate		Support	Support the change sought to the extent that NH-S1 should only apply where activities or development is proposed within a specific mapped natural hazard area and where it is identified that the scale and nature of the proposal warrants a site-specific assessment.	Allow	Amend note 2 as follows 2. Any application for a land use resource consent in relation to a site location that is potentially affected by natural hazards must be accompanied by a report prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced engineer that addresses the matters identified in the relevant objectives, policies, performance standards and matters of control/discretion. Any application for a subdivision consent must additionally include an assessment of whether the site any new site to be created includes an area of land susceptible to instability.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Advice Notes

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>FS547.015</b>	Heron Point Limited		Support in part	Support the change sought to the extent that NH-S1 should solely be applicable where activities or development are proposed within a natural hazard area. The submitter seeks that Note 2 is amended to clarify that the special information requirement solely applies to activities being undertaken within a mapped natural hazard area. This removes ambiguity when interpreting the current wording with requires a report where a site is potentially affected by natural hazards.	Allow in part	Amend	Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Advice Notes
<b>S561.043</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Notes	Oppose	Under the Rules heading, Note 2 repeats the same comments under Standard NH-S1. Recommend deleting Note 2 from this section.	Delete Note 2 from under Rules headings and amend as follows: Notes: 1. There may be rules in other District-Wide Matters and the underlying zone in Part 3 - Area Specific Matters that apply to a proposed activity, in addition to the rules in this chapter. These other rules may be more stringent than the rules in this chapter. Ensure that the underlying zone chapter and other relevant District- Wide Matters chapters are also referred to, in addition to this chapter, to determine whether resource consent is required under other rules in the District Plan. Refer to the how the plan works chapter to determine the activity status of a proposed activity where resource consent is required under multiple rules. <del>2. Any application for a land use resource consent in relation to a site that is potentially affected by natural hazards must be accompanied by a report prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced engineer that addresses the matters</del>		Reject	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Advice Notes

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					identified in the relevant objectives, policies, performance standards and matters of control/discretion. Any application for a subdivision consent must additionally include an assessment of whether the site includes an area of land susceptible to instability. 3. 2. Coastal hazard rules are located in the Coastal Environment Chapter.			
FS32.097	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	<p>The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes.</p> <p>The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts.</p> <p>The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change</p>	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Advice Notes



## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.				
<b>FS23.315</b>	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Reject	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Advice Notes
<b>FS47.057</b>	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Advice Notes
<b>FS348.130</b>	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Advice Notes
<b>S168.016</b>	Setar Thirty Six Limited	Notes	Oppose	Note 2 to the rules applies the requirement for a report prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced engineer/instability assessment to activities and subdivision on the site as a whole, rather than just that part	Amend note 2 as follows: 2. Any application for a land use resource consent in relation to a <b>site location</b> that is potentially affected by natural		Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Advice Notes

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				impacted by the identified natural hazard, imposing unnecessary cost. The amendments sought target the requirements just to the mapped hazard area.	hazards must be accompanied by a report prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced engineer that addresses the matters identified in the relevant objectives, policies, performance standards and matters of control/discretion. Any application for a subdivision consent must additionally include an assessment of whether <del>the site</del> <b>any new site to be created</b> includes an area of land susceptible to instability			
<b>FS547.0010</b>	Heron Point Limited		Support in part	Support the change sought to the extent that NH-S1 should solely be applicable where activities or development are proposed within a natural hazard area. The submitter seeks that Note 2 is amended to clarify that the special information requirement solely applies to activities being undertaken within a mapped natural hazard area. This removes ambiguity when interpreting the current wording with requires a report where a site is potentially affected by natural hazards.	Allow in part	Amend	Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Advice Notes
<b>FS305.034</b>	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	Rules relating to Natural Hazards should only apply to the portion of the site over which the overlay applies.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Advice Notes
<b>S243.018</b>	Matauri Trustee Limited	Notes	Oppose	Note 2 to the rule applies the requirement for a report prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced engineer/instability assessment to activities and subdivision on the site as	Amend note 2 as follows 2. Any application for a land use resource consent in relation to a <b>site location</b> that is potentially affected by natural		Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Advice Notes

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				a whole, rather than just that part impacted by the identified natural hazard, imposing unnecessary cost. The amendments sought target the requirements just to the mapped hazard area.	hazards must be accompanied by a report prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced engineer that addresses the matters identified in the relevant objectives, policies, performance standards and matters of control/discretion. Any application for a subdivision consent must additionally include an assessment of whether <del>the site</del> <b>any new site to be created</b> includes an area of land susceptible to instability.			
<b>FS570.576</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Advice Notes
<b>FS566.590</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Advice Notes
<b>FS569.612</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key Issue 5: Advice Notes
<b>S483.113</b>	Top Energy Limited	NH-R1	Not Stated	It is unclear to Top Energy how maintenance, repair or upgrade of infrastructure in a 1 in 10 year River Flood Hazard and it assumed that this would default to discretionary activity. Top Energy seek that this be provided for as a permitted activity where there is not increase to footprint	Amend Rule NH-R1 as indicated below to provide for maintenance, repair or upgrading of infrastructure in 1 in 10 year floods as indicated in submission.		Accept	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS196.201	Joe Carr		Support		Allow		Accept	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
FS345.164	Ngawha Generation Limited		Support	NGL is a subsidiary of Top Energy Limited. NGL supports all submission points made by Top Energy.	Allow	Allow all of the relief sought by Top Energy Limited in its submission (S483).	Accept	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
S483.114	Top Energy Limited	NH-R1	Not Stated	While Top Energy appreciates the risk caused by natural hazards, it is considered that PER -1 (which requires no increase in above ground footprint) is overly restrictive for the 1 in 100 year River Flood Hazard Areas and will require unnecessary resource consent applications. As currently written, the rule does not adequately 'provide for' upgrades (even to a minor degree) as is rightfully directed in NH-P10. Further, for above ground infrastructure, it is more restrictive than NH-R2 and NH-R3 (2) which relate to buildings and structures generally e.g. no enablement in acknowledgment of the importance of infrastructure.	Amend Rule NH-R1 as follows (or the same effect): NH-R1 Maintenance repair, or upgrading of infrastructure, including structural mitigation assets  1 in 100 Year River Flood Hazard Areas <b>1 in 10 year River Flood Hazard Areas</b> Activity status: Permitted Where: <b>PER-1The works are located in a 1 in 10 Year River Flood hazard area</b> 1. There is no increase to the footprint of any above ground infrastructure; and <b>2. Any works to maintain, repair or upgrade infrastructure do not alter or divert an overland flow path; and</b> <b>3. Ground is reinstated to the equivalent state that existed prior to the works</b>  <b>PER-2The works are located in a 1 in 100 Year River Flood hazard area</b> 1. Any works to maintain, repair or upgrade infrastructure do		Accept	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					<b>not result in an increase of footprint or GFA by more than 10m<sup>2</sup>; and</b> 2. Any works to maintain, repair or upgrade infrastructure do not alter or divert an overland flow path; and <b>3. Ground is reinstated to the same ground level that existed prior to the works.</b> <del>PER – 3Ground is reinstated to the equivalent state that existed prior to the works</del>			
<b>FS196.202</b>	Joe Carr		Support		Allow		Accept	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS345.165</b>	Ngawha Generation Limited		Support	NGL is a subsidiary of Top Energy Limited. NGL supports all submission points made by Top Energy.	Allow	Allow all of the relief sought by Top Energy Limited in its submission (S483).	Accept	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S356.048</b>	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	NH-R1	Support	not stated	Retain NH-R1 as notified		Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS369.323</b>	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy seeks amendments to this rule as it is overly restrictive for the 1 in 100 year River Flood Hazard Areas.	Allow in part	Amend	Accept	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S421.069</b>	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	NH-R1	Support	Federated Farmers supports the inclusion of rules NH-R1, NH-2, NH-3, NH-5, NH-6, NH-7, NH-8, and NH-9 as currently worded in the proposed district plan.	Retain Rule NH-R1 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent		Accept	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>FS369.324</b>	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy seeks amendments to this rule as it is overly restrictive for the 1 in 100 year River Flood Hazard Areas	Allow in part	Amend	Accept	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS570.1301</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS346.303</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS566.1315</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS569.1337</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS369.354</b>	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy seeks to retain this rule as notified	Allow in part	Retain	Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S454.073</b>	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	NH-R1	Support	Transpower supports the inclusion of NH-R1 in the FNPDP.	Retain NH-R1		Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS369.325</b>	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy seeks amendments to this rule as it is overly restrictive for the 1 in 100 year River Flood Hazard Areas	Allow in part	Amend	Accept	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>S355.015</b>	Wakaiti Dalton	NH-R2	Support in part	Part of our site is partially subject to flood hazard, and while we do not have any buildings located in this area, we have concerns regarding the approach taken to this hazard. Whirinaki area is subject to flood hazard with many number of the existing dwellings located in areas susceptible to flooding. In our view, it is considered that existing activities and buildings should be recognised and provided for. Further, it is considered that the default performance standard of no increase in GFA or footprint of structures, is overly restrictive and will require unnecessary resource consent applications.	Amend NH-R2 to provide for additional and alterations to existing activities as a permitted activity.	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S385.017</b>	McDonalds Restaurants (NZ) Limited	NH-R2	Support in part	McDonald's Kaitia and mapped as being within a River Flood Hazard Area. This rule provides for extensions and alterations to buildings and structures where they result in no more than a 10m2 increase to Gross Floor Area. On review of the s32 analysis for Natural Hazards, it is unclear where this threshold has come from and how they are justified, particularly when considering the allowances that have been made for other structures (e.g; 30m2 for a deck and 100m2 for a structure ancillary to farming.) McDonald's seeks that the thresholds for non-habitable buildings and structures be re-considered to enable better flexibility for extensions and alterations to existing structures in both the 1 in 100 and 1 in 10 Flood Hazard Area.	Amend NH-R3 as follows (or to same effect) Activity status: Permitted 1 in 100 Year River flood hazard area <b>1 in 10 River flood hazard area</b> Where: <b>PER-1The works are located in a 1 in 10 Year River Flood hazard area and1. there is no increase to the GFA of the building or footprint of the structure that results in the building or structure exceeding the limits for new buildings or structures in NH-R3- PER 1 and new buildings or structures ancillary to farming activities in NH-R4 PER 1.PER-22.No part of the building or structure is enclosed in a manner that alters or diverts an overland flow path or reduces flood plain</b>	Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					storagePER-2The works are located in a 1 in 100 Year River Flood hazard area and:1.The increase in GFA to any building or structure is no more than 100m22.No part of the building or structure is enclosed in a manner that alters or diverts an overland flow path or reduces flood plain storage			
<b>S363.012</b>	Foodstuffs North Island Limited	NH-R2	Not Stated	The considers that rule NH-R2 Extensions and alterations to existing buildings or structures, that existing activities and buildings should be recognised and provided for. and that the default performance standard of no increase in GFA or footprint of structures, is overly restrictive and will require unnecessary resource consent applications.	Amend rule NH-R2 Extensions and alterations to existing buildings or structures, to provide for additions and alterations to existing activities as a permitted activity in the 1 in 10 and 1 in 100 River Flood Hazard Area.		Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S541.024</b>	Elbury Holdings	NH-R2	Oppose	We do not support the new flood zone landuse rules and instead seek more flexibility in these rules to allow large extensions for modifications to existing buildings. The rule NH-R2 should provide for flood risks to be addressed through alternative building designs, not just by limiting building GFA or footprint. NH-R2 does not implement Policy NH-P6, which allows for mitigation of hazards through building design.	Amend NH-R2 PER-1 to allow building extensions and alterations that increase GFA or footprint where the extension or alteration is designed so that it will not impede flood flows.		Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS155.39</b>	Fiona King		Support		Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules



## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>FS196.22</b>	Joe Carr		Support	the relief sought by the submitter is practicable and effects based, as it should be in such matters.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS405.023</b>	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the requested amendment sought within this submission point, on the basis that existing activities and buildings should be recognised and provided for.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS542.055</b>	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Support in part	Foodstuffs supports amendments to provide for extensions and alterations	Allow in part	amend to provide for extensions and alterations	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS406.045</b>	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Support in part	McDonald's support amendments to this rule for the reasons outlined in its original submission.	Allow in part	amend NH-R2	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS361.0010</b>	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the requested amendment sought within this submission point, on the basis that existing activities and buildings should be recognised and provided for.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S485.027</b>	Elbury Holdings	NH-R2	Oppose	We seek more flexibility in these rules to allow large extensions for modifications to existing buildings. The rule NH-R2 should provide for flood risks to be addressed through alternative building designs, not just by limiting building GFA or footprint. NH-R2 does not implement policy NH-P6, which allows for mitigation of hazards through building design.	Amend NH-R2 PER-1 to allow building extensions and alterations that increase GFA or footprint where the extension or alteration is designed so that it will not impede flood flows.		Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS155.40</b>	Fiona King		Support		Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>FS405.022</b>	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the requested amendment sought within this submission point, on the basis that existing activities and buildings should be recognised and provided for.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS542.053</b>	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Support in part	Foodstuffs supports amendments to provide for extensions and alterations	Allow in part	amend to provide for extensions and alterations	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS406.043</b>	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Support in part	McDonald's support amendments to this rule for the reasons outlined in its original submission.	Allow in part	amend NH-R2	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS361.009</b>	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the requested amendment sought within this submission point, on the basis that existing activities and buildings should be recognised and provided for.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S519.027</b>	Elbury Holdings	NH-R2	Oppose	We seek more flexibility in these rules to allow large extensions for modifications to existing buildings. The rule NH-R2 should provide for flood risks to be addressed through alternative building designs, not just by limiting building GFA or footprint. NH-R2 does not implement policy NH-P6, which allows for mitigation of hazards through building design.	Amend NH-R2 PER-1 to allow building extensions and alterations that increase GFA or footprint where the extension or alteration is designed so that it will not impede flood flows.		Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS155.42</b>	Fiona King		Support		Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS542.054</b>	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Support in part	Foodstuffs supports amendments to provide for extensions and alterations	Allow in part	amend to provide for extensions and alterations	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>FS406.044</b>	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Support in part	McDonald's support amendments to this rule for the reasons outlined in its original submission.	Allow in part	amend NH-R2	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S342.007</b>	Waipapa Pine Limited and Adrian Broughton Trust (now Fletcher Building Ltd)	NH-R2	Oppose	Both rules centre on the potential effect of a structure in terms of diverting or altering overland flows or reducing flood plain storage. This involves a design solution which can be assessed at the time of a Building Consent. This falls within the same context as Council requiring an earthquake report at the Building Consent stage. The threshold should be removed, and the rule be amended to allow the presentation of a report at the time of the Building Consent application. This is reflected in Rule NH-S1.	delete in relation to 10m2 threshold (inferred)		Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS374.021</b>	Waipapa Pine Limited		Support	The original submission reflects the position of Waipapa Pine Limited of support for the Heavy Industrial Zone with proposed changes to rules that would better support heavy industrial activities.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S257.021</b>	Te Hiku Community Board	NH-R2	Oppose	Do not support the new flood zone landuse rules and instead seek more flexibility in these rules to allow large extensions for modifications to existing buildings. The rule NH-R2 should provide for flood risks to be addressed through alternative building designs, not just by limiting building GFA or footprint. NH-R2 does not implement policy NH-P6, which allows for mitigation of hazards through building design.	Amend NH-R2 PER-1 to allow building extensions and alterations that increase GFA or footprint where the extension or alteration is designed so that it will not impede flood flows.		Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>FS405.017</b>	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the requested amendment sought within this submission point, on the basis that existing activities and buildings should be recognised and provided for.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS542.044</b>	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Support in part	Foodstuffs supports amendments to provide for extensions and alterations. This aligns with its original submissions	Allow in part	amend to provide for extensions and alterations. This aligns with its original submissions	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS406.034</b>	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Support in part	McDonald's supports amendments to provide for extensions and alterations within this rule.	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS361.004</b>	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the requested amendment sought within this submission point, on the basis that existing activities and buildings should be recognised and provided for.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S357.022</b>	Sean Frieling	NH-R2	Oppose	We do not support the new flood zone landuse rules and instead seek more flexibility in these rules to allow large extensions for modifications to existing buildings. The rule NH-R2 should provide for flood risks to be addressed through alternative building designs, not just by limiting building GFA or footprint. NH-R2 does not implement policy NH-P6, which allows for mitigation of hazards through building design.	Amend NH-R2 PER-1 to allow building extensions and alterations that increase GFA or footprint where the extension or alteration is designed so that it will not impede flood flows.		Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS405.018</b>	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the requested amendment sought within this submission point, on the basis that existing activities and buildings should	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				be recognised and provided for				
<b>FS542.048</b>	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Support in part	Foodstuffs supports amendments to provide for extensions and alterations.	Allow in part	amend to provide for extensions and alterations.	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS406.038</b>	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Support in part	McDonald's support amendments to this rule for the reasons outlined in its original submission	Allow in part	amend NH-R2	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS361.005</b>	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the requested amendment sought within this submission point, on the basis that existing activities and buildings should be recognised and provided for.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S358.022</b>	Leah Frieling	NH-R2	Oppose	We do not support the new flood zone landuse rules and instead seek more flexibility in these rules to allow large extensions for modifications to existing buildings. The rule NH-R2 should provide for flood risks to be addressed through alternative building designs, not just by limiting building GFA or footprint. NH-R2 does not implement policy NH-P6, which allows for mitigation of hazards through building design	Amend PER-1 of Rule NH-R2 to allow building extensions and alterations that increase GFA or footprint where the extension or alteration is designed so that it will not impede flood flows.		Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS405.019</b>	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the requested amendment sought within this submission point, on the basis that existing activities and buildings should be recognised and provided for.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS542.049</b>	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Support in part	Foodstuffs supports amendments to provide for extensions and alterations	Allow in part	amend to provide for extensions and alterations	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>FS406.039</b>	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Support in part	McDonald's support amendments to this rule for the reasons outlined in its original submission	Allow in part	amend NH-R2	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS361.006</b>	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the requested amendment sought within this submission point, on the basis that existing activities and buildings should be recognised and provided for.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S543.026</b>	LJ King Limited	NH-R2	Oppose	We seek more flexibility in these rules to allow large extensions for modifications to existing buildings. The rule NH-R2 should provide for flood risks to be addressed through alternative building designs, not just by limiting building GFA or footprint. NH-R2 does not implement policy NH-P6, which allows for mitigation of hazards through building design	Amend NH-R2 PER-1 to allow building extensions and alterations that increase GFA or footprint where the extension or alteration is designed so that it will not impede flood flows		Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS405.020</b>	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the requested amendment sought within this submission point, on the basis that existing activities and buildings should be recognised and provided for.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS542.056</b>	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Support in part	Foodstuffs supports amendments to provide for extensions and alterations	Allow in part	amend to provide for extensions and alterations	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS406.046</b>	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Support in part	McDonald's support amendments to this rule for the reasons outlined in its original submission.	Allow in part	amend NH-R2	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS361.007</b>	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the requested amendment sought within this submission point, on the basis that existing activities and buildings	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				should be recognised and provided for.				
<b>FS566.2187</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S472.022</b>	Michael Foy	NH-R2	Support in part	We do not support the new flood zone landuse rules and instead seek more flexibility in these rules to allow large extensions for modifications to existing buildings. The rule NH-R2 should provide for flood risks to be addressed through alternative building designs, not just by limiting building GFA or footprint. NH-R2 does not implement policy NH-P6, which allows for mitigation of hazards through building design	Amend NH-R2 PER-1 to allow building extensions and alterations that increase GFA or footprint where the extension or alteration is designed so that it will not impede flood flows.		Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS405.021</b>	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the requested amendment sought within this submission point, on the basis that existing activities and buildings should be recognised and provided for.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS406.042</b>	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Support in part	McDonald's support amendments to this rule for the reasons outlined in its original submission.	Allow in part	amend NH-R2	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS361.008</b>	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the requested amendment sought within this submission point, on the basis that existing activities and buildings should be recognised and provided for.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S335.025</b>	BP Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited,	NH-R2	Support	Support the intent of the provisions in the Natural Hazards and seek that they are retained as drafted. They enable alterations to existing buildings and	Retain Rule NH-R2 as notified		Accept	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
	Z Energy Limited			structures and new minor buildings and structures in flood hazard areas subject to performance standards.				
<b>FS405.024</b>	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Oppose	Ballantyne & Agnew opposes the retention of NH-R2 on the basis that it does not provide for additional and alterations to existing activities as a permitted activity.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS542.045</b>	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs seeks amendments to this rule to provide for extensions and alterations.	Disallow	amend this rule to provide for extensions and alterations.	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS406.035</b>	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Oppose	McDonald's considers that this rule needs to be amended as outlined in its original submission.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS361.011</b>	Willowridge Developments Limited		Oppose	Willowridge Developments Limited opposes the retention of NH-R2 on the basis that it does not provide for additions and alterations to existing activities as a permitted activity.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S421.070</b>	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	NH-R2	Support	Federated Farmers supports the inclusion of rules NH-R1, NH-2, NH-3, NH-5, NH-6, NH-7, NH-8, and NH-9 as currently worded in the proposed district plan.	Retain Rule NH-R2 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent		Accept	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS405.025</b>	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Oppose	Ballantyne & Agnew opposes the retention of NH-R2 on the basis that it does not provide for additional and alterations to existing activities as a permitted activity.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS542.050</b>	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs supports amendments to provide for extensions and alterations	Disallow	amend to provide for extensions and alterations	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules



## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>FS406.040</b>	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Oppose	McDonald's considers that this rule needs to be amended as outlined in its original submission.	Allow in part	disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS361.012</b>	Willowridge Developments Limited		Oppose	Willowridge Developments Limited opposes the retention of NH-R2 on the basis that it does not provide for additions and alterations to existing activities as a permitted activity.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS570.1302</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS346.304</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS566.1316</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS569.1338</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S250.003</b>	Willowridge Developments Limited	NH-R2	Not Stated	Existing activities and buildings should be recognised and provided for. The default performance standard of no increase in GFA or footprint of structures is overly restrictive and will require unnecessary resource consent applications.	Amend NH-R2 to provide for additions and alterations to existing activities as a permitted activity.		Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS542.043</b>	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Support	Foodstuffs supports amendments to provide for extensions and	Allow	amend to provide for extensions and alterations. This aligns	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				alterations. This aligns with its original submissions..		with its original submissions..		
<b>FS332.256</b>	Russell Protection Society		Oppose	Allowing an increase in GFA in hazard areas increases risk of legal action for Council.	Disallow in part	Disallow the submission in part.	Accept	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS406.033</b>	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Support	McDonald's supports the amendments to NH-R2.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS570.689</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS566.703</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS569.725</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S339.022</b>	Te Aupōuri Commercial Development Ltd	NH-R2	Not Stated	TACDL's sites of interest listed in Figure 1 - 4 of the submission are subject to Flood hazards. TACDL considers that existing activities and buildings should be recognised and provided for. Further, TACDL consider that the default performance standard of no increase in GFA or footprint of structures, is overly restrictive and will require unnecessary resource consent applications.	Amend NH-R2 to provide for additional and alterations to existing activities as a permitted activity.		Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS542.046</b>	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Support	Foodstuffs supports amendments to provide for extensions and alterations. This aligns with its original submissions.	Allow	amend to provide for extensions and alterations. This aligns with its original submissions.	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>FS406.036</b>	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Support	McDonald's support amendments to this rule for the reasons outlined in its original submission.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S344.010</b>	Paihia Properties Holdings Corporate Trustee Limited and UP Management Ltd	NH-R2	Not Stated	The default performance standard of no increase in GFA or footprint of structures is overly restrictive and will require unnecessary resource consent applications.	Amend NH-R2 to provide for additional and alterations to existing activities as a permitted activity.		Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS542.047</b>	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Support	Foodstuffs supports amendments to provide for extensions and alterations. This aligns with its original submissions.	Allow	amend to provide for extensions and alterations. This aligns with its original submissions.	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS406.037</b>	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Support	McDonald's support amendments to this rule for the reasons outlined in its original submission.	Allow	amend NH-R2	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS396.031</b>	Ed and Inge Amsler		Support	The submission seeks various changes in relation to the urban environment / coastal environment interface as well as specific provisions in the Mixed Use Zone. Additionally, the submission seeks better reflection of business land needs that should be reflected throughout the Plan.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S464.028</b>	LJ King Ltd	NH-R2	Oppose	We seek more flexibility in these rules to allow large extensions for modifications to existing buildings. The rule NH-R2 should provide for flood risks to be addressed through alternative building designs, not just by limiting building GFA or footprint. NH-R2 does not implement policy NH-P6, which allows for mitigation of hazards through building design.	Amend NH-R2 PER-1 to allow building extensions and alterations that increase GFA or footprint where the extension or alteration is designed so that it will not impede flood flows.		Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>FS542.051</b>	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Support in part	Foodstuffs supports amendments to provide for extensions and alterations	Allow in part	amend to provide for extensions and alterations	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS542.058</b>	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Support in part	Foodstuffs supports amendments to provide for extensions and alterations.	Allow in part	amend to provide for extensions and alterations.	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS406.041</b>	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Support in part	McDonald's support amendments to this rule for the reasons outlined in its original submission.	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS406.048</b>	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Support in part	McDonald's support amendments to this rule for the reasons outlined in its original submission.	Allow in part	amend NH-R2	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS566.1571</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S547.026</b>	LJ King Limited	NH-R2	Oppose	We seek more flexibility in these rules to allow large extensions for modifications to existing buildings. The rule NH-R2 should provide for flood risks to be addressed through alternative building designs, not just by limiting building GFA or footprint. NH-R2 does not implement policy NH-P6, which allows for mitigation of hazards through building design	Amend NH-R2 PER-1 to allow building extensions and alterations that increase GFA or footprint where the extension or alteration is designed so that it will not impede flood flows		Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS542.057</b>	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Support in part	Foodstuffs supports amendments to provide for extensions and alterations	Allow in part	amend to provide for extensions and alterations	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS406.047</b>	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Support in part	McDonald's support amendments to this rule for the reasons outlined in its original submission.	Allow in part	amend NH-R2	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S217.021</b>	New Zealand Defence Force	NH-R3	Support in part	TMTA may require the placement of temporary buildings and structures in flood hazard areas to enable realistic training, such as the placement of temporary bridges. It is appropriate that	Amend NH-R3 PER-1 to also permit temporary structures and buildings for TMTA as follows: PER-1 The building or structure is one of the		Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				such structures used in military training are permitted in flood hazard areas due to their temporary nature.	following: 1. Above ground buildings or structures with a footprint of 10m <sup>2</sup> or less; or 2. deck less than 30m <sup>2</sup> and less than 1m in height; or 3. boardwalks or stairs that are less than 500mm above ground level and located within a public reserve or legal road; or <b>4. temporary building or structures associated with temporary military training activities.</b>			
<b>S257.022</b>	Te Hiku Community Board	NH-R3	Oppose	Do not support the new flood zone landuse rules and instead seek more flexibility in these rules to allow large decks, for modifications to existing buildings". The rule should provide for flood risks to be addressed through alternative building designs, not just by limiting deck area and height. NH-R3 PER 1 does not fully implement policy NH-P6, which allows for mitigation of hazards through building design.	Amend NH-R3 PER-1 to allow new decks more than 30m <sup>2</sup> and more than 1m in height where the deck is designed so that it will not impede flood flows.		Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S541.025</b>	Elbury Holdings	NH-R3	Oppose	We do not support the new flood zone landuse rules and instead seek more flexibility in these rules to allow large decks, for modifications to existing buildings". The Rule (NH-R3) should provide for flood risks to be addressed through alternative building designs, not just by limiting deck area and height. NH-R3 PER 1 does not fully implement policy NH-P6, which allows for mitigation of hazards through building design.	Amend NH-R3 PER-1 to allow new decks more than 30m <sup>2</sup> and more than 1m in height where the deck is designed so that it will not impede flood flows.		Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS155.41</b>	Fiona King		Support		Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS369.335	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy seek amendments to this rule as it is overly restrictive for the 1 in 100 year River Flood Hazard Areas to provide for above ground infrastructure as a permitted activity.	Allow in part	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
S485.028	Elbury Holdings	NH-R3	Oppose	We seek more flexibility in these rules to allow large decks, for modifications to existing buildings". The rule should provide for flood risks to be addressed through alternative building designs, not just by limiting deck area and height. NH-R3 PER 1 does not fully implement policy NH-P6, which allows for mitigation of hazards through building design.	Amend NH-R3 PER-1 to allow new decks more than 30m2 and more than 1m in height where the deck is designed so that it will not impede flood flows.		Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
FS155.43	Fiona King		Support		Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
FS369.333	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy seek amendments to this rule as it is overly restrictive for the 1 in 100 year River Flood Hazard Areas to provide for above ground infrastructure as a permitted activity.	Allow in part	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
S519.028	Elbury Holdings	NH-R3	Oppose	We seek more flexibility in these rules to allow large decks, for modifications to existing buildings". The rule should provide for flood risks to be addressed through alternative building designs, not just by limiting deck area and height. NH-R3 PER 1 does not fully implement policy NH-P6, which allows for mitigation of hazards through building design.	Amend NH-R3 PER-1 to allow new decks more than 30m2 and more than 1m in height where the deck is designed so that it will not impede flood flows.		Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS155.44	Fiona King		Support		Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
FS369.334	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy seek amendments to this rule as it is overly restrictive for the 1 in 100 year River Flood Hazard Areas to provide for above ground infrastructure as a permitted activity.	Allow in part	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
S483.115	Top Energy Limited	NH-R3	Oppose	<p>This rule should include a provision for new network utilities that is more enabling than PER-1, noting that infrastructure is not habitable.</p> <p>Top Energy seeks that all new underground structures be permitted, and that above ground infrastructure of an appropriate scale is provided for in acknowledgment of the critical importance of this infrastructure and that it is not habitable.</p> <p>Top Energy highlight that NH-R4 provides for structures ancillary to farming of up to 100m<sup>2</sup> in area with no height threshold and seek similar enablement for new network utilities</p>	<p>Insert a new permitted rule for new infrastructure in the 1 in 100 Year Flood hazard zone as follows (or to the same effect):</p> <p><b>NH-RX New network utilities</b></p> <p><b>1 in 100 Year River Flood hazard areas</b></p> <p><b>Activity status permitted</b></p> <p><b>Where :PER-1Any building or structure associated with the new network utility is one of the following:</b></p> <p><b>1.Underground;</b></p> <p><b>or</b></p> <p><b>2.Has a footprint that is less than 100m<sup>2</sup>:</b></p> <p><b>PER -2Any building or structure associated with the new network utility is not located within or does not alter or divert an overland flow path.</b></p> <p><b>Activity status where compliance with PER -1 and PER 2 is not achieved:</b></p> <p><b>Restricted Discretionary</b></p> <p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p> <p><b>a. the effects of flood hazards on the integrity of the building or</b></p>		Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					structure to the extent that such effects are not appropriately managed by the building consent process under the Building Act 2004;b. the effects of the building or structure on overland flow paths and flooding on surrounding sites; andc. the extent to which the risk to people and property from the flood hazard is avoided or managed.			
<b>FS196.23</b>	Joe Carr		Support	Provides for the sensible use of land for buildings in flood hazard zone, however the land owner should absolve the Council of any liability in such an instance.	Allow		Awaiting recommendation	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS196.203</b>	Joe Carr		Support	Electricity is an essential service and this submission and other preceding ones are supported to enable the provision of a resilient and reliable electricity supply	Allow		Awaiting recommendation	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS345.166</b>	Ngawha Generation Limited		Support	NGL is a subsidiary of Top Energy Limited. NGL supports all submission points made by Top Energy.	Allow	Allow all of the relief sought by Top Energy Limited in its submission (S483).	Awaiting recommendation	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S342.008</b>	Waipapa Pine Limited and Adrian Broughton Trust (now Fletcher Building Ltd)	NH-R3	Oppose	Both rules centre on the potential effect of a structure in terms of diverting or altering overland flows or reducing flood plain storage. This involves a design solution which can be assessed at the time of a Building Consent. This falls within the same context as Council requiring an	delete in relation to 10m2 threshold (inferred)		Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules



## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				earthquake report at the Building Consent stage. The threshold should be removed, and the rule be amended to allow the presentation of a report at the time of the Building Consent application. This is reflected in Rule NH-S1.				
<b>FS374.022</b>	Waipapa Pine Limited		Support	The original submission reflects the position of Waipapa Pine Limited of support for the Heavy Industrial Zone with proposed changes to rules that would better support heavy industrial activities.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS369.327</b>	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy seek amendments to this rule as it is overly restrictive for the 1 in 100 year River Flood Hazard Areas to provide for above ground infrastructure as a permitted activity.	Allow in part	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S335.026</b>	BP Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited, Z Energy Limited	NH-R3	Support	Support the intent of the provisions in the Natural Hazards and seek that they are retained as drafted. They enable alterations to existing buildings and structures and new minor buildings and structures in flood hazard areas subject to performance standards.	Retain Rule NH-R3 as notified		Accept	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS369.326</b>	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy seek amendments to this rule as it is overly restrictive for the 1 in 100 year River Flood Hazard Areas to provide for above ground infrastructure as a permitted activity.	Allow in part	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S357.023</b>	Sean Frieling	NH-R3	Oppose	We do not support the new flood zone landuse rules and instead seek more flexibility in these rules to allow large extensions for modifications to existing buildings. The rule NH-R2 should	Amend NH-R3 PER-1 to allow new decks more than 30m2 and more than 1m in height where the deck is designed so that it will not impede flood flows.		Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>provide for flood risks to be addressed through alternative building designs, not just by limiting building GFA or footprint. NH-R2 does not implement policy NH-P6, which allows for mitigation of hazards through building design.</p> <p>We do not support the new flood zone landuse rules and instead seek more flexibility in these rules to allow large decks, for modifications to existing buildings". The rule should provide for flood risks to be addressed through alternative building designs, not just by limiting deck area and height. NH-R3 PER 1 does not fully implement policy NH-P6, which allows for mitigation of hazards through building design.</p>				
<b>FS369.328</b>	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy seek amendments to this rule as it is overly restrictive for the 1 in 100 year River Flood Hazard Areas to provide for above ground infrastructure as a permitted activity.	Allow in part	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S358.023</b>	Leah Frieling	NH-R3	Oppose	We do not support the new flood zone landuse rules and instead seek more flexibility in these rules to allow large decks, for modifications to existing buildings". The rule should provide for flood risks to be addressed through alternative building designs, not just by limiting deck area and height. NH-R3 PER 1 does not fully implement policy NH-P6, which allows for mitigation of hazards through building design.	Amend PER-1 of Rule NH-R3 to allow new decks more than 30m <sup>2</sup> and more than 1m in height where the deck is designed so that it will not impede flood flows.		Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS369.329</b>	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy seek amendments to this rule as it is overly restrictive for the 1 in 100 year River Flood Hazard Areas to provide for above	Allow in part	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				ground infrastructure as a permitted activity.				
<b>S421.071</b>	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	NH-R3	Support	Federated Farmers supports the inclusion of rules NH-R1, NH-2, NH-3, NH-5, NH-6, NH-7, NH-8, and NH-9 as currently worded in the proposed district plan.	Retain Rule NH-R3 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent		Accept	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS369.330</b>	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy seek amendments to this rule as it is overly restrictive for the 1 in 100 year River Flood Hazard Areas to provide for above ground infrastructure as a permitted activity.	Allow in part	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS570.1303</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS346.305</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS566.1317</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS569.1339</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S464.029</b>	LJ King Ltd	NH-R3	Oppose	We seek more flexibility in these rules to allow large decks, for modifications to existing buildings". The rule should provide for flood risks to be addressed through alternative building designs,	Amend NH-R3 PER-1 to allow new decks more than 30m2 and more than 1m in height where the deck is designed so that it will not impede flood flows.		Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				not just by limiting deck area and height. NH-R3 PER 1 does not fully implement policy NH-P6, which allows for mitigation of hazards through building design.				
<b>FS369.331</b>	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy seek amendments to this rule as it is overly restrictive for the 1 in 100 year River Flood Hazard Areas to provide for above ground infrastructure as a permitted activity.	Allow in part	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS566.1572</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S472.023</b>	Michael Foy	NH-R3	Support in part	We do not support the new flood zone landuse rules and instead seek more flexibility in these rules to allow large decks, for modifications to existing buildings". The rule should provide for flood risks to be addressed through alternative building designs, not just by limiting deck area and height. NH-R3 PER 1 does not fully implement policy NH-P6, which allows for mitigation of hazards through building design	Amend NH-R3 PER-1 to allow new decks more than 30m2 and more than 1m in height where the deck is designed so that it will not impede flood flows.		Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS369.332</b>	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy seek amendments to this rule as it is overly restrictive for the 1 in 100 year River Flood Hazard Areas to provide for above ground infrastructure as a permitted activity.	Allow in part	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S543.027</b>	LJ King Limited	NH-R3	Oppose	We seek more flexibility in these rules to allow large decks, for modifications to existing buildings". The rule should provide for flood risks to be addressed through alternative building designs,	Amend NH-R3 PER-1 to allow new decks more than 30m2 and more than 1m in height where the deck is designed so that it will not impede flood flows		Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				not just by limiting deck area and height. NH-R3 PER 1 does not fully implement policy NH-P6, which allows for mitigation of hazards through building design				
<b>FS369.336</b>	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy seek amendments to this rule as it is overly restrictive for the 1 in 100 year River Flood Hazard Areas to provide for above ground infrastructure as a permitted activity.	Allow in part	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS566.2188</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S547.027</b>	LJ King Limited	NH-R3	Oppose	We seek more flexibility in these rules to allow large decks, for modifications to existing buildings". The rule should provide for flood risks to be addressed through alternative building designs, not just by limiting deck area and height. NH-R3 PER 1 does not fully implement policy NH-P6, which allows for mitigation of hazards through building design	Amend NH-R3 PER-1 to allow new decks more than 30m2 and more than 1m in height where the deck is designed so that it will not impede flood flows		Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS369.337</b>	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy seek amendments to this rule as it is overly restrictive for the 1 in 100 year River Flood Hazard Areas to provide for above ground infrastructure as a permitted activity.	Allow in part	Amend	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S159.043</b>	Horticulture New Zealand	NH-R4	Oppose	Artificial crop protection structures and crop support structures should be provided for within Rule NH-R4 as they are open structures which water can flow through	Amend Rule NH-R4 to include: <b>PER-4Artificial crop protection structures and crop support structures</b>		Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS151.203	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Awaiting recommendation	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
FS570.205	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Awaiting recommendation	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
FS566.219	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Awaiting recommendation	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
FS569.241	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Awaiting recommendation	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
S421.077	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	NH-R4	Support in part	Federated Farmers supports the new buildings or structures (excluding residential activities) ancillary to farming buildings being classified as permitted activities. It is noted that the footprint is limited to less than 100m <sup>2</sup> which is small for an ancillary building. It would be more appropriate to increase the size of the footprint to 250m <sup>2</sup> which is the average size required for ancillary buildings such as hay barns.	Amend PER-1 of Rule NH-R4 to increase the threshold as follows: The building or structure has a footprint that is less than <del>100m<sup>2</sup></del> <b>250m<sup>2</sup></b> .		Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
FS196.24	Joe Carr		Support	provides for the reasonable use of land, providing other standards are met.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
FS570.1309	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
FS346.311	Royal Forest and Bird Protection		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
	Society of New Zealand Inc.			section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.				
<b>FS566.1323</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS569.1345</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S355.016</b>	Wakaiti Dalton	NH-R5	Support in part	NH-R5 and R6 require all new buildings and extensions or alterations to buildings that accommodate vulnerable activities to be set back a minimum of 20m from the dripline of any 'contiguous scrub or shrubland, woodlot or forestry', none of which are defined terms. This provision is very similar to that contained in Chapter 12 of the ODP and is often a trigger for resource consents, whereby FNDC typically request approval from Fire and Emergency NZ who assess whether there is adequate provision of fire sighting supply and access. There is considered to be adequate consideration of firefighting water supply within the NH-R5 and R6 PER-1 and TRAN-R3-PER-1. Therefore, it is considered unnecessary to include a setback requirement when there is already adequate provision of the firefighting supply and access requirements.	Delete PER-2 from rule NH-R5		Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S339.023</b>	Te Aupōuri Commercial Development Ltd	NH-R5	Not Stated	Rules NH-R5 and R6 require all new buildings and extensions or alterations to buildings that accommodate vulnerable activities to be set back a minimum of 20m from the dripline of any 'contiguous scrub or shrubland,	Delete PER-2 from Rules NH-R5 and NH-R6.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				woodlot or forestry', none of which are defined terms. This provision is very similar to that contained in Chapter 12 of the ODP and is often a trigger for resource consents, whereby FNDC typically request approval from Fire and Emergency NZ who assess whether there is adequate provision of fire sighting supply and access. There is considered to be adequate consideration of firefighting water supply within the NH-R5 and R6 PER-1 and TRAN-R3-PER-1. Therefore, it is considered unnecessary to include a setback requirement when there is already adequate provision of the firefighting supply and access requirements.				
<b>S167.010</b>	Bentzen Farm Limited	NH-R5	Oppose	Non-conformity with the rule should be a restricted discretionary activity, rather than full discretionary, as the matters managed by the rule are confined to the single issue of fire risk. The matters of discretion sought to be added by this submission will appropriately direct decision making.	Amend the activity status in Rule NH-R5 where compliance is not achieved with PER-1 or PER-1 from Discretionary to Restricted Discretionary Activity. Add the following matters of discretion: a. The availability of water for fire-fighting; b. The scale of the extension or alteration; c. Alternative options for the location of the extension or alteration; d. The use of building materials to reduce fire risk; e. The extent and type of vegetation present and f. The nature and density of any planting to reduce fire risk, including use of low flammability species.		Accept	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS176.10</b>	Summit Forests New Zealand Limited		Oppose	Any restriction of discretion must include a means of managing the risk of fire spread from the activity needing consent to any surrounding vegetation. Such means must include passive management and not rely solely on active management.	Disallow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules



## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>FS405.026</b>	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support in part	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the amendment sought within this submission point to change the activity status to restricted discretionary, but notes that it has requested the amendment that NH-R5 PER-2 should be deleted in its original submission	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS361.013</b>	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support in part	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the amendment sought within this submission point to change the activity status to restricted discretionary, but notes that it has requested the amendment that NH-R5 PER-2 should be deleted in its original submission	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS566.372</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow		Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S95.001</b>	Lynley Newport	NH-R5	Oppose	Surprised that the Council has considered it necessary to persist with a rule such as NH-R5 PER-2. The same rule in the Operative District Plan has not served any useful purpose, the issue being much better addressed through the Building Consent process and FENZ standards and guidelines, and is often in conflict with rules restricting the clearance of indigenous vegetation. In fact the proposed new wording is even worse than the existing wording in the Operative District Plan because it deletes the words "area of" and simply states contiguous scrub or shrubland, woodlot or forestry - meaning a single row of shelter planting is likely caught by the rule. Imposing a specific buffer distance is a nonsense. A fire is not going to follow	Delete Rule NH-R5 PER-2.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				the rule and know not to spread when the gap between building and dripline is 20.Sm, compared with spreading if the distance is 19.Sm. The emphasis should be on sensible and practical provision of the means by which fires can be extinguished - safe, sufficient and accessible water supply - and by providing homeowners with useful and practical advice in regard to plant species and building materials that might be suitable when building near or within areas of vegetation.				
<b>FS196.25</b>	Joe Carr		Support	because the submission is more practicable and effective	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S479.010</b>	Tracy and Kenneth Dalton	NH-R5	Support in part	Requires all new buildings and extensions or alterations to buildings that accommodate vulnerable activities to be set back a minimum of 20m from the dripline of any 'contiguous scrub or shrubland, woodlot or forestry', none of which are defined terms. This provision is very similar to that contained in Chapter 12 of the ODP and is often a trigger for resource consents, whereby FNDC typically request approval from Fire and Emergency NZ who assess whether there is adequate provision of fire sighting supply and access. There is considered to be adequate consideration of firefighting water supply within the NH-R5 and R6 PER-1 and TRAN-R3-PER-1. Therefore, it is considered unnecessary to include a setback requirement when there is already adequate provision of the firefighting supply and access requirements.	Delete PER-2		Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS196.184	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
FS369.338	Top Energy		Oppose	Top Energy seeks to retain this rule as notified.	Disallow	Retain	Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
S251.005	New Zealand Maritime Parks Ltd	NH-R5	Support in part	NZMPL note that PDP has retained provisions to manage the risks of wildfire, including the requirements for buildings used for vulnerable activities to be setback a minimum of 20m from "the dripline of any contiguous scrub or shrubland, woodlot or forestry". Whilst it is recognised that this is a risk that requires management, it is considered that wildfire is suitably managed by the requirements to provide a dedicated firefighting water supply and access that accommodates firefighting appliances in PER-R1, clauses (1) and (2) of rule NH-R5. Further, the Transport and Subdivision Chapters also contain provisions that set minimum access and firefighting water supply standards. In NZMPL's view, the risk is sufficiently managed by these provisions and there is no requirement to apply the setback provisions. Furthermore, the phrase "the dripline of any contiguous scrub or shrubland, woodlot or forestry" that appears in the ODP already creates interpretation issues and is inconsistently applied as there are no determining thresholds in the standard.	Delete PER-2 of Rule NH-R5		Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
FS400.0010	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Support	Submission 251 rightly notes that the underlying analyses related to the Coastal Environment provisions has not sufficiently considered the appropriate implementation of these provision in the urban	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				environment. Specific provisions such a height limits and gross floor area restrictions (for example) require flexibility when considered against the urban environment values and existing environment.				
<b>FS396.0010</b>	Ed and Inge Amsler		Support	Submission 251 rightly notes that the underlying analyses related to the Coastal Environment provisions has not sufficiently considered the appropriate implementation of these provision in the urban environment. Specific provisions such a height limits and gross floor area restrictions (for example) require flexibility when considered against the urban environment values and existing environment.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S168.017</b>	Setar Thirty Six Limited	NH-R5	Oppose	Non-conformity with the rule should be a restricted discretionary activity, rather than full discretionary, as the matters managed by the rule are confined to the single issue of fire risk. There are circumstances where the rule cannot be met, and indeed such an outcome could be a compromise compared to wider landscape and biodiversity outcomes. For example, new dwellings where landscape mitigation close to the house is desirable or required as an existing condition of subdivision consent. In these circumstances, the matters of discretion sought to be added by this submission will appropriately direct decision making. These include the ability to consider the suitability of low flammability plant species as fire risk mitigation adjoining the house.	Amend the activity status in Rule NH-R5 where compliance is not achieved with PER-1 or PER-2 (inferred) from Discretionary to Restricted Discretionary Activity. Add the following matters of discretion: <b>a. The availability of water for fire-fighting;b. The scale of the extension or alteration;c. Alternative options for the location of the extension or alteration;d. The use of building materials to reduce fire risk;e. The extent and type of vegetation present andf. The nature and density of any planting to reduce</b>		Accept	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					<b>fire risk, including use of low flammability species.</b>			
<b>FS405.027</b>	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support in part	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the amendment sought within this submission point to change the activity status to restricted discretionary, but notes that it has requested the amendment that NH-R5 PER-2 should be deleted in its original submission	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS361.014</b>	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support in part	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the amendment sought within this submission point to change the activity status to restricted discretionary, but notes that it has requested the amendment that NH-R5 PER-2 should be deleted in its original submission.	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S187.010</b>	The Shooting Box Limited	NH-R5	Oppose	Refer to submission for detailed reasons for decision requested relating, but not limited to, change of activity status to restricted discretionary activity and matters managed by the rule are confined to the single issue of fire risk.	Amend the activity status in Rule NH-R5 where compliance is not achieved with PER-1 or PER-1 from Discretionary to <b>Restricted Discretionary Activity</b> . Add the following matters of discretion: <b>a. The availability of water for fire-fightingb. The scale of the extension or alterationc. Alternative options for the location of the extension or alteration;d. The use of building materials to reduce fire riske. The extent and type of vegetation present; andf. The nature and density of any planting to reduce</b>		Accept	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					<b>fire risk, including use of low flammability</b>			
<b>FS405.028</b>	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support in part	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the amendment sought within this submission point to change the activity status to restricted discretionary, but notes that it has requested the amendment that NH-R5 PER-2 should be deleted in its original submission.	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS361.015</b>	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support in part	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the amendment sought within this submission point to change the activity status to restricted discretionary, but notes that it has requested the amendment that NH-R5 PER-2 should be deleted in its original submission.	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S222.009</b>	Wendover Two Limited	NH-R5	Oppose	Non-conformity with the rule should be a restricted discretionary activity, rather than full discretionary, as the matters managed by the rule are confined to the single issue of fire risk. There are circumstances where the rule can not be met, and indeed such an outcome would be a compromise compared to wider landscape and biodiversity outcomes. For example, new dwellings where landscape mitigation close to the house is desirable or required as an existing condition of subdivision consent. In these circumstances, the matters of discretion sought to be added by this submission will appropriately direct decision making. These include the ability to consider the suitability of low flammability plant species as fire risk mitigation adjoining	Amend the activity status in Rule NH-R5 where compliance is not achieved with PER-1 or PER-1 from Discretionary to Restricted Discretionary Activity.  Insert the following matters of discretion: <b>a. the availability of water for fire-fighting;b. The scale of the extension or alteration;c. Alternative options for the location of the extension or alteration;d. The use of building materials to reduce fire risk;e. The extent and type of vegetation present andf. The nature and</b>		Accept	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				the house as described in the following reference: <a href="https://fireandemergency.nz/home-and-community-fire-safety/flammability-of-plant-species/">https://fireandemergency.nz/home-and-community-fire-safety/flammability-of-plant-species/</a>	<b>density of any planting to reduce fire risk, including use of low flammability species.</b>			
<b>FS405.029</b>	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support in part	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the amendment sought within this submission point to change the activity status to restricted discretionary, but notes that it has requested the amendment that NH-R5 PER-2 should be deleted in its original submission	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS361.016</b>	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support in part	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the amendment sought within this submission point to change the activity status to restricted discretionary, but notes that it has requested the amendment that NH-R5 PER-2 should be deleted in its original submission.	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S243.019</b>	Matauri Trustee Limited	NH-R5	Oppose	Non-conformity with the rule should be a restricted discretionary activity, rather than full discretionary, as the matters managed by the rule are confined to the single issue of fire risk. There are circumstances where the rule cannot be met, and indeed such an outcome would be a compromise compared to wider landscape and biodiversity outcomes. For example, new dwellings where landscape mitigation close to the house is desirable or required as an existing condition of subdivision consent. In these circumstances, the matters of discretion sought to be added by this	Amend the activity status in Rule NH-R5 where compliance is not achieved with PER-1 or PER-2 (inferred) from discretionary to restricted discretionary activity. Insert the following matters of discretion: <b>a. The availability of water for fire-fighting;b. The scale of the extension or alteration;c. Alternative options for the location of the extension or alteration;d. The use of building materials to reduce fire risk;e. The</b>		Accept	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				submission will appropriately direct decision making	<b>extent and type of vegetation present andf. The nature and density of any planting to reduce fire risk, including use of low flammability species.</b>			
<b>FS405.030</b>	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support in part	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the amendment sought within this submission point to change the activity status to restricted discretionary, but notes that it has requested the amendment that NH-R5 PER-2 should be deleted in its original submission.	Allow in part	allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS361.017</b>	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support in part	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the amendment sought within this submission point to change the activity status to restricted discretionary, but notes that it has requested the amendment that NH-R5 PER-2 should be deleted in its original submission.	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS570.577</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS566.591</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS569.613</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules



## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>S333.010</b>	P S Yates Family Trust	NH-R5	Support in part	Non-conformity with the rule should be a restricted discretionary activity, rather than full discretionary, as the matters managed by the rule are confined to the single issue of fire risk. There are circumstances where the rule can not be met, and indeed such an outcome would be a compromise compared to wider landscape and biodiversity outcomes. For example, new dwellings where landscape mitigation close to the house is desirable or required as an existing condition of subdivision consent. In these circumstances, the matters of discretion sought to be added by this submission will appropriately direct decision making. These include the ability to consider the suitability of low family plant species as fire risk mitigation adjoining the house as described in the following reference: <a href="https://fireandemergency.nz/home-and-communityfire-safety/flammability-of-plant-species/">https://fireandemergency.nz/home-and-communityfire-safety/flammability-of-plant-species/</a>	Amend the activity status in Rule NH-R5 where compliance is not achieved with PER-1 or PER-1 from Discretionary to Restricted Discretionary Activity.  Insert the following matters of discretion: <b>a. The availability of water for fire-fighting;b. The scale of the extension or alteration;c. Alternative options for the location of the extension or alteration;d. The use of building materials to reduce fire risk;e. The extent and type of vegetation present andf. The nature and density of any planting to reduce fire risk, including use of low flammability species.</b>		Accept	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS405.031</b>	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support in part	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the amendment sought within this submission point to change the activity status to restricted discretionary, but notes that it has requested the amendment that NH-R5 PER-2 should be deleted in its original submission.	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS361.018</b>	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support in part	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the amendment sought within this submission point to change the activity status to restricted discretionary, but notes that it has requested the amendment that NH-R5	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				PER-2 should be deleted in its original submission.				
<b>S502.043</b>	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	NH-R5	Support in part	Provision is requested to allow sites which have access to a fire hydrant, to be excluded from the 20 metres setback requirement. This is due to the sites which have access to a fire hydrant being located in urban zones, with good quick access to fire fighting services, and a stable high pressure water supply. Generally urban sites with fire hydrants in the area trigger consent due to bush areas within the vicinity of their site, such as on a public reserve where they are unable to mitigate the effect. Consents are currently processed with comments from FENZ which stipulate that they have no issue given the fire hydrant connection. The 135m requirement is the FENZ standard.	Amend NH-R5 PER-2 PER-2 Any building used for a vulnerable activity (excluding accessory buildings) is set back at least 20m from the dripline of any contiguous scrub or shrubland, woodlot or forestry. <b>Where the vulnerable activity is within 135m of a fire hydrant PER-2 does not apply.</b>		Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS405.032</b>	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Oppose	Ballantyne & Agnew opposes the submission point to amend NH-R5 PER-2 as it considers that NH-R5 PER-2 should be deleted.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS361.019</b>	Willowridge Developments Limited		Oppose	Willowridge Developments Limited opposes the submission by Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited to amend NH-R5 PER-2 as it considers that NH-R5 PER-2 should be deleted.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS369.340</b>	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy seeks to retain this rule as notified.	Allow in part	Retain	Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S484.002</b>	James Phillips	NH-R5	Oppose	No specific reason provided.	Delete NH-R5 in respect to the General Residential Zone.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS369.339	Top Energy		Oppose	Top Energy seeks to retain this rule as notified.	Disallow	Retain	Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
S512.022	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	NH-R5	Support in part	Fire and Emergency support this rule as it will require vulnerable activities (including residential activities) to have adequate water for firefighting. However, demand on reticulated water systems can mean existing fire hydrants do not have sufficient pressure for firefighting	Amend NH-R5 Any building used for a vulnerable activity (excluding accessory buildings) either: 1. is located on a site that has <b>suitable</b> access to a fire hydrant(s) with sufficient water pressure and supply for firefighting as per the SNZ PAS 4509:2008 New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice; or 2. provides for <b>an alternative</b> water supply and access to water supplies for fire fighting purposes in compliance with the SNZ PAS 4509:2008 New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice		Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
FS369.341	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy seeks to retain this rule as notified.	Allow in part	Retain	Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
S250.004	Willowridge Developments Limited	NH-R5	Support in part	It is considered that the risks to and of wild fire are suitably managed by the requirements to provide for a firefighting water supply in the Subdivision chapter. The Transport Chapter requires adequate standards for access for firefighting vehicles. It is not considered necessary to require a 20m setback from the dripline	Amend rule NH-R5 to remove PER-2		Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				of bush areas, where the requirements of water supply and access are met.				
<b>FS570.690</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS566.704</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS569.726</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S283.040</b>	Trent Simpkin	NH-R5	Support in part	Submitter wants to be clear that his interpretation of rule is correct - if submitter has a house that's within 20m of bush, and we are in compliance with NZS4509 (or have approval from FENZ - maybe this needs to be added as another PER item) then we don't require a resource consent? Submitter fully supports not requiring a resource consent if a structure is within 20m of bush and Fire and Emergency NZ have provided their approval.	Amend the rule to clarify the intent, that resource consent is not required if a structure is within 20m of bush and Fire and Emergency NZ have provided their approval.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS570.854</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS566.868</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS569.890</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>S421.072</b>	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	NH-R5	Support	Federated Farmers supports the inclusion of rules NH-R1, NH-2, NH-3, NH-5, NH-6, NH-7, NH-8, and NH-9 as currently worded in the proposed district plan.	Retain Rule NH-R5 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent		Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS570.1304</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS346.306</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS566.1318</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS569.1340</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S483.116</b>	Top Energy Limited	NH-R5	Support	Top Energy supports that this rule only relates to non-habitable structures.	Retain Rule NH-R5		Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS345.167</b>	Ngawha Generation Limited		Support	NGL is a subsidiary of Top Energy Limited. NGL supports all submission points made by Top Energy.	Allow	Allow all of the relief sought by Top Energy Limited in its submission (S483).	Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S333.011</b>	P S Yates Family Trust	NH-R6	Support in part	Non-conformity with the rule should be a restricted discretionary activity, rather than full discretionary, as the matters managed by the rule are confined to the single issue of fire risk. There are	Insert the following matter of discretion to rule NH-R6: <b>f. The nature and density of any planting to reduce fire risk,</b>		Accept	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				circumstances where the rule can not be met, and indeed such an outcome would be a compromise compared to wider landscape and biodiversity outcomes. For example, new dwellings where landscape mitigation close to the house is desirable or required as an existing condition of subdivision consent. In these circumstances, the matters of discretion sought to be added by this submission will appropriately direct decision making. These include the ability to consider the suitability of low family plant species as fire risk mitigation adjoining the house as described in the following reference: <a href="https://fireandemergency.nz/home-and-communityfire-safety/flammability-of-plant-species/">https://fireandemergency.nz/home-and-communityfire-safety/flammability-of-plant-species/</a>	<b>including use of low flammability species.</b>		
<b>S484.003</b>	James Phillips	NH-R6	Oppose	No specific reason provided.	Delete NH-R6 in respect to the General Residential Zone.	Accept	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S355.017</b>	Wakaiti Dalton	NH-R6	Support in part	NH-R5 and R6 require all new buildings and extensions or alterations to buildings that accommodate vulnerable activities to be set back a minimum of 20m from the dripline of any 'contiguous scrub or shrubland, woodlot or forestry', none of which are defined terms. This provision is very similar to that contained in Chapter 12 of the ODP and is often a trigger for resource consents, whereby FNDC typically request approval from Fire and Emergency NZ who assess whether there is adequate provision of fire sighting supply and access. There is considered to be adequate consideration of firefighting water supply within the NH-R5 and R6 PER-1 and TRAN-R3-PER-1. Therefore, it is	Delete PER-2 from rule NH-R6.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				considered unnecessary to include a setback requirement when there is already adequate provision of the firefighting supply and access requirements.			
<b>S168.018</b>	Setar Thirty Six Limited	NH-R6	Support in part	Non-conformity with the rule should be a restricted discretionary activity, rather than full discretionary, as the matters managed by the rule are confined to the single issue of fire risk. There are circumstances where the rule cannot be met, and indeed such an outcome could be a compromise compared to wider landscape and biodiversity outcomes. For example, new dwellings where landscape mitigation close to the house is desirable or required as an existing condition of subdivision consent. In these circumstances, the matters of discretion sought to be added by this submission will appropriately direct decision making. These include the ability to consider the suitability of low flammability plant species as fire risk mitigation adjoining the house.	Insert the following matter of discretion to Rule NH-R6: <b>f. The nature and density of any planting to reduce fire risk, including use of low flammability species.</b>	Accept	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S187.011</b>	The Shooting Box Limited	NH-R6	Support in part	Refer to submission for detailed reasons for decision requested relating, but not limited to, matters managed by the rule are confined to the single issue of fire risk.	Insert the following matter of discretion to Rule NH-R6: <b>f. The nature and density of any planting to reduce fire risk, including use of low flammability species.</b>	Accept	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S222.010</b>	Wendover Two Limited	NH-R6	Support in part	As per submission point 9.	Insert the following matter of discretion to rule NH-R6: <b>f. The nature and density of any planting to reduce fire risk, including use of low flammability species.</b>	Accept	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S339.024	Te Aupōuri Commercial Development Ltd	NH-R6	Not Stated	Rules NH-R5 and R6 require all new buildings and extensions or alterations to buildings that accommodate vulnerable activities to be set back a minimum of 20m from the dripline of any 'contiguous scrub or shrubland, woodlot or forestry', none of which are defined terms. This provision is very similar to that contained in Chapter 12 of the ODP and is often a trigger for resource consents, whereby FNDC typically request approval from Fire and Emergency NZ who assess whether there is adequate provision of fire sighting supply and access. There is considered to be adequate consideration of firefighting water supply within the NH-R5 and R6 PER-1 and TRAN-R3-PER-1. Therefore, it is considered unnecessary to include a setback requirement when there is already adequate provision of the firefighting supply and access requirements.	Delete PER-2 from Rules NH-R5 and NH-R6.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
S512.023	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	NH-R6	Support in part	Fire and Emergency support this rule as it will require vulnerable activities (including residential activities) to have adequate water for firefighting. However, demand on reticulated water systems can mean existing fire hydrants do not have sufficient pressure for firefighting. Fire and Emergency support the inclusion of considerations around building materials and vegetation types under the matters of discretion.	Amend NH-R6 Extensions or alterations that increase the GFA of a building used for a vulnerable activity (excluding accessory buildings) either: a. is located on a site that has <b>suitable access</b> <b>to a fire hydrant(s) with sufficient waterpressure and supply for firefighting as per the SNZ PAS 4509:2008 New Zealand FireService Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice; or</b>	Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules



## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					b. provides <b>for an alternative</b> water supply and access to water supplies for fire fighting purposes in compliance with the SNZ PAS 4509:2008 New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice. Matters of discretion are restricted to: a. The <del>availability</del> <b>adequacy (volume, pressure and access)</b> of water for firefighting; b. The scale of the extension or alteration; c. Alternative options for the location of the extension or alteration; d. The use of building materials to reduce fire risk; and e. The extent and type of vegetation present			
<b>FS176.11</b>	Summit Forests New Zealand Limited		Support	Clarifies what is required to adequately manage the requirements to fight a fire.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S479.011</b>	Tracy and Kenneth Dalton	NH-R6	Support in part	Requires all new buildings and extensions or alterations to buildings that accommodate vulnerable activities to be set back a minimum of 20m from the dripline of any 'contiguous scrub or shrubland, woodlot or forestry', none of which are defined terms. This provision is very similar to that contained in	Delete PER-2		Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				Chapter 12 of the ODP and is often a trigger for resource consents, whereby FNDC typically request approval from Fire and Emergency NZ who assess whether there is adequate provision of fire sighting supply and access. There is considered to be adequate consideration of firefighting water supply within the NH-R5 and R6 PER-1 and TRAN-R3-PER-1. Therefore, it is considered unnecessary to include a setback requirement when there is already adequate provision of the firefighting supply and access requirements.				
<b>FS196.183</b>	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S251.006</b>	New Zealand Maritime Parks Ltd	NH-R6	Support in part	NZMPL note that PDP has retained provisions to manage the risks of wildfire, including the requirements for buildings used for vulnerable activities to be setback a minimum of 20m from "the dripline of any contiguous scrub or shrubland, woodlot or forestry". Whilst it is recognised that this is a risk that requires management, it is considered that wildfire is suitably managed by the requirements to provide a dedicated firefighting water supply and access that accommodates firefighting appliances in PER-R1, clauses (1) and (2) of rule NH-R6. Further, the Transport and Subdivision Chapters also contain provisions that set minimum access and firefighting water supply standards. In NZMPL's view, the risk is sufficiently managed by these provisions and there is no requirement to apply the setback provisions. Furthermore, the phrase "the dripline of any contiguous scrub or	Delete PER-2 of Rule NH-R6		Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				shrubland, woodlot or forestry" that appears in the ODP already creates interpretation issues and is inconsistently applied as there are no determining thresholds in the standard.				
<b>FS400.011</b>	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Support	Submission 251 rightly notes that the underlying analyses related to the Coastal Environment provisions has not sufficiently considered the appropriate implementation of these provision in the urban environment. Specific provisions such a height limits and gross floor area restrictions (for example) require flexibility when considered against the urban environment values and existing environment.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS396.011</b>	Ed and Inge Amsler		Support	Submission 251 rightly notes that the underlying analyses related to the Coastal Environment provisions has not sufficiently considered the appropriate implementation of these provision in the urban environment. Specific provisions such a height limits and gross floor area restrictions (for example) require flexibility when considered against the urban environment values and existing environment.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S502.044</b>	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	NH-R6	Support in part	Provision is requested to allow sites which have access to a fire hydrant, to be excluded from the 20 metres setback requirement. This is due to the sites which have access to a fire hydrant being located in urban zones, with good quick access to fire fighting services, and a stable high pressure water supply. Generally urban sites	Amend NH-R6 PER-2 PER-2 Extensions or alterations that increase the GFA of a building used for a vulnerable activity (excluding accessory buildings) are set back at least 20m from the dripline of any contiguous scrub or shrubland, woodlot or forestry. <b>Where the vulnerable</b>		Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				with fire hydrants in the area trigger consent due to bush areas within the vicinity of their site, such as on a public reserve where they are unable to mitigate the effect. Consents are currently processed with comments from FENZ which stipulate that they have no issue given the fire hydrant connection. The 135m requirement is the FENZ standard.	<b>activity is within 135m of a fire hydrant PER-2 does not apply.</b>			
<b>FS405.033</b>	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Oppose	Ballantyne & Agnew opposes the submission point to amend NH-R5 PER-2 as it considered that NH-R5 PER-2 should be deleted.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS361.020</b>	Willowridge Developments Limited		Oppose	Willowridge Developments Limited opposes the submission by Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited to amend NH-R5 PER-2 as it considered that NH-R5 PER-2 should be deleted.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S243.020</b>	Matauri Trustee Limited	NH-R6	Support in part	Non-conformity with the rule should be a restricted discretionary activity, rather than full discretionary, as the matters managed by the rule are confined to the single issue of fire risk. There are circumstances where the rule cannot be met, and indeed such an outcome would be a compromise compared to wider landscape and biodiversity outcomes. For example, new dwellings where landscape mitigation close to the house is desirable or required as an existing condition of subdivision consent. In these circumstances, the matters of discretion sought to be added by this submission will appropriately direct decision making	Insert the following matter of discretion to rule NH-R6: <b>f. The nature and density of any planting to reduce fire risk, including use of low flammability species.</b>		Accept	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>FS570.578</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS566.592</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS569.614</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S250.005</b>	Willowridge Developments Limited	NH-R6	Support in part	It is considered that the risks to and of wild fire are suitably managed by the requirements to provide for a firefighting water supply in the Subdivision chapter. The Transport Chapter requires adequate standards for access for firefighting vehicles. It is not considered necessary to require a 20m setback from the dripline of bush areas, where the requirements of water supply and access are met.	Amend rule NH-R6 to remove PER-2		Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS570.691</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS566.705</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS569.727</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S421.073</b>	Northland Federated	NH-R6	Support	Federated Farmers supports the inclusion of rules NH-R1, NH-2, NH-3, NH-5, NH-6, NH-7, NH-8, and NH-9 as	Retain Rule NH-R6 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent		Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
	Farmers of New Zealand			currently worded in the proposed district plan.				
<b>FS570.1305</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS346.307</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS566.1319</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS569.1341</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S483.117</b>	Top Energy Limited	NH-R6	Support	Top Energy supports that this rule only relates to non-habitable structures.	Retain Rule NH-R6		Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS345.168</b>	Ngawha Generation Limited		Support	NGL is a subsidiary of Top Energy Limited. NGL supports all submission points made by Top Energy.	Allow	Allow all of the relief sought by Top Energy Limited in its submission (S483).	Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S167.011</b>	Bentzen Farm Limited	NH-R6	Support in part	Non-conformity with the rule should be a restricted discretionary activity as the matters managed by the rule are confined to the single issue of fire risk. The matter of discretion sought to be added by this submission will appropriately direct decision making.	Insert the following matter of discretion to rule NH-R6: f. The nature and density of any planting to reduce fire risk, including use of low flammability species.		Accept	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>FS566.373</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S516.047</b>	Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland	NH-R7	Support	Ngā Tai Ora support the concept of managing vulnerable activities within hazard areas.	Retain Rule NH-R7		Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S421.074</b>	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	NH-R7	Support	Federated Farmers supports the inclusion of rules NH-R1, NH-2, NH-3, NH-5, NH-6, NH-7, NH-8, and NH-9 as currently worded in the proposed district plan.	Retain Rule NH-R7 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent		Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS570.1306</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS403.127</b>	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support in part	Te Whatu Ora support this rule as notified.	Allow in part	Te Whatu Ora support this rule as notified.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS346.308</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS566.1320</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS569.1342</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S331.034</b>	Ministry of Education Te	NH-R7	Support in part	The submitter supports in part rule NH-R7 New buildings, and extensions or alterations that increase the GFA of	Amend rule rule NH-R7 New buildings, and extensions or alterations that increase the GFA of existing buildings, as follows:		Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
	Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga			<p>existing buildings, and acknowledges the risk which natural hazards can pose on people, property and the environment, particularly for vulnerable activities. However, NH-R7 RDIS-1 is not clear in its wording. The submitter interprets the rule as, where the new building, extension or alteration is or will be used for a vulnerable activity, it should not be located in the 1 in 10 year River Flood Hazard area (and where compliance is not achieved, it becomes a Non-Complying activity). The submitter supports that vulnerable activities should not be located in the 1 in 10 year River Flood Hazard area. This had already been reflected in NH-R12 and the Ministry recommends deletion from NH-R7 for clarity. Vulnerable activities should be allowed to establish in the 1 in 100 year flood hazard area as a restricted discretionary activity if they comply with the appropriate building standards (as set out in NH-R7).</p>	<p>New buildings, and extensions or alterations that increase the GFA of existing buildings Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: RDIS-1 The new building, extension or alteration is not located in the 1 in 10 Year River Flood Hazard area. <del>and is or will be used for a vulnerable activity.</del> RDIS-2 The finished floor level of: a. any new building or extension or alteration to an existing building that will accommodate vulnerable activities must be at least 500mm above the maximum water level in a 1 in 100 year flood event; b. any extension or alteration that increases the GFA of a building that accommodates vulnerable activities must be at least 500mm above the maximum water level in a 1 in 100 year flood event; and c. all other new buildings, or extensions or alterations to existing buildings, must be at least 300mm above the maximum water level in a 1 in 100 year flood event. RDIS-3 The new, extended or altered building does not divert an overland flow path onto other</p>		



## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					<p>properties.</p> <p>RIDS-4</p> <p>The building complies with standard: NH-S1 Information requirements</p> <p>Matters of discretion are limited to:</p> <p>a. the effects of flood hazards on the integrity of the building to the extent that such effects are not appropriately managed by the building consent process under the Building Act 2004;</p> <p>b. whether the works are likely to accelerate, worsen or result in material damage to that land, other land or any building or structure through inundation;</p> <p>c. the effects of the development, including earthworks, on overland flow paths and flood depths, velocity or frequency within the site or on surrounding sites;</p> <p>d. the ability to relocate the building or structure or adapt to the flood hazard over time or in response to direct effects of the hazard;</p> <p>e. the extent to which the risk to people and property from the</p>		

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					<p>flood hazard is avoided or managed;</p> <p>f. the nature of the activity being undertaken and its vulnerability to the potential effects of flooding;</p> <p>g. provision of safe access and egress to the building or structure during a flood event;</p> <p>h. whether there is a functional or operational need for the building, structure or activity to be located within the flood hazard area;</p> <p>i. the proposed use of, necessity for and design of engineering solutions (soft or hard) to mitigate the hazard;</p> <p>j. the resilience of the buildings or structures to the effects of the hazard; and</p> <p>k. the methods provided to manage activities and uses within the site, including safe egress from buildings or structures or the site and the management of people and property during a flood event.</p> <p>Activity status where compliance with RDIS-1 is not achieved: Non-complying (refer Rule NH-R12)</p>		

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					Activity status where compliance with RDIS-2, RDIS-3 or RDIS-4 is not achieved: Discretionary			
<b>FS403.126</b>	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support in part	Te Whatu Ora support this rule as notified.	Allow in part	Te Whatu Ora support this rule as notified.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S516.048</b>	Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland	NH-R8	Support	Ngā Tai Ora support the concept of managing vulnerable activities within hazard areas.	Retain Rule NH-R8		Accept	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S421.075</b>	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	NH-R8	Support	Federated Farmers supports the inclusion of rules NH-R1, NH-2, NH-3, NH-5, NH-6, NH-7, NH-8, and NH-9 as currently worded in the proposed district plan.	Retain Rule NH-R8 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent		Accept	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS570.1307</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS346.309</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS566.1321</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS569.1343</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S454.074</b>	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	NH-R9	Support	Transpower supports the inclusion of NH-R9 in the FNPDP.	Retain NH-R9		Accept	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>S421.076</b>	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	NH-R9	Support	Federated Farmers supports the inclusion of rules NH-R1, NH-2, NH-3, NH-5, NH-6, NH-7, NH-8, and NH-9 as currently worded in the proposed district plan.	Retain Rule NH-R9 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent		Accept	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS570.1308</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS346.310</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS566.1322</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS569.1344</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S356.049</b>	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	NH-R9	Support	not stated	Retain NH-R9 as notified		Accept	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>FS403.128</b>	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support	Te Whatu Ora support this rule as notified.	Allow	Te Whatu Ora support this rule as notified.	Accept	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S516.049</b>	Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland	NH-R12	Support	Ngā Tai Ora support the concept of managing vulnerable activities within hazard areas.	Retain Rule NH-R12		Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key Issue 6: Natural Hazards Rules
<b>S93.014</b>	Lynley Newport	Standards	Support in part	Support the need to manage development within coastal hazard areas but believe all hazard provisions should be located in the Natural	Transfer the standards from the Coastal Environment chapter (rules section addressing coastal hazards) into the Natural Hazards chapter. Consequently, insert a		Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				Hazards chapter. A cross reference in the Coastal Environment back to the Natural hazards chapter can be included.	cross reference within the Coastal Environment chapter to this effect.			the Natural Hazards Chapter
<b>S333.012</b>	P S Yates Family Trust	NH-S1	Support in part	The information requirement applies the need for a report prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced engineer/instability to activities and subdivision on the site as a whole, rather than just that part impacted by the identified natural hazard, imposing unnecessary cost. The amendments sought target the requirements just to the mapped hazard area location.	Amend Information Requirement NH-S1 as follows: Any application for a resource consent in relation to a <del>site</del> <b>location</b> that is potentially affected by natural hazards must be accompanied by a report prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced engineer that addresses the matters identified in the relevant objectives, policies, performance standards and matters of control/discretion		Accept in part	Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Natural Hazards Standard NH-S1
<b>FS446.017</b>	Omata Estate		Support	Support the change sought to the extent that NH-S1 should only apply where activities or development is proposed within a specific natural hazard area and where it is identified that the scale and nature of the proposal warrants a site-specific assessment.	Allow	Amend Information Requirement NH-S1 as follows: Any application for a resource consent in relation to a site location that is potentially affected by natural hazards must be accompanied by a report prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced engineer that addresses the matters identified in the relevant objectives, policies, performance standards and matters of control/discretion	Accept in part	Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Natural Hazards Standard NH-S1
<b>FS547.016</b>	Heron Point Limited		Support in part	Support the change sought to the extent that NH-S1 should solely be applicable where activities or	Allow in part	Amend	Accept in part	Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Natural

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				development are proposed within a natural hazard area. The submitter seeks that Note 2 is amended to clarify that the special information requirement solely applies to activities being undertaken within a mapped natural hazard area. This removes ambiguity when interpreting the current wording with requires a report where a site is potentially affected by natural hazards.				Hazards Standard NH-S1
<b>S561.044</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	NH-S1	Oppose	The reference to "potentially affected" is not specific and the comment should clarify that this relates to the mapped hazard areas.	Amend NH-S1 as follows: Information requirements Any application for a resource consent in relation to a site that is potentially affected by <b>the mapped natural hazards (as noted in the Plan definitions)</b> must be accompanied by a report prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced engineer that addresses the matters identified in the relevant objectives, policies, performance standards and matters of control/discretion.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Natural Hazards Standard NH-S1
<b>FS446.018</b>	Omata Estate		Support in part	Support the decision sought to the extent that NH-S1 should only be triggered where a proposed activity is to occur within a portion of a site is affected by mapped natural hazard. Omata Estate seeks that the information requirements of NH-S1 solely apply to a resource consent application where an activity is proposed on land affected by a mapped natural hazard and it is determined by the consenting authority	Allow in part	amend Omata Estate seeks that the information requirements of NH-S1 solely apply to a resource consent application where an activity is proposed on land affected by a mapped natural hazard and it is determined by the consenting authority that the scale and nature	Accept in part	Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Natural Hazards Standard NH-S1

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				that the scale and nature of the activity warrants an engineering report		of the activity warrants an engineering report.		
<b>FS32.098</b>	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	<p>The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes.</p> <p>The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts.</p> <p>The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.</p>	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Natural Hazards Standard NH-S1
<b>FS547.019</b>	Heron Point Limited		Support in part	<p>Support the decision sought to the extent that NH-S1 should only be triggered where a proposed activity is to occur within a portion of a site is affected by mapped natural hazard. The submitter seeks that the information requirements of NH-S1 solely apply to a resource consent application where an activity is proposed on land affected by a mapped natural hazard.</p>	Allow in part	Amend	Accept in part	Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Natural Hazards Standard NH-S1

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>FS354.088</b>	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	The proposed standard is not specific and is too general. The submitter seeks that the natural hazard should be identified on a map in the DP and this is supported.	Allow	Allow S561.044	Accept in part	Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Natural Hazards Standard NH-S1
<b>FS23.316</b>	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Natural Hazards Standard NH-S1
<b>FS47.058</b>	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Natural Hazards Standard NH-S1
<b>FS348.131</b>	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept in part	Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Natural Hazards Standard NH-S1
<b>S168.019</b>	Setar Thirty Six Limited	NH-S1	Oppose	The information requirement applies the need for a report prepared by a	Amend Standard NH-S1 as follows: Any application for a resource consent in		Accept in part	Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Natural



## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				suitably qualified and experienced engineer/instability to activities and subdivision on the site as a whole, rather than just that part impacted by the identified natural hazard, imposing unnecessary cost. The amendments sought target the requirements just to the mapped hazard area location.	relation to a <b>site location</b> that is potentially affected by natural hazards must be accompanied by a report prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced engineer that addresses the matters identified in the relevant objectives, policies, performance standards and matters of control/discretion.			Hazards Standard NH-S1
<b>FS547.011</b>	Heron Point Limited		Support in part	Support the change sought to the extent that NH-S1 should solely be applicable where activities or development are proposed within a natural hazard area. The submitter seeks that Note 2 is amended to clarify that the special information requirement solely applies to activities being undertaken within a mapped natural hazard area. This removes ambiguity when interpreting the current wording with requires a report where a site is potentially affected by natural hazards.	Allow in part	Amend	Accept in part	Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Natural Hazards Standard NH-S1
<b>S187.012</b>	The Shooting Box Limited	NH-S1	Oppose	The information requirement applies the need for a report prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced engineer/instability to activities and subdivision on the site as a whole, rather than just that part impacted by the identified natural hazard, imposing unnecessary cost. The amendments sought target the requirements just to the mapped hazard area location.	Amend Information Requirement NH-S1 as follows: Any application for a resource consent in relation to a <b>site location</b> that is potentially affected by natural hazards must be accompanied by a report prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced engineer that addresses the matters identified in the relevant		Accept in part	Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Natural Hazards Standard NH-S1

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					objectives, policies, performance standards and matters of control/discretion.			
FS547.012	Heron Point Limited		Support in part	Support the change sought to the extent that NH-S1 should solely be applicable where activities or development are proposed within a natural hazard area. The submitter seeks that Note 2 is amended to clarify that the special information requirement solely applies to activities being undertaken within a mapped natural hazard area. This removes ambiguity when interpreting the current wording with requires a report where a site is potentially affected by natural hazards.	Allow in part	Amend	Accept in part	Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Natural Hazards Standard NH-S1
S222.019	Wendover Two Limited	NH-S1	Support in part	The information requirement applies the need for a report prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced engineer/instability to activities and subdivision on the site as a whole, rather than just that part impacted by the identified natural hazard, imposing unnecessary cost. The amendments sought target the requirements just to the mapped hazard area location.	Amend Information Requirement NH-S1 as follows: Any application for a resource consent in relation to a <b>site location</b> that is potentially affected by natural hazards must be accompanied by a report prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced engineer that addresses the matters identified in the relevant objectives, policies, performance standards and matters of control/discretion.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Natural Hazards Standard NH-S1
FS547.013	Heron Point Limited		Support in part	Support the change sought to the extent that NH-S1 should solely be applicable where activities or development are proposed within a natural hazard area.	Allow in part	Amend	Accept in part	Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Natural Hazards Standard NH-S1

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				The submitter seeks that Note 2 is amended to clarify that the special information requirement solely applies to activities being undertaken within a mapped natural hazard area. This removes ambiguity when interpreting the current wording with requires a report where a site is potentially affected by natural hazards.				
<b>S243.021</b>	Matauri Trustee Limited	NH-S1	Oppose	The information requirement applies the need for a report prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced engineer/instability to activities and subdivision on the site as a whole, rather than just that part impacted by the identified natural hazard, imposing unnecessary cost. The amendments sought target the requirements just to the mapped hazard area location	Amend Information Requirement NH-S1 as follows: Any application for a resource consent in relation to a <b>site location</b> that is potentially affected by natural hazards must be accompanied by a report prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced engineer that addresses the matters identified in the relevant objectives, policies, performance standards and matters of control/discretion		Accept in part	Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Natural Hazards Standard NH-S1
<b>FS547.014</b>	Heron Point Limited		Support in part	Support the change sought to the extent that NH-S1 should solely be applicable where activities or development are proposed within a natural hazard area. The submitter seeks that Note 2 is amended to clarify that the special information requirement solely applies to activities being undertaken within a mapped natural hazard area. This removes ambiguity when interpreting the current wording with requires a report where a site is potentially affected by natural hazards.	Allow in part	Amend	Accept in part	Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Natural Hazards Standard NH-S1

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS570.579	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Natural Hazards Standard NH-S1
FS566.593	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Natural Hazards Standard NH-S1
FS569.615	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Natural Hazards Standard NH-S1
S548.005	Omata Estate	NH-S1	Oppose	site-specific engineering report should be dependent on the nature and scale of a proposal and the proximity of the proposal to an area identified as being potential affected by a natural hazard. Applying a blanket requirement to provide a site-specific engineering report for any resource consent applications for a site potentially affected by a natural hazard would result in undue cost constraints to applicant and does not meet the requirements of s32.	delete NH-S1		Reject	Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Natural Hazards Standard NH-S1
FS332.255	Russell Protection Society		Oppose	Rule NH-S1 is relevant for this coastal site.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept	Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Natural Hazards Standard NH-S1
FS403.129	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Oppose	Te Whatu Ora support the standard and seek to improve links in the standards table.	Disallow	Te Whatu Ora support the standard and seek to improve links in the standards table.	Accept	Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Natural Hazards Standard NH-S1
S483.118	Top Energy Limited	NH-S1	Not Stated	The information standard is not linked in the table and located at the end of the page making it easy to miss. The standard should be linked in the	Insert requirement to comply with Standard NH-S1 where resource consent is required in the activities table		Accept in part	Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Natural Hazards Standard NH-S1

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				second column of the rules table to make it clear that where resource consent is required, compliance must be achieved with NH-S1.				
<b>FS345.169</b>	Ngawha Generation Limited		Support	NGL is a subsidiary of Top Energy Limited. NGL supports all submission points made by Top Energy.	Allow	Allow all of the relief sought by Top Energy Limited in its submission (S483).	Accept in part	Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Natural Hazards Standard NH-S1
<b>S167.012</b>	Bentzen Farm Limited	NH-S1	Oppose	The information requirement applies the need for a report prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced engineer/instability to activities and subdivision on the site as a whole, rather than just that part impacted by the identified natural hazard, imposing unnecessary cost. The amendments sought target the requirements just to the mapped hazard area location.	Amend Information Requirement NH-S1 as follows: Any application for a resource consent in relation to a <b>site location</b> that is potentially affected by natural hazards must be accompanied by a report prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced engineer that addresses the matters identified in the relevant objectives, policies, performance standards and matters of control/discretion.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Natural Hazards Standard NH-S1
<b>FS566.374</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.8 Key Issue 8: Natural Hazards Standard NH-S1
<b>S215.030</b>	Haigh Workman Limited	SUB-R8	Support in part	The definition of 'Land Susceptible to Instability' appropriately includes a combination of geological units, overall ground slope and proximity to steeper land. The definition is useful as a mapping tool to indicate when land may be unstable and geotechnical advice should be sought, but it does not necessarily mean that the ground is	Amend SUB-R8 so that Controlled Activity status apply to subdivisions where a geotechnical report by a qualified professional establishes that the land subject to subdivision is not prone to instability or can be engineered to be stable even though it falls within the definition of Land Susceptible to Instability'.		Reject	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: SUB-R8, SUB-R11, and SUB-R12

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>unstable. This is quite different from the areas mapped by NRC as subject to flooding or coastal erosion where extensive analysis and modelling has been carried out and there is a high degree of certainty that the land is subject to the hazard.</p> <p>Under the definition, large portions of Northland would be deemed 'Land Susceptible to Instability'. Under Rule NH-R10, a resource consent would be required for many new buildings or extensions to existing buildings in addition to the building consents required under the Building Act. Given that the Building Act process would require geotechnical design that addresses any instability issues, we wonder what the purpose is in having another statutory layer addressing the same issue.</p> <p>It seems probable that within the next 10 years, that a study will be carried out to more accurately define land susceptible to instability in the Far North District. As with flood mapping, ideally the definition would provide sufficient flexibility to allow the use of any published geotechnical assessment that more accurately maps land susceptible to instability.</p>				
<b>FS289.4</b>	Reuben Wright		Support in part	<p>It is considered appropriate to require suitable engineering information to support any subdivision where a new building site and/or access is required, as a policy and rule for subdivision. However, the mapping of land stability across the district should be left as a matter to be addressed outside the District Plan.</p>	Allow in part		Reject	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: SUB-R8, SUB-R11, and SUB-R12

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS570.519	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: SUB-R8, SUB-R11, and SUB-R12
FS566.533	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: SUB-R8, SUB-R11, and SUB-R12
FS569.555	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: SUB-R8, SUB-R11, and SUB-R12
S512.031	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	SUB-R8	Support in part	Given Fire and Emergency's secondary function responding to natural hazard emergencies, Fire and Emergency support the approach of controlling development/subdivision in identified natural hazard areas. It is essential that emergency responders are able to access potential emergencies on these sites.	insert an additional matter of control/matter of discretion to SUB-R8 on having adequate access for emergency response to each lot created		Reject	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: SUB-R8, SUB-R11, and SUB-R12
S117.001	Lynley Newport	SUB-R8	Oppose	Rule SUB-R8 as written lacks clarity and could be interpreted as applying to the entire site. The words "proposed development area" are too vague. The amended wording will still require/enable assessment of build platforms and services in relation to areas of land instability.	Amend CON-1 of Rule SUB-R8 as follows: <b>The proposed development area, including the building platforms and any area that is required for access and services associated with buildings, is are located wholly outside of any area on the site that is identified as being land susceptible to land instability.</b>		Accept in part	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: SUB-R8, SUB-R11, and SUB-R12
FS196.73	Joe Carr		Support	as per submitter's reasons	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: SUB-R8, SUB-R11, and SUB-R12

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>FS403.139</b>	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support in part	Te Whatu Ora seek to amend rule SUB-R8 to locate building platforms, access and services in the least as risk portion of the parent site.	Allow in part	Te Whatu Ora seek to amend rule SUB-R8 to locate building platforms, access and services in the least as risk portion of the parent site.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: SUB-R8, SUB-R11, and SUB-R12
<b>S516.056</b>	Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland	SUB-R8	Not Stated	Ngā Tai Ora support the creation of resilient communities, responding to and managing risk from natural hazards to ensure the health, safety and wellbeing of Northland residents. Ngā Tai Ora consider that SUB-R8 is ineffective and inefficient. The rule requires building platforms, access and services to be located wholly outside of any area on site which is identified as land susceptible to land instability. Land susceptible to land instability is not mapped in the PDP, instead the PDP provides a complicated definition which requires applicants to undertake individual mapping of their own site. Ngā Tai Ora, consider that this method is onerous, placing considerable cost on landowners particularly when provisions of affordable, safe and healthy housing is essential in the Far North District.	Insert rules applying to areas of risk which are appropriately identified through further mapping of land instability and where the potential risk of land instability throughout the District is understood. Or alternatively:  Amend the definition of land identified as susceptible to land instability, to be easily understandable and identifiable. Amend Rule SUB-R8 to locate building platforms, access and services in the least as risk portion of the parent site.		Reject	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: SUB-R8, SUB-R11, and SUB-R12
<b>FS243.085</b>	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports provisions that will contribute to Te Tai Tokerau being more responsive and resilient to natural hazards, including as these hazards evolve because of climate change.	Allow in part	Insert rules applying to areas .....	Reject	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: SUB-R8, SUB-R11, and SUB-R12
<b>S178.003</b>	Reuben Wright	SUB-R8	Support in part	Rule SUB-R8 refers to 'Subdivision of a site containing land susceptible to land instability'. The definition of land instability in the Plan is very detailed and onerous and relies on information that will not be contained in the District Plan (ie. NZ Geology Web Map). All subdivisions are required to be	[Amend to delete SUB-R8] and alternatively Rule SUB-R2 could include a requirement to define a suitable building site on each vacant lot by way of engineering report or certification to confirm stability.		Reject	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: SUB-R8, SUB-R11, and SUB-R12



## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				assessed against Section 106 of the RMA which includes consideration of any significant risk of natural hazards. There does not appear to be a need to address land instability via a rule where it is addressed directly by statute.				
<b>FS403.140</b>	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support in part	Te Whatu Ora seek to amend rule SUB-R8 to locate building platforms, access and services in the least as risk portion of the parent site.	Allow in part	Te Whatu Ora seek to amend rule SUB-R8 to locate building platforms, access and services in the least as risk portion of the parent site.	Reject	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: SUB-R8, SUB-R11, and SUB-R12
<b>S204.001</b>	Thomson Survey Ltd	SUB-R8	Oppose	The rule as written lacks clarity and could be interpreting as applying to the entire site.	Amend CON-1 <del>The p-Proposed building platforms and any area that is required for access and services associated with buildings are development area, including the building platform and any area that is required for access and services, is located wholly outside of any area on the site that is identified as being land susceptible to land instability.</del>		Accept in part	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: SUB-R8, SUB-R11, and SUB-R12
<b>FS403.141</b>	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support in part	Te Whatu Ora seek to amend rule SUB-R8 to locate building platforms, access and services in the least as risk portion of the parent site.	Allow in part	Te Whatu Ora seek to amend rule SUB-R8 to locate building platforms, access and services in the least as risk portion of the parent site.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: SUB-R8, SUB-R11, and SUB-R12
<b>S193.001</b>	Thomson Survey Ltd	SUB-R11	Oppose	The rule is overly restrictive. There are a host of methods available to land owners to ensure they can remedy or mitigate the risk of material damage from flooding when building. Council should be more interested in	Amend SUB-R11 to default to non-complying activity status for the 1 in 10 year flood event and default to discretionary activity status for the 1 in 100 year flood event.		Reject	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: SUB-R8, SUB-R11, and SUB-R12

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				assessing the suitability of subdivisions in regard to the 1 in 10 year event. The rule does not accurately reflect the requirements of the Regional Policy Statement for Northland.			
<b>S512.032</b>	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	SUB-R11	Support in part	Given Fire and Emergency's secondary function responding to natural hazard emergencies, Fire and Emergency support the approach of controlling development/subdivision in identified natural hazard areas. It is essential that emergency responders are able to access potential emergencies on these sites.	Include an additional matter of control/matter of discretion to SUB-R11 on having adequate access for emergency response to each lot created.	Reject	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: SUB-R8, SUB-R11, and SUB-R12
<b>S502.084</b>	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	SUB-R11	Support in part	The spatial extent of the 1:100 year flood plain refers to the mapped extent of a flood plain. In some cases river control works or earthworks consented by the regional council have been undertaken to ensure that a building platform can be established outside of this mapped flood hazard area. Where this is the case the proposal should also be able to achieve a Restricted Discretionary Activity status as opposed to being a Non-Complying activity. As such item 1 has been updated to reflect this scenario.	Amend SUB-R11 RDIS-1 RDIS -1 1. Building platforms are located wholly outside the spatial extent of the 1 in 100 year floodplain, <b>or a site specific report has been provided by a suitably qualified and experienced practitioner which confirms that the building platform is located outside of the 1 in 100 year floodplain:</b> 2. Newly created allotments must be located and designed to not divert flood flow onto other properties or otherwise result in any increase in flood hazard beyond the site; 3. Any private roads, right of ways or accessways must be located where the depth of flood waters in	Reject	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: SUB-R8, SUB-R11, and SUB-R12

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					a 1 in 100 year flood event does not exceed 200mm above ground level.			
<b>S215.031</b>	Haigh Workman Limited	SUB-R11	Support	We support subdivisions in natural hazard areas being much more restricted than subdivisions outside these areas. Subdivisions that result in development in flood hazard areas should be avoided.	Retain Restricted Discretionary and Non-Complying status for subdivisions in natural hazards areas.		Accept	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: SUB-R8, SUB-R11, and SUB-R12
<b>FS44.31</b>	Northland Planning & Development 2020 Ltd		Support in part	Provision should be made for sites which have obtained a site specific report has been provided which confirms a building platform is located outside of the 1 in 100 year floodplain	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: SUB-R8, SUB-R11, and SUB-R12
<b>FS570.520</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: SUB-R8, SUB-R11, and SUB-R12
<b>FS566.534</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: SUB-R8, SUB-R11, and SUB-R12
<b>FS569.556</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: SUB-R8, SUB-R11, and SUB-R12
<b>S115.001</b>	Lynley Newport	SUB-R11	Oppose	Rule SUB-R11 is overly restrictive, not necessarily in its wording or activity status, but what it defaults to if RDIS-1 cannot be met. Given that there are a host of methods available to landowners to ensure they can remedy or mitigate the risk of material damage from flooding when building, I believe non-complying status to be overly restrictive and believe discretionary activity status to be adequate to enable	Amend Rule SUB-R11 to be less restrictive by reserving the default to a non-complying activity status for the 1 in 10-year flood event and default to discretionary activity status for the 1 in 100-year flood event.		Reject	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: SUB-R8, SUB-R11, and SUB-R12

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>the Council to assess for risk appropriately. The rule addresses the 1 in 100-year event - a 1% likelihood of occurring every year. It would seem to me that the Council should be more interested in assessing the suitability of subdivisions in regard to the 1 in 10-year event - where there is at least a 10% chance of flooding occurring every year - a higher risk of occurring.</p> <p>The rule does not accurately reflect the requirements of the Regional Policy Statement for Northland either. That document refers to a '100 year flood event' and a '10 year flood event' whereas the Proposed District Plan uses the terminology "spatial extent of the 1 in 100 year floodplain". The latter infers reliance to ascertain compliance with the rule is on maps regardless of whether a report is provided refuting the accuracy of those maps; whereas the former infers an ability for an assessment from a suitably qualified person to confirm compliance.</p>				
<b>FS196.68</b>	Joe Carr		Support	as per submitter's reasoning	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: SUB-R8, SUB-R11, and SUB-R12
<b>S561.049</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	SUB-R11	Support	Rule SUB-R11 is part of the natural hazard framework contained within the Proposed Plan ensuring land unsuitable for development is removed from development potential.	Retain Rule SUB-R11 as notified.		Accept	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: SUB-R8, SUB-R11, and SUB-R12
<b>FS32.103</b>	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Reject	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: SUB-R8, SUB-R11, and SUB-R12

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes.</p> <p>The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts.</p> <p>The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.</p>				
<b>FS403.142</b>	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support	Te Whatu Ora seek to amend SUB-R11 and SUB-R12 to be a permitted activity where building platforms and associated access for each allotment is located wholly outside the spatial extent of the Coastal Hazard Area.	Allow in part	Seek provision details as above ...	Accept in part	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: SUB-R8, SUB-R11, and SUB-R12
<b>FS23.321</b>	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Accept	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: SUB-R8, SUB-R11, and SUB-R12

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>FS47.063</b>	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: SUB-R8, SUB-R11, and SUB-R12
<b>FS348.136</b>	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Reject	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: SUB-R8, SUB-R11, and SUB-R12
<b>S344.011</b>	Paihia Properties Holdings Corporate Trustee Limited and UP Management Ltd	SUB-R11	Not Stated	As proposed, rule SUB-R11 is inefficient and ineffective. Coastal and flood hazard areas are mapped overlays, rules and constraints apply to the mapped location. These rules will result in any subdivision of any site containing a portion of identified coastal hazard as a restricted discretionary activity no matter what the potential risk is.	Amend SUB-R11 to provide for subdivision of land mapped as a coastal or flood hazard area as a restricted discretionary activity.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: SUB-R8, SUB-R11, and SUB-R12
<b>FS396.032</b>	Ed and Inge Amsler		Support	The submission seeks various changes in relation to the urban environment / coastal environment interface as well as specific provisions in the Mixed Use Zone. Additionally, the submission seeks better reflection of business land needs	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: SUB-R8, SUB-R11, and SUB-R12

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				that should be reflected throughout the Plan.				
<b>S205.001</b>	Thomson Survey Limited	SUB-R12	Oppose	The rule is overly restrictive and not consistent with the Regional Policy Statement for Northland. Whilst a default to non-complying activity status when not meeting the restricted discretionary status would appear reasonable if it isn't possible to identify building platforms outside the high risk coastal hazard areas, I believe a default to discretionary activity status is more appropriate where the risk is not as high.	Amend SUB-R12 to default to non-complying activity status for the high risk coastal hazards; and default to discretionary activity status for the lesser risk (likelihood) coastal hazard events.		Reject	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: SUB-R8, SUB-R11, and SUB-R12
<b>S512.033</b>	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	SUB-R12	Support in part	Given Fire and Emergency's secondary function responding to natural hazard emergencies, Fire and Emergency support the approach of controlling development/subdivision in identified natural hazard areas. It is essential that emergency responders are able to access potential emergencies on these sites.	Include an additional matter of control/matter of discretion to SUB-R12 having adequate access for emergency response to each lot created.		Reject	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: SUB-R8, SUB-R11, and SUB-R12
<b>S516.057</b>	Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland	SUB-R12	Not Stated	As proposed, rules SUB-R11 and SUB-R12 are inefficient and ineffective. Coastal and flood hazard areas are mapped overlays, rules and constraints apply to the mapped location. These rules will result in any subdivision of any site containing a portion of identified coastal hazard as a restricted discretionary activity no matter what the potential risk is. Ngā Tai Ora, consider that this method is onerous, placing considerable cost on landowners particularly when provisions of affordable, safe and healthy housing is essential in the Far North District.	Amend Rule SUB-R12 to be a permitted activity where building platforms and associated access for each allotment is located wholly outside the spatial extent of the Coastal Hazard Area.		Reject	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: SUB-R8, SUB-R11, and SUB-R12
<b>S113.001</b>	Lynley Newport	SUB-R12	Oppose	The rule is overly restrictive, and not completely consistent with the Regional	Amend the rule to be less restrictive. Council could reserve the default to non complying		Reject	

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>Policy Statement for Northland. The latter requires subdivision plans to identify that building platforms are located outside high risk coastal hazard areas where as SUB-R12 just says 'coastal hazard area' regardless of level of risk.</p> <p>My understanding is that there is a distinction in the NRC's on-line coastal hazard mapping between levels of risk and these maps I believe have been brought into the PDP. Whilst a default to non complying activity status when not meeting the restricted discretionary status would appear reasonable, if it is isn't possible to identify building platforms outside the high risk coastal hazard areas, I believe a default to discretionary activity status is more appropriate where the risk is not as high.</p>	activity status for the high risk coastal hazards; and default to discretionary activity status for the lesser risk (likelihood) coastal hazard events.			
<b>FS196.66</b>	Joe Carr		Support	AS PER SUBMITTER	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: SUB-R8, SUB-R11, and SUB-R12
<b>S561.050</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	SUB-R12	Support	Rule SUB-R12 is part of the natural hazard framework contained within the Proposed Plan ensuring land unsuitable for development is removed from development potential.	Retain Rule SUB-R12 as notified.		Accept	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: SUB-R8, SUB-R11, and SUB-R12
<b>FS32.104</b>	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Reject	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: SUB-R8, SUB-R11, and SUB-R12



## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>the proposed changes.</p> <p>The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts.</p> <p>The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.</p>				
<b>FS403.143</b>	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support in part	Te Whatu Ora seek to amend SUB-R11 and SUB-R12 to be a permitted activity where building platforms and associated access for each allotment is located wholly outside the spatial extent of the Coastal Hazard Area.	Allow in part	Seek provision details as above .....	Accept in part	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: SUB-R8, SUB-R11, and SUB-R12
<b>FS23.322</b>	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Accept	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: SUB-R8, SUB-R11, and SUB-R12
<b>FS47.064</b>	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: SUB-R8, SUB-R11, and SUB-R12

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document				
<b>FS348.137</b>	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Reject	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: SUB-R8, SUB-R11, and SUB-R12
<b>S29.006</b>	Bayswater Inn Ltd	SUB-R12	Oppose	Subdivision of 40 Marsden Road, Paihia, would be assessed as a restricted discretionary activity but the building platform and access must be outside the Coastal Hazard Area	Amend SUB-R12 as it applies to 40 Marsden Road, Paihia, as the rule is not appropriate for the site given its frontage and existing use rights which make it impractical to achieve the requirement.		Reject	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: SUB-R8, SUB-R11, and SUB-R12
<b>FS400.027</b>	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Support	The submission opposes the Paihia Heritage Overlay which seeks to depart from the Environment Court 2005/2006 decision. The decision of the Environment Court should be retained.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: SUB-R8, SUB-R11, and SUB-R12
<b>S215.032</b>	Haigh Workman Limited	SUB-R12	Support	We support subdivisions in natural hazard areas being much more restricted than subdivisions outside these areas. Subdivisions that result in development in flood hazard areas should be avoided.	Retain Restricted Discretionary and Non-Complying status for subdivisions in natural hazards areas.		Accept	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: SUB-R8, SUB-R11, and SUB-R12
<b>FS570.521</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is	Reject	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: SUB-R8,

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
						inconsistent with our original submission		SUB-R11, and SUB-R12
<b>FS566.535</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: SUB-R8, SUB-R11, and SUB-R12
<b>FS569.557</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: SUB-R8, SUB-R11, and SUB-R12
<b>S344.012</b>	Paihia Properties Holdings Corporate Trustee Limited and UP Management Ltd	SUB-R12	Not Stated	As proposed, rule SUB-R12 is inefficient and ineffective. Coastal and flood hazard areas are mapped overlays, rules and constraints apply to the mapped location. These rules will result in any subdivision of any site containing a portion of identified coastal hazard as a restricted discretionary activity no matter what the potential risk is	Amend SUB-R12 to provide for subdivision of land mapped as a coastal or flood hazard area as a restricted discretionary activity.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: SUB-R8, SUB-R11, and SUB-R12
<b>FS396.033</b>	Ed and Inge Amsler		Support	The submission seeks various changes in relation to the urban environment / coastal environment interface as well as specific provisions in the Mixed Use Zone. Additionally, the submission seeks better reflection of business land needs that should be reflected throughout the Plan.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.10 Key Issue 10: SUB-R8, SUB-R11, and SUB-R12
<b>S493.009</b>	William Goodfellow	CE-R10	Oppose	The submitter also considers that the activity status and standards imposed on activities within the coastal environment are unnecessarily onerous. These include imitations on setback for buildings from MHWS, and limitations over the area, height, colour and reflectivity of buildings.	Amend the provisions within the plan that impose limitations on the area of new buildings located within the coastal environment overlay be deleted.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>FS67.116</b>	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The further submitter is concerned about the potential effects on landscape and visual amenity and coastal character with the removal of all controls on height, area, colour and reflectivity of buildings as would be the outcome of this submission point, whether by way of removing the overlays or by way of removing the specific controls referred to by the submitter.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules
<b>FS68.113</b>	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The further submitter is concerned about the potential effects on landscape and visual amenity and coastal character with the removal of all controls on height, area, colour and reflectivity of buildings as would be the outcome of this submission point, whether by way of removing the overlays or by way of removing the specific controls referred to by the submitter.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules
<b>FS361.062</b>	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support in part	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the requested amendments as they consider that the default performance standard of no increase in GFA or footprint of structures is overly restrictive, but notes that CE-R10 should be provided for as a permitted activity.	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules
<b>S496.007</b>	Philip Thornton	CE-R10	Oppose	The submitter considers that the activity status imposed on activities within the coastal environment are unnecessarily onerous. These include imitations on the height, colour and reflectivity of buildings.	Amend the provisions within the plan that impose limitations on the area of new buildings located within the coastal environment overlay be deleted.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>FS411.007</b>	Omarino Residents Association		Support	The Omarino residents association considers that these areas should be excluded from the ONL overlay and associated controls as anticipated by the subdivision consent, particularly given that the design conditions imposed by the subdivision consent render such controls nugatory.	Allow	remove the ONL overlay from all of the areas specified in Condition 9 of the subdivision consent as attached.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules
<b>FS361.064</b>	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support in part	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the requested amendments as they consider that the default performance standard of no increase in GFA or footprint of structures is overly restrictive, but notes that CE-R10 should be provided for as a permitted activity	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules
<b>S251.009</b>	New Zealand Maritime Parks Ltd	CE-R10	Support in part	The PDP seeks to manage the risk from natural hazards to people, property and infrastructure. NZMPL's site of interest is subject to Coastal Flood hazards, while NZMPL appreciate the importance of managing risk from natural hazards, it considers that existing activities and buildings should be recognised and provided for. NZMPL consider that the default performance standard of no increase in GFA or footprint of structures, is overly restrictive and will require unnecessary resource consent applications	Amend Rule CE-R10 to provide for additional and alterations to existing activities as a permitted activity.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules
<b>FS400.014</b>	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Support	Submission 251 rightly notes that the underlying analyses related to the Coastal Environment provisions has not sufficiently considered the appropriate implementation of these provision in the urban environment. Specific provisions such a height limits and gross floor area	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				restrictions (for example) require flexibility when considered against the urban environment values and existing environment.				
<b>FS396.014</b>	Ed and Inge Amsler		Support	Submission 251 rightly notes that the underlying analyses related to the Coastal Environment provisions has not sufficiently considered the appropriate implementation of these provision in the urban environment. Specific provisions such a height limits and gross floor area restrictions (for example) require flexibility when considered against the urban environment values and existing environment.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules
<b>FS449.029</b>	The Proprietors of Tapuaetahi Incorporation		Support in part	The PDP seeks to manage the risk from natural hazards to people, property and infrastructure. NZMPL's site of interest is subject to Coastal Flood hazards, while NZMPL appreciate the importance of managing risk from natural hazards, it considers that existing activities and buildings should be recognised and provided for. NZMPL consider that the default performance standard of no increase in GFA or footprint of structures, is overly restrictive and will require unnecessary resource consent applications	Allow in part	allow in part original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules
<b>S431.044</b>	John Andrew Riddell	CE-R10	Not Stated	Not stated	Amend the 'matters of discretion' in Rule CE-R10 to refer to Rule CE-R16 instead of Rule CE-R17		Reject	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules
<b>FS332.044</b>	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.				
<b>S250.016</b>	Willowridge Developments Limited	CE-R10	Support in part	Consider that existing activities and buildings should be recognised and provided for. The default performance standard of no increase in GFA or footprint of structures is overly restrictive and will require unnecessary resource consent applications.	Amend CE-R10 to provide for additional and alterations to existing activities as a permitted activity.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules
<b>FS332.263</b>	Russell Protection Society		Oppose	Allowing an increase in GFA in hazard areas increases risk of legal action for Council.	Disallow in part	Disallow the original submission in part.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules
<b>FS570.702</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules
<b>FS566.716</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules
<b>FS569.738</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules
<b>S494.009</b>	Ian Jepson	CE-R10	Oppose	Further, the submitter considers that the activity status imposed on activities within the coastal environment are unnecessarily onerous. These include the identification of farming and forestry as discretionary activities, and imitations on the height, colour and reflectivity of buildings.	Amend the provisions within the plan that impose limitations on the area of new buildings located within the coastal environment overlay be deleted.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules
<b>FS361.063</b>	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support in part	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the requested amendments as they consider that the default performance standard of no increase in GFA or	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				footprint of structures is overly restrictive, but notes that CE-R10 should be provided for as a permitted activity				
<b>S497.007</b>	Mark John Wyborn	CE-R10	Support in part	The imposition of controls intended to manage development make the reasonable use and development of the property unfairly and unnecessarily constrained (inferred).	Amend the provisions within the plan that impose limitations on the area of new buildings located within the coastal environment overlay be deleted.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules
<b>FS361.065</b>	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support in part	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the requested amendments as they consider that the default performance standard of no increase in GFA or footprint of structures is overly restrictive, but notes that CE-R10 should be provided for as a permitted activity	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules
<b>S344.019</b>	Paihia Properties Holdings Corporate Trustee Limited and UP Management Ltd	CE-R10	Not Stated	The default performance standard of no increase in GFA or footprint of structures is overly restrictive and will require unnecessary resource consent applications.	Amend CE-R10 to provide for additional and alterations to existing activities as a permitted activity.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules
<b>FS396.040</b>	Ed and Inge Amsler		Support	The submission seeks various changes in relation to the urban environment / coastal environment interface as well as specific provisions in the Mixed Use Zone. Additionally, the submission seeks better reflection of business land needs that should be reflected throughout the Plan.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules
<b>S93.001</b>	Lynley Newport	CE-R10	Support in part	Support the need to manage development within coastal hazard areas but believe all hazard provisions should be located in the Natural Hazards chapter. A cross reference in	Transfer Rule CE-R10 from the Coastal Environment chapter (rules section addressing coastal hazards) into the Natural Hazards chapter. Consequently, insert a		Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on



## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				the Coastal Environment back to the Natural hazards chapter can be included.	cross reference within the Coastal Environment chapter to this effect.			the Natural Hazards Chapter
<b>S93.002</b>	Lynley Newport	CE-R11	Support in part	Support the need to manage development within coastal hazard areas but believe all hazard provisions should be located in the Natural Hazards chapter. A cross reference in the Coastal Environment back to the Natural hazards chapter can be included.	Transfer Rule CE-R11 from the Coastal Environment chapter (rules section addressing coastal hazards) into the Natural Hazards chapter. Consequently, insert a cross reference within the Coastal Environment chapter to this effect.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter
<b>S431.045</b>	John Andrew Riddell	CE-R11	Not Stated	Not stated	Amend the 'matters of discretion' in Rule CE-R11 to refer to Rule CE-R16 instead of Rule CE-R17		Reject	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules
<b>FS332.045</b>	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules
<b>FS369.470</b>	Top Energy		Oppose	Top Energy seeks to retain rule CE-R11 as notified	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules
<b>S483.176</b>	Top Energy Limited	CE-R11	Support	Top Energy supports the permitted activity status for this activity where there is no increase in footprint for above ground infrastructure and does not direct coastal inundation. Top Energy also supports the restricted discretionary activity status for non-compliance with this rule.	Retain Rule CE-R11		Accept	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules
<b>FS345.227</b>	Ngawha Generation Limited		Support	NGL is a subsidiary of Top Energy Limited. NGL supports all submission points made by Top Energy.	Allow	Allow all of the relief sought by Top Energy Limited in its submission (S483).	Accept	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>S516.060</b>	Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland	CE-R12	Support	Ngā Tai Ora support the concept of managing vulnerable activities within hazard areas.	Retain Rule CE-R12		Accept	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules
<b>S431.046</b>	John Andrew Riddell	CE-R12	Not Stated	Not stated	Amend the 'matters of discretion' in Rule CE-R12 to refer to Rule CE-R16 instead of Rule CE-R17		Reject	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules
<b>FS332.046</b>	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules
<b>FS403.154</b>	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support in part	Te Whatu Ora seek to retain rule CE-R12.	Allow in part	Te Whatu Ora seek to retain rule CE-R12.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules
<b>S344.020</b>	Paihia Properties Holdings Corporate Trustee Limited and UP Management Ltd	CE-R12	Not Stated	CE-R12 as drafted will not enable the development of any form of new building, change of use of buildings or extension of existing buildings of appropriate size without the requirement to obtain a resource consent. This is overly restrictive and will require unnecessary resource consent applications.	Amend CE-R12 to provide new buildings and structures within urban zoned land as a permitted activity.		Reject	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules
<b>FS396.041</b>	Ed and Inge Amsler		Support	The submission seeks various changes in relation to the urban environment / coastal environment interface as well as specific provisions in the Mixed Use Zone. Additionally, the submission seeks better reflection of business land needs that should be reflected throughout the Plan.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules
<b>FS403.152</b>	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support in part	Te Whatu Ora seek to retain rule CE-R12.	Allow in part	Te Whatu Ora seek to retain rule CE-R12.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>S407.002</b>	Tapuaetahi Incorporation	CE-R12	Support in part	It is contended that a provision should be provided within the PDP which enables, as a permitted activity, the ability for people to exercise their existing use rights, where rebuilding a house 'like for like' and which result in effects which are the same or similar in character, intensity, and scale.	Amend CE-R12 to: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The building or structure is one of the following: i. above ground buildings and structures with a footprint of 10m2 or less and are not used for a vulnerable activity. ii. decks less than 30m2 and less than 1m in height. PER 2 The building or structure including any associated earthworks, does not direct coastal inundation onto other properties. PER 3 All standards of the relevant zone applying to the activity are met. <b>Exemption:A building or structure which is developed in accordance with s10 and s20 of the RMA.</b>		Reject	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules
<b>FS403.153</b>	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support in part	Te Whatu Ora seek to retain rule CE-R12.	Allow in part	Te Whatu Ora seek to retain rule CE-R12.	Accept	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules
<b>S93.003</b>	Lynley Newport	CE-R12	Support in part	Support the need to manage development within coastal hazard areas but believe all hazard provisions should be located in the Natural Hazards chapter. A cross reference in the Coastal Environment back to the Natural hazards chapter can be included.	Transfer Rule CE-R12 from the Coastal Environment chapter (rules section addressing coastal hazards) into the Natural Hazards chapter. Consequently, insert a cross reference within the Coastal Environment chapter to this effect.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter
<b>FS369.471</b>	Top Energy		Oppose	Top Energy seeks to retain rule CE-R11 as notified	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>S93.004</b>	Lynley Newport	CE-R13	Support in part	Support the need to manage development within coastal hazard areas but believe all hazard provisions should be located in the Natural Hazards chapter. A cross reference in the Coastal Environment back to the Natural hazards chapter can be included.	Transfer Rule CE-R13 from the Coastal Environment chapter (rules section addressing coastal hazards) into the Natural Hazards chapter. Consequently, insert a cross reference within the Coastal Environment chapter to this effect.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter
<b>S502.021</b>	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	CE-R13	Support in part	If you need consent for any other rule in a zone then you also breach this standard. This should be removed for this reason as it triggers unnecessary consent.	Delete PER-5 of Rule CE-R13If similar wording remains, we ask that an assessment of the district is completed to ensure that there are no special zones or lifestyle zoning which may lie outside of the Rural environment which would trigger this rule.		Accept	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules
<b>S503.019</b>	Waitangi Limited	CE-R13	Not Stated	If you need consent for any other rule in a zone then you also breach this standard. This should be removed for this reason as it triggers unnecessary consent.	Delete PER-5 of Rule CE-R13 If similar wording remains, we ask that an assessment of the district is completed to ensure that there are no special zones or lifestyle zoning which may lie outside of the Rural environment which would trigger this rule.		Accept	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules
<b>S516.061</b>	Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland	CE-R14	Support	Ngā Tai Ora support the concept of managing vulnerable activities within hazard areas.	Retain Rule CE-R14		Accept	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules
<b>S493.010</b>	William Goodfellow	CE-R14	Oppose	The submitter also considers that the activity status and standards imposed on activities within the coastal environment are unnecessarily onerous. These include imitations on setback for buildings from MHWS, and limitations over the area, height, colour and reflectivity of buildings.	Amend the provisions within the plan that impose limitations on the area of new buildings located within the coastal environment overlay be deleted.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules
<b>FS67.117</b>	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The further submitter is concerned about the potential effects on landscape and visual amenity and coastal character with the removal of all controls on height, area, colour and reflectivity of buildings as would be the outcome of this submission point,	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				whether by way of removing the overlays or by way of removing the specific controls referred to by the submitter.				
<b>FS68.114</b>	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The further submitter is concerned about the potential effects on landscape and visual amenity and coastal character with the removal of all controls on height, area, colour and reflectivity of buildings as would be the outcome of this submission point, whether by way of removing the overlays or by way of removing the specific controls referred to by the submitter.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules
<b>FS403.157</b>	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support in part	Te Whatu Ora seek to retain rule CE-R14	Allow in part	Te Whatu Ora seek to retain rule CE-R14	Accept in part	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules
<b>S496.008</b>	Philip Thornton	CE-R14	Oppose	The submitter considers that the activity status imposed on activities within the coastal environment are unnecessarily onerous. These include imitations on the height, colour and reflectivity of buildings.	Amend the provisions within the plan that impose limitations on the area of new buildings located within the coastal environment overlay be deleted.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules
<b>FS411.008</b>	Omarino Residents Association		Support	The Omarino residents association considers that these areas should be excluded from the ONL overlay and associated controls as anticipated by the subdivision consent, particularly given that the design conditions imposed by the subdivision consent render such controls nugatory.	Allow	remove the ONL overlay from all of the areas specified in Condition 9 of the subdivision consent as attached.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules
<b>FS403.159</b>	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support in part	Te Whatu Ora seek to retain rule CE-R14	Allow in part	Te Whatu Ora seek to retain rule CE-R14	Accept in part	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>S344.021</b>	Paihia Properties Holdings Corporate Trustee Limited and UP Management Ltd	CE-R14	Not Stated	CE-R14 as drafted will not enable the development of any form of new building, change of use of buildings or extension of existing buildings of appropriate size without the requirement to obtain a resource consent. This is overly restrictive and will require unnecessary resource consent applications.	Amend CE-R14 to provide new buildings and structures within urban zoned land as a permitted activity.		Reject	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules
<b>FS396.042</b>	Ed and Inge Amsler		Support	The submission seeks various changes in relation to the urban environment / coastal environment interface as well as specific provisions in the Mixed Use Zone. Additionally, the submission seeks better reflection of business land needs that should be reflected throughout the Plan.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules
<b>FS403.156</b>	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support in part	Te Whatu Ora seek to retain rule CE-R14	Allow in part	Te Whatu Ora seek to retain rule CE-R14	Accept in part	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules
<b>S93.005</b>	Lynley Newport	CE-R14	Support in part	Support the need to manage development within coastal hazard areas but believe all hazard provisions should be located in the Natural Hazards chapter. A cross reference in the Coastal Environment back to the Natural hazards chapter can be included.	Transfer Rule CE-R14 from the Coastal Environment chapter (rules section addressing coastal hazards) into the Natural Hazards chapter. Consequently, insert a cross reference within the Coastal Environment chapter to this effect.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter
<b>FS403.155</b>	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support in part	Te Whatu Ora seek to retain rule CE-R14	Allow in part	Te Whatu Ora seek to retain rule CE-R14	Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter
<b>S494.010</b>	Ian Jepson	CE-R14	Oppose	Further, the submitter considers that the activity status imposed on activities within the coastal environment are unnecessarily onerous. These include the identification of farming and forestry as discretionary activities, and	Amend the provisions within the plan that impose limitations on the area of new buildings located within the coastal environment overlay be deleted.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				imitations on the height, colour and reflectivity of buildings.				
<b>FS403.158</b>	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support in part	Te Whatu Ora seek to retain rule CE-R14	Allow in part	Te Whatu Ora seek to retain rule CE-R14	Accept in part	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules
<b>S497.008</b>	Mark John Wyborn	CE-R14	Support in part	The imposition of controls intended to manage development make the reasonable use and development of the property unfairly and unnecessarily constrained (inferred).	Amend the provisions within the plan that impose limitations on the area of new buildings located within the coastal environment overlay be deleted.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules
<b>FS403.160</b>	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support in part	Te Whatu Ora seek to retain rule CE-R14	Allow in part	Te Whatu Ora seek to retain rule CE-R14	Accept in part	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules
<b>S93.006</b>	Lynley Newport	CE-R15	Support in part	Support the need to manage development within coastal hazard areas but believe all hazard provisions should be located in the Natural Hazards chapter. A cross reference in the Coastal Environment back to the Natural hazards chapter can be included.	Transfer Rule CE-R15 from the Coastal Environment chapter (rules section addressing coastal hazards) into the Natural Hazards chapter. Consequently, insert a cross reference within the Coastal Environment chapter to this effect.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter
<b>S344.022</b>	Paihia Properties Holdings Corporate Trustee Limited and UP Management Ltd	CE-R15	Not Stated	CE-R15 as drafted will not enable the development of any form of new building, change of use of buildings or extension of existing buildings of appropriate size without the requirement to obtain a resource consent. This is overly restrictive and will require unnecessary resource consent applications.	Amend CE-R15 to provide new buildings and structures within urban zoned land as a permitted activity.		Reject	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules
<b>FS396.043</b>	Ed and Inge Amsler		Support	The submission seeks various changes in relation to the urban environment / coastal environment interface as well as specific provisions in the Mixed Use Zone. Additionally, the submission seeks better reflection of business land needs that should be reflected throughout the Plan.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>S93.007</b>	Lynley Newport	CE-R16	Support in part	Support the need to manage development within coastal hazard areas but believe all hazard provisions should be located in the Natural Hazards chapter. A cross reference in the Coastal Environment back to the Natural hazards chapter can be included.	Transfer Rule CE-R16 from the Coastal Environment chapter (rules section addressing coastal hazards) into the Natural Hazards chapter. Consequently, insert a cross reference within the Coastal Environment chapter to this effect.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter
<b>S344.023</b>	Paihia Properties Holdings Corporate Trustee Limited and UP Management Ltd	CE-R16	Not Stated	CE-R16 as drafted will not enable the development of any form of new building, change of use of buildings or extension of existing buildings of appropriate size without the requirement to obtain a resource consent. This is overly restrictive and will require unnecessary resource consent applications.	Amend CE-R16 to provide new buildings and structures within urban zoned land as a permitted activity.		Reject	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules
<b>FS396.044</b>	Ed and Inge Amsler		Support	The submission seeks various changes in relation to the urban environment / coastal environment interface as well as specific provisions in the Mixed Use Zone. Additionally, the submission seeks better reflection of business land needs that should be reflected throughout the Plan.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules
<b>S516.062</b>	Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland	CE-R17	Oppose	The provision duplicates Rule HS-R8, Ngā Tai Ora support the activity status of HS-R8.	Delete Rule CE-R17		Accept	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules
<b>S93.008</b>	Lynley Newport	CE-R17	Support in part	Support the need to manage development within coastal hazard areas but believe all hazard provisions should be located in the Natural Hazards chapter. A cross reference in the Coastal Environment back to the Natural hazards chapter can be included.	Transfer Rule CE-R17 from the Coastal Environment chapter (rules section addressing coastal hazards) into the Natural Hazards chapter. Consequently, insert a cross reference within the Coastal Environment chapter to this effect.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter



## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS403.161	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Oppose	Te Whatu Ora seek to delete this rule to avoid duplication with HZ-R8.	Disallow	Te Whatu Ora seek to delete this rule to avoid duplication with HZ-R8.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules
S502.022	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	CE-R17	Support in part	seek that the hyperlinking is checked to ensure CE-R17 is covering the right information	Amend to ensure that the hyperlinking in CE-R17 is covering the right information		Reject	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules
FS403.162	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Oppose	Te Whatu Ora seek to delete this rule to avoid duplication with HZ-R8.	Disallow	Te Whatu Ora seek to delete this rule to avoid duplication with HZ-R8.	Accept	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules
S516.063	Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland	CE-R18	Oppose	The provision duplicates Rule HS-R8, Ngā Tai Ora support the activity status of HS-R8.	Delete Rule CE-R18		Accept	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules
S93.009	Lynley Newport	CE-R18	Support in part	Support the need to manage development within coastal hazard areas but believe all hazard provisions should be located in the Natural Hazards chapter. A cross reference in the Coastal Environment back to the Natural hazards chapter can be included.	Transfer Rule CE-R18 from the Coastal Environment chapter (rules section addressing coastal hazards) into the Natural Hazards chapter. Consequently, insert a cross reference within the Coastal Environment chapter to this effect.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter
FS403.163	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Oppose	Te Whatu Ora seek to delete this rule to avoid duplication with HZ-R8.	Disallow	Te Whatu Ora seek to delete this rule to avoid duplication with HZ-R8.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules
S502.023	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	CE-R18	Oppose	CE-R18 is a copy of CE-R17	Delete CE-R18		Accept	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules
FS403.164	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Oppose	Te Whatu Ora seek to delete this rule to avoid duplication with HZ-R8.	Disallow	Te Whatu Ora seek to delete this rule to avoid duplication with HZ-R8.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules
S93.010	Lynley Newport	CE-R19	Support in part	Support the need to manage development within coastal hazard areas but believe all hazard provisions should be located in the Natural Hazards chapter. A cross reference in the Coastal Environment back to the	Transfer Rule CE-R19 from the Coastal Environment chapter (rules section addressing coastal hazards) into the Natural Hazards chapter. Consequently, insert a cross reference within the Coastal Environment chapter to this effect.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				Natural hazards chapter can be included.				
<b>S344.024</b>	Paihia Properties Holdings Corporate Trustee Limited and UP Management Ltd	CE-R19	Oppose	CE, HNCA, ONCA and Coastal Hazards are overlays in the district plan, management of land use and activities is more appropriately managed via the underlying zone. It is considered that a catch all default of discretionary activity is inappropriate and restrictive.	Delete Rule CE-R19		Reject	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules
<b>FS396.045</b>	Ed and Inge Amsler		Support	The submission seeks various changes in relation to the urban environment / coastal environment interface as well as specific provisions in the Mixed Use Zone. Additionally, the submission seeks better reflection of business land needs that should be reflected throughout the Plan.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.7 Key Issue 7: Coastal Hazards Rules
<b>S93.011</b>	Lynley Newport	CE-S4	Support in part	Support the need to manage development within coastal hazard areas but believe all hazard provisions should be located in the Natural Hazards chapter. A cross reference in the Coastal Environment back to the Natural hazards chapter can be included.	Transfer Standard CE-S4 from the Coastal Environment chapter (standards section addressing coastal hazards) into the Natural Hazards chapter. Consequently, insert a cross reference within the Coastal Environment chapter to this effect.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submission on the Natural Hazards Chapter
<b>S562.001</b>	RS Eng Ltd	CE-S4	Not Stated	Standard CE-S4 is incorrectly worded and could be misinterpreted. The standard also requires minimum floor levels which are greater than required by the building code. New buildings only require a design life of 50 years, and thus 0.5m of sea level rise. Whilst subdivisions require planning timeframes of 100 years, so the 1m sea level rise is correct.	Amend Standard CE-S4 to separate new buildings from subdivision.		Reject	Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Coastal Hazards Standards

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS348.022	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept	Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Coastal Hazards Standards
S93.012	Lynley Newport	CE-S5	Support in part	Support the need to manage development within coastal hazard areas but believe all hazard provisions should be located in the Natural Hazards chapter. A cross reference in the Coastal Environment back to the Natural hazards chapter can be included.	Transfer Standard CE-S5 from the Coastal Environment chapter (standards section addressing coastal hazards) into the Natural Hazards chapter. Consequently, insert a cross reference within the Coastal Environment chapter to this effect.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter
S168.080	Setar Thirty Six Limited	CE-S5	Oppose	As drafted, the standard may trigger the need for an engineering report for a resource consent for an activity anywhere on a site subject to a coastal hazard overlay. In most instances, the coastal hazard overlays are limited in area on a property The related rules in this section consistently refer to 'location' which limits the assessment to the location of the activity sought, relative to the overlay. The standard should also refer to location to avoid this potential interpretation	Amend standard CE-S5 as follows: Any application for a resource consent in relation to a <b>site location</b> that is potentially affected by a coastal hazard must be accompanied by a report prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced engineer that addresses the matters identified in the relevant objectives, policies, performance standards and matters of control/discretion.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Coastal Hazards Standards
S187.071	The Shooting Box Limited	CE-S5	Oppose	As drafted, the standard may trigger the need for an engineering report for a resource consent for an activity anywhere on a site subject to a coastal hazard overlay. In most instances, the coastal hazard overlays are limited in area on a property The related rules in this section consistently refer to 'location' which limits the assessment to the location of the activity sought, relative to the overlay. The standard should also refer	Amend standard CE-S5 as follows: Any application for a resource consent in relation to a <b>site location</b> that is potentially affected by a coastal hazard must be accompanied by a report prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced engineer that addresses the matters identified in the relevant		Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Coastal Hazards Standards

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				to location to avoid this potential interpretation.	objectives, policies, performance standards and matters of control/discretion.			
<b>S222.074</b>	Wendover Two Limited	CE-S5	Support in part	As drafted, the standard may trigger the need for an engineering report for a resource consent for an activity anywhere on a site subject to a coastal hazard overlay. In most instances, the coastal hazard overlays are limited in area on a property. The related rules in this section consistently refer to 'location' which limits the assessment to the location of the activity sought, relative to the overlay. The standard should also refer to location to avoid this potential interpretation.	Amend standard CE-S5 as follows: Any application for a resource consent in relation to a <b>site location</b> that is potentially affected by a coastal hazard must be accompanied by a report prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced engineer that addresses the matters identified in the relevant objectives, policies, performance standards and matters of control/discretion.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Coastal Hazards Standards
<b>S167.082</b>	Bentzen Farm Limited	CE-S5	Oppose	As drafted, the standard may trigger the need for an engineering report for a resource consent for an activity anywhere on a site subject to a coastal hazard overlay. In most instances, the coastal hazard overlays are limited in area on a property. The related rules in this section consistently refer to 'location' which limits the assessment to the location of the activity sought, relative to the overlay. The standard should also refer to location to avoid this potential interpretation.	Amend standard CE-S5 as follows: Any application for a resource consent in relation to a <b>site location</b> that is potentially affected by a coastal hazard must be accompanied by a report prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced engineer that addresses the matters identified in the relevant objectives, policies, performance standards and matters of control/discretion.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Coastal Hazards Standards
<b>FS143.35</b>	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support	The further submitter agrees with the submission point because as drafted, the standard may trigger the need for an engineering report for a resource	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Coastal Hazards Standards

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				consent for an activity anywhere on a site subject to a coastal hazard overlay (rather than just within the overlay itself).				
FS566.444	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Coastal Hazards Standards
S333.072	P S Yates Family Trust	CE-S5	Support in part	As drafted, the standard may trigger the need for an engineering report for a resource consent for an activity anywhere on a site subject to a coastal hazard overlay. In most instances, the coastal hazard overlays are limited in area on a property. The related rules in this section consistently refer to 'location' which limits the assessment to the location of the activity sought, relative to the overlay. The standard should also refer to location to avoid this potential interpretation.	Amend Standard CE-S5 as follows: <i>Any application for a resource consent in relation to a site location</i> that is potentially affected by a coastal hazard must be accompanied by a report prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced engineer that addresses the matters identified in the relevant objectives, policies, performance standards and matters of control/discretion		Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Coastal Hazards Standards
FS547.020	Heron Point Limited		Support	Support the decision sought to the extent that NH-S1 should only be triggered where a proposed activity is to occur within a portion of a site is affected by mapped natural hazard. The submitter seeks that the information requirements of NH-S1 solely apply to a resource consent application where an activity is proposed on land affected by a mapped natural hazard.	Allow	Amend	Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Coastal Hazards Standards
FS305.018	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	The rule should only be applicable where activities or development are proposed within a natural hazard area.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Coastal Hazards Standards

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>S548.004</b>	Omata Estate	CE-S5	Oppose	a site specific engineering report should be dependent on the natural and scale of a proposal and the proximity of the proposal to an area identified as being potential affected by the coastal hazard. Applying a blanket requirement to provide a site-specific engineering report for any resource consent applications for a site potentially affected by a coastal hazard would result in undue cost constraints to applicants and does not meet the requirements of s32.	delete CE-S5		Reject	Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Coastal Hazards Standards
<b>FS547.021</b>	Heron Point Limited		Support	Support the decision sought to the extent that NH-S1 should only be triggered where a proposed activity is to occur within a portion of a site is affected by mapped natural hazard. The submitter seeks that the information requirements of NH-S1 solely apply to a resource consent application where an activity is proposed on land affected by a mapped natural hazard.	Allow	Delete CE-S5	Reject	Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Coastal Hazards Standards
<b>FS332.254</b>	Russell Protection Society		Oppose	Rule CE-S5 is relevant for this coastal site.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept	Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Coastal Hazards Standards
<b>S243.100</b>	Matauri Trustee Limited	CE-S5	Oppose	As drafted, the standard may trigger the need for an engineering report for a resource consent for an activity anywhere on a site subject to a coastal hazard overlay. In most instances, the coastal hazard overlays are limited in area on a property. The related rules in this section consistently refer to 'location' which limits the assessment to the location of the activity sought, relative to the overlay. The standard should also refer to location to avoid this potential interpretation.	Amend standard CE-S5 as follows: Any application for a resource consent in relation to a <b>site location</b> that is potentially affected by a coastal hazard must be accompanied by a report prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced engineer that addresses the matters identified in the relevant		Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Coastal Hazards Standards

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					objectives, policies, performance standards and matters of control/discretion			
<b>FS570.658</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Coastal Hazards Standards
<b>FS566.672</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Coastal Hazards Standards
<b>FS569.694</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key Issue 9: Coastal Hazards Standards
<b>S282.007</b>	Chorus New Zealand Limited, Spark New Zealand Trading Limited, Spark TowerCo Limited, Vodafone New Zealand Limited	Objectives	Oppose	The current drafting of this section applies to telecommunications infrastructure. The application of natural hazard rules to telecommunications infrastructure is not supported given that telecommunications operators can make their own decisions around where it is appropriate and necessary to site cabinets given that these structures are not expected to exacerbate existing hazards. The NES-TF specifically disallows natural hazard rules in District Plans to regulated activities under NESTF Regulation 57, following a consideration of the risk profile of this type of equipment in making the regulations.	Amend the Natural Hazards section of the Plan to not apply to telecommunications infrastructure.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter
<b>S282.008</b>	Chorus New Zealand Limited, Spark New Zealand Trading	Policies	Oppose	The current drafting of this section applies to telecommunications infrastructure. The application of natural hazard rules to	Amend the Natural Hazards section of the Plan to not apply to telecommunications infrastructure.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
	Limited, Spark TowerCo Limited, Vodafone New Zealand Limited			telecommunications infrastructure is not supported given that telecommunications operators can make their own decisions around where it is appropriate and necessary to site cabinets given that these structures are not expected to exacerbate existing hazards. The NES-TF specifically disapplies natural hazard rules in District Plans to regulated activities under NESTF Regulation 57, following a consideration of the risk profile of this type of equipment in making the regulations.			the Natural Hazards Chapter
<b>S282.009</b>	Chorus New Zealand Limited, Spark New Zealand Trading Limited, Spark TowerCo Limited, Vodafone New Zealand Limited	Rules	Oppose	The current drafting of this section applies to telecommunications infrastructure. The application of natural hazard rules to telecommunications infrastructure is not supported given that telecommunications operators can make their own decisions around where it is appropriate and necessary to site cabinets given that these structures are not expected to exacerbate existing hazards. The NES-TF specifically disapplies natural hazard rules in District Plans to regulated activities under NESTF Regulation 57, following a consideration of the risk profile of this type of equipment in making the regulations.	Amend the Natural Hazards section of the Plan to not apply to telecommunications infrastructure.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter
<b>S74.005</b>	Brownie Family Trust	Coastal Erosion (Zones 1-3)	Support	Coastal erosion hazards do need to be managed to ensure long term viability of development.	Retain the Coastal Erosion (Zones 1-3) overlays as notified	Accept	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards
<b>S259.020</b>	Nicole Wooster	Coastal Erosion (Zones 1-3)	Support in part	We accept that coastal hazards exist and will change over time as sea level rises. However if any issue is	Amend coastal hazard maps as appropriate to ensure that they are correctly identifying current and future risk.	Reject	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards



## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				established with the mapping we want the coastal hazards identified on our property reviewed and amended as appropriate.			
<b>S358.038</b>	Leah Frieling	Coastal Erosion (Zones 1-3)	Oppose	<p>Change the mapping of the Coastal Erosion hazard 2 zone adjacent to 275 Foreshore Road, Ahipara (Lot 1 DP 431209) to be reflective of geology, as it is clear that different substrates erode at different rates, and also that the site contains gabion baskets that have lifted the site well above the surrounding properties, and has been established by a geotechnical engineer - PK engineering, in June 2017</p> <p>A generic approach has been taken, instead of looking at the geology of the site, and therefore if it will erode or not. The report from PK engineering specifically has considered potential erosion of the sub-strate, and it is clear that blue rock will not erode such as sand or other sedimentary rock may do so</p>	Amend the Coastal Erosion hazard 2 line adjacent to 275 Foreshore Road, Ahipara (Lot 1 DP 431209).	Reject	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards
<b>S357.031</b>	Sean Frieling	Coastal Erosion (Zones 1-3)	Oppose	<p>The coastal erosion hazard 2 line maps are not drawn and established relative to the gabion basket heights. Change the maps for the coastal erosion hazard 2 line maps to be reflective of geology, as it is clear that different substrates erode at different rates, and also that the site contains gabion baskets that have lifted the site well above the surrounding properties, and has been established by a geotechnical engineer - PK engineering, in June 2017. See submission.</p>	Amend the coastal erosion hazard 2 line where it runs past this site to reflect the PK engineering assessment that was also provided to Toby Kay at NRC when the coastal hazard mapping was done by NRC (13.6.17).	Reject	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards
<b>S547.012</b>	LJ King Limited	Coastal Erosion (Zones 1-3)	Oppose	The coastal Erosion Hazard 2 line maps are not drawn and established relative to the gabion basket heights.	Amend Coastal Erosion Zone 2 Line to be reflective of geology at 2 Panorama Lane, 4 Panorama Lane and 5 Panorama Lane,	Reject	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					Ahipara (as per engineering assessment in submission).			
<b>S541.012</b>	Elbury Holdings	Coastal Erosion (Zones 1-3)	Oppose	The coastal Erosion Hazard 2 line maps are not drawn and established relative to the gabion basket heights.	Amend Coastal Erosion Zone 2 Line to be reflective of geology at 2 Panorama Lane, 4 Panorama Lane and 5 Panorama Lane, Ahipara (as per engineering assessment in submission).		Reject	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards
<b>FS155.81</b>	Fiona King		Support	have already shown NRC that these lines are incorrect. Please correct Panarama land Ahipara	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards
<b>S519.013</b>	Elbury Holdings	Coastal Erosion (Zones 1-3)	Oppose	The coastal Erosion Hazard 2 line maps are not drawn and established relative to the gabion basket heights	Amend Coastal Erosion Zone 2 Line to be reflective of geology at 2 Panorama Lane, 4 Panorama Lane and 5 Panorama Lane, Ahipara (as per engineering assessment in submission).		Reject	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards
<b>FS155.82</b>	Fiona King		Support	The gabion baskets are not the level . It is the rock base that sits behind them and further up the hill. Notice the land contours rise from the beach front up to the Panarama road entrance and is blue rock that is the base there. Engineer reported this already.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards
<b>S485.013</b>	Elbury Holdings	Coastal Erosion (Zones 1-3)	Oppose	The coastal Erosion Hazard 2 line maps are not drawn and established relative to the gabion basket heights.	Amend Coastal Erosion Zone 2 Line to be reflective of geology at 2 Panorama Lane, 4 Panorama Lane and 5 Panorama Lane, Ahipara (as per engineering assessment in submission).		Reject	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards
<b>FS155.83</b>	Fiona King		Oppose	see reasons attached as above and in the original report from the engineer that was attached to the submission .	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards
<b>S472.039</b>	Michael Foy	Coastal Erosion (Zones 1-3)	Oppose	A generic approach has been taken, instead of looking at the geology of the site, and therefore if it will erode or not. The report from PK engineering specifically has considered potential erosion of the sub-strate, and it is clear that blue rock will not erode such as	amend coastal erosion hazard 2 line maps for Gabion Basket heights, 275 Foreshore road , Ahipara.		Reject	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				sand or other sedimentary rock may do so. evidence by way of letter.				
FS258.8	logan king		Support		Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards
FS259.12	Leah Frieling		Support		Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards
S543.012	LJ King Limited	Coastal Erosion (Zones 1-3)	Oppose	The coastal Erosion Hazard 2 line maps are not drawn and established relative to the gabion basket heights	Amend Coastal Erosion Zone 2 Line to be reflective of geology at 2 Panorama Lane, 4 Panorama Lane and 5 Panorama Lane, Ahipara (as per engineering assessment in submission).		Reject	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards
FS259.2	Leah Frieling		Support		Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards
FS566.2173	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards
S464.012	LJ King Ltd	Coastal Erosion (Zones 1-3)	Oppose	A generic approach has been taken, instead of looking at the geology of the site, and therefore if it will erode or not. A report from PK engineering specifically has considered potential erosion of the sub-strate, and it is clear that blue rock will not erode such as sand or other sedimentary rock may do so.	Amend the Coastal Erosion Zone 2 line as it applies to 2, 4 and 5 Panorama Lane, Ahipara to reflect the geology of the area.		Reject	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards
FS566.1557	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards
S74.049	Brownie Family Trust	Coastal Flood (Zones 1-3) : 50 Year Scenario)	Support	Coastal hazards do need to be managed to ensure long term viability of development.	Retain the Coastal Flood (Zones 1-3) overlays as notified		Accept	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS323.5	Nicole Wooster		Support in part	Not all coastal hazards will have been identified correctly in the plan, and there should be scope for landowners to demonstrate their property is not affected by a hazard or the scale of hazard identified.	Disallow in part		Reject	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards
S486.097	Te Rūnanga o Whaingaroa	Coastal Flood (Zones 1-3) : 50 Year Scenario)	Oppose	All flood risk maps included in the PDP were created at a scale of 1:250,000. This means there is insufficient accuracy to identify at-risk areas of an individual land parcel. This will place heavy financial burdens on tāngata whenua to gain expert analysis of each site and case by case. It would be more efficient for the Council to undertake these assessments alongside tāngata whenua.	Amend the planning maps to Improve the accuracy of all flood risk maps by surveying and ground truthing the at-risk areas before the plan becomes operative in collaboration with tāngata whenua.		Reject	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards
FS405.092	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the requested amendments sought in this submission point as it is considered that flood risk would be more efficiently managed if it was adequately mapped and clearly identified.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards
FS361.075	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the requested amendments sought in this submission point as it is considered that flood risk would be more efficiently managed if it was adequately mapped and clearly identified.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards
S486.098	Te Rūnanga o Whaingaroa	River Flood Hazard Zone (10 Year ARI Event)	Oppose	All flood risk maps included in the PDP were created at a scale of 1:250,000. This means there is insufficient accuracy to identify at-risk areas of an individual land parcel. This will place heavy financial burdens on tāngata whenua to gain expert analysis of each	Amend the planning maps to Improve the accuracy of all flood risk maps by surveying and ground truthing the at-risk areas before the plan becomes operative in collaboration with tāngata whenua.		Reject	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				site and case by case. It would be more efficient for the Council to undertake these assessments alongside tāngata whenua.				
<b>S390.084</b>	Te Runanga o Ngai Takoto Trust	River Flood Hazard Zone (10 Year ARI Event)	Oppose	The submitter opposes all flood risk maps included in the PDP were created at a scale of 1:250,000. This means there is insufficient accuracy to identify at-risk areas of an individual land parcel. This will place heavy financial burdens on tāngata whenua to gain expert analysis of each site and case by case. It would be more efficient for the Council to undertake these assessments alongside tāngata whenua.	Improve the accuracy of all flood risk maps by surveying and ground truthing the at-risk areas before the plan becomes operative in collaboration with tāngata whenua.		Reject	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards
<b>S498.085</b>	Te Rūnanga Ā Iwi O Ngapuhi	River Flood Hazard Zone (10 Year ARI Event)	Oppose	The submitter opposes all flood risk maps included in the PDP were created at a scale of 1:250,000. This means there is insufficient accuracy to identify at-risk areas of an individual land parcel. This will place heavy financial burdens on tāngata whenua to gain expert analysis of each site and case by case. It would be more efficient for the Council to undertake these assessments alongside tāngata whenua.	Improve the accuracy of all flood risk maps by surveying and ground truthing the at-risk areas before the plan becomes operative in collaboration with tāngata whenua.		Reject	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards
<b>FS151.132</b>	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards
<b>FS23.253</b>	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	It is important that provisions are consistent with Treaty principles and recognise and provide for Māori interests, including (but not limited to) appropriate economic development of their land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Reject	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards
<b>S561.001</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	River Flood Hazard Zone (10 Year ARI Event)	Support in part	Kāinga Ora seek that River Flood Hazard Area maps are removed from the FNPDP and placed in a non-	Delete all River Flood Hazard Area maps from the FNPDP and placed in a non-statutory layer available via a GIS viewer.		Reject	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				statutory layer available via a GIS viewer. This is a consistent approach to identify such hazards countrywide and provides for regular updates to hazard information without the requirement to go through Plan Changes to update the planning maps. At the same time, further investigation needs to be carried out into flood risk particularly given the significant flooding extent experienced in parts of the District. This review should address the depth of flood waters, velocity, timing of flooding to identify locations of high risk and low risk and amend zoning in those locations accordingly.				
FS32.055	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	<p>The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes.</p> <p>The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts.</p> <p>The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change</p>	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.				
<b>FS23.273</b>	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Reject	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards
<b>FS47.015</b>	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards
<b>FS348.088</b>	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards
<b>S65.005</b>	Imerys Performance Minerals Asia Pacific	River Flood Hazard Zone (10 Year ARI Event)	Oppose	The Natural Hazard Maps seem to have, in error, covered an existing operational clay dam within the Landholdings. This is detailed below It is clear that this is an operational dam on the Landholdings and it	delete river flood hazard zone (10 year ARI event ) from Matauri Bay Road - ROT NA18D/1020 (Lot 1 DP 62019 ); - ROT NA31B/294 ( Pt Lot 1 DP 54194); - ROT NA93D/602( Pt Lot 1 DP 50232 ) [ In part ] ;		Accept	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				is unclear how this is implicated by a River Flood Hazard event. The overlay should be removed.	- ROT NA15D/1478 (Pt Lot 5 DP 50235 ) [ In part ]; - ROT 501460 ( Mahimahi E 5 )			
<b>FS346.811</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	Forest & Bird agrees that there is some uncertainty created by the use of overlay vs zoning, as set out in paragraph 8 of its original submission. However, Forest & Bird opposes any relaxation of the rules/provisions relating to mineral extraction activities, particularly where that would lessen the protection afforded to areas of indigenous biodiversity, natural character or outstanding natural landscapes. Forest & Bird also opposes the extension of the MEO.	Disallow	Disallow in part the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards
<b>S259.002</b>	Nicole Wooster	River Flood Hazard Zone (100 Year ARI Event)	Oppose	The flood hazard maps incorrectly identify a river flood hazard next to the submitter's house that was built in 1970s and at most this is an overland flow path in heavy rain which is very shallow and disappears immediately. The property has been in the family since 1902 and is not affected by river flooding. The mapping identifies much larger areas of flooding than what actually occurs. It is over representing the flood areas. The orchard areas do not flood for example, nor does much of the farmland due to the drainage networks in place even in extreme weather events.	Amend river flood hazards maps in consultation with submitter to correct and take into account existing drainage and other flood mitigation infrastructure.		Reject	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards
<b>S486.099</b>	Te Rūnanga o Whaingaroa	River Flood Hazard Zone (100 Year ARI Event)	Oppose	All flood risk maps included in the PDP were created at a scale of 1:250,000. This means there is insufficient accuracy to identify at-risk areas of an individual land parcel. This will place heavy financial burdens on tāngata whenua to gain expert analysis of each site and case by case. It would be more efficient for the Council to	Amend the planning maps to Improve the accuracy of all flood risk maps by surveying and ground truthing the at-risk areas before the plan becomes operative in collaboration with tāngata whenua.		Reject	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards



## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				undertake these assessments alongside tāngata whenua.				
<b>S554.050</b>	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited	River Flood Hazard Zone (100 Year ARI Event)	Oppose	<p>Flood modelling by Northland Regional Council identifies the Site is subject to a flood hazard, as is surrounding land. In support of the Proposal, KFO commissioned assessments to determine the maximum area of land on the Site needed and the feasibility of engineered solutions to manage the flood hazard.</p> <p>The Proposal proposes a floodway to convey floodwaters and mitigate the impact of flood hazard outside the site. The alignment of this floodway generally follows the alignment of the existing overland flow path once it has collected floodwaters that spilled across SH10. The proposed floodway is defined spatially using an Overlay. The Overlay relates to rules in the proposed Precinct that will require the land area for flood hazard management to be defined and secured alongside the first development consent on the land and ahead of any building.</p>	Delete the River Flood Hazard Zone Overlay (100 Year ARI Event) and apply the overlay in Figure 3 of the Section 32 Report, based on the site-specific flood hazard assessment prepared in support of the Structure Plan and Precinct.		Reject	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards
<b>FS32.053</b>	Jeff Kemp		Support in part	<p>The submitter supports the overall intent and purpose of the original submission as it is the only viable and practical option to enable planned and coordinated development in and around Kerikeri and the Waipapa area.</p> <p>The submitter notes that the documentation on proposed traffic movements is unclear. The original submission has not provided details on potential traffic movements and intersections for Waitotara Dive and Waipapa Road and how these might link to State Highway 10. For example, it is unclear if the new link from State</p>	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to consideration of traffic movements, flood mitigation measures and amending the zoning as depicted in the original submission.	Reject	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>Highway 10 through to the Kerikeri Town Centre is going to be a primary route and the link through to Waipapa Road a secondary route.</p> <p>The submitter notes it is unclear if the proposed flood mitigation measures will increase or reduce flooding along Waitotara Drive. The submitter also supports the proposed zoning as depicted within the original submission is an efficient use of land.</p>				
<b>FS389.056</b>	Smartlife Trust		Oppose	All of submission S554 in relation to the proposed Structure Plan for the landholding. In particular, the documents / plans which refer to a future access point through the Further Submitters land	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards
<b>S561.002</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	River Flood Hazard Zone (100 Year ARI Event)	Support in part	Kāinga Ora seek that River Flood Hazard Area maps are removed from the FNPDP and placed in a non-statutory layer available via a GIS viewer. This is a consistent approach to identify such hazards countrywide and provides for regular updates to hazard information without the requirement to go through Plan Changes to update the planning maps. At the same time, further investigation needs to be carried out into flood risk particularly given the significant flooding extent experienced in parts of the District. This review should address the depth of flood waters, velocity, timing of flooding to identify locations of high risk and low risk and amend zoning in those locations accordingly.	Delete all River Flood Hazard Area maps from the FNPDP and placed in a non-statutory layer available via a GIS viewer.		Reject	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards
<b>FS32.056</b>	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	The original submission seeks to amend the FNDP in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes.</p> <p>The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts.</p> <p>The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.</p>				
<b>FS23.274</b>	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Reject	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards
<b>FS47.016</b>	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document				
<b>FS348.089</b>	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards
<b>S65.006</b>	Imerys Performance Minerals Asia Pacific	River Flood Hazard Zone (100 Year ARI Event)	Oppose	The Natural Hazard Maps seem to have, in error, covered an existing operational clay dam within the Landholdings. This is detailed below It is clear that this is an operational dam on the Landholdings and it is unclear how this is implicated by a River Flood Hazard event. The overlay should be removed	delete river flood hazard zone (100 year ARI event ) from Matauri Bay Road - ROT NA18D/1020 (Lot 1 DP 62019 ); - ROT NA31B/294 ( Pt Lot 1 DP 54194); - ROT NA93D/602( Pt Lot 1 DP 50232 ) [ In part ] ; - ROT NA15D/1478 (Pt Lot 5 DP 50235 ) [ In part ] ; - ROT 501460 ( Mahimahi E 5 )		Accept	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards
<b>FS346.812</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	Forest & Bird agrees that there is some uncertainty created by the use of overlay vs zoning, as set out in paragraph 8 of its original submission. However, Forest & Bird opposes any relaxation of the rules/provisions relating to mineral extraction activities, particularly where that would lessen the protection afforded to areas of indigenous biodiversity, natural character or outstanding natural landscapes. Forest & Bird also opposes the extension of the MEO.	Disallow	Disallow in part the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>S428.006</b>	Kapiro Residents Association	General / Miscellaneous	Support in part	A pop-out window in the PDP map, entitled News Feed - How to use the Eplan, points out that the coastal and flooding hazard maps in the draft plan are out of date, and asks users to check the updated NRC Natural Hazards Maps on NRC website. However, the sections of the PDP that refer to flooding and natural hazards do not provide the above warning to users. As a result, people may use out-of-date mapping information. The PDP section should refer specifically to the most recent NRC Natural Hazards maps, and PDP maps should be updated regularly, as soon as possible.	Amend PDP to apply the <i>precautionary approach</i> with regard to mapped inland flood and coastal hazards, areas to take account of longer-term changes expected from climate change, as well as the limitations in mapping.	Reject	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter
<b>S359.013</b>	Northland Regional Council	General / Miscellaneous	Support in part	Understand a constraints mapping approach has been undertaken to provide underlying guidance as to which are the most appropriate zonings across the district, by excluding those areas where more intensive development and subdivision should be restricted due to constraints such as highly versatile soils, flood and coastal hazards, ONLs and ONFs, historic/cultural heritage sites and areas. The proposed maps appear to rezone a number of areas to provide greater development intensity in areas at risk from natural hazards or that are unserved (e.g. lack three waters infrastructure). Do not support further intensification in flood plains given storm/flood events are predicted to intensify with climate change. Enabling further development in areas prone to flooding is at odds with direction in the RPS Policy 7.1.2 and Method 7.1.7 It appears that some areas with	Amend the planning maps to ensure that areas prone to natural hazards are not zoned for intensification.	Defer consideration until Hearing 15D	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				potential flood hazards allow for intensive development. Applying a hazard overlay does not fully address this issue as the underlying zoning can create a development expectation. This is of particular concern for industrial zones with the potential for hazardous chemical storage, but is also relevant to sensitive activities such as residential development, education facilities, visitor accommodation etc.				
<b>FS25.079</b>	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Support	Greenfield development is a more appropriate and more cost-effective way of meeting housing demands. Retrofitting networks to service infill development can be problematic and costly, particularly where existing development has already established infrastructure.	Allow	Allow original submission to the extent that hazard prone areas are correctly identified and mapped and that there are appropriate consent triggers that enable more detailed assessment in appropriate circumstances.	Defer consideration until Hearing 15D	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter
<b>FS25.136</b>	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Support	Supports the intention of managing zoning to avoid natural hazard risks, subject to appropriate identification of areas at risk and consideration of whether risk can be appropriately managed in other ways.	Allow	Allow the original submission, subject to appropriate wording.	Defer consideration until Hearing 15D	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter
<b>FS325.053</b>	Turnstone Trust Limited		Support	TT further submits that greenfield development is a more appropriate and more cost-effective way of meeting housing demands. Retrofitting networks to service infill development can be problematic and costly, particularly where existing development has already established infrastructure.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Defer consideration until Hearing 15D	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter
<b>FS325.081</b>	Turnstone Trust Limited		Support	TT supports the intention of managing zoning to avoid natural hazard risks, subject to appropriate identification of areas at risk and consideration of	Allow	Allow the original submission, subject to appropriate wording and mapping.	Defer consideration until Hearing 15D	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				whether risk can be appropriately managed in other ways.				
<b>FS243.208</b>	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose	Kāinga Ora original submission sought that further investigation is carried out into flood risk particularly given the significant flooding extent experienced in parts of the district. This review should address the depth of flood waters, velocity, timing of flooding to identify locations of high risk and low risk and amend zoning in those locations accordingly. Where the natural hazard review indicates high risk, then the NRC submission point is agreed with. However, until that time, intensification should be enabled in key locations.	Disallow	Amend the planning maps to ensure that areas prone to natural hazards are not zoned for intensification.	Defer consideration until Hearing 15D	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter
<b>FS570.1049</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Defer consideration until Hearing 15D	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter
<b>FS346.474</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS and Part 2 of the RMA and the NPS IB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission	Allow	Allow the original submission	Defer consideration until Hearing 15D	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter
<b>FS566.1063</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Defer consideration until Hearing 15D	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter
<b>FS569.1085</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Defer consideration until Hearing 15D	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>S250.030</b>	Willowridge Developments Limited	General / Miscellaneous	Support	The definition proposed to identify and manage Land Susceptible to Land Instability is complex. It is considered that this risk would be more efficiently managed if it was mapped and clearly identified, ensuring consistent application of the definition and management of the hazard.	Insert map of land instability as a non statutory information layer showing areas of low, medium and high instability.		Reject	Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: Definitions
<b>FS570.716</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: Definitions
<b>FS566.730</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: Definitions
<b>FS569.752</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.12 Key Issue 12: Definitions
<b>S443.006</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust	General / Miscellaneous	Support in part	A pop-out window in the PDP map, entitled News Feed - How to use the Eplan, points out that the coastal and flooding hazard maps in the draft plan are out of date, and asks users to check the updated NRC Natural Hazards Maps on NRC website. However, the sections of the PDP that refer to flooding and natural hazards do not provide the above warning to users. As a result, people may use out-of-date mapping information. The PDP section should refer specifically to the most recent NRC Natural Hazards maps, and PDP maps should be updated regularly, as soon as possible.	Amend PDP to apply the <i>precautionary approach</i> with regard to mapped inland flood and coastal hazards, areas to take account of longer-term changes expected from climate change, as well as the limitations in mapping.		Reject	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter
<b>FS569.1751</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on



## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
								the Natural Hazards Chapter
<b>FS570.1731</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: General Submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter
<b>S588.001</b>	WALTER (Wally) HICKS	Coastal Flood Hazard - Te Werahi Beach	Support	The Coastal flood hazard mapping (inferred) acknowledges Climate Change, Sea-Level Rise and Weather Event Emergencies	Retain coastal flood hazard mapping layer as notified for Plan Variation 1		Accept	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards
<b>S588.002</b>	WALTER (Wally) HICKS	Coastal Flood Hazard - Kokota	Support	The coastal flood hazard mapping acknowledges Climate Change, Sea Level Rise and Weather Event Emergencies	Retain coastal flood hazard mapping layer as notified for Plan Variation 1		Accept	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards
<b>S588.003</b>	WALTER (Wally) HICKS	Coastal Flood Hazard - Rangaunu Harbour and surrounding areas	Support	The coastal flood hazard mapping acknowledges Climate Change, Sea Level Rise and Weather Event Emergencies	Retain coastal flood hazard mapping layer as notified for Plan Variation 1		Accept	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards
<b>S591.001</b>	Tristan Williams	Coastal Flood Hazard - Rangaunu Harbour and surrounding areas	Oppose	Submitter opposes changes because they consider there is no context or explanation of what the change is or why, therefore rejects any changes without prior understanding and agreement. Submitter notes that Council doesn't own the land and as landowner they provide no authority to unexplained changes.	Delete flood hazard mapping layer from land at 3 Matarau Road, Awanui (inferred). Reject all proposed changes in Plan Variation 1 relating to this property without an understanding of the ramifications.		Reject	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards
<b>S594.001</b>	David Travers	Coastal Flood Hazard - Rangaunu Harbour and surrounding areas	Oppose	The Coastal Flood layer should be removed from the plan as there is a paper road around the bottom of 23 Ronas Place, therefore flood hazards (inferred) should not affect the property at all.	Delete the Coastal Flood Hazard Layer from the property at 23 Ronas Place, Kaingaroa.		Reject	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards
<b>S599.001</b>	ZOE Maginn	Coastal Flood Hazard - Rangaunu Harbour and surrounding areas	Oppose	These zones have been modelled using 'extremes' and may not be 'likely' effects, as required in New Zealand Law.	Delete (or do not update) the Coastal Flood Hazard Zone/Layer and River Flood Hazard Zone/Layers at Rangaunu Harbour To amend the Coastal Flood Hazard		Reject	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>The hazard maps and zones must remain correct and current. This can only be done by monitoring and reviewing their accuracy in line with real data and events. The models may be shown to be inaccurate when compared to actual data, and therefore irrelevant. Future effects of this plan, and decisions based on it, could be totally wrong if based on old modelling and data.</p> <p>The hazard maps and zones must be accurate for each property, rather than applied in a blanket fashion as they have far reaching consequences for each individual property.</p> <p>We are concerned that these hazard layers are based on predicted and modelled scenarios. We do not believe that these scenarios are backed up by actual evidence of inundation and sea level rise on the ground. Has there been a detailed verification of the modelled scenarios using historical information from the area?</p> <p>The assumptions on which the modelling and the coastal hazard assessments are based must be based on likely effect of climate change (as required by NZ law) and not on unlikely or improbable scenarios.</p> <p>We are aware of the community on the Kapiti Coast that have recently engaged their own Coastal Hazard assessment which has found significant issues in the work done by the Councils consultant (in this instance Jacobs). It found that basing</p>	<p>Zone/Layer and River Flood Hazard Zone/Layer on land at 409A Rangiputa Road, Karikari Peninsula.</p> <p>To review actual flooding incidences and sea levels (real data), and compare them to the modelled data.</p> <p>To amend models and hazard zones based on actual data and events, in a structured and periodic manner. This may be yearly, for example. So that hazard zones remain relevant and current.</p> <p>To review modelling accuracy to ensure based on likely scenarios (and not extreme or unlikely scenarios) - as required by New Zealand law.</p>		

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>their assumptions on MFE guidelines resulted in improbable and even implausible scenarios.</p> <p>Council must ensure that work done by consultants and the underlying assumptions do not fall significantly short as they have in the case of Kapiti District Council's consultant's work, before new hazard layers are included in the Plan.</p> <p>We are extremely concerned that the Coastal Hazard Layers you are proposing to add will have significant implications on property LIMs, values, uses, ability to insure and to secure loans for properties. This being the case we believe it is absolutely essential that these maps are based on actual and probable scenarios not on extreme or improbable scenarios.</p> <p>The coastal flood hazard and river flood hazard layers cover approximately 90% of our property, which may make it impossible to build on the property. We should have the right to build on our property, and the council may make it impossible to do that by imposing these hazard zones. I don't believe the council should be able to potentially remove that right based on modelling using extreme scenarios that are imposed and not monitored. We have owned the property for over 13 years, and there has been no major flooding that reflects the hazard maps in any way. The previous owner has confirmed there was no flooding in the previous 27 years that his family owned it. That is no flooding that reflects the hazard maps in any way in the last 40</p>			

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				years.  We therefore strongly object to these Coastal Hazard Maps being added, unless they are reviewed, corrected and applied accurately based on real data, that is reviewed and updated.			
<b>S604.001</b>	Rangiputa Community Incorporated	Coastal Flood Hazard - Rangaunu Harbour and surrounding areas	Oppose	We are concerned about Plan Variation 1 and the addition of the Coastal Flood Hazard layers specifically in relation to Rangaunu Harbour and surrounding areas, particularly Karikari Peninsula. We are concerned that these hazard layers are based on predicted and modelled scenarios and do not believe they are backed up by actual evidence of inundation and sea level rise on the ground. This being the case we believe it is absolutely essential that these maps are based on actual and probable scenarios not on improbable scenarios. We are concerned the Coastal Hazard Layers will have significant implications on people LIMs, their property values and uses and abilities to insure and secure loans for their properties.	Delete or amend coastal flood hazard layer in relation to Rangaunu Harbour until Council has gone through a thorough process including (1) Calibrating scenarios against actual historical evidence of sea level rise in the area (2) Taking the learning from the Kapiti situation and applying these, and (3) Working with the affected community and determining exactly the impacts on individuals affected.	Reject	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards
<b>S605.001</b>	Elbury Holdings, LJ King, Fiona King, LJ King LTD, West Coast Farms, Leah Frieling	Coastal Flood Hazard - Rangaunu Harbour and surrounding areas	Oppose	Maps are inaccurate, inconsistent and too old. Inundate model only of Rangaunu Harbour and no maps for Taipa or other large rivers. No work has been done on other river catchments to date and only using LIDAR.	Amend mapping and geotech to improve accuracy before labeling peoples properties at risk if they are not (inferred).	Reject	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards
<b>S605.003</b>	Elbury Holdings, LJ King, Fiona King, LJ King LTD, West	Coastal Flood Hazard - Rangaunu Harbour and surrounding areas	Oppose	189 State highway 1 is higher than the Awanui main street which isn't within the flood zone mapping, therefore the property shouldn't be within the flood zone. (Inferred)	Delete the coastal flood hazard layers from 189 State highway 1 Awanui (Inferred).	Reject	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
	Coast Farms, Leah Frieling						
<b>S605.004</b>	Elbury Holdings, LJ King, Fiona King, LJ King LTD, West Coast Farms, Leah Frieling	Coastal Flood Hazard - Rangaunu Harbour and surrounding areas	Oppose	It appears the coastal hazards were prepared expecting all rivers from the Ranganunu Harbour to rise without consideration for the stopping banking done by NRC recently. The maps are too old and do not take account of the new work completed.	Amend maps to account for new buildings sites, work completed and the stopping banks done by NRC.	Reject	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards
<b>S605.005</b>	Elbury Holdings, LJ King, Fiona King, LJ King LTD, West Coast Farms, Leah Frieling	Coastal Flood Hazard - Rangaunu Harbour and surrounding areas	Oppose	The Whangatane spillway - Kumi Road/Pairatahi river that is below state highway 10 does not show flooding in this area, only coastal flood hazard.	Amend the maps at Whangatane spillway to show flooding in this area. (inferred)	Reject	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards
<b>S605.006</b>	Elbury Holdings, LJ King, Fiona King, LJ King LTD, West Coast Farms, Leah Frieling	Coastal Flood Hazard - Rangaunu Harbour and surrounding areas	Oppose	It appears that no consideration has been given to the Kaitia drainage scheme channels and drains rated for by FNDC, or the improvements they have had on drainage. Please correct in the modelling.	Amend the flood hazard modeling to reflect the drainage work. (Inferred)	Reject	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards
<b>S588.004</b>	WALTER (Wally) HICKS	Coastal Flood Hazard - Karikari Peninsula	Support	The coastal flood hazard mapping acknowledges Climate Change, Sea Level Rise and Weather Event Emergencies. Supports Future Coastal Retreat provisions.	Retain coastal flood hazard layer as notified for Plan Variation 1	Accept	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards
<b>S601.001</b>	Kingheim Limited	Coastal Flood Hazard - Karikari Peninsula	Oppose	There is an incompatibility between the modelling plans being used (NRC maps) and the written words of the Coastal Hazard policy NH-P7, which considers the 1% Annual Exceedance Probability flood hazard plus 1m of sea level rise. If the intent is for NH-P7 to relate the 1% AEP storm flood level plus the stated 1m, then there is no relevance to defining anything other than the Coastal Flood Hazard Zone 0 in the River Flooding Hazards section, since all other flood elevations cannot	Amend the coastal hazard flood mapping to include Coastal Flood Hazard Zone 0 for design referencing and Coastal Flood Hazard Zone 1 & Coastal Flood Hazard Zone 2 mapping for information only. Coastal Flood Hazard Zone 3 should not be included or referenced in the plan variation or Proposed District Plan (inferred)	Reject	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				be related to the policy requirement. (inferred)			
<b>S605.009</b>	Elbury Holdings, LJ King, Fiona King, LJ King LTD, West Coast Farms, Leah Frieling	Coastal Flood Hazard - Karikari Peninsula	Oppose	Does the Pukehe hill lakes discharge sometimes under the inland road out to Whatwhiwi beach in high water table levels. It is not showing on the maps. I believe Coastal inundation of Pukehe will probably cross the road and flow ot onto Tokerau Beach.	Insert the coastal flood layers for the Whatwhiwi areas. (inferred)	Reject	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards
<b>S588.005</b>	WALTER (Wally) HICKS	Coastal Flood Hazard - Ngārui-o-te-Marangai Beach	Support	The coastal flood hazard mapping acknowledges future Climate Change, Sea Level Rise and Weather Event Emergencies	Retain coastal flood hazard layer as notified for Plan Variation 1	Accept	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards
<b>S588.006</b>	WALTER (Wally) HICKS	Coastal Flood Hazard - Areas of Te Puna Inlet	Support	Supports future Climate Change, Sea Level Rise and Weather Event Emergencies actions	Retain coastal flood hazard layer as notified for Plan Variation 1	Accept	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards
<b>S598.001</b>	Karen Barrow	Coastal Flood Hazard - Areas of Te Puna Inlet	Oppose	Submitter requests that 213 McKenzie Road, Kerikeri is excluded from the Coastal Flood Hazard Layer. The reasons are that I have lived at 213 McKenzie Road, Kerikeri for approximately 50 years. There has been no noticeable change to the high tide mark during this period. The property has never flooded. The submitter notes that the area of the property identified with the Coastal Hazard layer is minor and they would be able to take steps to mitigate/reduce any affect to the area.	Delete the Coastal Flood Hazard layer from the land at 213 McKenzie Road, Kerikeri.	Reject	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards
<b>S588.007</b>	WALTER (Wally) HICKS	Coastal Flood Hazard - Kerikeri Inlet	Support	Supports future actions on Climate Change, Sea Level Rise & Weather Event Emergencies	Retain coastal flood hazard layer as notified for Plan Variation 1	Accept	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards
<b>S589.001</b>	Kathy Davies	Coastal Flood Hazard - Kerikeri Inlet	Oppose	The various LINZ and NRC maps used to create the Coastal Hazard maps are not correct for this area of the Hauparua Inlet - possibly why the area is not shown in the Provisions selection.	Delete the proposed new coastal hazard maps (notified as part of Plan Variation 1) or correct them for the property at 22 Quinces Landing, located at the end of Hauparua Inlet.	Reject	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>The LINZ maps currently show a lot of our existing property as 'hydro', which is not correct. This has likely been used as a base starting point.</p> <p>The NRC hazard maps (I assume used to generate the updated FNDC maps) are incorrect as very inconsistent with the NZ Searise data and maps - which I assume are a base point for all Councils. If NZ Searise is not the base data set for Coastal Hazard modelling could you please let me know what data has been used?</p> <p>The new maps show all land up to 2m above sea level as being in Coastal Hazard in the 50 year plan. The NZ Searise data shows the median estimate of sea level rise at .39m for this property by 2070 and this includes the vertical land level change estimated. At 100 years (2120) the NZ Searise shows the rise at this property at .82m</p> <p>The 'sea' / water at this end of the estuary is protected by an extremely narrow entry ('the narrows') to the basin of water. Mountains rising steeply to 50m elevation on Wharau Rd surround the basin providing shelter from wind. Hence it is very protected and there is no 'wave action' to be considered. The flood zone should equate to the sea level rise estimates along with vertical land level changes which equal .39m at 2070 and .82m at 2120 on the NZ Searise site.</p> <p>Why then do the maps show hazard zones up to and over 2m? It is</p>			

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>obviously very incorrect to map coastal hazard to this level at 50 years and still actually incorrect at the 100 year projection.</p> <p>I note that the current flood zone assessment on the NRC maps shows some existing flooding hazard where the current district plan shows none. I can confirm that during our ownership we have never seen flooding on the land and this includes time during cyclone Gabriel when winds were at a maximum and a tree was downed on our road. Also no flooding during the tsunami warning a few years ago that saw the evacuation of the area and in which social media notes from people on the Kerikeri Inlet that they noticed high water levels. We noticed none as we watched on our cameras from afar.</p> <p>This submission is in relation to Variation 1 of PDP which says changes are minor and insignificant. The proposed changes are not at all insignificant to this property.</p>			
<b>S595.001</b>	Tim Brandon	Coastal Flood Hazard - Kerikeri Inlet	Oppose	<p>To oppose the new plan variation 1 that proposes to zone the Hauparua Lane area as a flood plain, as it clearly is NOT. There are no rivers in the vicinity and having lived here for 21 years and have experienced significant rainfall over short periods of time, there has never been a flood! There has never been a flood, even in severe downpours.</p> <p>I strongly object to this zone proposal. Requests to speak to the local residents and hear all involved, and re think this decision.</p>	Delete the coastal flood hazard layer from the Hauparua Lane area (inferred).	Reject	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards



## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
<b>S602.001</b>	Hamish Starr	Coastal Flood Hazard - Kerikeri Inlet	Oppose	There has been no significant increase in the sea level nor has flooding occurred of any significance at 351 Wharau Road. The property is in an inlet and isn't exposed to extreme storm impact. The layers are exaggerated and should be revised (inferred)	Significantly reduce proposed coastal flood hazard layers, including deleting the coastal flood hazard layers from land at 351 Wharau Road, Kerikeri.	Reject	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards
<b>S603.001</b>	Maria and David Manning	Coastal Flood Hazard - Kerikeri Inlet	Support	To provide information of our experience of living on the coast at 427 Wharau Road for 70 years including weather events, at Wharau Beach (explained on Page 3 of original submission)	Support whatever is considered appropriate by council. (inferred)	Accept in part	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards
<b>S588.008</b>	WALTER (Wally) HICKS	Coastal Flood Hazard - East of Cape Brett to Owhai Bay	Support	Supports future actions on Climate Change, Sea Level Rise and Weather Event Emergencies	Retain coastal flood hazard layer as notified for Plan Variation 1	Accept	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards
<b>S588.009</b>	WALTER (Wally) HICKS	Coastal Flood Hazard - Rangiora to Motukaraka Point	Support	Supports future actions on Climate Change, Sea Level Rise and Weather Event Emergencies	Retain coastal flood hazard layer as notified for Plan Variation 1	Accept	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards
<b>S588.010</b>	WALTER (Wally) HICKS	Coastal Flood Hazard - Rāwene	Support	Supports future actions on Climate Change, Sea Level Rise and Weather Event Emergencies	Retain coastal flood hazard layer as notified for Plan Variation 1	Accept	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards
<b>S588.011</b>	WALTER (Wally) HICKS	Coastal Flood Hazard - Waima River and Waipoua River.	Support	Supports future actions on Climate Change, Sea Level Rise and Weather Event Emergencies	Retain coastal flood hazard layer as notified for Plan Variation 1	Accept	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards
<b>S140.002</b>	Mark and Emma Klinac	Planning maps – River Flood Hazard Zone (100 Year ARI Event)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the zoning of Lot 2 DP 321759 & Lot 3 DP 321759 (1/2 share); and Lot 1 DP 321759 & Lot 3 DP 321759 (1/2 share) as Flood Hazard (10 Year ARI Event & 100 Year ARI Event) Zone as the site has only been subjected to flooding on one occasion, during Cyclone Bola. Since then, flood protection has occurred throughout the Kerikeri / Waipapa	Delete the flood hazard zoning of Lot 2 DP 321759 & Lot 3 DP 321759 (1/2 share); and Lot 1 DP 321759 & Lot 3 DP 321759 (1/2 share).	Reject	Section 5.2.11 Key Issue 11: Mapping of Natural Hazards

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

---

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				Region resulting in less flooding effects to the region.			

---