

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
<b>S442.010</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	Street lights for subdivisions/developments should be energy-efficient, suitable for nocturnal wildlife such as kiwi, and 'dark sky friendly' to minimise glare, minimise upward light and scattered light, and retain the visibility of stars.	Amend PDP to provide] street lights for subdivisions/developments which should be suitable for nocturnal wildlife, such as kiwi, and dark-sky-friendly (certified to minimise glare, reduce light trespass and protect the visibility of stars).		Accept in part
<b>FS404.071</b>	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Support	The relief seeks to achieve the purpose of the Act and is consistent with the intent of the D-G's primary submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
<b>FS570.1706</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
<b>FS346.621</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
<b>FS569.1733</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Accept in part
<b>S454.014</b>	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	BEST PRACTICABLE OPTION	Support	Transpower supports the inclusion of this definition in the FNPDP.	Retain the definition of BEST PRACTICABLE OPTION.		Accept
<b>FS369.035</b>	Top Energy		Support	Top Energy also supports the retention of this definition.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
<b>S159.009</b>	Horticulture New Zealand	BIRD SCARING DEVICE	Support in part	The definition includes firearms which are not devices used primarily for scaring birds. Rule NOISE-R8 refers to audible bird scaring devices. The definition should be amended to be consistent with the rule.	Amend the definition of bird scaring devices as follows: <b>Audible bird scaring devices means a gas gun, avian distress alarm, firearm or other such device used primarily for the purposes of scaring birds.</b>		Accept
<b>FS95.001</b>	Northland Fish and Game Council		Oppose	Oppose the proposed amendment to exclude firearms from the definition of bird scaring device. Firearms are commonly used as bird scaring devices and the permits NFGC issue	Disallow	Retain the reference to firearms in the definition of bird scaring device (inferred)	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				under the crop depredation SOP include the use of firearms as a method of dispersal.			
FS151.161	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept
FS570.171	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
FS566.185	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
FS569.207	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
S159.011	Horticulture New Zealand	FROST FANS OR HORTICULTURAL WIND MACHINES	Support	Definition is consistent with explanation of frost fans	Retain the definition of frost fan		Accept
FS151.163	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept
FS570.173	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
FS566.187	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
FS569.209	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
S333.002	P S Yates Family Trust	New Definition	Not Stated	See submission point in this submission on rule NOISES4 Helicopter landing areas	Insert the following new definition: " <b>Helicopter landing areas means an identified landing</b>		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					<b>area for helicopter landing, loading and take-off but does not include refuelling, servicing, a hangar, or a freight handling facility".</b>	
<b>FS109.4</b>	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association		Oppose	Refueling and servicing are critical functional elements when operating helicopters from helicopter landing areas undertaking agricultural aviation activities therefore NZAAA seeks to have the definition submitted by NZAAA in S182.006 accepted to include refueling and servicing (it is assumed that the term "servicing" includes refueling). Further, the definition sought relates to helicopter landing areas used on an infrequent, intermittent basis NOT fixed location bases.	Disallow	Accept in part
<b>FS184.8</b>	Richard Milner		Support in part	<p>A Helicopter landing area should allow of fuelling of the aircraft especially if a temporary landing area</p> <p>Field Maintenance should also be allowed as a temporary operation may require some inspection and routine maintenance during operations - Transits to maintenance at larger airports is not practical in Northland with Whangerei and Auckland as closest airports with helicopter maintenance facilities</p> <p>Example would be for Powerlines assessment and maintenance - on site fuelling should be allowed as the dead leg to and from a fuelling station could be many miles adding unnecessary cost to the community and economy - Northland does not have many airports so the transit (dead leg) to and from fuel is possibly large</p> <p>Also Agricultural Aircraft will suffer from the same restriction if this is allowed entirely.</p>	Allow in part	Accept in part
<b>S168.002</b>	Setar Thirty Six Limited	New Definition	Oppose	Standard Noise-S4 would benefit from a definition of 'Helicopter landing areas'	Insert the following new definition for 'Helicopter landing areas': <b>Helicopter landing areas means an identified landing area for helicopter landing, loading and take-off but does not</b>	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					<b>include refuelling, servicing, a hangar, or a freight handling facility.</b>	
FS109.5	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association		Oppose	Refueling and servicing are critical functional elements when operating helicopters from helicopter landing areas undertaking agricultural aviation activities therefore NZAAA seeks to have the definition submitted by NZAAA in S182.006 accepted to include refueling and servicing (it is assumed that the term "servicing" includes refueling). Further, the definition sought relates to helicopter landing areas used on an infrequent, intermittent basis NOT fixed location bases.	Disallow	Accept in part
FS184.9	Richard Milner		Support in part	<p>A Helicopter landing area should allow of fuelling of the aircraft especially if a temporary landing area</p> <p>Field Maintenance should also be allowed as a temporary operation may require some inspection and routine maintenance during operations - Transits to maintenance at larger airports is not practical in Northland with Whangerei and Auckland as closest airports with helicopter maintenance facilities</p> <p>Example would be for Powerlines assessment and maintenance - on site fuelling should be allowed as the dead leg to and from a fuelling station could be many miles adding unnecessary cost to the community and economy - Northland does not have many airports so the transit (dead leg) to and from fuel is possibly large</p> <p>Also Agricultural Aircraft will suffer from the same restriction if this is allowed entirely.</p>	Disallow in part	Accept in part
S243.003	Matauri Trustee Limited	New Definition	Oppose	'Helicopter landing areas' are presumably dedicated landing areas, rather than simply the landing and take-off of helicopter areas per se.	Insert the following new definition for helicopter landing areas: <b>Helicopter landing areas means an identified landing area for helicopter landing, loading and take-off but does not include refuelling, servicing, a hangar, or a freight handling facility.</b>	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS109.6	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association		Oppose	<p>Refueling and servicing are critical functional elements when operating helicopters from helicopter landing areas undertaking agricultural aviation activities therefore NZAAA seeks to have the definition submitted by NZAAA in S182.006 accepted to include refueling and servicing (it is assumed that the term "servicing" includes refueling). Further, the definition sought relates to helicopter landing areas used on an infrequent, intermittent basis NOT fixed location bases.</p>	Disallow	Accept in part
FS184.10	Richard Milner		Support in part	<p>A Helicopter Landing area may be temporary in nature for activities that require helicopters to be used away from a base - such as lifting of equipment, water tanks, machinery, gravel, livestock etc. Removal of trees, maintaining or constructing infrastructure such as Powerlines, Cell towers etc, Maintaining or developing tracks, roads, slips. Survey operations, flight training and utility work like survey or agricultural activities or frost protection. All of these activities would require a helicopter landing site of a temporary nature and it should be Permitted Activity</p> <p>A Helicopter landing area should allow of fuelling of the aircraft especially if a temporary landing area</p> <p>Field Maintenance should also be allowed as a temporary operation may require some inspection and routine maintenance during operations - Transits to maintenance at larger airports is not practical in Northland with Whangerei and Auckland as closest airports with helicopter maintenance facilities</p> <p>Example would be for Powerlines assessment and maintenance - on site fuelling should be allowed as the dead leg to and from a fuelling station could be many miles adding unnecessary cost to the community and economy - Northland does not have many airports so the transit (dead leg) to and from fuel is possibly large</p> <p>Also Agricultural Aircraft will suffer from the same restriction if this is allowed entirely.</p>	Disallow in part	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS570.561	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
FS566.575	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
FS569.597	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
S187.002	The Shooting Box Limited	New Definition	Oppose	Refer to submission point in this submission on rule NOISE-S4 Helicopter landing areas.	Amend to add the following new definition: "Helicopter landing areas means an identified landing area for helicopter landing, loading and take-off but does not include refuelling, servicing, a hangar, or a freight handling facility".		Accept in part
FS109.7	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association		Oppose	Refueling and servicing are critical functional elements when operating helicopters from helicopter landing areas undertaking agricultural aviation activities therefore NZAAA seeks to have the definition submitted by NZAAA in S182.006 accepted to include refueling and servicing (it is assumed that the term "servicing" includes refueling). Further, the definition sought relates to helicopter landing areas used on an infrequent, intermittent basis NOT fixed location bases.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS184.11	Richard Milner		Support in part	<p>A Helicopter Landing area may be temporary in nature for activities that require helicopters to be used away from a base - such as lifting of equipment, water tanks, machinery, gravel, livestock etc. Removal of trees, maintaining or constructing infrastructure such as Powerlines, Cell towers etc, Maintaining or developing tracks, roads, slips. Survey operations, flight training and utility work like survey or agricultural activities or frost protection. All of these activities would require a helicopter landing site of a temporary nature and it should be Permitted Activity</p> <p>A Helicopter landing area should allow of fuelling of the aircraft especially if a temporary landing area</p> <p>Field Maintenance should also be allowed as a temporary operation may require some inspection and routine</p>	Disallow in part		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>maintenance during operations - Transits to maintenance at larger airports is not practical in Northland with Whangarei and Auckland as closest airports with helicopter maintenance facilities</p> <p>Example would be for Powerlines assessment and maintenance - on site fuelling should be allowed as the dead leg to and from a fuelling station could be many miles adding unnecessary cost to the community and economy - Northland does not have many airports so the transit (dead leg) to and from fuel is possibly large</p> <p>Also Agricultural Aircraft will suffer from the same restriction if this is allowed entirely.</p>		
<b>S222.002</b>	Wendover Two Limited	New Definition	Oppose	See submission point in this submission on rule NOISE-S4 Helicopter landing areas.	Insert the following new definition <b>Helicopter landing areas means an identified landing areas for helicopter landing, loading and take-off but does not include refueling, servicing, a hangar, or a freight handling facility.</b>	Accept in part
<b>FS109.8</b>	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association		Oppose	Refueling and servicing are critical functional elements when operating helicopters from helicopter landing areas undertaking agricultural aviation activities therefore NZAAA seeks to have the definition submitted by NZAAA in S182.006 accepted to include refueling and servicing (it is assumed that the term "servicing" includes refueling). Further, the definition sought relates to helicopter landing areas used on an infrequent, intermittent basis NOT fixed location bases.	Disallow	Accept in part
<b>S167.002</b>	Bentzen Farm Limited	New Definition	Oppose	There is a lack of specificity as to what comprises a helicopter landing area. There is a disconnect between "helicopter landing areas" (presumably dedicated areas for this purpose) and the content of rules which apply to the movements and landing of helicopters. If the intent is to apply to dedicated helicopter landing areas,	Insert the following new definition: "Helicopter landing areas means an identified landing area for helicopter landing, loading and take-off but does not include refuelling, servicing, a hangar, or a freight handling facility".	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				then a definition of that landuse is warranted to give the rule specificity.			
FS184.3	Richard Milner		Support in part	<p>A Helicopter landing area should allow of fuelling of the aircraft especially if a temporary landing area</p> <p>Example would be for Powerlines assessment and maintenance - on site fuelling should be allowed as the dead leg to and from a fuelling station could be many miles adding unnecessary cost to the community and economy - Northland does not have many airports so the transit (dead leg) to and from fuel is possibly large</p> <p>Also Agricultural Aircraft will suffer from the same restriction if this is allowed entirely.</p>	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS354.039	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	There should be a distinction between helicopter depots and helicopter landing areas with helicopter depots being used on a regular basis or as a base while helicopter landing areas could be used on a less regular basis.	Disallow in part	include a definition for helicopter landing area: means any area of land, building, or structure intended or designed to be used, whether wholly or partly, for helicopter movement or servicing	Accept in part
FS566.364	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow		Accept in part
S182.006	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association	New Definition	Not Stated	Seek a definition of Helicopter landing area in the Plan	Insert a new definition of Helicopter landing area means any area of land, building, or structure intended or designed to be used, whether wholly or partly, for helicopter movement or servicing		Accept in part
FS184.6	Richard Milner		Support	Fully support	Allow		Accept in part
S563.001	Anna Clarke	Overview	Support in part	<p>This information is largely correct and I am pleased to see the council acknowledging the adverse effects that poor artificial lighting can produce.</p> <p>There is however, also evidence to suggest that poor night time lighting also can worsen safety outcomes - I.e. causing hard shadows and glare that can create blind spots, and that increased night time lighting increases likelihood of activity</p>	amend to include comment that poorly designed night time lighting can have adverse effects on safety. Include a comment as to the significant natural and cultural heritage value of clear night sky observation to our region		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				into the night time hours - including crime, and making targets easier to identify. Several studies showing this are referenced at: <a href="https://www.darksky.org/light-pollution/lighting-crime-and-safety/">https://www.darksky.org/light-pollution/lighting-crime-and-safety/</a>			
<b>FS348.213</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
<b>S364.074</b>	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	Objectives	Support in part	The Director-General requests the addition of an objective, policy, and/or rule that acknowledges the potential adverse effects that bright lights can have on indigenous fauna. The additional objective/policy should seek to avoid, minimise/remedy, or mitigate adverse effects from lighting on indigenous fauna. The policy should apply for activities adjacent to or within SNAs.	<p>Insert an objective, policy, and/or rule (inferred) with lighting recommendations in line with the following document, which New Zealand is a party to as part of the United Nations Convention on Migratory Species: National Light Pollution Guidelines for Wildlife Including Marine Turtles, Seabirds and Migratory Shorebirds - DAWE</p> <p>In summary, best practice lighting design incorporates the following design principles:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.Start with natural darkness and only add light for specific purposes.</li> <li>2.Use adaptive light controls to manage light timing, intensity and colour.</li> <li>3.Light only the object or area intended - keep lights close to the ground, directed and shielded to avoid light spill.</li> <li>4.Use the lowest intensity lighting appropriate for the task.</li> <li>5. Use non-reflective, dark-coloured surfaces.</li> <li>6. Use lights with reduced or filtered blue, violet and ultraviolet- wavelengths with a correlated colour temperature of 2700K or warmer</li> </ol>		Accept in part
<b>FS25.089</b>	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Oppose	The submission is based on overseas research, rather than an assessment of potential effects on indigenous fauna in Northland. No assessment has been provided of the costs of the proposal, nor the potential benefits. There is no justification for including the proposed provisions in the FNDP.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part
<b>FS354.169</b>	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	DOC seeks a new objective, policy and rules to avoid, minimise/remedy, or mitigate adverse effects from lighting on indigenous fauna. The policy should apply for activities adjacent to or within SNAs. The submission sets out a range	Disallow	Disallow S364.074	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				of 'best practice' methods to minimise effects but it would be unreasonable to prescribe these as regulations.			
<b>FS570.1155</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
<b>FS346.214</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 in part
<b>FS566.1169</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
<b>FS569.1191</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
<b>S463.079</b>	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited	LIGHT-O1	Oppose	Sub-clauses (a) and (c) are ambiguous in terms of what adverse effects are required to be minimised, and which locations constitute "light sensitive areas" (this term is not defined).	Delete Objective LIGHT-O1		Reject
<b>S356.103</b>	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	LIGHT-O2	Support	Support inclusion of the transport network being included in this objective.	Retain LIGHT-O2 as notified		Accept
<b>S364.075</b>	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	Policies	Support in part	The Director-General requests the addition of an objective, policy, and/or rule that acknowledges the potential adverse effects that bright lights can have on indigenous fauna. The additional objective/policy should seek to avoid, minimise/remedy, or mitigate adverse effects from lighting on indigenous fauna. The policy should apply for activities adjacent to or within SNAs.	<p>Insert an objective, policy, and/or rule (inferred) with lighting recommendations in line with the following document, which New Zealand is a party to as part of the United Nations Convention on Migratory Species: National Light Pollution Guidelines for Wildlife Including Marine Turtles, Seabirds and Migratory Shorebirds - DAWE</p> <p>In summary, best practice lighting design incorporates the following design principles:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.Start with natural darkness and only add light for specific purposes.</li> <li>2.Use adaptive light controls to manage light timing,</li> </ol>		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					<p>intensity and colour.</p> <p>3. Light only the object or area intended - keep lights close to the ground, directed and shielded to avoid light spill.</p> <p>4. Use the lowest intensity lighting appropriate for the task.</p> <p>5. Use non-reflective, dark-coloured surfaces.</p> <p>6. Use lights with reduced or filtered blue, violet and ultraviolet- wavelengths with a correlated colour temperature of 2700K or warmer</p>		
<b>FS225.10</b>	Pacific Eco-Logic		Support	These lighting principles should better protect seabirds and migratory shorebirds.	Allow		Accept in part
<b>FS354.170</b>	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	DOC seeks a new objective, policy and rules to avoid, minimise/remedy, or mitigate adverse effects from lighting on indigenous fauna. The policy should apply for activities adjacent to or within SNAs. The submission sets out a range of 'best practice' methods to minimise effects but it would be unreasonable to prescribe these as regulations.	Disallow	Disallow S364.075	Accept in part
<b>FS25.137</b>	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Oppose	The submission is based on overseas research, rather than an assessment of potential effects on indigenous fauna in Northland. No assessment has been provided of the costs of the proposal, nor the potential benefits. There is no justification for including the proposed provisions in the FNDP.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept in part
<b>FS570.1156</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
<b>FS346.215</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 in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.1170	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
FS569.1192	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
S563.003	Anna Clarke	LIGHT-P1	Support	Support the thoughtful management of light at night.	retain LIGHT-P1		Accept
FS348.215	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
S356.104	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	LIGHT-P2	Support in part	Add additional matter to cover safety effects of light spill on the transport network.	Amend as follows: "Control the intensity, location, and direction of outdoor lighting to: a. ensure artificial lighting avoids conflict with existing light sensitive areas, other established uses, <del>and the transport network;</del> b. internalises light spill within the site, and minimises light spill at the site boundary; c. avoid adverse effects on views of the night sky and intrinsically dark landscapes; <del>and</del> d. manage adverse effects on the health, safety, and wellbeing of people and communities in the surrounding area, unless it is for critical health and safety reasons; <b>and</b> e. <b>ensure the safety of the transport network is not compromised.</b>		Reject
S399.070	Te Hiku Iwi Development Trust	LIGHT-P2	Not Stated	Adverse effects of lighting on wildlife are recognised in the overview and objectives, but not provided for in the policies.	Insert new point e. within Policy LIGHT-P2 as follows: <b>e. manage adverse effects on indigenous fauna</b>		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation	
<b>S463.080</b>	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited	LIGHT-P2	Oppose	Sub-clause (a) and (c) impose policy directions in respect of undefined and subjective "light sensitive areas", "views of the night sky" and "intrinsically dark landscapes".	Delete Policy LIGHT-P2	Reject	
<b>S563.004</b>	Anna Clarke	LIGHT-P2	Support in part	Support the thoughtful management of light at night. However I would like to see the council adopt standards that will provide clearer guidance and better outcomes to ensure that this provision of the plan is met	amend LIGHT -P2 to Adopt standards and guidelines for best practice lighting. Make reference to: IDA-IES Model Lighting Ordinance - Lighting Ordinance Task Force - Cambridge Massachusetts 2011 (International Dark Skies Association, Illuminating Engineering Society) Aoraki Mackenzie Dark Sky Application Document: <a href="https://www.darksky.org/wpcontent/uploads/2018/03/Aoraki_Mackenzie_IDSP_Application.pdf">https://www.darksky.org/wpcontent/uploads/2018/03/Aoraki_Mackenzie_IDSP_Application.pdf</a> Kaikoura lighting guidelines - under development, available upon request. International Dark Sky Association website: <a href="https://www.darksky.org/our-work/lighting">https://www.darksky.org/our-work/lighting</a>	Reject	
<b>FS348.216</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
<b>S364.076</b>	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	Rules	Support in part	The Director-General requests the addition of an objective, policy, and/or rule that acknowledges the potential adverse effects that bright lights can have on indigenous fauna. The additional objective/policy should seek to avoid, minimise/remedy, or mitigate adverse effects from lighting on indigenous fauna. The policy should apply for activities adjacent to or within SNAs.	Insert an objective, policy, and/or rule (inferred) with lighting recommendations in line with the following document, which New Zealand is a party to as part of the United Nations Convention on Migratory Species: National Light Pollution Guidelines for Wildlife Including Marine Turtles, Seabirds and Migratory Shorebirds - DAWE In summary, best practice lighting design incorporates the following design principles:  1.Start with natural darkness and only add light for specific purposes.  2.Use adaptive light controls to manage light timing, intensity and colour.  3.Light only the object or area intended - keep lights close to the ground, directed and shielded to avoid light spill.	Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					<p>4. Use the lowest intensity lighting appropriate for the task.</p> <p>5. Use non-reflective, dark-coloured surfaces.</p> <p>6. Use lights with reduced or filtered blue, violet and ultraviolet- wavelengths with a correlated colour temperature of 2700K or warmer</p>		
<b>FS25.090</b>	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Oppose	The submission is based on overseas research, rather than an assessment of potential effects on indigenous fauna in Northland. No assessment has been provided of the costs of the proposal, nor the potential benefits. There is no justification for including the proposed provisions in the FNDP.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part
<b>FS225.11</b>	Pacific Eco-Logic		Support	These lighting principles should better protect seabirds and migratory shorebirds.	Allow		Accept in part
<b>FS354.171</b>	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	DOC seeks a new objective, policy and rules to avoid, minimise/remedy, or mitigate adverse effects from lighting on indigenous fauna. The policy should apply for activities adjacent to or within SNAs. The submission sets out a range of 'best practice' methods to minimise effects but it would be unreasonable to prescribe these as regulations.	Disallow	Disallow S364.076	Accept in part
<b>FS570.1157</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
<b>FS346.216</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 in part
<b>FS566.1171</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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS569.1193	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
S529.169	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	Rules	Support in part	Street lights for subdivisions/developments should be energy-efficient, suitable for nocturnal wildlife such as kiwi,12 and 'dark sky friendly' to minimise glare, minimise upward light and scattered light, and retain the visibility of stars.	Amend rules to ensure development lighting is energy-efficient, suitable for nocturnal wildlife such as kiwi,12 and 'dark sky friendly' to minimise glare, minimise upward light and scattered light, and retain the visibility of stars (Inferred)		Accept in part
FS570.2057	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.2071	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.2093	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S51.008	Jeff and Robby Kemp	LIGHT-R1	Support in part	The rule as it applies to the Rural Production Zone is supported however the rule should relate to sensitive activities as distinct from the zone itself.	Amend LIGHT-R1 to relate to sensitive activities as distinct from the zone itself.		Reject
S368.042	Far North District Council	LIGHT-R1	Support in part	Drafting error	Amend LIGHT-R1 PER-1 Artificial light emitted <del>undertaken on</del> from a site complies with AS/NZS 4282:2019 - Control of the Obtrusive Effects of Outdoor Lighting;		Accept
S463.081	Waiau Bay Farm Limited	LIGHT-S1	Oppose	In WBF's view the matters of discretion require amendment to capture the likely lighting scenarios at Kauri Cliffs and to dispense with subjective and unenforceable criteria.	Amend points a, b and c of the matters of discretion for Standard LIGHT-S1 as follows: a. whether artificial lighting is for operation or functional purposes <b>or provides a safety or wayfinding function;</b> b. whether <b>the adverse effects of lighting can be managed by adjustments to</b> timing, duration, direction, intensity, focus, design, height, or type of lighting <del>contributes to</del>		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					<del>avoidable or unnecessary light spill;</del> and c. adverse effects on the predominant character and amenity of the surrounding area, including views <del>and enjoyment</del> of the night sky;	
S563.002	Anna Clarke	LIGHT-S1	Support in part	It is great to see the council adopting concrete standards for light pollution control, and setting policy goals that aim to minimise unintended and adverse effects. However - the concrete standards as recommended here in the proposed plan are not likely to meet the policy goals, nor minimise adverse effects. Best practice lighting guidelines show ideal lighting values generally an order of magnitude lower than those recommended here. As per: IDA-IES Model Lighting Ordinance - Lighting Ordinance Task Force - Cambridge Massachusetts 2011 (International Dark Skies Association, Illuminating Engineering Society) See Lighting Zones 0,1, and 2 ( relevant to Northland's rural and small towns characteristics)	amend LIGHT -S1 to adopt lighting standards in line with international best practice, as given above - that are therefore able to achieve the policy objectives. ( See submission Table F Maximum Vertical Illuminance at any point in plane of the property line)	Reject
FS348.214	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
S399.071	Te Hiku Iwi Development Trust	Overview	Not Stated	The Overview does not consider adverse effects of noise on indigenous fauna.	Amend the third sentence of the first paragraph of the Overview as follows: Noise can be the cause of annoyance, impacting community health, wellbeing and the quality of living environments <b>and adversely affecting fauna.</b>	Accept in part
S399.073	Te Hiku Iwi Development Trust	Objectives	Not Stated	The objectives do not provide for adverse effects due to noise on indigenous fauna.	Amend Objective NOISE-O1 as follows: Activities generate noise effects that are compatible with the role, function and character of each zone and do not compromise community health, safety and wellbeing <b>or ecological values.</b>  Alternatively, a separate objective relating to	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					fauna could be inserted.		
S182.019	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association	Objectives	Not Stated	New objective as existing noise generating activities should be able to continue functioning	Insert new objective: Lawfully established and permitted noise generating activities can continue to function and operate		Reject
FS374.048	Waipapa Pine Limited		Support	The submission provides for and recognises that existing uses such as those undertaken by Waipapa Pine Limited. These lawfully established activities should be formally recognised through an Objective in the Proposed District Plan	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
S516.064	Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland	Objectives	Not Stated	Objectives NOISE-O1 and NOISE-O2 are currently both framed as relating to activities generating noise. Based on evidence from the World Health Organisation, existing environmental noise causes significant harm to the health of communities. This public health matter warrants action as an important resource management issue to be addressed in the Noise chapter, and not just as a corollary to polluting activities.	Insert a new objective as follows: <b>NOISE-O3 The health and wellbeing of people and communities are protected from significant levels of noise.</b>		Reject
FS354.172	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	The submitter seeks a new objective: NOISE-O3 The health and wellbeing of people and communities are protected from significant levels of noise. HortNZ does not support an objective of 'protection' but rather that noise is managed consistent with the function of the zone to not cause significant adverse effects on people.	Disallow	Disallow S516.064	Accept
S45.019	Puketona Business Park Limited	NOISE-O1	Support	The Noise chapter of the PDP as notified is generally acceptable	Retain the objectives in the Noise chapter.		Accept
S143.007	Ballance Agri-Nutrients Limited	NOISE-O1	Support	Ballance supports the recognition of noisy activities that are compatible with the role, function and character of the General Rural Zone such as agricultural aviation and the operation of rural airstrips.	Retain the objective NOISE -O1		Accept
S356.105	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	NOISE-O1	Support	not stated	Retain NOISE-O1 as notified		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
<b>S399.072</b>	Te Hiku Iwi Development Trust	NOISE-O1	Not Stated	The objectives do not provide for adverse effects due to noise on indigenous fauna.	Amend Objective NOISE-O1 as follows: Activities generate noise effects that are compatible with the role, function and character of each zone and do not compromise community health, safety and wellbeing <b>or ecological values.</b> Alternatively, a separate objective relating to fauna could be inserted.		Reject
<b>S159.084</b>	Horticulture New Zealand	NOISE-O1	Support	The noise should reflect the underlying character of the zone	Retain Objective NOISE-O1		Accept
<b>FS151.253</b>	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept
<b>FS534.045</b>	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited		Support	WBFL agrees that the policy framework for noise should reflect the underlying zoning	Allow	retain as notified	Accept
<b>FS570.246</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
<b>FS566.260</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
<b>FS569.282</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
<b>S342.010</b>	Waipapa Pine Limited and Adrian Broughton Trust	NOISE-O1	Oppose	The submitters believe that the provisions associated with the Heavy Industrial Zone requires careful consideration and attention. The underlying zone intent describes quite clearly that the zone will create some objectionable effects in this respect. A balance needs to be struck between enabling heavy industrial activities to be able to operate effectively and efficiently within the Zone, whilst ensuring that the potential effects do not go over and beyond limits set under the PDP and within the s16 RMA 1991 requirements. To add further, the site is already managed by way of resource	Not stated		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				consent noise provisions and these consent conditions have been appropriately managed between the submitter and adjoining sites, and beyond. To this end, the submitter opposes the noise provisions until their own expert can consider the rules in context of their operations and underlying resource consenting requirements, and potential for growth.			
FS374.024	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
S143.008	Ballance Agri-Nutrients Limited	NOISE-O2	Support	Ballance supports the recognition that existing noisy activities, especially in the General Rural Zone, should be protected from reverse sensitivity effects.	retain the objective NOISE -O2		Accept in part
FS129.15	Waste Management New Zealand Limited		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS109.14	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association		Support	It is important to ensure that new sensitive activities are located and designed to avoid reverse sensitivity effects.	Allow		Accept in part
FS369.486	Top Energy		Oppose	Top Energy seeks to amend this objective to ensure consistency with policy 5.1.1 of the RPS.	Disallow in part		Accept in part
S159.085	Horticulture New Zealand	NOISE-O2	Support	Minimising potential reverse sensitivity effects is supported.	Retain Objective NOISE-O2		Accept in part
FS109.15	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association		Support	It is important to ensure that new sensitive activities are located and designed to avoid reverse sensitivity effects.	Allow		Accept in part
FS151.254	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS570.247	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.261	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
FS569.283	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
FS369.487	Top Energy		Oppose	Top Energy seeks to amend this objective to ensure consistency with policy 5.1.1 of the RPS.	Disallow in part		Accept in part
S483.181	Top Energy Limited	NOISE-O2	Oppose	The wording of this objective is inconsistent with the approach required in the RPS (see Policy 5.1.1, RPS) which is to "avoid" the potential for reverse sensitivity effects. The District Plan is required to give effect to the RPS and use of the word "manage" does not give effect to the "avoid" directive in the RPS.	Amend Objective NOISE - O2 as follows: New noise sensitive activities are designed and/or located to minimise conflict <b>with (and avoid reverse sensitivity effects on) existing lawfully established noise generating activities.</b>		Accept in part
FS196.223	Joe Carr		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS354.174	Horticulture New Zealand		Support in part	HortNZ supports a strengthening of the objective to 'avoid reverse sensitivity'.	Allow	Allow S483.181	Accept in part
FS345.232	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
S416.037	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	NOISE-O2	Support	Specific recognition of the need to manage the effects of noise particularly through the design and placement of noise sensitive activities is supported.	Retain Objective NOISE-O2		Accept in part
FS36.063	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency		Support	Supports recognition of the need to manage the effects of noise particularly through the design and placement of noise sensitive activities.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part
FS369.492	Top Energy		Oppose	Top Energy seeks to amend this objective to ensure consistency with policy 5.1.1 of the RPS.	Disallow in part		Accept in part
S342.023	Waipapa Pine Limited and Adrian Broughton Trust	NOISE-O2	Oppose	The submitters believe that the provisions associated with the Heavy Industrial Zone requires careful consideration and attention. The underlying zone intent describes quite clearly that the zone will create some objectionable effects in this	Delete the objectives (inferred)		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>respect.</p> <p>A balance needs to be struck between enabling heavy industrial activities to be able to operate effectively and efficiently within the Zone, whilst ensuring that the potential effects do not go over and beyond limits set under the PDP and within the s16 RMA 1991 requirements.</p> <p>To add further, the site is already managed by way of resource consent noise provisions and these consent conditions have been appropriately managed between the submitter and adjoining sites, and beyond.</p> <p>To this end, the submitter opposes the noise provisions until their own expert can consider the rules in context of their operations and underlying resource consenting requirements, and potential for growth.</p>			
FS374.037	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
FS369.490	Top Energy		Oppose	Top Energy seeks to amend this objective to ensure consistency with policy 5.1.1 of the RPS.	Disallow in part		Accept
S356.106	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	NOISE-O2	Support in part	As per the attached s32 report, Waka considers that this objective should be reworded to focus on protecting health and wellbeing rather than reverse sensitivity	Amend as follows: New noise sensitive activities are designed and/or located to minimise conflict and <del>reverse sensitivity</del> <b>effects protect health and wellbeing.</b>		Accept in part
FS243.090	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendment.	Allow	Amend NOISE-O2 as follows: New noise sensitive activities are designed and/or located to minimise conflict and reverse sensitivity effects protect health and wellbeing.	Accept in part
FS354.173	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	The submitter seeks to delete reverse sensitivity. HortNZ considers that it is important that sensitive activities are located to minimise potential for reverse sensitivity.	Disallow	Disallow S356.106	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS369.491	Top Energy		Oppose	Top Energy seeks to amend this objective to ensure consistency with policy 5.1.1 of the RPS.	Disallow in part		Accept in part
FS369.496	Top Energy		Oppose	Top Energy seeks to amend this objective to ensure consistency with policy 5.1.1 of the RPS.	Disallow		Accept in part
S436.040	Northland Fish and Game Council	NOISE-O2	Support	Existing game bird hunting activities are often constrained by surrounding land use, and generally becomes untenable when this land use changes; for example, when urban and lifestyle encroachment occurs near traditionally hunted sites. Recreational game bird hunting is a very popular activity in the rural environment. The game bird season involves the discharge of shotgun noise. This is not like other constant noises rather it is very brief in duration. Game bird hunting begins at 6:30am in the morning and concludes at 6:30pm at night for the length of the season. Introducing new dwelling areas near areas of recreational significance to hunters can have implications on the future of hunting in these areas. For example, complaints can be made under the Arms Act 1983 which makes clear that anyone discharging a firearm in a public place so as to deliberately endanger, frighten or annoy any other person is guilty of an offence. Shotgun noise may also be a particular issue for public places such as any equestrian arena in the vicinity of maimai used during the game bird hunting season.	Retain Objective NOISE-O2.		Accept in part
FS570.1504	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
FS346.126	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 of Fish and Game other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.1518	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
FS569.1540	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS369.493	Top Energy		Oppose	Top Energy seeks to amend this objective to ensure consistency with policy 5.1.1 of the RPS.	Disallow in part		Accept in part
S45.037	Puketona Business Park Limited	NOISE-O2	Support	The Noise chapter of the PDP as notified is generally acceptable	Retain the objectives in the Noise chapter.		Accept in part
FS369.485	Top Energy		Oppose	Top Energy seeks to amend this objective to ensure consistency with policy 5.1.1 of the RPS.	Disallow in part		Accept in part
S182.018	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association	NOISE-O2	Support	support the objective that new sensitive activities are located and designed to avoid reverse sensitivity effects	retain NOISE-O2		Accept in part
FS369.488	Top Energy		Oppose	Top Energy seeks to amend this objective to ensure consistency with policy 5.1.1 of the RPS.	Disallow in part		Accept in part
S331.050	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	NOISE-O2	Support	The submitter supports objective NOISE-O2 and acknowledges the importance of reducing reverse sensitivity effects through the design and/or location of noise sensitive activities. The Ministry can design educational facilities to a high standard with insulation to minimise reverse sensitivity effects without needing to consider the location.	Retain objective NOISE-O2, as proposed.		Accept in part
FS369.489	Top Energy		Oppose	Top Energy seeks to amend this objective to ensure consistency with policy 5.1.1 of the RPS.	Disallow in part		Accept in part
FS369.495	Top Energy		Oppose	Top Energy seeks to amend this objective to ensure consistency with policy 5.1.1 of the RPS.	Disallow in part		Accept in part
S416.038	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	Policies	Support in part	The proposed Plan policies are supported but don't specifically cover railway corridor noise in all zones where rail is located in the district and a new policy is provided	Insert a new policy, Policy NOISE-P4, as follows: <b>Ensure buildings for noise sensitive activities near railway corridors are designed and constructed to minimise the level of noise received within buildings.</b>		Reject
FS243.095	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the requested 5m setback; a considerably reduced set back would provide adequate space for maintenance activities within sites adjacent to the rail network. In doing so, it will continue to protect the safe, efficient, and effective operation of the rail infrastructure while balancing the cost on landowners. The amendments are unnecessary.	Disallow	Insert a new policy, Policy NOISE-P4, as follows: .....	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S342.011	Waipapa Pine Limited and Adrian Broughton Trust	NOISE-P1	Oppose	<p>The submitters believe that the provisions associated with the Heavy Industrial Zone requires careful consideration and attention. The underlying zone intent describes quite clearly that the zone will create some objectionable effects in this respect.</p> <p>A balance needs to be struck between enabling heavy industrial activities to be able to operate effectively and efficiently within the Zone, whilst ensuring that the potential effects do not go over and beyond limits set under the PDP and within the s16 RMA 1991 requirements.</p> <p>To add further, the site is already managed by way of resource consent noise provisions and these consent conditions have been appropriately managed between the submitter and adjoining sites, and beyond.</p> <p>To this end, the submitter opposes the noise provisions until their own expert can consider the rules in context of their operations and underlying resource consenting requirements, and potential for growth.</p>	Not stated		Reject
FS374.025	Waipapa Pine Limited		Support	<p>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.</p>	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
S516.065	Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland	NOISE-P1	Not Stated	<p>To protect public health it is essential to control types of activities and noise levels. However, in this proposed policy these actions are only listed in terms of upholding character and amenity, which are secondary issues to the protection of health.</p>	Amend Policy NOISE-P1 as follows: <b>Protect public health and uphold the character and amenity of each zone by controlling the types of activities and noise levels that are permitted in each zone.</b>		Reject
FS354.175	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	<p>The submitter seeks a new policy to protect public health HortNZ does not support a policy of 'protection' but rather that noise is managed consistent with the function of the zone to not cause significant adverse effects on people.</p>	Disallow	Disallow S516.065	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S45.020	Puketona Business Park Limited	NOISE-P1	Support	The Noise chapter of the PDP as notified is generally acceptable	Retain the policies in the Noise chapter.	Accept
FS403.165	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Oppose	Te Whatu Ora seek to amend this policy to protect public health.	Disallow in part Te Whatu Ora seek to amend this policy to protect public health.	Reject
S331.051	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	NOISE-P2	Support in part	The submitter supports in part policy NOISE-P2 and acknowledges the importance of reducing reverse sensitivity effects through the design and location of noise sensitive activities. However, both design and location are not needed to achieve this. The Ministry can design educational facilities to a high standard with insulation to minimise reverse sensitivity effects without needing to consider the location.	Amend policy NOISE-P2 as follows: Ensure noise sensitive activities proposing to locate within the Mixed Use, Light Industrial and Air Noise Boundary are located, <b>and/or</b> designed, constructed and operated in a way which will minimise adverse noise on community health, safety and wellbeing by having regard to:  a) any existing noise generating activities and the level of noise that will be received within any noise sensitive building; b) the primary purpose and the frequency of use of the activity; and c) the ability to design and construct buildings accommodating noise sensitive activities with sound insulation and/or other mitigation measures to ensure the level of noise received within the building is minimised particularly at night.	Accept in part
S483.182	Top Energy Limited	NOISE-P2	Oppose	Top Energy seeks amendments to this policy to achieve better alignment with the RPS	Amend Policy NOISE - P2 as follows, to achieve better alignment with the RPS objective 3.6 and policy 5.1.1: Ensure noise sensitive activities ... having regard to: a. any existing <b>lawfully established</b> noise	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					generating activities and the level of noise that will be received within any noise sensitive building; <b>b. the need to avoid any reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established noise generating activities.</b> c. the primary purpose ... d. the ability to design ...		
FS109.16	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association		Support	Existing lawfully established noise generating activities should be protected from reverse sensitivities	Allow		Accept in part
FS196.224	Joe Carr		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS345.233	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
S342.021	Waipapa Pine Limited and Adrian Broughton Trust	NOISE-P2	Support	<p>The submitters believe that the provisions associated with the Heavy Industrial Zone requires careful consideration and attention. The underlying zone intent describes quite clearly that the zone will create some objectionable effects in this respect.</p> <p>A balance needs to be struck between enabling heavy industrial activities to be able to operate effectively and efficiently within the Zone, whilst ensuring that the potential effects do not go over and beyond limits set under the PDP and within the s16 RMA 1991 requirements.</p> <p>To add further, the site is already managed by way of resource consent noise provisions and these consent conditions have been appropriately managed between the submitter and adjoining sites, and beyond.</p> <p>To this end, the submitter opposes the noise provisions until their own expert can consider the rules in context of their operations and underlying resource consenting requirements, and potential for growth.</p>	Not stated		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS374.035	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
S356.107	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	NOISE-P2	Support in part	Waka Kotahi considers that land near state highways need to also be considered in this policy.	Amend as follows: Ensure noise sensitive activities proposing to locate within the Mixed Use, Light Industrial, <b>on land near state highways</b> and Air Noise Boundary are located, designed, constructed and operated in a way which will minimise adverse noise on community health, safety and wellbeing by having regard to:		Accept
FS243.091	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendment, to the extent that the land near state highways is properly mapped and identified in the District Plan. Otherwise, this may be open to interpretation, if the land near state highways is not identified or mapped. Any such controls should be informed by evidential noise modelling.	Allow	Amend NOISE-P2 as follows: .....	Accept in part
S45.038	Puketona Business Park Limited	NOISE-P2	Support	The Noise chapter of the PDP as notified is generally acceptable	Retain the policies in the Noise chapter.		Accept in part
FS369.494	Top Energy		Oppose	Top Energy seeks to amend this objective to ensure consistency with policy 5.1.1 of the RPS.	Disallow in part		Accept in part
S217.009	New Zealand Defence Force	NOISE-P3	Support	This policy seeks to ensure that noise effects are of a type, scale and level appropriate for the character of the receiving environment, while having regard to the temporary or permanent nature of adverse effects, which is appropriate.	Retain policy as drafted.		Accept
S399.074	Te Hiku Iwi Development Trust	NOISE-P3	Not Stated	The policies as written do not provide for management of adverse effects due to noise on indigenous fauna.	Insert new point e. in Policy NOISE-P3 as follows: <b>e. Any adverse effects on indigenous fauna and habitats</b>		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
<b>S45.039</b>	Puketona Business Park Limited	NOISE-P3	Support	The Noise chapter of the PDP as notified is generally acceptable	Retain the policies in the Noise chapter.		Accept
<b>S159.086</b>	Horticulture New Zealand	NOISE-P3	Support	The noise should reflect the underlying character of the zone	Retain Policy NOISE-P3		Accept
<b>FS151.255</b>	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept
<b>FS534.046</b>	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited		Support	WBFL agrees that the policy framework for noise should reflect the underlying zoning.	Allow	Retain as notified.	Accept
<b>FS570.248</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
<b>FS566.262</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
<b>FS569.284</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
<b>S342.022</b>	Waipapa Pine Limited and Adrian Broughton Trust	NOISE-P3	Oppose	<p>The submitters believe that the provisions associated with the Heavy Industrial Zone requires careful consideration and attention. The underlying zone intent describes quite clearly that the zone will create some objectionable effects in this respect.</p> <p>A balance needs to be struck between enabling heavy industrial activities to be able to operate effectively and efficiently within the Zone, whilst ensuring that the potential effects do not go over and beyond limits set under the PDP and within the s16 RMA 1991 requirements.</p> <p>To add further, the site is already managed by way of resource consent noise provisions and these consent conditions have been appropriately managed between the submitter and adjoining sites, and beyond.</p> <p>To this end, the submitter opposes the noise provisions until</p>	Not stated		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				their own expert can consider the rules in context of their operations and underlying resource consenting requirements, and potential for growth.			
FS374.036	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
S148.040	Summit Forests New Zealand Limited	Rules	Not Stated	While the chapter on noise states that the noise rules and effects standards do not apply to noise generated by "...forestry planting and forestry harvesting in the Rural Production, Horticulture and Horticulture processing zones" (point 5), the chapter fails to reference that noise and vibration associated with all plantation forestry activities is a permitted activity subject to the provisions of regulation 98 of the NES-PF.	Amend the chapter to make it clear that noise and vibration associated with all plantation forestry activities is a permitted activity subject to the provisions of regulation 98 of the NES-PF.		Accept in part
FS108.19	Manulife Forest Management		Support	As described by the original submitter and provides consistency with the NES-PF.	Allow		Accept in part
FS85.35	PF Olsen Ltd		Support	PF Olsen supports SFNZL's submission to amend the chapter to include that noise and vibration associated with all plantation forestry activities is a permitted activity subject to the provisions of regulation 98 of the NES-PF.	Allow		Accept in part
FS346.546	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. Loss of natural character, coastal environment values and the values of outstanding landscapes could also result.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.152	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
S281.001	Northern Rescue	Rules	Support in part	The rules are confusing and should be reviewed.	Insert rule to allow emergency rescue helicopters to be unconstrained and exempt from any noise rules.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Helicopter Limited						
FS184.13	Richard Milner		Support	Support	Allow		Accept in part
FS404.006	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Support in part	The D-G wants to be involved in review of this rule, including to explicitly provide for conservation or DOC operational activities that require the use of helicopters and other aircraft.	Allow	allow in par the original submission	Accept in part
S143.009	Ballance Agri-Nutrients Limited	Rules	Not Stated	Ballance seeks to have a specific Permitted Activity rule for agricultural aviation to ensure these activities are adequately provided for in the District Plan. Agricultural aircraft landing and taking off from rural airstrips is a vital activity for support of agricultural production as well as conservation. Agricultural aircraft movements of fixed-wing aircraft spreading fertiliser for example, are governed by: the volume of product that can be safely held in the aircraft's hopper; weather conditions; and seasonal requirements (for fertiliser as well as pesticide spraying etc). It is important for the district's agricultural production that agricultural aviation is appropriately provided for within the District Plan.	Insert a new rule: <b>NOISE-RX Agricultural aviation activitiesRural production zoneHorticulture ZoneOpen Space and Recreation ZoneNatural Open Space ZoneAgricultural aviation activities for the purpose of farming, forestry or conservation on a seasonal, temporary or intermittent basis meets the relevant requirements of standard NOISE-S1.</b>		Accept in part
FS184.45	Richard Milner		Support		Allow		Accept in part
S182.022	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association	Rules	Not Stated	Seek a new rule for agricultural aviation activities to ensure they are adequately provided for in the Plan	Insert new rule NOISE-RXX Agricultural aviation activities Rural production zone Horticulture zone Open Space and Recreation zone Natural Open Space zone Agricultural aviation activities for the purpose of farming, forestry or conservation on a seasonal, temporary or intermittent basis for a period up to 30 days in any 12 month period or 315 aircraft hours (whichever is greater).		Accept in part
FS184.46	Richard Milner		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS354.176	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	The submitter seeks a new rule for agricultural aviation activities to ensure they are adequately provided for in the	Allow	Allow S182.022	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Plan. HortNZ supports ensuring that such activities are provided for.			
<b>S342.012</b>	Waipapa Pine Limited and Adrian Broughton Trust	Rules	Oppose	<p>The submitters believe that the provisions associated with the Heavy Industrial Zone requires careful consideration and attention. The underlying zone intent describes quite clearly that the zone will create some objectionable effects in this respect.</p> <p>A balance needs to be struck between enabling heavy industrial activities to be able to operate effectively and efficiently within the Zone, whilst ensuring that the potential effects do not go over and beyond limits set under the PDP and within the s16 RMA 1991 requirements.</p> <p>To add further, the site is already managed by way of resource consent noise provisions and these consent conditions have been appropriately managed between the submitter and adjoining sites, and beyond.</p> <p>To this end, the submitter opposes the noise provisions until their own expert can consider the rules in context of their operations and underlying resource consenting requirements, and potential for growth.</p>	Not stated		Accept in part
<b>FS374.026</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	Accept in part
<b>S436.026</b>	Northland Fish and Game Council	Rules	Not Stated	<p>Existing game bird hunting activities are often constrained by surrounding land use, and generally becomes untenable when this land use changes; for example, when urban and lifestyle encroachment occurs near traditionally hunted sites. Recreational game bird hunting is a very popular activity in the rural environment. The game bird season involves the discharge of shotgun noise. This is not like other constant noises rather it is very brief in duration. Game bird hunting begins at 6:30am in the morning and concludes at 6:30pm at night for the length of the season.</p> <p>Introducing new dwelling areas near areas of recreational</p>	Insert provisions for the associated discharge of noise of firearms for all informal and legitimate proposes such as recreational hunting, pest control and sight adjustment, as permitted activities		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				significance to hunters can have implications on the future of hunting in these areas. For example, complaints can be made under the Arms Act 1983 which makes clear that anyone discharging a firearm in a public place so as to deliberately endanger, frighten or annoy any other person is guilty of an offence. Shotgun noise may also be a particular issue for public places such as any equestrian arena in the vicinity of maimai used during the game bird hunting season.			
<b>FS570.1490</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
<b>FS346.112</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 of Fish and Game other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
<b>FS566.1504</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
<b>FS569.1526</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
<b>S91.018</b>	PF Olsen Limited	Rules	Oppose	The chapter on noise states that the noise rules and effects standards do not apply to noise generated by "...forestry planting and forestry harvesting in the Rural Production, Horticulture and Horticulture processing zones". However, the chapter does not recognise that noise and vibration associated with all plantation forestry activities is a permitted activity subject to the provisions of regulation 98 of the NES-PF. There is no direction for plantation forestry to follow the NES-PF rather than the rules in the plan.	Insert a "note #2" in the rules section of the noise section that directs plantation forestry activities to the NES-PF (regulation 98).		Accept in part
<b>FS566.107</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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S416.039	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	Notes	Support	KiwiRail support the clarification provided under point 4 in the introduction that trains on rail lines and crossing bells, including at railway yards, railway sidings or stations are exempt from the noise standards within this chapter.	Retain point 4 of the NOTES.		Accept
S512.037	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Notes	Support	Emergency sirens play a crucial role in facilitating a prompt emergency response and provide a critical backup to the pager system used by Fire and Emergency. A siren can also be the most effective means of communication in alerting volunteers as well as providing assurance to the people who have made the call that help is on the way. Fire and Emergency support FNDC's approach of noise standards not applying to emergency response activities.	retain note		Accept
S516.066	Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland	Notes	Oppose	Noise limits associated with plantation forestry are set in the National Environmental Standards for Plantation Forestry (this appears to have been omitted from consideration in 3.2.3 of the s32 report). If reference is made to forestry, it should be clarified that noise limits do apply.	Amend point 5 of the exclusions (third paragraph) to delete the words ', forestry planting and forestry harvesting' as follows: 5. agriculture, horticulture and pastoral farming activities undertaken for a limited duration, including using agricultural vehicles, machinery or equipment used on a seasonal or intermittent basis, <del>forestry planting and forestry harvesting</del> in the Rural Production, Horticulture and Horticulture Processing zones;		Accept
S159.087	Horticulture New Zealand	Notes	Support	The Plan provides an exemption of horticulture activities of a limited duration, but the exemption is not included in the rules or standards. Therefore, the status is questioned. It would be more appropriate to provide a permitted activity rule for the matters to which exemptions apply	Amend exemptions 1-14 under the Note to a new permitted rule with no condition		Reject
FS151.256	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject
FS151.257	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject
FS570.249	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.263	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
FS569.285	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
S483.183	Top Energy Limited	Notes	Not Stated	<p>Top Energy seeks to ensure that an exemption from the noise rules is provided in all zones for emergency use of generators required to ensure continued supply of electricity and that the exemption for use of generators for this purpose is not limited to operation by emergency services or lifeline utilities.</p> <p>Note 8 provides an exemption, but the 48 hour restriction is arbitrary and unnecessary. There is no guarantee that the requirement to utilise generators in an emergency will be less than 48 hours, and having to apply the rules of the Noise Chapter and potentially apply for consents in emergency is impractical and inefficient</p>	Amend Note 8 as follows: 8. the use of generators and mobile equipment (including vehicles) for emergency purposes, including testing and maintenance <del>not exceeding 48 hours in duration</del> , where they are operated by emergency services or lifeline utilities		Accept in part
FS196.225	Joe Carr		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS345.234	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
S436.041	Northland Fish and Game Council	Notes	Not Stated	<p>Existing game bird hunting activities are often constrained by surrounding land use, and generally becomes untenable when this land use changes; for example, when urban and lifestyle encroachment occurs near traditionally hunted sites. Recreational game bird hunting is a very popular activity in the rural environment. The game bird season involves the discharge of shotgun noise. This is not like other constant noises rather it is very brief in duration. Game bird hunting begins at 6:30am in the morning and concludes at 6:30pm at night for the length of the season.</p> <p>Introducing new dwelling areas near areas of recreational significance to hunters can have implications on the future of hunting in these areas. For example, complaints can be made under the Arms Act 1983 which makes clear that anyone discharging a firearm in a public place so as to deliberately endanger, frighten or annoy any other person is guilty of an offence. Shotgun noise may also be a particular</p>	Insert a further point within the notes in the Noise Chapter stating that the noise rules and effects standards do not apply to noise generated by <b>hunting</b>		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				issue for public places such as any equestrian arena in the vicinity of maimai used during the game bird hunting season. Noise generated by recreational hunting should be made a permitted activity.			
FS570.1505	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
FS346.127	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 of Fish and Game other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS566.1519	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
FS569.1541	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
S45.017	Puketona Business Park Limited	NOISE-R1	Support	The Noise chapter of the PDP as notified is generally acceptable.	Retain the rules in the Noise chapter.		Accept
S182.020	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association	NOISE-R1	Oppose	Seek a separate rule for agricultural aviation activities	Insert new rule: NOISE-RXX Agricultural aviation activities		Accept in part
S331.052	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	NOISE-R1	Support	The submitter supports rule NOISE-R1 Emission of noise (not otherwise provided for in this chapter), subject to compliance with NOISE-S1 Maximum noise levels.	Retain rule NOISE-R1 Emission of noise (not otherwise provided for in this chapter), as proposed.		Accept
S356.108	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	NOISE-R2	Support in part	It is considered that this rule needs to be amended to apply to all spaces containing noise sensitive activities, not solely habitable spaces (i.e. healthcare, places of worship etc).	Amend as follows: All <b>spaces containing noise sensitive activities and</b> habitable rooms comply with the noise insulation for noise sensitive activities effect standards which are relevant		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					to the underlying zone or specific area identified: NOISE-S5 Noise insulation.		
<b>S331.053</b>	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	NOISE-R2	Support	The submitter supports rule NOISE-R2 New buildings, alterations and/or additions to an existing building for a noise sensitive activity, subject to compliance of all habitable rooms with the noise insulation for noise sensitive activities effect standards which are relevant to the underlying zone or specific area identified - NOISE-S5 Noise insulation.	Retain rule NOISE-R2 New buildings, alterations and/or additions to an existing building for a noise sensitive activity.		Accept
<b>S45.040</b>	Puketona Business Park Limited	NOISE-R2	Support	The Noise chapter of the PDP as notified is generally acceptable.	Retain the rules in the Noise chapter.		Accept
<b>S344.025</b>	Paihia Properties Holdings Corporate Trustee Limited and UP Management Ltd	NOISE-R2	Oppose	The requirement to attenuate 40m from the State Highway is onerous, given the nature of the use of the road. PPHCTL are concerned that the MUZ and State Highway setback noise attenuation rules have different standards.	Not stated (Amend NOISE-R2 inferred)		Reject
<b>FS36.064</b>	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency		Oppose	Supports the protection of human health and noise sensitive activities through the provision of noise insulation standards within buffer zones adjacent to the State Highway network. However, as per Waka Kotahi's original submission the preference is to map the area of interest with a (modelled) noise contour line (NCBO) being established. Activities 'inside' the NCBO are a permitted activity (for the purposes of noise) if specific requirements are met.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept
<b>FS396.046</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	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				reflected throughout the Plan.			
<b>S416.040</b>	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	NOISE-R2	Support	KiwiRail support that where mitigation is provided new buildings, alterations and/or additions to an existing building for a noise sensitive activity is a permitted activity. The rule refers to Noise-S5 Noise insulation to which KiwiRail seeks to add a new railway standard.	Retain Rule NOISE-R2		Accept
<b>FS548.126</b>	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	The proposed controls are overly restrictive and impose additional costs which may not be able to met by our members at a time of economic downturn and a cost-of-living crisis.	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Reject
<b>FS243.096</b>	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought. Kāinga Ora considers that effects should only be mitigated by noise sensitive activities in the receiving environment following adopting of the Best Practicable Option ("BPO") to minimise and mitigate at source and in the vicinity of the corridor the off-site effects as far as possible. Restrictions on neighbouring noise sensitive activities should be no more stringent than necessary. Any such controls should be informed by evidential noise modelling	Disallow	Insert a standard (as outlined in the submission) to apply in all zones to built development at any point within 100 metres from the legal boundary of any railway network	Reject
<b>S45.041</b>	Puketona Business Park Limited	NOISE-R3	Support	The Noise chapter of the PDP as notified is generally acceptable.	Retain the rules in the Noise chapter.		Accept
<b>S45.042</b>	Puketona Business Park Limited	NOISE-R4	Support	The Noise chapter of the PDP as notified is generally acceptable.	Retain the rules in the Noise chapter.		Accept
<b>S217.010</b>	New Zealand Defence Force	NOISE-R5	Support	NZDF supports a specific permitted activity rule for TMTA noise in the District Plan.	Retain rule with amendments as listed in points 11 to 13		Accept in part
<b>S217.012</b>	New Zealand Defence Force	NOISE-R5	Oppose	NZDF requests a Controlled Activity status for noise from TMTA that does not meet the Permitted Activity noise standards. NZDF considers that this activity status is appropriate where the effects are known, as is the case with noise effects.	Amend to Controlled Activity status for TMTA where the activity does not comply with the permitted activity standards.		Reject
<b>S217.013</b>	New Zealand Defence Force	NOISE-R5	Support in part	The matters of discretion listed under Rule Noise-R5 for PER-2 are considered appropriate in relation to the potential noise effects from TMTA, however as noted above NZDF	Amend the matters of discretion listed under Rule NOISE-R5 to become matters of control for a Controlled Activity status.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				requests that the activity status is amended to Controlled. The matters currently listed are also appropriate for matters of control.		
<b>S45.043</b>	Puketona Business Park Limited	NOISE-R5	Support	The Noise chapter of the PDP as notified is generally acceptable.	Retain the rules in the Noise chapter.	Accept in part
<b>S217.011</b>	New Zealand Defence Force	NOISE-R5	Support in part	TMTA may at times include the use of helicopters, which is not recognised under Rule NOISE-R7 as drafted. NZDF requests that provision for helicopter landing areas associated with TMTA are included in NOISE-R5.	Insert a new Standard PER-3 to provide for helicopter landings areas associated with TMTA, in accordance with the NZDF noise limits request in Attachment 3 to this feedback, and shown below for completeness: <b>NOISE-R3 PER-3:Helicopter landing areas shall comply with NZS6807:1994 Noise Management and Land Use Planning for Helicopter Landing Areas.Noise levels shall be measured in accordance with NZS6801:2008 Acoustics - Measurement of Sound.</b>	Accept in part
<b>FS184.14</b>	Richard Milner		Support in part		Disallow in part	Accept in part
<b>S217.014</b>	New Zealand Defence Force	NOISE-R6	Support in part	Providing for TMTA involving weapons firing and/or the use of explosives in the Rural Production zone only is overly restrictive and not reflective of the varied real-world situations which NZDF must train across. In order for NZDF to maintain its ability to deploy, it needs to be able to undertake training in both urban and rural environments. It is therefore vital that activities can be undertaken in all zones within the District.	Amend Rule NOISE-R6 so that it applies to All zones.	Accept
<b>S217.015</b>	New Zealand Defence Force	NOISE-R6	Support	NZDF has developed bespoke noise standards with respect to TMTA, including those that involve weapons firing and/or the use explosives, that NZDF is seeking to be included in every district plan throughout the country. The standards have been specifically developed to manage the particular noise characteristics of TMTA and include a separation distances or peak sound pressure where the activity does not meet the separation distances. The advantage of this approach is that separation distances are easy to comply with and monitor. This approach has been	Retain PER-1 and PER-2 as notified.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				recognised in PER-1 and PER-2 of NOISE-R6 and NZDF supports the inclusion of PER-1 and PER-2.		
S217.016	New Zealand Defence Force	NOISE-R6	Oppose	PER-3 requires that the activity comply with standard NOISE-S6 Explosives. However, this relates to quarrying activities and is not applicable to explosive use by NZDF. Having regard to PER-1 and PER-2, PER-3 should be deleted.	Delete NOISE-R6 PER-3	Accept in part
S217.017	New Zealand Defence Force	NOISE-R6	Oppose	NZDF requests a Controlled Activity status for noise from a TMTA that involves weapons firing and/or the use of explosives that does not meet the Permitted Activity noise standards. NZDF considers that this activity status is appropriate where the effects are known, as is the case with noise effects.	Amend to Controlled Activity status where the activity does not comply with the permitted activity standards.	Reject
S217.018	New Zealand Defence Force	NOISE-R6	Support in part	Include matters for control for Rule NOISE-R6, in keeping with those listed under Rule Noise-R5 for PER-2.	Include matters for control for Rule NOISE-R6 as follows: <b>1. the level, hours of operation, duration and nature of the noise;2. proximity and nature of nearby activities and the adverse effects they may experience from the noise;3. the existing noise environment;4. effects on character and amenity values on the surrounding environment;5. effects on the health and wellbeing of people; and6. any noise reduction measures.</b>	Reject
S516.067	Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland	NOISE-R6	Support	The three permitted activity conditions should all apply in conjunction and not as alternatives. In accordance with the Noise and Vibration Metrics National Planning Standard and in turn NZS 6801, the peak sound levels should be expressed in "dB LCpeak"	Amend Rule NOISE-R6 as follows: Where: PER-1 1. At least 5 working days prior to the commencement of the activity, notify the Council of the activity, including details of the nature, duration and scale of activity, and any consultation that has been undertaken; <b>and</b> <del>PER 2</del> 2. The activity complies with the following: i. <del>1</del> —occurs between the hours of 7.00am to	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					7.00pm, and achieves either a 500m minimum separation distance to, or peak sound pressure level of 95 dBC LCpeak when measured within. the notional boundary of any noise sensitive activity: and/or ii. 2-occurs between 7.00pm to 7.00am, an achieves either a 1250m minimum separation distance to, or peak sound pressure level of 85 dBC LCpeak when measured within, the notional boundary of any noise sensitive activity; andPER-3 3.The activity complies with standard:NOISE-S6 Explosives.	
<b>S45.044</b>	Puketona Business Park Limited	NOISE-R6	Support	The Noise chapter of the PDP as notified is generally acceptable.	Retain the rules in the Noise chapter.	Accept in part
<b>S337.001</b>	Ironwood Trust Limited	NOISE-R7	Support in part	Supports in principle the inclusion of provisions for helicopter landing areas set out in the proposal but considers that these need to be amended to remove potential ambiguity and provide greater clarity.	Amend Rule NOISE-R7 to provide for landing areas that do not meet the standard referred to in PER-2 to be identified as restricted discretionary activities instead of discretionary.	Accept in part
<b>FS67.89</b>	The Shooting Box Limited		Support	The proposed RDA activity class sought where the standards are not met appropriately targets the matters under consideration, which should relate to noise effects.	Allow	Accept in part
<b>FS68.88</b>	P S Yates Family Trust		Support	The proposed RDA activity class sought where the standards are not met appropriately targets the matters under consideration, which should relate to noise effects.	Allow	Accept in part
<b>FS69.86</b>	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Support	The proposed RDA activity class sought where the standards are not met appropriately targets the matters under consideration, which should relate to noise effects.	Allow	Accept in part
<b>FS66.158</b>	Bentzen Farm Limited		Support	The proposed RDA activity class sought where the standards are not met appropriately targets the matters under consideration, which should relate to noise effects.	Allow	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS184.20	Richard Milner		Oppose		Disallow	Accept in part
S167.087	Bentzen Farm Limited	NOISE-R7	Oppose	<p>It would serve a better resource management purpose, if flight movements for emergency purposes such as medical emergencies, search and rescue or firefighting purposes are exempt from the standard NOISE-S4. That would also be consistent with note 10 in this section that the noise rules and standards do not apply to helicopters used for an emergency and as an air ambulance.</p> <p>As drafted there would appear there is no provision for helicopters other than flight movements for emergency purposes. The intent of the rule might be better served by allowing helicopter landing site complying with standard: NOISE-S4 Helicopter landing areas, irrespective of the use of the helicopter.</p> <p>The rule lacks specificity as to what comprises a helicopter landing area.</p>	<p>Amend Rule Noise-R7 as follows (adding "Or"): Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 Flight movements are for emergency purposes such as medical emergencies, search and rescue or firefighting purposes;<b>Or</b> PER-2 The helicopter landing site complies with standard: NOISE-S4 Helicopter landing areas. This standard does not apply to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Emergency or rescue helicopter operation occurring to or from Bay of Islands, Rawene or Kaitaia Hospital (excludes established helicopter bases on hospital land).</li> <li>ii. Emergency or rescue helicopter landings, departures, overflights or activity during operations that occur away from the permanently established helicopter base.</li> <li>iii. Cropping, top dressing, and spraying for the purpose of farming or conservation carried out in the Rural Production, Horticulture zones, or within Significant Natural Area on a seasonal, temporary, or intermittent basis for a period up to 30 days in any 12 month period.</li> </ol>	Accept in part
FS109.17	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association		Support in part	Agricultural aviation activities that include fixed wing and helicopters and ALL agricultural aviation activities should be provided for in the plan as sought in S182.021	Allow in part	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
<b>FS184.15</b>	Richard Milner		Support in part	<p>Non Air transport commercial aviation should be added to R7 PER 2 as Item IV for the use of Helicopter Operations conducted for Utility, Maintenance, Inspection or Survey purposes such as but not limited to:</p> <p>lifting of equipment, water tanks, machinery, gravel, livestock etc. Removal of trees, maintaining or constructing infrastructure such as Powerlines, Cell towers etc, Maintaining or developing tracks, roads, slips. Survey operations, flight training and utility work like survey or agricultural activities or frost protection. All of these activities would require a helicopter landing site of a temporary nature and it should be Permitted Activity</p> <p>A Helicopter landing area should allow of fuelling of the aircraft especially if a temporary landing area</p> <p>Field Maintenance should also be allowed as a temporary operation may require some inspection and routine maintenance during operations - Transits to maintenance at larger airports is not practical in Northland with Whangerei and Auckland as closest airports with helicopter maintenance facilities</p> <p>Example would be for Powerlines assessment and maintenance - on site fuelling should be allowed as the dead leg to and from a fuelling station could be many miles adding unnecessary cost to the community and economy - Northland does not have many airports so the transit (dead leg) to and from fuel is possibly large</p>	Allow in part		Accept in part
<b>FS354.177</b>	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	HortNZ has sought changes to the rule to address a number of issues sought by the submitter.	Disallow	Disallow S167.087 but amend as sought in S159.088	Accept in part
<b>FS566.449</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
<b>FS403.168</b>	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Oppose	Te Whatu Ora seek amendment of this rule to improve clarity and activities which potentially have adverse effects on public health should have controls.	Disallow in part	Te Whatu Ora seek amendment of this rule to improve clarity and activities which potentially have adverse	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					effects on public health should have controls.	
<b>S333.077</b>	P S Yates Family Trust	NOISE-R7	Oppose	<p>As drafted, Rule Noise-R7 only permits Helicopter landing areas where flight movements are for emergency purposes such as medical emergencies, search and rescue or firefighting purposes and the helicopter landing site complies with standard: NOISE-S4 Helicopter landing areas. In other words, both PER- 1 and PER-2 need to be met in order to comply with the rule (consistent with the structure of other rules in the Plan).</p> <p>Given the nature of the activity, it would serve a better resource management purpose, if flight movements for emergency purposes such as medical emergencies, search and rescue or firefighting purposes are exempt from the standard NOISE-S4 Helicopter landing areas. That would also be consistent with note 10 in this section that the noise rules and standards do not apply to helicopters used for an emergency and as an air ambulance.</p> <p>As drafted there would appear to be no provision for helicopters other than flight movements for emergency purposes such as medical emergencies, search and rescue or firefighting purposes. The intent of the rule might be better served by allowing helicopter landing site complying with standard: NOISE-S4 Helicopter landing areas, irrespective of the use of the helicopter.</p> <p>Redrafting of the rule to make PER-1 and PER-2 separately applicable would meet the above issues (ie the addition of an 'or')</p> <p>In addition, the rule lacks specificity as to what comprises a helicopter landing area, although there is a disconnect between the title of the rule which applies to "helicopter landing areas" (presumably dedicated areas for this purpose) and the content of the rule which applies to the movements and landing of helicopters. If the intent is to apply to dedicated helicopter landing areas, then a definition of that land use is warranted to give the rule specificity. The following definition is proposed to be included by this submission: "Helicopter landing areas means an identified landing area for helicopter landing, loading and take-off but does not include refuelling, servicing, a hangar, or a freight handling facility".</p>	<p>Amend Rule Noise-R7 as follows:<i>Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 Flight movements are foremergency purposes such as medical emergencies, search and rescue or firefighting purposes; Or PER-2 The helicopter landing site complies with standard: NOISE-S4 Helicopter landing areas. This standard does not apply to: i. Emergency or rescue helicopter operation occurring to or from Bay of Islands, Rawene or Kaitaia Hospital (excludes established helicopter bases on hospital land). ii. Emergency or rescue helicopter landings, departures, overflights or activity during operations that occur away from the permanently established helicopter base. iii. Cropping, top dressing, and spraying for the purpose of farming or conservation carried out in the Rural Production, Horticulture zones, or within Significant Natural Area on a seasonal, temporary, or intermittent basis for a period up to 30 days in any 12 month period.</i></p>	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS109.18	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association		Support in part	Agricultural aviation activities that include fixed wing and helicopters and ALL agricultural aviation activities should be provided for in the plan as sought in S182.021	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS184.17	Richard Milner		Support in part	<p>Non Air transport commercial aviation should be added to R7 PER 2 as Item IV for the use of Helicopter Operations conducted for Utility, Maintenance, Inspection or Survey purposes such as but not limited to:</p> <p>lifting of equipment, water tanks, machinery, gravel, livestock etc. Removal of trees, maintaining or constructing infrastructure such as Powerlines, Cell towers etc, Maintaining or developing tracks, roads, slips. Survey operations, flight training and utility work like survey or agricultural activities or frost protection. All of these activities would require a helicopter landing site of a temporary nature and it should be Permitted Activity</p> <p>A Helicopter landing area should allow of fuelling of the aircraft especially if a temporary landing area</p> <p>Field Maintenance should also be allowed as a temporary operation may require some inspection and routine maintenance during operations - Transits to maintenance at larger airports is not practical in Northland with Whangerei and Auckland as closest airports with helicopter maintenance facilities</p> <p>Example would be for Powerlines assessment and maintenance - on site fuelling should be allowed as the dead leg to and from a fuelling station could be many miles adding unnecessary cost to the community and economy - Northland does not have many airports so the transit (dead leg) to and from fuel is possibly large</p>	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS403.175	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Oppose	Te Whatu Ora seek amendment of this rule to improve clarity and activities which potentially have adverse effects on public health should have controls.	Disallow in part	Te Whatu Ora seek amendment of this rule to improve clarity and activities which potentially have adverse effects on public health should have controls.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S159.088	Horticulture New Zealand	NOISE-R7	Oppose	The rules exempt some activities from PER-2 of Rule NOISE-R7 and Standard NOISE-S4. However, these should be included as a permitted activity within the rule.	<p>Amend Rule PER-2 of NOISE-R7 as follows:                      PER-2                      The helicopter landing site complies with standard:                      NOISE-S4 Helicopter landing areas.</p> <p>This standard does not apply to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Emergency or rescue helicopter operation occurring to or from Bay of Islands, Rawene or Kaitaia Hospital (excludes established helicopter bases on hospital land).</li> <li>2. Emergency or rescue helicopter landings, departures, overflights or activity during operations that occur away from the permanently established helicopter base.</li> <li>3. <del>Cropping, top dressing, and spraying for the purpose of farming or conservation carried out in the Rural Production, Horticulture zones, or within Significant Natural Area on a seasonal, temporary, or intermittent basis for a period up to 30 days in any 12-month period.</del></li> </ol> <p>Insert: <b>PER-3 Cropping, topdressing and spraying and the use of drones for the purpose of farming or conservation carried out in the Rural Production, Horticulture zones or within Significant Natural areas on a seasonal, temporary or intermittent basis for a period up to 30 days in any 12-month period.</b>  <b>Activity status where compliance does not</b></p>	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					<b>achieve with PER-3: Restricted discretionary</b>		
FS109.19	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association		Support in part	Agricultural aviation activities that include fixed wing and helicopters and ALL agricultural aviation activities should be provided for in the plan as sought in S182.021	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS151.258	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS184.18	Richard Milner		Support in part	<p>Non Air transport commercial aviation should be added to R7 PER 2 as Item IV for the use of Helicopter Operations conducted for Utility, Maintenance, Inspection or Survey purposes such as but not limited to:</p> <p>lifting of equipment, water tanks, machinery, gravel, livestock etc. Removal of trees, maintaining or constructing infrastructure such as Powerlines, Cell towers etc, Maintaining or developing tracks, roads, slips. Survey operations, flight training and utility work like survey or agricultural activities or frost protection. All of these activities would require a helicopter landing site of a temporary nature and it should be Permitted Activity</p> <p>A Helicopter landing area should allow of fuelling of the aircraft especially if a temporary landing area</p> <p>Field Maintenance should also be allowed as a temporary operation may require some inspection and routine maintenance during operations - Transits to maintenance at larger airports is not practical in Northland with Whangerei and Auckland as closest airports with helicopter maintenance facilities</p> <p>Example would be for Powerlines assessment and maintenance - on site fuelling should be allowed as the dead leg to and from a fuelling station could be many miles adding unnecessary cost to the community and economy - Northland does not have many airports so the transit (dead leg) to and from fuel is possibly large</p>	Allow in part		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS570.250	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
FS566.264	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
FS569.286	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
FS403.167	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support in part	Te Whatu Ora seek amendment of this rule to improve clarity and activities which potentially have adverse effects on public health should have controls.	Allow in part	Te Whatu Ora seek amendment of this rule to improve clarity and activities which potentially have adverse effects on public health should have controls.	Accept in part
S243.105	Matauri Trustee Limited	NOISE-R7	Oppose	<p>As drafted, Rule Noise-R7 only permits Helicopter landing areas where flight movements are for emergency purposes such as medical emergencies, search and rescue or firefighting purposes and the helicopter landing site complies with standard: NOISE-S4 Helicopter landing areas. In other words, both PER- 1 and PER-2 need to be met in order to comply with the rule (consistent with the structure of other rules in the Plan).</p> <p>Given the nature of the activity, it would serve a better resource management purpose, if flight movements for emergency purposes such as medical emergencies, search and rescue or firefighting purposes are exempt from the standard NOISE-S4 Helicopter landing areas. That would also be consistent with note 10 in this section that the noise rules and standards do not apply to helicopters used for an emergency and as an air ambulance.</p> <p>As drafted there would appear to be no provision for helicopters other than flight movements for emergency purposes such as medical emergencies, search and rescue or firefighting purposes. The intent of the rule might be better served by allowing helicopter landing site complying with standard: NOISE-S4 Helicopter landing areas, irrespective of the use of the</p>	<p>Amend Rule Noise-R7 as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 Flight movements are for emergency purposes such as medical emergencies, search and rescue or firefighting purposes;<b>Or</b> PER-2 The helicopter landing site complies with standard: NOISE-S4 Helicopter landing areas. This standard does not apply to: i. Emergency or rescue helicopter operation occurring to or from Bay of Islands, Rawene or Kaitaia Hospital (excludes established helicopter bases on hospital land). ii. Emergency or rescue helicopter landings, departures, overflights or activity during</p>		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>helicopter. Redrafting of the rule to make PER-1 and PER-2 separately applicable would meet the above issues (i.e. the addition of an 'or') In addition, the rule lacks specificity as to what comprises a helicopter landing area, although there is a disconnect between the title of the rule which applies to "helicopter landing areas" (presumably dedicated areas for this purpose) and the content of the rule which applies to the movements and landing of helicopters. If the intent is to apply to dedicated helicopter landing areas, then a definition of that land use is warranted to give the rule specificity.</p>	<p>operations that occur away from the permanently established helicopter base. iii. Cropping, top dressing, and spraying for the purpose of farming or conservation carried out in the Rural Production, Horticulture zones, or within Significant Natural Area on a seasonal, temporary, or intermittent basis for a period up to 30 days in any 12 month period.</p>	
<p><b>FS109.20</b></p>	<p>NZ Agricultural Aviation Association</p>		<p>Support in part</p>	<p>Agricultural aviation activities that include fixed wing and helicopters and ALL agricultural aviation activities should be provided for in the plan as sought in S182.021</p>	<p>Allow in part</p>	<p>Accept in part</p>
<p><b>FS184.22</b></p>	<p>Richard Milner</p>		<p>Support in part</p>	<p>Support the inclusion of: OR  and  Non Air transport commercial aviation should be added to R7 PER 2 as Item IV for the use of Helicopter Operations conducted for Utility, Maintenance, Inspection or Survey purposes such as but not limited to:  lifting of equipment, water tanks, machinery, gravel, livestock etc. Removal of trees, maintaining or constructing infrastructure such as Powerlines, Cell towers etc, Maintaining or developing tracks, roads, slips. Survey operations, flight training and utility work like survey or agricultural activities or frost protection. All of these activities would require a helicopter landing site of a temporary nature and it should be Permitted Activity  A Helicopter landing area should allow of fuelling of the aircraft especially if a temporary landing area  Field Maintenance should also be allowed as a temporary operation may require some inspection and routine maintenance during operations - Transits to maintenance at larger airports is not practical in Northland with Whangerei</p>	<p>Allow in part</p>	<p>Accept in part</p>

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				and Auckland as closest airports with helicopter maintenance facilities  Example would be for Powerlines assessment and maintenance - on site fuelling should be allowed as the dead leg to and from a fuelling station could be many miles adding unnecessary cost to the community and economy - Northland does not have many airports so the transit (dead leg) to and from fuel is possibly large			
<b>FS570.663</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
<b>FS566.677</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
<b>FS569.699</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
<b>FS403.174</b>	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Oppose	Te Whatu Ora seek amendment of this rule to improve clarity and activities which potentially have adverse effects on public health should have controls.	Disallow in part	Te Whatu Ora seek amendment of this rule to improve clarity and activities which potentially have adverse effects on public health should have controls.	Accept in part
<b>S187.076</b>	The Shooting Box Limited	NOISE-R7	Oppose	Refer to submission for detailed reasons for decision(s) requested relating, but not limited to, to the following: it would serve a better resource management purpose, if flight movements for emergency purposes such as medical emergencies, search and rescue are exempt from the standard NOISE-S4 Helicopter Landing Areas; there would appear to be no provision for helicopters other than flight movements for emergency purposes - the intent of the rule might be better serve by allowing helicopter landing site complying with standard NOISE-S4 Helicopter landing areas, irrespective of the use of the helicopter; redrafting of the rule to make PER-1 and PER2 separately applicable would meet the above issues; and the rule lacks specificity as to what comprises a helicopter landing area - include the following definition:	Amend Rule Noise-R7 as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 Flight movements are for emergency purposes such as medical emergencies, search and rescue or firefighting purposes; Or PER-2 The helicopter landing site complies with standard: NOISE-S4 Helicopter landing areas. This standard does not apply to: i. Emergency or rescue helicopter operation occurring to or from Bay of Islands, Rawene or Kaitaia Hospital (excludes established helicopter bases on hospital land).		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				"Helicopter landing areas means an identified landing area for helicopter loading and take-off but does not include refueling, servicing, a hanger, or a freight handling facility".	ii. Emergency or rescue helicopter landings, departures, overflights or activity during operations that occur away from the permanently established helicopter base. iii. Cropping, top dressing, and spraying for the purpose of farming or conservation carried out in the Rural Production, Horticulture zones, or within Significant Natural Area on a seasonal, temporary, or intermittent basis for a period up to 30 days in any 12 month period.	
<b>FS109.21</b>	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association		Support in part	Agricultural aviation activities that include fixed wing and helicopters and ALL agricultural aviation activities should be provided for in the plan as sought in S182.021	Allow in part	Accept in part
<b>FS184.23</b>	Richard Milner		Support in part	Support the inclusion of: OR  and  Non Air transport commercial aviation should be added to R7 PER 2 as Item IV for the use of Helicopter Operations conducted for Utility, Maintenance, Inspection or Survey purposes such as but not limited to:  lifting of equipment, water tanks, machinery, gravel, livestock etc. Removal of trees, maintaining or constructing infrastructure such as Powerlines, Cell towers etc, Maintaining or developing tracks, roads, slips. Survey operations, flight training and utility work like survey or agricultural activities or frost protection. All of these activities would require a helicopter landing site of a temporary nature and it should be Permitted Activity  A Helicopter landing area should allow of fuelling of the aircraft especially if a temporary landing area  Field Maintenance should also be allowed as a temporary operation may require some inspection and routine maintenance during operations - Transits to maintenance at larger airports is not practical in Northland with Whangerei and Auckland as closest airports with helicopter maintenance facilities  Example would be for Powerlines assessment and maintenance - on site fuelling should be allowed as the dead	Allow in part	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				leg to and from a fuelling station could be many miles adding unnecessary cost to the community and economy - Northland does not have many airports so the transit (dead leg) to and from fuel is possibly large			
<b>FS403.171</b>	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Oppose	Te Whatu Ora seek amendment of this rule to improve clarity and activities which potentially have adverse effects on public health should have controls.	Disallow in part	Te Whatu Ora seek amendment of this rule to improve clarity and activities which potentially have adverse effects on public health should have controls.	Accept in part
<b>S421.198</b>	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	NOISE-R7	Support in part	Federated Farmers supports the intent of rule Noise - R7. However, we seek clarification on the exceptions listed in performance standard PER-2. PER-2 states that the rule does not apply to cropping, top dressing, and spraying for the purpose of farming or conservation carried out in the Rural Production, Horticulture zones, or within Significant Natural Area on a seasonal, temporary, or intermittent basis for a period up to 30 days in any 12-month period. The exception is broad in its application in that it does not say what state what scale is applicable. Is the exception to be applied on a site-by-site basis so that it is intended to cover the land of a farm owned by one person. Alternatively, is it meant to apply on a larger scale so that if a person owned land in more than one title, the 30 days apply to all of that land regardless of it being in different certificates of title. The district plan needs to provide for the continuance of existing, lawfully established activities such as farming. The rule as currently drafted is confusing, particularly when regard is had to the text under the heading 'Rules' and before the rules themselves. The text states that the noise rules and standards do not apply for agriculture, horticulture and pastoral farming activities undertaken for a limited duration, including using agricultural vehicles, machinery or equipment used on a seasonal or intermittent basis, forestry planting and forestry harvesting in the Rural Production, Horticulture and Horticulture Processing zones.	Amend PER-2 of Rule NOISE-R7 to clarify the third exception and how Council intends to apply and enforce exception		Accept in part
<b>FS109.22</b>	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association		Support in part	Agricultural aviation activities that include fixed wing and helicopters and ALL agricultural aviation activities should be provided for in the plan as sought in S182.021	Allow in part		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS196.124	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko	Allow		Accept in part
FS354.179	Horticulture New Zealand		Support in part	The submitter is concerned as to how the exemption in NOISE-R7 iii) would be applied. HortNZ considers that this is best addressed through a separate permitted activity rule for agricultural aviation.	Allow	Allow S421.198 by including a separate permitted activity rule for agricultural aviation	Accept in part
FS570.1430	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
FS346.432	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
FS566.1444	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
FS569.1466	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
FS403.176	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Oppose	Te Whatu Ora seek amendment of this rule to improve clarity and activities which potentially have adverse effects on public health should have controls.	Disallow in part	Te Whatu Ora seek amendment of this rule to improve clarity and activities which potentially have adverse effects on public health should have controls.	Accept in part
S222.079	Wendover Two Limited	NOISE-R7	Support in part	As drafted, Rule Noise-R7 only permits Helicopter landing areas where flight movements are for emergency purposes such as medical emergencies, search and rescue or firefighting purposes and the helicopter landing site complies with standard: NOISES4 Helicopter landing areas. In other words, both PER- 1 and PER-2 need to be met in order to comply with the rule (consistent with the structure of other rules in the Plan). Given the nature of the activity, it would serve a better resource management purpose, if flight movements for emergency purposes such as medical emergencies,	Amend Rule Noise-R7 as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 Flight movements are for emergency purposes such as medical emergencies, search and rescue or firefighting purposes; <b>Or</b> PER-2 The helicopter landing site complies with standard:		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>search and rescue or firefighting purposes are exempt from the standard NOISE-S4 Helicopter landing areas. That would also be consistent with note 10 in this section that the noise rules and standards do not apply to helicopters used for an emergency and as an air ambulance. As drafted there would appear to be no provision for helicopters other than flight movements for emergency purposes such as medical emergencies, search and rescue or firefighting purposes. The intent of the rule might be better served by allowing helicopter landing site complying with standard: NOISE-S4 Helicopter landing areas, irrespective of the use of the helicopter.</p> <p>Redrafting of the rule to make PER-1 and PER-2 separately applicable would meet the above issues (ie the addition of an 'or')</p> <p>In addition, the rule lacks specificity as to what comprises a helicopter landing area, although there is a disconnect between the title of the rule which applies to "helicopter landing areas" (presumably dedicated areas for this purpose) and the content of the rule which applies to the movements and landing of helicopters.</p>	<p>NOISE-S4 Helicopter landing areas. This standard does not apply to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Emergency or rescue helicopter operation occurring to or from Bay of Islands, Rawene or Kaitaia Hospital (excludes established helicopter bases on hospital land).</li> <li>ii. Emergency or rescue helicopter landings, departures, overflights or activity during operations that occur away from the permanently established helicopter base.</li> <li>iii. Cropping, top dressing, and spraying for the purpose of farming or conservation carried out in the Rural Production, Horticulture zones, or within Significant Natural Area on a seasonal, temporary, or intermittent basis for a period up to 30 days in any 12 month period.</li> </ul>	
FS109.23	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association		Support in part	Agricultural aviation activities that include fixed wing and helicopters and ALL agricultural aviation activities should be provided for in the plan as sought in S182.021	Allow in part	Accept in part
FS184.24	Richard Milner		Support in part	<p>support the inclusion of: OR</p> <p>and</p> <p>Non Air transport commercial aviation should be added to R7 PER 2 as Item IV for the use of Helicopter Operations conducted for Utility, Maintenance, Inspection or Survey purposes such as but not limited to:</p> <p>lifting of equipment, water tanks, machinery, gravel, livestock etc. Removal of trees, maintaining or constructing infrastructure such as Powerlines, Cell towers etc, Maintaining or developing tracks, roads, slips. Survey</p>	Allow in part	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>operations, flight training and utility work like survey or agricultural activities or frost protection. All of these activities would require a helicopter landing site of a temporary nature and it should be Permitted Activity</p> <p>A Helicopter landing area should allow of fuelling of the aircraft especially if a temporary landing area</p> <p>Field Maintenance should also be allowed as a temporary operation may require some inspection and routine maintenance during operations - Transits to maintenance at larger airports is not practical in Northland with Whangerei and Auckland as closest airports with helicopter maintenance facilities</p> <p>Example would be for Powerlines assessment and maintenance - on site fuelling should be allowed as the dead leg to and from a fuelling station could be many miles adding unnecessary cost to the community and economy - Northland does not have many airports so the transit (dead leg) to and from fuel is possibly large</p>			
FS403.173	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Oppose	Te Whatu Ora seek amendment of this rule to improve clarity and activities which potentially have adverse effects on public health should have controls.	Disallow in part	Te Whatu Ora seek amendment of this rule to improve clarity and activities which potentially have adverse effects on public health should have controls.	Accept in part
S516.068	Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland	NOISE-R7	Oppose	The drafting of the rule is not clear. There is a list under "This standard does not apply to:..." which might have been with the intention of making the listed activities permitted, but actually is excluding them from being permitted. Regardless, these activities have adverse effects on public health so should have controls. To avoid ambiguity the activities should be deleted.	Delete the following text from Rule NOISE-R7: <del>This standard does not apply to: i. Emergency or rescue helicopter operation occurring to or from Bay of Islands, Rawene or Kaitaia Hospital (excludes established helicopter bases on hospital land). ii. Emergency or rescue helicopter landings, departures, overflights or activity during operations that occur away from the permanently established helicopter base. iii. Cropping, top</del>		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					<del>dressing, and spraying for the purpose of farming or conservation carried out in the Rural Production, Horticulture zones, or within Significant Natural Area on a seasonal, temporary, or intermittent basis for a period up to 30 days in any 12 month period.</del>		
FS109.24	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association		Oppose	Agricultural aviation activities that include fixed wing and helicopters and ALL agricultural aviation activities should be provided for in the plan as sought in S182.021	Disallow		Accept in part
FS184.26	Richard Milner		Oppose	NZHA does not support this submitters view	Disallow		Accept in part
FS354.180	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	The submitter is concerned as to how the exemptions in NOISE R7 will be applied. HortNZ considers that this is best addressed through a separate permitted activity rule for agricultural aviation.	Disallow	Allow S516.068 by including a separate permitted activity rule for agricultural aviation	Accept in part
S217.019	New Zealand Defence Force	NOISE-R7	Support in part	TMTA may at times include the use of helicopters, which is not recognised under Rule NOISE-R7 as drafted. NZDF requests that helicopter landings associated with TMTA are excluded from NOISE-R7 and instead addressed under NOISE-R5.	Amend NOISE-R7 as follows: This standard does not apply to: <b>iv. helicopter operation or landings associated with temporary military training activities which are addressed in NOISE-R5.</b>		Accept in part
FS184.16	Richard Milner		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS403.172	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Oppose	Te Whatu Ora seek amendment of this rule to improve clarity and activities which potentially have adverse effects on public health should have controls.	Disallow in part	Te Whatu Ora seek amendment of this rule to improve clarity and activities which potentially have adverse effects on public health should have controls.	Accept in part
S168.085	Setar Thirty Six Limited	NOISE-R7	Oppose	Rule Noise-R7 only permits Helicopter landing areas where flight movements are for emergency purposes such as medical emergencies, search and rescue or firefighting purposes and the helicopter landing site complies with standard: NOISES4 Helicopter landing areas. In other words, both PER-1 and PER-2 need	Amend Rule NOISE-R7 as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 ... <b>Or</b>		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>to be met in order to comply with the rule (consistent with the structure of other rules in the Plan).                      Given the nature of the activity, it would serve a better resource management purpose, if flight movements for emergency purposes such as medical emergencies, search and rescue or firefighting purposes are exempt from the standard NOISE-S4 Helicopter landing areas. That would also be consistent with note 10 in this section that the noise rules and standards do not apply to helicopters used for an emergency and as an air ambulance.                      As drafted there would appear to be no provision for helicopters other than flight movements for emergency purposes such as medical emergencies, search and rescue or firefighting purposes. The intent of the rule might be better served by allowing helicopter landing site complying with standard:                      NOISE-S4 Helicopter landing areas, irrespective of the use of the helicopter.                      Redrafting of the rule to make PER-1 and PER-2 separately applicable would meet the above issues (ie the addition of an 'or')                      In addition, the rule lacks specificity as to what comprises a helicopter landing area, although there is a disconnect between the title of the rule which applies to helicopter landing areas" (presumably dedicated areas for this purpose) and the content of the rule which applies to the movements and landing of helicopters. If the intent is to apply to dedicated helicopter landing areas, then a definition of that land use is warranted to give the rule specificity.</p>	<p>PER-2 ...</p>	
<p><b>FS184.19</b></p>	<p>Richard Milner</p>		<p>Support in part</p>	<p>Agree with the addition of OR but also                       Non Air transport commercial aviation should be added to R7 PER 2 as Item IV for the use of Helicopter Operations conducted for Utility, Maintenance, Inspection or Survey purposes such as but not limited to:                       lifting of equipment, water tanks, machinery, gravel, livestock etc. Removal of trees, maintaining or constructing infrastructure such as Powerlines, Cell towers etc, Maintaining or developing tracks, roads, slips. Survey operations, flight training and utility work like survey or agricultural activities or frost protection. All of these activities</p>	<p>Allow in part</p>	<p>Accept in part</p>

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>would require a helicopter landing site of a temporary nature and it should be Permitted Activity</p> <p>A Helicopter landing area should allow of fuelling of the aircraft especially if a temporary landing area</p> <p>Field Maintenance should also be allowed as a temporary operation may require some inspection and routine maintenance during operations - Transits to maintenance at larger airports is not practical in Northland with Whangarei and Auckland as closest airports with helicopter maintenance facilities</p> <p>Example would be for Powerlines assessment and maintenance - on site fuelling should be allowed as the dead leg to and from a fuelling station could be many miles adding unnecessary cost to the community and economy - Northland does not have many airports so the transit (dead leg) to and from fuel is possibly large</p>			
<b>FS403.169</b>	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Oppose	Te Whatu Ora seek amendment of this rule to improve clarity and activities which potentially have adverse effects on public health should have controls.	Disallow in part	Te Whatu Ora seek amendment of this rule to improve clarity and activities which potentially have adverse effects on public health should have controls.	Accept in part
<b>S337.003</b>	Ironwood Trust Limited	NOISE-R7	Support in part	Supports in principle the inclusion of provisions for helicopter landing areas set out in the proposal but considers that these need to be amended to remove potential ambiguity and provide greater clarity.	Amend the exclusion provisions in Rule NOISE-R7 to clarify that the exclusions relate to PER-2, and delete sub-clauses i and ii of the exclusions		Accept in part
<b>FS184.21</b>	Richard Milner		Support in part	<p>Non Air transport commercial aviation should be added to R7 PER 2 as Item IV (as it currently reads) for the use of Helicopter Operations conducted for Utility, Maintenance, Inspection or Survey purposes such as but not limited to:</p> <p>lifting of equipment, water tanks, machinery, gravel, livestock etc. Removal of trees, maintaining or constructing infrastructure such as Powerlines, Cell towers etc, Maintaining or developing tracks, roads, slips. Survey operations, flight training and utility work like survey or agricultural activities or frost protection. All of these activities</p>	Allow in part		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>would require a helicopter landing site of a temporary nature and it should be Permitted Activity</p> <p>A Helicopter landing area should allow of fuelling of the aircraft especially if a temporary landing area</p> <p>Field Maintenance should also be allowed as a temporary operation may require some inspection and routine maintenance during operations - Transits to maintenance at larger airports is not practical in Northland with Whangarei and Auckland as closest airports with helicopter maintenance facilities</p> <p>Example would be for Powerlines assessment and maintenance - on site fuelling should be allowed as the dead leg to and from a fuelling station could be many miles adding unnecessary cost to the community and economy - Northland does not have many airports so the transit (dead leg) to and from fuel is possibly large</p>		
<b>S463.082</b>	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited	NOISE-R7	Support	<p>WBF supports the enablement of general helicopter flights as a permitted activity under sub-clause PER-2 of this rule. It suggests a minor amendment to reflect that helicopter movements are the source of the effect, not the helicopter landing site.</p>	<p>Amend PER-2 of Rule NOISE-R7 as follows:  <b>PER-2 Helicopter movements and landings at</b>  <b>tThe helicopter landing areasite complies</b>  <b>with standard:</b>  <b>NOISE-S4 Helicopter landing areas.</b></p>	Accept in part
<b>FS184.25</b>	Richard Milner		Oppose	<p>Does not seek change to existing wording however</p> <p>Non Air transport commercial aviation should be added to R7 PER 2 as Item IV for the use of Helicopter Operations conducted for Utility, Maintenance, Inspection or Survey purposes such as but not limited to:</p> <p>lifting of equipment, water tanks, machinery, gravel, livestock etc. Removal of trees, maintaining or constructing infrastructure such as Powerlines, Cell towers etc, Maintaining or developing tracks, roads, slips. Survey operations, flight training and utility work like survey or agricultural activities or frost protection. All of these activities would require a helicopter landing site of a temporary nature</p>	Disallow	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>and it should be Permitted Activity</p> <p>A Helicopter landing area should allow of fuelling of the aircraft especially if a temporary landing area</p> <p>Field Maintenance should also be allowed as a temporary operation may require some inspection and routine maintenance during operations - Transits to maintenance at larger airports is not practical in Northland with Whangerei and Auckland as closest airports with helicopter maintenance facilities</p> <p>Example would be for Powerlines assessment and maintenance - on site fuelling should be allowed as the dead leg to and from a fuelling station could be many miles adding unnecessary cost to the community and economy - Northland does not have many airports so the transit (dead leg) to and from fuel is possibly large</p>			
FS403.177	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Oppose	Te Whatu Ora seek amendment of this rule to improve clarity and activities which potentially have adverse effects on public health should have controls.	Disallow in part	Te Whatu Ora seek amendment of this rule to improve clarity and activities which potentially have adverse effects on public health should have controls.	Accept in part
S182.021	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association	NOISE-R7	Oppose	Seek a separate permitted activity rule for agricultural aviation therefore the exemption in NOISE-R7 is not needed	Delete NOISE-R7 PER-2 iii <del>Cropping, top dressing, and spraying for the purpose of farming or conservation carried out in the Rural Production, Horticulture zones, or within Significant natural Area on a seasonal, temporary, or intermittent basis for a period up to 30 days in any 12 month period.</del>		Accept in part
FS354.178	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	The submitter seeks to delete the exemption in NOISE-R7 iii) as they seek a separate permitted activity rule for agricultural aviation so the exemption is not needed.	Allow	Allow S182.021 and include a separate permitted activity rule for agricultural aviation	Accept in part
FS403.170	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Oppose	Te Whatu Ora seek amendment of this rule to improve clarity and activities which	Disallow in part	Te Whatu Ora seek amendment of this rule to improve clarity and activities	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				potentially have adverse effects on public health should have controls.		which potentially have adverse effects on public health should have controls.	
<b>S45.045</b>	Puketona Business Park Limited	NOISE-R7	Support	The Noise chapter of the PDP as notified is generally acceptable.	Retain the rules in the Noise chapter.		Accept in part
<b>FS403.166</b>	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support in part	Te Whatu Ora seek amendment of this rule to improve clarity and activities which potentially have adverse effects on public health should have controls.	Allow in part	Te Whatu Ora seek amendment of this rule to improve clarity and activities which potentially have adverse effects on public health should have controls.	Accept in part
<b>S159.089</b>	Horticulture New Zealand	NOISE-R8	Oppose	A limitation of 7am - 7pm is not appropriate for audible bird scaring devices as the main activity is prior to sunrise and after sunset	Amend PER-1 of Rule NOISE-R8: <b>Audible bBird scaring devices must only be used between 7.00am and 7.00pm on any calendar year ½ before sunrise and ½ hour after sunset</b>		Accept in part
<b>FS151.259</b>	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part
<b>FS570.251</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
<b>FS566.265</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
<b>FS569.287</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
<b>FS403.179</b>	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Oppose	Te Whatu Ora seek amendment of this rule to ensure that the three permitted activity consideration apply in conjunction and not as alternatives.	Disallow in part	Te Whatu Ora seek amendment of this rule to ensure that the three permitted activity consideration apply in conjunction and not as alternatives.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS403.181	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Oppose	Te Whatu Ora seek amendment of this rule to ensure that the three permitted activity consideration apply in conjunction and not as alternatives. The term maximum noise should be avoided.	Disallow in part	Te Whatu Ora seek amendment of this rule to ensure that the three permitted activity consideration apply in conjunction and not as alternatives. The term maximum noise should be avoided.	Accept in part
S516.069	Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland	NOISE-R8	Support	The three permitted activity conditions should all apply in conjunction and not as alternatives. The term "maximum noise level frequency" is erroneous and could lead to incorrect interpretation.	Amend Rule NOISE-R8 as follows: PER-11....; <b>and (inferred)</b> <del>PER-22. ...</del> ii. A maximum noise level frequency of <b>sound levels not exceeding</b> 65 dB LAE within the notional boundary of any noise sensitive activity not owned by the operator of the device; <b>and</b> <del>PER-33....</del>		Accept in part
FS354.181	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	PER-3 should not be in conjunction with PER 3 as the maximum noise level is set in PER2 so NOISE-S1 should not apply.	Disallow	Allow S516.069 to amend PER 2 but delete PER 3.	Accept in part
S45.046	Puketona Business Park Limited	NOISE-R8	Support	The Noise chapter of the PDP as notified is generally acceptable.	Retain the rules in the Noise chapter.		Accept in part
FS403.178	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Oppose	Te Whatu Ora seek amendment of this rule to ensure that the three permitted activity consideration apply in conjunction and not as alternatives.	Disallow in part	Te Whatu Ora seek amendment of this rule to ensure that the three permitted activity consideration apply in conjunction and not as alternatives.	Accept in part
FS403.180	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Oppose	Te Whatu Ora seek amendment of this rule to ensure that the three permitted activity consideration apply in conjunction and not as alternatives. The term maximum noise should be avoided.	Disallow in part	Te Whatu Ora seek amendment of this rule to ensure that the three permitted activity consideration apply in conjunction and not as alternatives. The term	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
						maximum noise should be avoided.	
<b>S159.090</b>	Horticulture New Zealand	NOISE-R9	Oppose	The inclusion of multiple frost fans should apply to fans located on the same site. A grower cannot control the noise from fans on other sites	Amend PER-3 of Rule NOISE-R9 as follows: The maximum noise generated by a single <del>or</del> <b>multiple</b> frost fans shall not exceed 55 dB LAeq(15min) at any time when assessed within the notional boundary of any noise sensitive activity on another site.		Reject
<b>FS151.260</b>	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject
<b>FS570.252</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
<b>FS566.266</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
<b>FS569.288</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
<b>S516.070</b>	Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland	NOISE-R9	Support	The three permitted activity conditions should all apply in conjunction and not as alternatives. The term "maximum noise" should be avoided as maximum noise level is a specific acoustics metric. The note regarding special audible characteristics could be misinterpreted and should be rephrased and included in the main clause.	Amend Rule NOISE-R9 as follows: <del>PER-11....; and PER-2 2....; and PER-33.</del> <b>PER-11....; and PER-2 2....; and PER-33.</b> The maximum noise generated by a single or multiple frost fans shall not exceed 55 dB LAeq(15min) at any time when assessed within the notional boundary of any noise sensitive activity on another site, <b>with no adjustment applied for any special audible characteristics.</b> Note: The noise limit includes a correction		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					for the special audible characteristics of frost fans.		
<b>FS354.182</b>	Horticulture New Zealand		Support in part	It should be clear that there will be no further correction for special audible characteristics	Allow	Allow S516.070	Accept in part
<b>S331.054</b>	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	NOISE-R9	Support	The submitter supports rule NOISE-R9 Noise from frost fans and horticultural wind machines, as the proposed permitted activity standards of noise limits to manage the noise effects from frost fans and horticultural wind machines on noise sensitive activities.	Retain rule NOISE-R9 Noise from frost fans and horticultural wind machines, as proposed.		Accept in part
<b>FS403.182</b>	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Oppose	Te Whatu Ora seek amendment of this rule to ensure that the three permitted activity consideration apply in conjunction and not as alternatives. The term maximum noise should be avoided.	Disallow in part	Te Whatu Ora seek amendment of this rule to ensure that the three permitted activity consideration apply in conjunction and not as alternatives. The term maximum noise should be avoided.	Accept in part
<b>S45.047</b>	Puketona Business Park Limited	NOISE-R9	Support	The Noise chapter of the PDP as notified is generally acceptable.	Retain the rules in the Noise chapter.		Accept in part
<b>S45.048</b>	Puketona Business Park Limited	NOISE-R10	Support	The Noise chapter of the PDP as notified is generally acceptable.	Retain the rules in the Noise chapter.		Accept
<b>S45.049</b>	Puketona Business Park Limited	NOISE-R11	Support	The Noise chapter of the PDP as notified is generally acceptable.	Retain the rules in the Noise chapter.		Accept
<b>S342.013</b>	Waipapa Pine Limited and Adrian Broughton Trust	Standards	Oppose	The submitters believe that the provisions associated with the Heavy Industrial Zone requires careful consideration and attention. The underlying zone intent describes quite clearly that the zone will create some objectionable effects in this respect. A balance needs to be struck between enabling heavy industrial activities to be able to operate effectively and efficiently within the Zone, whilst ensuring that the potential effects do not go over and beyond limits set under the PDP and within the s16 RMA 1991 requirements.	Not stated		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				To add further, the site is already managed by way of resource consent noise provisions and these consent conditions have been appropriately managed between the submitter and adjoining sites, and beyond. To this end, the submitter opposes the noise provisions until their own expert can consider the rules in context of their operations and underlying resource consenting requirements, and potential for growth.			
<b>FS374.027</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	Accept in part
<b>S51.009</b>	Jeff and Robby Kemp	NOISE-S1	Support	The rule as it applies to the Rural Production Zone is supported.	Retain NOISE-S1		Accept in part
<b>S213.024</b>	Timothy and Dion Spicer	NOISE-S1	Support in part	In Dion and Timothy Spicer's opinion, there is no logical reason to reduce noise limits between the hours of 7am to 10pm.	amend Rule NOISE-S1 Maximum Noise Levels (RRZ) to be consistent with current noise limits under the ODP.		Reject
<b>S316.003</b>	FNR Properties Limited	NOISE-S1	Support in part	It is noted that the maximum noise limits in the Rural Production zone and Mineral Extraction overlay, specifically those that apply to the period of 10pm to 7am, are conflicting. Given the Mineral Extraction overlay largely applies to sites with an underlying zone of Rural Production, specifying different noise limits essentially defeats the purpose of having such limits in the Mineral Extraction overlay. This could lead to confusion and interpretation issues.	Amend Rule NOISE-S1 so that noise limits in the Rural Production zone are consistent with those in the Mineral Extraction overlay.		Accept in part
<b>S331.056</b>	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	NOISE-S1	Support	The submitter supports standard NOISE-S1 Maximum noise levels - zone specific, as educational facilities are noise sensitive activities and often established in residential zones. The Ministry therefore supports the matters of discretion, specifically to consider the location of the noise generation activity in relation to any noise sensitive activities (b).	Retain standard NOISE-S1 Maximum noise levels - zone specific, as proposed.		Accept in part
<b>S331.057</b>	Ministry of Education Te	NOISE-S1	Support	The submitter supports standard NOISE-S1 Maximum noise levels - zone specific, in the Rural Production zone, Rural	Retain standard NOISE-S1 Maximum noise levels - zone specific, in the Rural Production zone, Rural Lifestyle		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga			Lifestyle zone, Māori Purpose zone, Horticulture zone, Moturoa Island zone, Kauri Cliffs zone, Ngawha Innovation and Enterprise Park zone, as educational facilities are noise sensitive activities and often established in rural zones. The Ministry therefore support the matters of discretion, specifically to consider the location of the noise generation activity in relation to any noise sensitive activities (b).	zone, Māori Purpose zone, Horticulture zone, Moturoa Island zone, Kauri Cliffs zone, Ngawha Innovation and Enterprise Park zone.	
<b>S331.058</b>	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	NOISE-S1	Support	The submitter supports standard NOISE-S1 Maximum noise levels - zone specific, in the Settlement zone, Carrington Estate zone, as educational facilities are noise sensitive activities and often established in rural zones. The Ministry therefore support the matters of discretion, specifically to consider the location of the noise generation activity in relation to any noise sensitive activities (b).	Retain standard NOISE-S1 Maximum noise levels - zone specific, in the Settlement zone, Carrington Estate zone, as proposed.	Accept in part
<b>S331.059</b>	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	NOISE-S1	Support	The submitter supports standard NOISE-S1 Maximum noise levels - zone specific, in the Mixed Use zone, as educational facilities are noise sensitive activities and often established in mixed use zones. The Ministry therefore support the matters of discretion, specifically to consider the ability to design and construct buildings accommodating noise sensitive activities with sound insulation and/or other mitigation measures to ensure the level of noise received within the building is minimised (d).	Retain standard NOISE-S1 Maximum noise levels - zone specific, in the Mixed Use zone, as proposed.	Accept in part
<b>S463.083</b>	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited	NOISE-S1	Support	With specific regard to Kauri Cliffs, WBF considers the permitted noise limited to be compatible with the general range of activities undertaken in the KCZ.	Retain Standard NOISE-S1	Accept in part
<b>S463.084</b>	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited	NOISE-S1	Support	Applying the noise rules for the NOSZ to the Natural Heritage subzone at Kauri Cliffs is inappropriate, given the NOSZ in this location is contained entirely in a private landholding.	Amend Standard NPOISE-S1 as follows: Noise generated by any activity shall not exceed the following noise limits at any point within any other site in the Natural Open Space ( <b>excluding the Kauri Cliffs Natural Heritage subzone</b> ), Open Space, and Sport and Active Recreation zone...	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
<b>S516.071</b>	Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland	NOISE-S1	Oppose	The term "maximum noise levels" has a defined meaning in acoustics standards relating to one specific noise metric. An alternative term should be used for referring to noise limits in general.	Amend the title of Standard NOISE-S1 (and all references to it in other provisions) to read: <del>Maximum noise levels</del> <b>Noise limits - zone specific"</b>		Accept
<b>S159.091</b>	Horticulture New Zealand	NOISE-S1	Support	The levels for the Rural Production and Horticulture zones are supported.	Retain Standard NOISE-S1 as relates to the Rural Production and Horticulture zones		Accept in part
<b>FS151.261</b>	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part
<b>FS570.253</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
<b>FS566.267</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
<b>FS569.289</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
<b>S516.072</b>	Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland	NOISE-S1	Oppose	<p>The s32 appendix report recommended a comprehensive set of zone noise limits including limits within zones and between zones. It recommended an overarching provision that, unless otherwise specified, emissions from any zone have to comply with the "within zone" noise limits for the receiving zone. In the notified proposed plan, those recommendations from the s32 report appendix have not been implemented. It appears an attempt has been made to simplify and combine the "within" and "between" zone noise limits, but in this process it has created numerous gaps where noise emissions between zones are not controlled. As such, the notified provisions are inadequate to protect public health. With the current structure of NOISE-S1 there is not a simple remedy and therefore specific wording has not been proposed here as comprehensive redrafting is required to address this issue.</p> <p>For airport noise, inclusion of both outer control boundaries and air noise boundaries is often appropriate for land use planning purposes. However, as a "noise limit", only one control line should apply to each airport. By default, this</p>	<p>Delete Standard NOISE-S1 and insert a table containing noise limits for each zone, applying to noise received in sites in each zone, regardless of whether the noise originated from other sites in that zone or sites in another zone.</p> <p>Only set airport noise limits at one boundary (outer control or air noise) for each airport.</p> <p>If separate noise limits are maintained for aircraft engine testing, amend the metric to read:</p> <p><b>"...dB LAeq(15 min) (9 hour) ..."</b></p>		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				should be the air noise boundary, unless for a small airport this line does not extend far enough to be practical. In accordance with the Noise and Vibration Metrics National Planning Standard and in turn NZS 6802, engine testing noise (that is not otherwise included in aircraft operations noise), should be subject to noise limits using the metric LAeq(15 min) and not with a 9 hour average.			
FS184.47	Richard Milner		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS243.097	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, as it is inconsistent with its primary submission. Kāinga Ora supports the retention of the standard as notified. The amendment is unnecessary.	Disallow	Delete Standard NOISE-S1 and insert a table .....	Accept in part
FS354.183	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	The submitter is seeking a re-write of S1 but has not provided the changes sought. Without the re-write being available it is not possible to assess the effect of the changes sought.	Disallow	Disallow S516.072	Accept in part
S561.054	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	NOISE-S1	Support	Providing for an increased noise level during daytime activities within the Māori Purpose zones is enabling for the economic growth and development of Māori within the District.	Retain Noise-S1 as notified.		Accept in part
FS32.108	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</p>	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.			
<b>FS402.014</b>	Te Whatu Ora - Health New Zealand		Oppose	Te Whatu Ora seek to amend NOISE-S1 to provide for hospitals to operate as Regionally Significant Infrastructure, along with recognising their prominence in the existing environment.	Disallow in part	Seek provision detail as above.	Accept in part
<b>FS23.326</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
<b>FS47.068</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
<b>FS348.141</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
<b>S454.104</b>	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	NOISE-S1	Not Stated	Night time noise limits in these zones are set at 40dBA LAeq between 10pm and 7am. The night time noise limit in many of the equivalent zones in the Operative Far North District Plan is 45dBA LAeq. It is unclear that a reduction in the night time noise limit is necessary to address adverse effects or maintain amenity in these zones. A night time noise limits of 45dBA LAeq is consistent with similar environments in other districts. The National Grid traverses the entire country and to have these	Amend the PDP where the night time noise limit is set at 40dBA LAeq (15 min) in any of the zones in the Far North District, change the limit to 45dBA LAeq		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				types of limits applied inconsistently to the same type of infrastructure is problematic. Transpower therefore considers that the night time noise limits in these zones should be retained at 45dBA LAeq.			
<b>FS243.098</b>	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, as it is inconsistent with its primary submission. Kāinga Ora supports the retention of the standard as notified. The amendment is unnecessary.	Disallow	Amend the PDP where the night time noise limit is set at 40dBA LAeq (15 min) in any of the zones in the Far North District, change the limit to 45dBA LAeq	Accept in part
<b>S45.018</b>	Puketona Business Park Limited	NOISE-S1	Support	The Noise chapter of the PDP as notified is generally acceptable	Retain the standards in the Noise chapter.		Accept in part
<b>FS402.012</b>	Te Whatu Ora - Health New Zealand		Oppose	Te Whatu Ora seek to amend NOISE-S1 to provide for hospitals to operate as Regionally Significant Infrastructure, along with recognising their prominence in the existing environment.	Disallow in part	Seek provision detail as above.	Accept in part
<b>S45.050</b>	Puketona Business Park Limited	NOISE-S1	Support	The Noise chapter of the PDP as notified is generally acceptable.	Retain the standards in the Noise chapter.		Accept in part
<b>FS402.013</b>	Te Whatu Ora - Health New Zealand		Oppose	Te Whatu Ora seek to amend NOISE-S1 to provide for hospitals to operate as Regionally Significant Infrastructure, along with recognising their prominence in the existing environment.	Disallow in part	Seek provision detail as above.	Accept in part
<b>S42.015</b>	Te Whatu Ora - Health New Zealand, Te Tai Tokerau	NOISE-S1	Support in part	The Hospital is an existing use, located on the current sites for a number of years. Therefore, the Hospital is not new to the surrounding environment and its status as Regionally Significant Infrastructure, along with its long tenure in this environment, must be recognised. As such it must be ensured that any new development and/or redevelopment of the Hospital is not treated as though it is entirely new, rather recognising the Hospital and the adjacent landuses including residential land uses in the immediate environment have successfully coexisted for a significant period of time and the Hospital must be enabled to operate, expand and redevelop over time.	Amend the noise provisions in the chapter to ensure that the zone provisions don't constrain hospital activities nor the design and future expansion of the facilities		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS570.032	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
FS566.046	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
FS569.068	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
S516.073	Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland	NOISE-S2	Support	There is a typographical error for two noise metrics.	Amend Standard NOISE-S2 as required to correct the reference as follows: <del>dB</del> LAeq(1 min)		Accept
S45.051	Puketona Business Park Limited	NOISE-S2	Support	The Noise chapter of the PDP as notified is generally acceptable.	Retain the standards in the Noise chapter		Accept in part
S454.105	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	NOISE-S2	Not Stated	These noise limits apply to temporary activities such as the use of generators to provide power for lifeline utilities. This type of activity may not always be able to comply with the noise limits specified and the emergency nature of the activity means that it is unlikely that a resource consent could be applied for to authorise the exceedance in a timely way to ensure that the lifeline utilities can be provided when required. Transpower therefore considers that temporary activities providing lifeline utilities should be excluded from the standard.	Amend the first sentence of NOISE-S2 as follows: 1. The noise generated from any temporary activities (excluding temporary military training activities <b>and temporary activities providing lifeline utilities</b> ) and emergency management training activities, shall not exceed the following limits at any point:		Reject
FS369.497	Top Energy		Support	Top Energy supports the provision for temporary activities providing lifeline utilities.	Allow		Reject
S217.020	New Zealand Defence Force	NOISE-S3	Support in part	NZDF has developed a bespoke set of noise standards that are realistic and appropriate for the type of noise generated. These standards are based on professional acoustic advice and NZDF seeks their inclusion in proposed plans nationwide. NZDF seeks that the noise levels specified in NOISE-S3 are amended to reflect the NZDF standards.	Amend NOISE - S3 as follows: 1. 7am to 7pm - <b>50</b> dB LAeq(15min) 2. 7pm to 10pm - <b>50</b> dB LAeq(15min) 3. 10pm to 7am - <b>45</b> dB LAeq(15min) 4. 10pm to 7am - <b>75</b> dB L <sub>A</sub> max		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S45.052	Puketona Business Park Limited	NOISE-S3	Support	The Noise chapter of the PDP as notified is generally acceptable.	Retain the standards in the Noise chapter.	Accept in part
S463.085	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited	NOISE-S4	Support in part	WBF supports the provision for helicopter movements to/from Kauri Cliffs. It suggests a minor amendment to this rule to clarify where noise measurements are to be taken.	Amend Standard NOISE-S4 as follows: Noise generated from the movements and landing of helicopters shall comply with the following noise limits when measured at any point within <b>a site in separate ownership</b> in any General Residential and Rural Residential zones, or within the notional boundary of any noise sensitive activity <b>on a site in separate ownership</b> in the Rural Production, Rural Lifestyle, Settlement, Horticulture or Māori Purpose zones when assessed in accordance with NZS 6807:1994: Noise Management and Land Use Planning for Helicopter Landing Areas.	Reject
S516.074	Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland	NOISE-S4	Support	The text explicitly refers to "the following noise limits" but none are given.	Amend Standard NOISE-S4 to add noise limits from Table 1 of NZS 6807.	Accept in part
S159.092	Horticulture New Zealand	NOISE-S4	Support in part	It should be clear that there are exemptions in the rules so Standard NOISE-S4 does not apply. In particular NZS6807:1994 is not appropriate for the intermittent use for horticultural activities.	Amend Standard NOISE-S4 to clarify that it does not apply to activities exempted in Rule NOISE-R7	Accept in part
FS109.25	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association		Support in part	Agricultural aviation activities that include fixed wing and helicopters and ALL agricultural aviation activities should be provided for in the plan as sought in S182.021. Further, NOISE-S4 should include the note sought by the submitter relating to the new rule sought in S182.021	Allow in part	Accept in part
FS151.262	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS570.254	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
FS566.268	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
FS569.290	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
S42.016	Te Whatu Ora - Health New Zealand, Te Tai Tokerau	NOISE-S4	Support in part	The Hospital is an existing use, located on the current sites for a number of years. Therefore, the Hospital is not new to the surrounding environment and its status as Regionally Significant Infrastructure, along with its long tenure in this environment, must be recognised. As such it must be ensured that any new development and/or redevelopment of the Hospital is not treated as though it is entirely new, rather recognising the Hospital and the adjacent landuses including residential land uses in the immediate environment have successfully coexisted for a significant period of time and the Hospital must be enabled to operate, expand and redevelop over time.	Amend the noise provisions in the chapter to ensure that the zone provisions don't constrain hospital activities nor the design and future expansion of the facilities; protect the rights of helicopters to operate on the hospital sites.		Accept in part
FS184.27	Richard Milner		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS570.033	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
FS566.047	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
FS569.069	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
S182.023	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association	NOISE-S4	Support	NZS6807:2994 (NZS6807:1994 inferred) is not an appropriate standard for temporary and intermittent use of helicopters for agricultural aviation activities	Amend NOISE-S4 Note by adding NZS6807:1994 does not apply to agricultural aviation activities		Accept in part
FS184.28	Richard Milner		Support		Allow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
<b>FS184.29</b>	Richard Milner		Support in part	Amend NOISE -S4 by adding NZS6807:1994 does not apply to agricultural aviation activities and non Air Transport Commercial Aviation Activities	Allow in part		Accept in part
<b>FS354.185</b>	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	It needs to be clear that Noise -S4 does not apply to agricultural aviation activities.	Allow	Allow S182.023	Accept in part
<b>S167.088</b>	Bentzen Farm Limited	NOISE-S4	Oppose	The rule NOISE-S4 rule does not specify the noise standard to be complied with: referring to 'the following noise limits', without specifying what that is (with only reference to being 'assessed' in accordance with NZS 6807:1994: Noise Management and Land Use Planning for Helicopter Landing Areas, rather than any noise limit contained therein or otherwise expressing a noise limit). That lacks measurability as a rule. In addition, the rule ostensibly applies to 'helicopter landing areas' which presumably is the land use as proposed to be defined by this submission (ie dedicated landing areas), rather than simply the landing and take off of helicopter areas per se. If this is the case, then this would appropriately link with NZS6807:1994: Noise Management and Land Use Planning for Helicopter Landing Areas.	Delete NOISE-S4 Helicopter landing areas and replace with a rule that: 1. Applies the rule to helicopter landing areas only as sought to be defined by this submission. 2. References an appropriate noise limit to be complied with (for example 50 dB Ldn at the notional boundary of a vulnerable activity).		Accept in part
<b>FS184.30</b>	Richard Milner		Oppose		Disallow		Accept in part
<b>FS354.184</b>	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	HortNZ has sought changes to Noise S4.	Disallow	Disallow S167.088 and amend as sought in S159.092	Accept in part
<b>FS566.450</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow		Accept in part
<b>S333.078</b>	P S Yates Family Trust	NOISE-S4	Oppose	The rule NOISE-S4 rule does not specify the noise standard to be complied with: referring to 'the following noise limits', without specifying what that is (with only reference to being 'assessed' in accordance with NZS 6807:1994: Noise Management and Land Use Planning for Helicopter Landing Areas, rather than any noise limit contained therein or otherwise expressing a noise limit). That lacks measurability as a rule. In addition, the rule ostensibly applies to 'helicopter landing areas' which presumably is the land use as proposed to be defined by this submission (ie dedicated landing areas), rather than simply the landing and take off of helicopter	Delete NOISE-S4 Helicopter landing areas and replace with a rule that: 1. Applies the rule to helicopter landing areas only as sought to be defined by this submission. 2. References an appropriate noise limit to be complied with (for example 50 dB Ldn at the notional boundary of a vulnerable activity).		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				areas per se. If this is the case, then this would appropriately link with NZS 6807:1994: Noise Management and Land Use Planning for Helicopter Landing Areas.		
<b>FS184.31</b>	Richard Milner		Oppose		Disallow	Accept in part
<b>S168.086</b>	Setar Thirty Six Limited	NOISE-S4	Oppose	Standard NOISE-S4 does not specify the noise standard to be complied with: referring to 'the following noise limits', without specifying what that is (with only reference to being 'assessed' in accordance with NZS 6807:1994: Noise Management and Land Use Planning for Helicopter Landing Areas, rather than any noise limit contained therein or otherwise expressing a noise limit). That lacks measurability as a rule. In addition, the rule ostensibly applies to 'helicopter landing areas' which presumably is the land use as proposed to be defined by this submission (ie dedicated landing areas), rather than simply the landing and take off of helicopter areas per se. If this is the case, then this would appropriately link with NZS 6807:1994: Noise Management and Land Use Planning for Helicopter Landing Areas.	Delete standard NOISE-S4 Helicopter landing areas and replace with a rule that: 1. Applies the rule to helicopter landing areas only as sought to be defined by this submission. 2. References an appropriate noise limit to be complied with (for example 50 dB Ldn at the notional boundary of a vulnerable activity).	Accept in part
<b>FS184.32</b>	Richard Milner		Oppose		Disallow	Accept in part
<b>S337.002</b>	Ironwood Trust Limited	NOISE-S4	Support in part	Supports in principle the inclusion of provisions for helicopter landing areas set out in the proposal but considers that these need to be amended to remove potential ambiguity and provide greater clarity.	Amend Standard NOISE-S4 to clarify that noise generated from helicopter movements complies with the limits set out standard NZS 6807:1994 when measured at any point within the boundary of the General Residential and Rural Residential zones, or within the notional boundary of any noise sensitive activity in the Rural Production, Rural Lifestyle, Settlement, Horticulture or Maori Purposes zones	Accept in part
<b>FS184.33</b>	Richard Milner		Oppose		Disallow	Accept in part
<b>S243.106</b>	Matauri Trustee Limited	NOISE-S4	Oppose	The rule NOISE-S4 rule does not specify the noise standard to be complied with: referring to 'the following noise limits', without specifying what that is (with only reference to being 'assessed' in accordance with NZS 6807:1994: Noise Management and Land Use Planning for Helicopter Landing Areas, rather than any noise limit contained therein or otherwise expressing a noise limit). That lacks measurability as a rule.	Delete NOISE-S4 Helicopter landing areas and replace with a rule that: 1. Applies the rule to helicopter landing areas only as sought to be defined by this submission. 2. References an appropriate noise limit to be complied with (for example 50 dB Ldn at the notional boundary of a vulnerable activity).	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				In addition, the rule ostensibly applies to 'helicopter landing areas' which presumably is the land use as proposed to be defined by this submission (i.e. dedicated landing areas), rather than simply the landing and take-off of helicopter areas per se. If this is the case, then this would appropriately link with NZS 6807:1994: Noise Management and Land Use Planning for Helicopter Landing Areas.			
<b>FS184.34</b>	Richard Milner		Oppose		Disallow		Accept in part
<b>FS570.664</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
<b>FS566.678</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
<b>FS569.700</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
<b>S187.077</b>	The Shooting Box Limited	NOISE-S4	Oppose	<p>The rule NOISE-S4 rule does not specify the noise standard to be complied with: referring to 'the following noise limits', without specifying what that is (with only reference to being 'assessed' in accordance with NZS 6807:1994: Noise Management and Land Use Planning for Helicopter Landing Areas, rather than any noise limit contained therein or otherwise expressing a noise limit). That lacks measurability as a rule.</p> <p>In addition, the rule ostensibly applies to 'helicopter landing areas' which presumably is the land use as proposed to be defined by this submission (ie dedicated landing areas), rather than simply the landing and take off of helicopter areas per se. If this is the case, then this would appropriately link with NZS 6807:1994: Noise Management and Land Use Planning for Helicopter Landing Areas.</p>	Delete NOISE-S4 Helicopter landing areas and replace with a rule that: 1. Applies the rule to helicopter landing areas only as sought to be defined by this submission. 2. References an appropriate noise limit to be complied with (for example 50dB at the notional boundary of a vulnerable activity).		Accept in part
<b>FS184.35</b>	Richard Milner		Oppose		Disallow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
<b>S222.081</b>	Wendover Two Limited	NOISE-S4	Oppose	The rule NOISE-S4 rule does not specify the noise standard to be complied with: referring to 'the following noise limits', without specifying what that is (with only reference to being 'assessed' in accordance with NZS 6807:1994: Noise Management and Land Use Planning for Helicopter Landing Areas, rather than any noise limit contained therein or otherwise expressing a noise limit). That lacks measurability as a rule. In addition, the rule ostensibly applies to 'helicopter landing areas' which presumably is the land use as proposed to be defined by this submission (ie dedicated landing areas), rather than simply the landing and take off of helicopter areas per se. If this is the case, then this would appropriately link with NZS 6807:1994: Noise Management and Land Use Planning for Helicopter Landing Areas.	Delete NOISE-S4 Helicopter landing areas and insert a rule that: 1. Applies the rule to helicopter landing areas only as sought to be defined by this submission. 2. References an appropriate noise limit to be complied with (for example 50 dB Ldn at the notional boundary of a vulnerable activity).	Accept in part
<b>FS184.36</b>	Richard Milner		Oppose		Disallow	Accept in part
<b>S45.053</b>	Puketona Business Park Limited	NOISE-S4	Support	The Noise chapter of the PDP as notified is generally acceptable.	Retain the standards in the Noise chapter.	Accept in part
<b>FS402.015</b>	Te Whatu Ora - Health New Zealand		Oppose	Te Whatu Ora seek to amend NOISE-S4 to provide for hospitals to operate as Regionally Significant Infrastructure, along with recognising their prominence in the existing environment.	Disallow in part Seek provision detail as above.	Accept in part
<b>S331.060</b>	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	NOISE-S5	Support	The submitter supports standard NOISE-S5 Noise insulation standards for all noise sensitive activities, for all zones within 40m of a State Highway that exceed an average of 15,000 daily one-way vehicle movements, as educational facilities are noise sensitive activities, however, they may already be established or have an operational need to be established 40m of a State Highway that exceed an average of 15,000 daily one-way vehicle movements. The Ministry support in part the matters of discretion, specifically to consider the ability to design and construct buildings accommodating noise sensitive activities with sound insulation and/or other mitigation measures to ensure the level of noise received within the building is minimised (h).	Retain standard NOISE-S5 Noise insulation standards for all noise sensitive activities, for all zones within 40m of a State Highway that exceed an average of 15,000 daily one-way vehicle movements, as proposed.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S331.061	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	NOISE-S5	Support	The submitter supports standard NOISE-S5 Noise insulation standards for all noise sensitive activities, for Mixed Use zone, Light Industrial zone, Orongo Bay zone.	Retain standard NOISE-S5 Noise insulation standards for all noise sensitive activities, for Mixed Use zone, Light Industrial zone, Orongo Bay zone, as proposed.	Accept in part
S516.075	Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland	NOISE-S5	Support	For all parts of this provision, if residents need to close windows to maintain reasonable indoor noise levels then adequate alternative ventilation and cooling need to be provided. Clause G4 of the New Zealand Building Code only requires minimal ventilation and no cooling.	Amend Standard NOISE-S5 to replace existing ventilation requirements in all three rows with the following: <b>If windows are required to be closed to achieve the internal noise limit the building must be designed, constructed and maintained with a mechanical ventilation system that for habitable rooms:i. provides mechanical ventilation to satisfy clause G4 of the New Zealand Building Code; andii. is adjustable by the occupant to control the ventilation rate in increments up to a high air flow setting that provides at least 6 air changes per hour; andiii. provides relief for equivalent volumes of spill air; andiv. provides cooling and heating that is controllable by the occupant and can maintain the inside temperature between 18°C and 25°C; andv. does not generate more than 35 dBLAeq (30s) when measured 1m away from any grille or diffuser.</b>	Accept in part
S45.054	Puketona Business Park Limited	NOISE-S5	Support	The Noise chapter of the PDP as notified is generally acceptable.	Retain the standards in the Noise chapter.	Accept in part
S344.026	Paihia Properties Holdings Corporate	NOISE-S5	Oppose	The requirement to attenuate 40m from the State Highway is onerous, given the nature of the use of the road. PPHCTL are concerned that the MUZ and State Highway setback noise attenuation rules have different standards.	Delete Standard NOISE-S5	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Trustee Limited and UP Management Ltd						
<b>FS36.065</b>	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency		Oppose	Supports the protection of human health and noise sensitive activities through the provision of noise insulation standards within buffer zones adjacent to the State Highway network. However, as per Waka Kotahi's original submission the preference is to map the area of interest with a (modelled) noise contour line (NCBO) being established. Activities 'inside' the NCBO are a permitted activity (for the purposes of noise) if specific requirements are met.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept
<b>FS396.047</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
<b>S356.109</b>	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	NOISE-S5	Oppose	There are no State Highways in the district that exceed 15,000vpd. It is recommended the rule is reworded to apply to all areas within 100m of state highways, this distance may be reduced according to a mapped area that Waka Kotahi will provide to the Council in due course.	Delete reference to vpd and reword to apply to all areas within 100m of state highways.		Accept in part
<b>FS243.092</b>	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought. Kāinga Ora considers that effects should only be mitigated by noise sensitive activities in the receiving environment following adopting of the Best Practicable Option ("BPO") to minimise and mitigate at source and in the vicinity of the corridor the off-site effects as far as possible. Restrictions on neighbouring noise sensitive activities should be no more stringent than necessary. Any such controls should be informed by evidential noise modelling.	Disallow	Amend NOISE-S5 to delete reference to vpd and reword to apply to all areas within 100m of state highway	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S356.110	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	NOISE-S5	Support in part	<p>Part 1 - Amend to include criteria for other noise sensitive activities as per the default provision in the attached s32 report.</p> <p>Part 2 - Amend the 2dB to 3dB and to change the explanation "allowing for future traffic increase" to "allowing for uncertainty and routine changes"</p> <p>Part 3 - It is considered that ventilation should be addressed separately so last sentence should be deleted.</p> <p>Part 4 - It is considered that this partly duplicates Part 3 it is also considered this Part does not make sense.</p> <p>Waka Kotahi also seeks for a new clause to be added that states if windows need to be closed to achieve 1, then mechanical ventilation is to be provided.</p>	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Add criteria for other noise sensitive activities.</li> <li>2. Amend wording as follows: "Compliance with (1) above shall be achieved based on an existing noise level with a 2 3 decibel addition allowing for <del>future traffic increase</del> <b>increase uncertainty and routine changes;</b>"</li> <li>3. Amend wording as follows: "Compliance with (1) above shall be achieved if, prior to the construction of any building containing a habitable room, an acoustic design certificate from a suitably qualified acoustic engineer is provided to the Council stating the design will achieve compliance with this standard. The building shall be designed, constructed, and maintained in accordance with the design certificate. <del>The design certificate shall also state the required HVAC design noise levels that are to be included in the ventilation design as well as any relevant assumptions;</del>"</li> <li>4) Clarification is sought by Waka Kotahi as it is unclear what it sets to achieve.</li> <li>5) Add new clause to require mechanical ventilation to be required if windows need to be closed to achieve (1.)</li> </ol>		Accept in part
FS243.093	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose	<p>Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought. Kāinga Ora considers that effects should only be mitigated by noise sensitive activities in the receiving environment following adopting of the Best Practicable Option ("BPO") to minimise and mitigate at source and in the vicinity of the corridor the off-site effects as far as possible.</p> <p>Restrictions on neighbouring noise sensitive activities should</p>	Disallow in part	Part 1 - Amend .....	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				be no more stringent than necessary. Any such controls should be informed by evidential noise modelling. Kāinga Ora opposes the amendment which is overly prescriptive.			
<b>S356.111</b>	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	NOISE-S5	Oppose	Waka Kotahi suggests all matters b. through to h. be deleted. The 40dB standard is a bottom line for protection of health and it is not appropriate to add factors to open this up for litigation. It is considered that if there is appropriate mitigation, then it would result in meeting the standard.	Amend as follows:  Matters of discretion are restricted to: a. effects in the ability of existing or permitted activities to operate or establish without undue constraint; <del>b. any legal instruments proposed;</del> <del>c. mitigation of noise achieved through other means;</del> <del>d. any topographical or other site constraints;</del> <del>e. any alternative solutions proposed by a suitably qualified acoustic engineer to achieve appropriate amenity for present and future residents of the site;</del> <del>f. any existing noise generating activities and the level of noise that will be received within any noise sensitive building;</del> <del>g. the primary purpose and the frequency of use of the activity; and</del> <del>h. the ability to design and construct buildings accommodating noise sensitive activities with sound insulation and/or other mitigation measures to ensure the level of noise received within the building is minimised particularly at night.</del>		Accept in part
<b>FS243.094</b>	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought. Kāinga Ora considers that effects should only be mitigated by noise sensitive activities in the receiving environment following adopting of the Best Practicable Option ("BPO") to minimise and mitigate at source and in the vicinity of the corridor the off-site effects as far as possible. Restrictions on neighbouring noise sensitive activities should	Disallow	Amend NOISE-S5 to delete matters of discretion b. through .....	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				be no more stringent than necessary. Any such controls should be informed by evidential noise modelling.			
<b>S416.041</b>	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	NOISE-S5	Support in part	<p>KiwiRail seeks the inclusion of noise and vibration controls requiring acoustic insulation and ventilation to be installed in new (or altered) sensitive uses within 100m of the railway corridor.</p> <p>Noise and Vibration from rail corridors can potentially give rise to adverse health and amenity effects on noise sensitive activities located nearby if not properly addressed and provided for. The proposed standard provides options for developers in achieving an appropriate level of amenity for residents who live within 100m of the rail corridor.</p> <p>The rail network is a 24 hour a day, seven day a week operation, and the frequency, length and weight of trains can change without community consultation. Noise and vibration can have an impact on the internal amenity of a building. Appropriate mitigation, installed to ensure that the health and wellbeing of those living and working near to the rail network are not adversely affected, is pivotal to ensure that undue restrictions are not placed on the operation of the rail network.</p> <p>Rail activities not only generate noise, but also vibration effects. KiwiRail seek amendment to require acoustic and vibration treatment for sensitive activities within identified corridors adjacent to the railway networks to ensure an appropriate level of internal amenity is achieved in buildings adjacent to the rail corridor. The proposed standard includes the requirement for feedback form KiwiRail. As the railway and network utility operator, KiwiRail's feedback about any effects of non-compliance is required to ensure that any proposed mitigation is appropriate.</p> <p>KiwiRail also seeks controls within 60m of the railway corridor, for buildings containing new (or altered) sensitive uses to be constructed to manage the impacts of vibration. These controls are important to ensure new development is undertaken in a way that achieves a healthy living environment for people locating within proximity to the railway corridor, minimising the potential for complaints about the effects of the railway network.</p>	Insert a standard (as outlined in the submission) to apply in all zones to built development at any point within 100 metres from the legal boundary of any railway network		Accept in part
<b>FS534.047</b>	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited		Oppose	WBFL appreciates the intent of the relief sought but considers it irrelevant to the Kauri Cliffs Special Purpose	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Zone, given the location and discrete extent of the zone and the absence of rail designations in the area.			
<b>S45.055</b>	Puketona Business Park Limited	NOISE-S6	Support	The Noise chapter of the PDP as notified is generally acceptable.	Retain the standards in the Noise chapter.		Accept
<b>S342.024</b>	Waipapa Pine Limited and Adrian Broughton Trust	NOISE-Table 1	Oppose	<p>The submitters believe that the provisions associated with the Heavy Industrial Zone requires careful consideration and attention. The underlying zone intent describes quite clearly that the zone will create some objectionable effects in this respect.</p> <p>A balance needs to be struck between enabling heavy industrial activities to be able to operate effectively and efficiently within the Zone, whilst ensuring that the potential effects do not go over and beyond limits set under the PDP and within the s16 RMA 1991 requirements.</p> <p>To add further, the site is already managed by way of resource consent noise provisions and these consent conditions have been appropriately managed between the submitter and adjoining sites, and beyond.</p> <p>To this end, the submitter opposes the noise provisions until their own expert can consider the rules in context of their operations and underlying resource consenting requirements, and potential for growth.</p>	Not stated		Reject
<b>FS374.038</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
<b>S516.076</b>	Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland	NOISE-Table 1	Oppose	There are no design noise levels specified for the Orongo Bay zone, as required by NOISE-S5.	Insert design noise levels within NOISE-Table 1 for the Orongo Bay zone		Accept
<b>FS398.008</b>	Waitoto Developments Limited		Oppose	It is not provided in the submission why noise levels are required in the Orongo Bay Special Zone	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
<b>S516.077</b>	Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland	NOISE-Table 2	Support	There are two typographical errors in the vibration limits. All limits should be with units of mm/s. The number of blasts per year is erroneously stated as "all hours" and value of peak airblast sound limit is stated as "all" in two rows.	Amend NOISE-Table 2 as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amend two instances so that all vibration limits are in units of mm/s</li> <li>Amend the number of blasts and peak airblast sound limit to delete and replace entries of "all hours" and "all" respectively.</li> </ul>		Accept
<b>S342.025</b>	Waipapa Pine Limited and Adrian Broughton Trust	NOISE-Table 2	Oppose	The submitters believe that the provisions associated with the Heavy Industrial Zone requires careful consideration and attention. The underlying zone intent describes quite clearly that the zone will create some objectionable effects in this respect. A balance needs to be struck between enabling heavy industrial activities to be able to operate effectively and efficiently within the Zone, whilst ensuring that the potential effects do not go over and beyond limits set under the PDP and within the s16 RMA 1991 requirements.  To add further, the site is already managed by way of resource consent noise provisions and these consent conditions have been appropriately managed between the submitter and adjoining sites, and beyond. To this end, the submitter opposes the noise provisions until their own expert can consider the rules in context of their operations and underlying resource consenting requirements, and potential for growth.	Not stated		Reject
<b>FS374.039</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
<b>S182.001</b>	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association	New Definition	Not Stated	Seek to have agricultural aviation defined to include primary production, biosecurity, and conservation activities undertaken by agricultural aviation	Include a new definition Agricultural aviation activities. means the intermittent operation of an aircraft from a rural airstrip or helicopter landing area for primary production activities, and; conservation activities for biosecurity, or biodiversity purposes; including stock		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					management, and the application of fertiliser, agrichemicals, or vertebrate toxic agents (VTA's). For clarity, aircraft includes fixed wing aeroplanes, helicopters, and unmanned aerial vehicles (UAV's).		
<b>FS176.18</b>	Summit Forests New Zealand Limited		Support	As set out in the original submission.	Allow		Accept in part
<b>FS188.1</b>	Richard Milner		Support in part	<p>We seek the inclusion of the minimum weight of 200kg be added to the definition to read:</p> <p>Agricultural aviation activities.</p> <p>means the intermittent operation of an aircraft from a rural airstrip or helicopter landing area for primary production activities, and; conservation activities for biosecurity, or biodiversity purposes; including stock management, and the application of fertiliser, agrichemicals, or vertebrate toxic agents (VTA's). For clarity, aircraft includes fixed wing aeroplanes, helicopters, and unmanned aerial vehicles (UAV's) above 200kg.</p> <p>Our reasons for this is so that UAV that are smaller than 200kg are not limited in their function in the plan as they provide vital works in the areas of but not limited to safety, infrastructure, asset maintenance, survey, surveillance, TV and Film, Training. UAV provide financial gain to the economy and their use has also improved safety to many fields of work including agriculture. Small UAV (under 200kg) will provide agricultural aviation to work closer to boundaries and in areas that larger manned aircraft can not operate. However with the restrictions of all UAV from 250g and up this could be a significant limiting factor.</p>	Allow in part		Accept in part
<b>FS184.5</b>	Richard Milner		Support		Allow		Accept in part
<b>FS184.41</b>	Richard Milner		Support		Allow		Accept in part
<b>FS184.52</b>	Richard Milner		Support		Allow		Accept in part
<b>FS404.002</b>	Penny Nelson, Director-		Support	The D-G supports the definition and wishes to be involved in any further drafting through this process. The D-G seeks	Allow	Insert	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
	General of Conservation			clarity that the use of aircraft for conservation/DOC operational purposes will be provided for.			