

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|---|--|-----------------|---|--|--|-------------------------------|
| S516.030 | Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland | General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous | Not Stated | FNDC has determined that the proposed Infrastructure chapter does not apply to provision of private infrastructure (three waters infrastructure). This has led to very little policy direction with respect to the provision of three waters infrastructure. Ngā Tai Ora consider that sustainable and safe water supply, wastewater and stormwater systems (three waters systems) are essential for the health and wellbeing of the Far North population. Adequate provision of and access to three waters systems plays a major role in everyday lives in enhancing well-being of communities, impact on quality of life and overall health. | Amend the PDP to establish a separate Three Waters Chapter OR alternatively include policy direction and provisions within the proposed Infrastructure Chapter which manage and ensure the sustainable and safe, provision of water supply, wastewater and stormwater systems within the Far North District. | | Reject |
| S516.031 | Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland | General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous | Not Stated | Ngā Tai Ora note that where there are three waters provisions in the PDP, they are scattered throughout the chapters and are inconsistent. This will result in inconsistent provision and maintenance of three waters infrastructure. | Amend infrastructure provisions as required throughout the plan to ensure provisions achieve consistent management of infrastructure, particularly three waters. | | Accept in part |
| S425.066 | Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust | General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous | Oppose | PHTTCCT acknowledges the sensitivities of the Coastal Environment and supports the provision for the functional and operation need for regionally significant infrastructure but seeks amendments to make sure that minor upgrades are adequately provided for to enable the efficient and cost effective operation and maintenance of The Trail. | Amend CE to provide for maintenance, operation and upgrade of regionally significant infrastructure is appropriately provided for. | | Accept in part |
| S359.011 | Northland Regional Council | General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous | Support in part | Water resilience is a particular concern for the Far North district, as was highlighted in the 2019/2020 drought that exposed the vulnerability of existing supplies, primarily those that rely on 'run of river' and are highly unreliable during extended dry periods. We suggest this be embedded in the relevant sections of strategic direction chapter. We note drought is included in the District Wide Matters section on Hazards and Risks but feel the significance of these issues could be more strongly highlighted. | Insert provisions signaling that high intensity development will not be enabled unless serviced by a supply network or adequate on-site storage is provided to cater for extended dry spells/droughts. | | Accept in part |
| FS88.6 | Stephanie Lane | | Support | | Allow | | Accept in part |
| FS25.055 | Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited | | Support | Supports the intent of the submission, subject to appropriate wording being provided. | Allow | Allow the original submission, subject to appropriate wording. | Accept in part |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|-------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|
| FS374.042 | Waipapa Pine Limited | | Support | There is general agreement with the intention of the Submitter in that the Proposed District Plan should strengthen reverse sensitivity provisions - especially where lifestyle / rural residential development occurs and adjoins the Heavy Industrial Zone. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS243.003 | Kainga Ora Homes and Communities | | Support | Kāinga Ora generally supports development being aligned with the provision of adequate climate-resilient services and infrastructure. | Allow | Amend - Insert provisions signaling that high intensity development will not be enabled unless serviced by a supply network or adequate on-site storage is provided to cater for extended dry spells/droughts. | Accept in part |
| FS325.035 | Turnstone Trust Limited | | Support | TT supports the intent of the submission, subject to appropriate wording being provided. | Allow | Allow the original submission subject to appropriate wording. | Accept in part |
| FS570.1047 | 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 |
| FS346.472 | 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 |
| FS566.1061 | 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 |
| FS569.1083 | 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 |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|--|------------|--|---|-------------------------------|
| S257.023 | Te Hiku Community Board | General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous | Oppose | <p>Seek some rules under the District Plan for the existing mapped drainage district drains, as the current bylaws are not being enforced for the drainage districts.</p> <p>Mapping of the drainage district drains and overland flow paths in urban areas should be included in the District Plan.</p> | <p>Amend the Infrastructure section, by adding objectives, policies and rules providing for existing mapped drainage district drains, to ensure the ability to clean, unblock access and service the drainage channels in the Kaitaia, Waiharara/Kaikino and Motutangi drainage areas, as defined in the Far North Land Drainage Bylaw 2019.</p> <p>Add to the Planning Maps, maps indicating location of drainage channels in the Kaitaia, Waiharara/Kaikino and Motutangi drainage areas, as defined in the Far North Land Drainage Bylaw 2019. and overland flow paths in urban areas.</p> | Reject |
| FS155.8 | Fiona King | | Support | <p>Land Drainage districts in Te Hiku ward need to be recognized and acknowledged in all RC and Building consents. see the Land Drainage district by laws 2019 that have the restrictions that need to apply i.e., building distances from boundary, access for machine cleaning, connecting discharges into the drainage schemes.</p> | Allow | Reject |
| S483.188 | Top Energy Limited | General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous | Not Stated | <p>Top Energy appreciates that Council has included a CEL overlay and corresponding rules in the PDP as notified, however notes that the overlay has only been applied to the 110kv lines and not the equally important 33kv lines. No justification for this has been provided in the s32 analysis.</p> <p>Protection of the 33kv lines as well as the 110kv lines is critical to ensuring the reliability and improved resilience of the network, and subsequently a prosperous district (socially and economically). Further, Top Energy seeks that the provisions pertaining to the CEL overlay be contained in a standalone chapter to provide clarity to Plan users.</p> | <p>Insert provisions protecting all 'Critical Electricity Lines' (CEL), i.e. extend the provisions applying to 110kv lines to also include 33kv lines [inferred, this also includes amending the mapped overlay to include 33kv lines].</p> <p>Insert a new chapter addressing the provisions pertaining to the CEL overlay.</p> | Accept in part |
| FS84.1 | Kaitaia Marae Incorporated (Margaret Thomas-Amani Vicechair) | | Oppose | <p>Protect all lines - Top Energy is concerned over the protection of all its lines commercial or other and therefore are placing requests for all and sundry to comply with them to achieve their goals. More importantly the bigger picture for us in the original placement of all Electrical Lines Feeding from the substation in Okahu Road through to Pukepoto Road, have ALL been placed on our boundary which were</p> | Disallow | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|-------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | complete conducted without notification, permission and consent. We are not the only property where the lines could have run and this is total discrimination against what we are trying to achieve on our land and the principles as Maori that we live by. This decision not only interferes with our land and any lifestyle that we propose but it is an eyesore as well. Top Energy wishes to protect its lines and "we wish to protect our land". "We do not agree with this" We need an open response to this. | | | |
| FS371.030 | Oromahoe 18R2B2B2 Trust and its associated Hapu, Ngati Kawa, Te Ngare Hauata, Te Matarahurahu, Te Whanaurara, Ngati Kaihoru, Ngati Rahiri | | Oppose | Top Energy seeks to protect the 33Kv lines as well as the 110kv lines stating this will result in a prosperous district (socially and economically). This will have the opposite effect by placing restrictions on land owners rights. | Disallow | Status Quo. No change to wording or PDP. | Reject |
| FS131.030 | Oromahoe Land Owners: AW and DM Simpson, R.A.S Ltd, Arran Trust, Garry Stanners, Errol McIntyre, SW Halliday, SJ and PM Boys, Oromahoe 18R2B2B2 Trust and Tapuaetahi Incorporation | | Oppose | The original submission seeks to protect the 33Kv lines as well as the 110kv lines stating this will result in a prosperous district (socially and economically). This will have the opposite effect by placing restrictions on land owners rights. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Reject |
| FS448.002 | L & T Property Investments Limited | | Oppose | L & T Property Investments Ltd oppose any provisions that include 33kv lines within the 'Critical Electricity Lines' Overlay. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Reject |
| FS354.015 | Horticulture New Zealand | | Oppose | The submitter seeks provisions protecting all 'Critical Electricity Lines' (CEL), i.e. extend the provisions applying to 110kv lines to also include 33kv lines and | Disallow | Disallow S483.188 | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|-------------------|--|--|-----------------|---|--|---|-------------------------------|
| | | | | insert a new chapter addressing the provisions pertaining to the CEL overlay. HortNZ does not support this 'protection' as needs of affected landowners also need to be taken into account. | | | |
| FS345.239 | 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 |
| S559.012 | Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rēhia | General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous | Support in part | Our whenua is rural and, in most cases, lack a water supply network. With the growth of Kerikeri and its surrounding area, more demand is being put on our groundwater systems and in our coastal areas these systems are sensitive to extraction (saltwater intrusion). | Amend so that high intensity development is not enabled unless serviced by a supply network or adequate on-site storage is provided to cater for extended dry spells droughts. | | Reject |
| FS151.145 | Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust | | Support | | Allow | | Reject |
| FS277.20 | Jenny Collison | | Support | Makes sense to future proof for extreme climate adaptation. | Allow | | Reject |
| FS570.2202 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission | Reject |
| FS348.039 | 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 |
| FS566.2216 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission. | Allow | Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission. | Reject |
| FS569.2238 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission | Allow | Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission | Reject |
| S428.007 | Kapiro Residents Association | General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous | Support in part | The PDP should require all new buildings to store/use roof water wherever possible, to avoid the need for expensive reticulation systems and reduce the need for water top-ups via water tankers. New buildings connected to a public water supply should be required to collect roof water in storage vessels to use for | Amend PDP to require best practice water-sensitive, low-impact designs and measures for all stormwater and wastewater engineering, infrastructure and related development, to prevent problems associated with more extreme rainfall events in future, including provisions to | | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|--|-----------------|---|--|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | gardens and flushing toilets (at minimum) and contribute to other household water uses such as laundry connections. Water storage vessels do not need to be a traditional round tank - other useful shapes exist, such as rectangular upright vessels that are easy to install against the side of a house or garage, or short flat vessels designed to be completely buried underground or placed under the foundations of new builds. Greywater harvesting and re-use should also be required for new buildings. These types of water-saving measures would also reduce future Council infrastructure costs for additional water supplies and wastewater. | implement relevant parts of NPS-FM. | | |
| FS309.2 | Brad Hedger | | Support in part | Water reuse strategies should form part of all new development along with renewable energy. These aspects should have incentives in the plan to encourage use. | Allow in part | | Reject |
| S443.007 | Kapiro Conservation Trust | General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous | Support in part | <p>The PDP should require all new buildings to store/use roof water wherever possible, to avoid the need for expensive reticulation systems and reduce the need for water top-ups via water tankers. New buildings connected to a public water supply should be required to collect roof water in storage vessels to use for gardens and flushing toilets (at minimum) and contribute to other household water uses such as laundry connections.</p> <p>Water storage vessels do not need to be a traditional round tank - other useful shapes exist, such as rectangular upright vessels that are easy to install against the side of a house or garage, or short flat vessels designed to be completely buried underground or placed under the foundations of new builds. Greywater harvesting and re-use should also be required for new buildings. These types of water-saving measures would also reduce future Council infrastructure costs for additional water supplies and wastewater.</p> | Amend PDP to require best practice water-sensitive, low-impact designs and measures for all stormwater and wastewater engineering, infrastructure and related development, to prevent problems associated with more extreme rainfall events in future, including provisions to implement relevant parts of NPS-FM. | | Reject |
| FS309.6 | Brad Hedger | | Support in part | Water reuse strategies should form part of all new development along with renewable energy. These aspects should have incentives in the plan to encourage use. | Allow in part | | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|---|--|------------|---|--|--|-------------------------------|
| FS569.1752 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | | Reject |
| FS570.1732 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | | Reject |
| S483.032 | Top Energy Limited | General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous | Not Stated | Top Energy seeks clear direction within the infrastructure that the chapter supersedes. | Not stated | | Accept in part |
| FS351.0010 | A.W and D.M Simpson | | Oppose | Top Energy seeks discretion to interpret what " Does not constrain" means for their own interest. | Disallow | Retain as is which requires Top Energy to properly engage and consult the land owners and mana whenua. | Accept in part |
| FS371.0010 | Oromahoe 18R2B2B2 Trust and its associated Hapu, Ngati Kawa, Te Ngare Hauata, Te Matarahurahu, Te Whanaurara, Ngati Kaihoru, Ngati Rahiri | | Oppose | Top Energy seeks discretion to interpret what " Does not constrain" means for their own interest. | Disallow | Retain as is which requires Top Energy to properly engage and consult the land owners and mana whenua. | Accept in part |
| FS449.0010 | The Proprietors of Tapuaetahi Incorporation | | Oppose | Top Energy seeks discretion to interpret what " Does not constrain" means for their own interest. | Disallow | Retain provision | Accept in part |
| FS345.083 | 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 |
| S454.032 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous | Not Stated | The infrastructure chapter of the FNPDP contains provisions that provide for infrastructure, including the National Grid, however not all provisions relating the infrastructure are located within the chapter. The FNPDP contains provisions in a number of other chapters that relate to infrastructure, including the National Grid. These include for example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural Hazards | Retain the infrastructure chapter but amend it to ensure that all provisions relating to infrastructure, including the National Grid, are contained within that chapter and cross references within all other chapters of the FNPDP make it clear that the infrastructure provisions apply, or have primacy where necessary. | | Accept in part |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|--|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hazardous substances • Historic Heritage • Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity • Natural character • Natural features and landscapes • Subdivision • Earthworks • Notable trees <p>Where necessary, Transpower has made more specific submission on provisions throughout the FNPDP as drafted seeking to ensure that critical infrastructure, such as the National Grid, is appropriately provided for and the NPSET is given effect to efficiently and effectively.</p> <p>However, Transpower's preference is for a standalone set of provisions for infrastructure, including the National Grid, within the Infrastructure Chapter as it avoids duplication (for example in the zone rules) and provides a coherent set of rules which applicants / users can refer to. The ability of EPlan to provide links within the plan would ensure plan users can be directed to the Infrastructure chapter as required, when looking in other chapters. It could also be made clear that the objectives, policies and rules in the infrastructure chapter have primacy, in accordance with the requirements of the NPSET for example, where there is a conflict.</p> | <p>Should the FNPDP not be amended as requested, ensure that the District Wide Matters, Zones and Overlays and other relevant sections of the Plan (such as the How the Plan Works chapter) are amended to ensure that infrastructure is appropriately provided for and the cross-referencing between chapters clearly directs the plan user to the provisions of the Infrastructure chapter that apply to an activity and where these have primacy.</p> | | |
| FS354.009 | Horticulture New Zealand | | Support | The submitter seeks that all provisions for infrastructure are included in the infrastructure chapter. The intent is supported to the extent that there needs to be clarity where relevant provisions are located within the Plan. | Allow | Allow S454.032 to the extent that it provides clarity to the Plan. | Accept in part |
| FS346.020 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. | | Oppose | Forest & Bird opposes amendments that would give Infrastructure and transport provisions primacy over other sections of the plan, particularly IB, NATC, ONFLs and Notable Trees. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS369.011 | Top Energy | | Support | Top Energy supports appropriate cross-referencing between the Infrastructure Chapter and other | 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 |
|-------------------|---|--|------------|---|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| | | | | District Wide Chapters and that provisions are consistently applied across topics. | | | |
| S527.036 | Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK) | General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous | Not Stated | The PDP should support future transition to disposal-to-land schemes, which is anticipated to start within the life of the PDP. The PDP should include provisions to encourage and progressively require disposal-to-land wastewater treatment methods (based on coagulation and flocculation) and ensure the responsible use of solid waste from treatment plants as fertilizer and the use of wastewater for irrigation purposes. | Amend the PDP to support future transition to disposal-to-land schemes. | | Reject |
| FS566.1898 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| | | | | | | | |
| S516.016 | Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland | INFRASTRUCTURE | Not Stated | The PDP introduces definitions for "infrastructure" and "development infrastructure" there is no link or cross reference between the two definitions. Provisions throughout the PDP interchange and use the two terms resulting in inconsistency and confusion within the plan. | Amend references to "infrastructure" and "development infrastructure" where necessary to avoid duplication and ensure consistency. | | Accept |
| S516.018 | Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland | INFRASTRUCTURE | Not Stated | Infrastructure should be considered more holistically to include the natural environment such as trees and waterbodies. | Amend the definition of 'infrastructure' to include natural solutions. | | Reject |
| FS354.030 | Horticulture New Zealand | | Oppose | The definition of infrastructure is from s2 of the RMA so should be included as in the Act and not amended. | Disallow | Disallow S516.018 | Accept |
| S271.002 | Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust | INFRASTRUCTURE | Support | Not stated | Retain as drafted | | Accept |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|----------------|----------|---|---|---|-------------------------------|
| FS369.039 | Top Energy | | Support | Top Energy also supports the retention of this definition. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept |
| FS403.051 | Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora | | Oppose | Te Whatu Ora seek amendment to this definition to clarify relationship with "development infrastructure" and to include natural solutions in this definition. | Disallow | Te Whatu Ora seek amendment to this definition to clarify relationship with "development infrastructure" and to include natural solutions in this definition. | Reject |
| FS570.725 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept |
| FS566.739 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept |
| FS569.761 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept |
| S416.001 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | INFRASTRUCTURE | Support | The definition as proposed which replicates the RMA definition, is supported by KiwiRail, noting clause (g) includes rail. | Retain the definition of 'infrastructure' | | Accept |
| FS369.040 | Top Energy | | Support | Top Energy also supports the retention of this definition. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept |
| FS403.052 | Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora | | Oppose | Te Whatu Ora seek amendment to this definition to clarify relationship with "development infrastructure" and to include natural solutions in this definition. | Disallow | Te Whatu Ora seek amendment to this definition to clarify relationship with "development infrastructure" and to include natural solutions in this definition. | Reject |
| S446.002 | Kapiro Conservation Trust | INFRASTRUCTURE | Support | | Retain as drafted | | Accept |
| FS369.041 | Top Energy | | Support | Top Energy also supports the retention of this definition. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|----------------|----------|---|--|---|-------------------------------|
| FS403.053 | Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora | | Oppose | Te Whatu Ora seek amendment to this definition to clarify relationship with "development infrastructure" and to include natural solutions in this definition. | Disallow | Te Whatu Ora seek amendment to this definition to clarify relationship with "development infrastructure" and to include natural solutions in this definition. | Reject |
| FS569.1761 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | | Accept |
| FS570.1760 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | | Accept |
| S454.005 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | INFRASTRUCTURE | Support | Transpower supports the inclusion of this definition in the FNPDP. | Retain the definition of INFRASTRUCTURE. | | Accept |
| FS369.042 | Top Energy | | Support | Top Energy also supports the retention of this definition. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept |
| FS403.054 | Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora | | Oppose | Te Whatu Ora seek amendment to this definition to clarify relationship with "development infrastructure" and to include natural solutions in this definition. | Disallow | Te Whatu Ora seek amendment to this definition to clarify relationship with "development infrastructure" and to include natural solutions in this definition. | Reject |
| S489.001 | Radio New Zealand | INFRASTRUCTURE | Support | Definition of infrastructure is as per Section 2 of the RMA | Retain definition of 'infrastructure' | | Accept |
| FS369.043 | Top Energy | | Support | Top Energy also supports the retention of this definition. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept |
| FS403.055 | Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora | | Oppose | Te Whatu Ora seek amendment to this definition to clarify relationship with "development infrastructure" and to include natural solutions in this definition. | Disallow | Te Whatu Ora seek amendment to this definition to clarify relationship with "development infrastructure" and to include natural | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|-------------------|---|----------------|----------|---|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | | solutions in this definition. | |
| S524.002 | Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK) | INFRASTRUCTURE | Support | Not stated | Retain as drafted | | Accept |
| FS369.044 | Top Energy | | Support | Top Energy also supports the retention of this definition. | Allow | Accept | Accept |
| FS403.056 | Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora | | Oppose | Te Whatu Ora seek amendment to this definition to clarify relationship with "development infrastructure" and to include natural solutions in this definition. | Disallow | Te Whatu Ora seek amendment to this definition to clarify relationship with "development infrastructure" and to include natural solutions in this definition. | Reject |
| FS566.1820 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept |
| S529.067 | Carbon Neutral NZ Trust | INFRASTRUCTURE | Support | Not stated | Retain as drafted | | Accept |
| FS369.045 | Top Energy | | Support | Top Energy also supports the retention of this definition | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept |
| FS403.057 | Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora | | Oppose | Te Whatu Ora seek amendment to this definition to clarify relationship with "development infrastructure" and to include natural solutions in this definition. | Disallow | Te Whatu Ora seek amendment to this definition to clarify relationship with "development infrastructure" and to include natural solutions in this definition. | Reject |
| FS570.1955 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept |
| FS566.1969 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|------------------------|----------|---|---|--|-------------------------------|
| FS569.1991 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept |
| S483.006 | Top Energy Limited | INFRASTRUCTURE | Support | Top Energy supports the definition of Infrastructure, in particular the inclusion of clause d which specifically provides for electricity infrastructure. | Retain the definition of 'Infrastructure' | | Accept |
| FS345.057 | 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 |
| S454.008 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | NATIONAL GRID | Support | Transpower supports the inclusion of this definition in the FNPDP. | Retain the definition of NATIONAL GRID. | | Accept |
| FS369.046 | Top Energy | | Support | Top Energy also supports the retention of this definition. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept |
| S483.008 | Top Energy Limited | NATIONAL GRID | Support | Top Energy supports the definition, noting that Transpower will be better placed to comment on suitability of exact wording. | Retain the definition of 'National Grid' | | Accept |
| FS345.059 | 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 |
| S421.008 | Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand | NATIONAL GRID CORRIDOR | Support | Federated Farmers supports the proposed definitions for the national grid corridor and national grid yard which includes a 12-metre setback from support structures located within these areas. Federated Farmers would not and does not support any attempt to increase the width of the setbacks within the corridor and yard. | Retain the definition of 'National grid corridor' | | Accept in part |
| FS24.3 | Lynley Newport | | Support | Agree with submitter | Allow | | Accept in part |
| FS369.048 | Top Energy | | Support | Top Energy also supports the retention of this definition. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS570.1240 | 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 |
|------------------|--|------------------------|-----------------|---|---|--|-------------------------------|
| FS346.242 | 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 |
| FS566.1254 | 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 |
| FS569.1276 | 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 |
| FS369.415 | Top Energy | | Oppose | Top Energy seeks to amend this objective to ensure that existing electricity infrastructure is not compromised. Given the regional significance of most of the electricity infrastructure network, protection of this infrastructure is required to achieve alignment with the RPS and with SUB - R10 and SUB-R9. | Disallow in part | | Accept in part |
| S159.015 | Horticulture New Zealand | NATIONAL GRID CORRIDOR | Support in part | The National Grid corridor is specifically for subdivision purposes so should be referred to as such. | Amend the term to National Grid Subdivision Corridor | | Accept |
| FS151.168 | Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust | | Support | | Allow | | Accept |
| FS369.047 | Top Energy | | Oppose | Top Energy also supports the retention of this definition. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Reject |
| FS570.177 | 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 |
| FS566.191 | 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 |
| FS569.213 | 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 | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|------------------------|------------|--|--|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | | inconsistent with our original submission. | |
| S483.009 | Top Energy Limited | NATIONAL GRID CORRIDOR | Support | Top Energy supports the definition, noting that Transpower will be better placed to comment on suitability of exact wording. | Retain the definition of 'National Grid Corridor' | | Accept in part |
| FS345.060 | 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 |
| S454.009 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | NATIONAL GRID CORRIDOR | Not Stated | Transpower supports the inclusion of a definition of the National Grid Subdivision Corridor within the FNPDP however the definition in the FNPDP is incorrect and requires amendment. In addition, the diagram is not consistent with Transpower requirements and we request that this be amended. | Delete the proposed definition of NATIONAL GRID CORRIDOR and replace it with the definition of NATIONAL GRID SUBDIVISION CORRIDOR as follows: NATIONAL GRID SUBDIVISION CORRIDOR means, as depicted in Diagram 1, the area measured either side of the centre line of any above ground electricity transmission line as follows:14m of a 110kV transmission line on single poles;16m of a 110kV transmission line on pi poles;32m of a 110kV transmission line on towers (including tubular steel towers where these replace steel lattice towers); 37 metres of a 220kV transmission lines on towers (including tubular steel towers where these replace steel lattice towers);The measurement of setback distances from National Grid transmission lines shall be undertaken from the centre line of the National Grid transmission line and the outer visible edge of any support structure. The centre line at any point is a straight line between the centre points of the two | | Accept |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------------|--|---------------------------|---------------|--|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | <p>support structures at each end of the span.</p> <p>Note: the National Grid Subdivision Corridor does not apply to underground cables or any transmission lines (or sections of line) that are designated</p> <p>Insert Diagram 1 in the submission: National Grid Yard and National Grid Subdivision Corridor.</p> | |
| <p>S159.016</p> | <p>Horticulture New Zealand</p> | <p>NATIONAL GRID YARD</p> | <p>Oppose</p> | <p>The definition of National Grid Yard is not clear and applies a 12m distance from all support structures. There should be differentiation between poles and towers.</p> | <p>Amend the definition of 'National grid yard' to: means the area located within:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 12 metres in any direction from the visible outer edge of a National Grid support structure tower; or • 10m in any direction from a National Grid single pole or pi-pole; or • The area located within 10m either side of the centreline of any overhead 110kV National Grid line on single or pi-pole; or • The area located within 12m either side of the centre line of any overhead National Grid line on towers. • support structure and the area located 12 metres either side of the centreline of an overhead National Grid line. <p>Note: the measurement of setback distances from National Grid electricity lines shall be taken from the centre line of the National Grid line and the outer edge</p> | <p>Reject</p> |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|--------------------|------------|---|---|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | of any support structure. The centre line at any point is a straight line between the centre points of the two support structures at each end of the span. | | |
| FS151.169 | Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust | | Support | | Allow | | Reject |
| FS548.040 | Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc | | Support | The submitter seeks similar relief to that of Federated Farmers. It is important to ensure that the differentiation for setbacks is made to allow landowners to use their land effectively and efficiently. | Allow | Grant the relief sought. | Reject |
| FS369.049 | Top Energy | | Oppose | Top Energy opposes the submission point in relation to this definition as it supports the definition as notified. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Accept |
| FS570.178 | 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 |
| FS566.192 | 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 |
| FS569.214 | 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 |
| S454.010 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | NATIONAL GRID YARD | Not Stated | Transpower supports the inclusion of a definition of the National Grid Yard within the FNPDP however, the definition in the FNPDP is incorrect and requires amendment. | Delete the proposed definition of NATIONAL GRID YARD and replace it as follows: NATIONAL GRID YARD means (as shown in Diagram 1):- the area located 10 metres either side of the centreline of an overhead 110kV National Grid transmission line on single poles;- the area located 12 metres in any direction from the outer visible edge of a National Grid support structure;- the area located 12 metres either side of the centreline of | | Accept |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|-------------------|--|--------------------|----------|---|--|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | any overhead National Grid transmission line on pi poles or towers (including tubular steel towers where these replace steel lattice towers). Insert Diagram 1 in the submission: National Grid Yard and National Grid Subdivision Corridor. | | |
| FS354.031 | Horticulture New Zealand | | Oppose | HortNZ has sought another definition for the National Grid Yard. | Disallow | Disallow S454.010 | Reject |
| FS369.051 | Top Energy | | Support | Top Energy also supports the amendment of this definition. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept |
| S421.009 | Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand | NATIONAL GRID YARD | Support | Federated Farmers supports the proposed definitions for the national grid corridor and national grid yard which includes a 12-metre setback from support structures located within these areas. Federated Farmers would not and does not support any attempt to increase the width of the setbacks within the corridor and yard. | Retain the definition of 'National grid yard'. | | Accept in part |
| FS369.050 | Top Energy | | Oppose | Top Energy opposes the submission point in relation to this definition as it supports the definition as notified | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS570.1241 | 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 |
| FS346.243 | 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 |
| FS566.1255 | 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 |
| FS569.1277 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Oppose | Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission. | Disallow | Disallow to the extent that the submission is | Accept in part |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|--------------------------|----------|--|--|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | | inconsistent with our original submission. | |
| S483.010 | Top Energy Limited | NATIONAL GRID YARD | Support | Top Energy supports the definition, noting that Transpower will be better placed to comment on suitability of exact wording. | Retain the definition of 'National Grid Yard'. | | Accept in part |
| FS345.061 | 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 |
| S489.002 | Radio New Zealand | NETWORK UTILITY | Support | No comment | Retain definition of 'Network Utility.' | | Accept |
| FS369.057 | Top Energy | | Support | Top Energy also supports the amendment of this definition. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept |
| S483.011 | Top Energy Limited | NETWORK UTILITY | Support | Top Energy supports this definition as worded. | Retain the definition of 'Network Utility' | | Accept |
| FS345.062 | 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 |
| S454.011 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | NETWORK UTILITY OPERATOR | Support | Transpower supports the inclusion of this definition in the FNPDP. | Retain the definition of NETWORK UTILITY OPERATOR. | | Accept |
| S489.003 | Radio New Zealand | NETWORK UTILITY OPERATOR | Support | Definition of network utility operator is as per section 166 of the RMA. | Retain definition of 'Network Utility Operator' | | Accept |
| S416.004 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | NETWORK UTILITY OPERATOR | Support | KiwiRail support use of the RMA definition of Network Utility Operator, which includes railway activities in clause (f). | Retain the definition of 'Network Utility Operator'. | | Accept |
| FS369.058 | Top Energy | | Support | Top Energy also supports the amendment of this definition. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept |
| S483.012 | Top Energy Limited | NETWORK UTILITY OPERATOR | Support | Top Energy supports this definition as worded. | Retain the definition of 'Network Utility Operator'. | | Accept |
| FS345.063 | 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 |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|---|------------|----------|---|---|--|-------------------------------|
| S483.017 | Top Energy Limited | SUBSTATION | Support | Top Energy largely supports this definition, but consider that the phrase "and having equipment rated over 22KV" is unnecessary from a technical perspective. In some instances, equipment in a substation will be rated under 22KV, and Top Energy consider that including this arbitrary limit will result in unnecessary confusion and issues in interpretation when considering the definition. | Amend the definition of 'Substation' as follows: means those parts of works or electrical installations, being a building, structure, or enclosure exceeding 10m in area and having equipment rated at over 22 kV, and incorporating fittings that are used for the purposes of the control of the transformation, transmission, or distribution of electricity. | | Accept |
| FS351.004 | A.W and D.M Simpson | | Oppose | It is not within FNDC jurisdiction to define. | Disallow | A definition is not required as Top Energy's suggested definition is not fit for purpose | Reject |
| FS371.004 | Oromahoe 18R2B2B2 Trust and its associated Hapu, Ngati Kawa, Te Ngare Hauata, Te Matarahurahu, Te Whanaurara, Ngati Kaihoru, Ngati Rahiri | | Oppose | We are not sure if it within FNDC jurisdiction to define. | Disallow | No change as definitions are adequate - the suggested definition is not fit for purpose. | Reject |
| FS449.004 | The Proprietors of Tapuaetahi Incorporation | | Oppose | We are not sure if it within FNDC jurisdiction to define. | Disallow | No change as definitions are adequate. | Reject |
| FS345.068 | 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 |
| S454.020 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | SUBSTATION | Support | Transpower supports the inclusion of this definition in the FNPDP. | Retain the definition of SUBSTATION. | | Accept in part |
| FS369.073 | Top Energy | | Oppose | Top Energy supports amendment to the definition to remove the equipment rating. | Disallow in part | Disallow in part the original submission | Accept in part |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|-------------------|--|----------------|-----------------|---|--|--|-------------------------------|
| S421.040 | Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand | New Definition | Support in part | Policy I-P7 uses the term 'Critical Electricity Lines' in clause (e). The term is not included in the interpretation chapter of the proposed district plan. The term is used throughout the infrastructure chapter (e.g., Rule 1-R13 below). It would be useful to have a definition for what the term means and what is encompassed by the term (e.g., are the National Grid lines considered to be critical electricity lines?). | Insert a definition for the term 'Critical Electricity Lines'. | | Accept |
| FS24.5 | Lynley Newport | | Support in part | Agree that a definition is required, but do not believe there is justification for 33 kV lines to be included. | Allow in part | | Accept |
| FS369.081 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy support the inclusion of mapping and provisions with respect to Critical Electricity Lines. | Allow in part | Allow in part the original submission | Accept |
| FS570.1272 | 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 |
| FS346.274 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. | | Oppose | The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Reject |
| FS566.1286 | 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 |
| FS569.1308 | 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 |
| S421.042 | Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand | New Definition | Support in part | The rule deals with new buildings or structures, and extensions to existing buildings or structures, and earthworks within 10m of a Critical Electricity Lines Overlay. As previously highlighted in our submission, the district plan does not contain a definition for 'critical electricity lines'. It is unclear what actually falls within the scope of being a critical electricity line. Given that the term is used throughout the district plan, it is necessary that the term is defined. The definition | Insert a definition for 'Critical Electricity Line/s'. | | Accept |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|-------------------|--|----------------|-----------------|--|------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | should explain what is meant by the term means as well as what is encompassed by the term (e.g., are the National Grid lines considered to be critical electricity lines?). | | | |
| FS84.2 | Kaitaia Marae Incorporated (Margaret Thomas-Amani Vicechair) | | Oppose | There is an existing 10m council boundary on all new builds where exemptions can be sought. The difference with Top Energy's application for the same with its lines poses a difficulty for our land in that the lines should not be there. It is a huge financial loss for Kaitaia Marae Incorporated with any lines currently there. Compensation should be paid for this inconvenience to the existing positioning of the lines and the consequences inclusive of this application and the distancing. No in this instance advisory communication should be sought. | Disallow | | Reject |
| FS369.082 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy support the inclusion of mapping and provisions with respect to Critical Electricity Lines. | Allow in part | Allow in part the original submission | Accept |
| FS570.1274 | 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 |
| FS346.276 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. | | Oppose | The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Reject |
| FS566.1288 | 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 |
| FS569.1310 | 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 |
| S159.033 | Horticulture New Zealand | New Definition | Oppose | Critical electricity lines are not defined or described. | Define critical electricity lines. | | Accept |
| FS151.190 | Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust | | Support | | Allow | | Accept |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|----------------|-----------------|--|--|--|-------------------------------|
| FS448.001 | L & T Property Investments Limited | | Support | L & T Property Investments Ltd agrees a definition of 'Critical Electricity Lines' is required. | Allow | Define critical electricity lines. | Accept |
| FS369.074 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy supports the inclusion of mapping and provisions with respect to Critical Electricity Lines | Allow in part | Allow in part the original submission | Accept |
| FS570.195 | 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 |
| FS566.209 | 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 |
| FS569.231 | 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 |
| S159.034 | Horticulture New Zealand | New Definition | Oppose | Electricity distribution lines are not defined or described. | Define electricity distribution lines. | | Reject |
| FS151.191 | Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust | | Support | | Allow | | Reject |
| FS151.192 | Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust | | Support | | Allow | | Reject |
| FS369.075 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy supports provision for electricity distribution lines including clear definition. | Allow in part | Allow in part the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS570.196 | 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 |
| FS566.210 | 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 |
| FS569.232 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Oppose | Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission. | Disallow | Disallow to the extent that the submission is | Accept |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|---|----------------|------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | | inconsistent with our original submission. | |
| S483.018 | Top Energy Limited | New Definition | Not Stated | <p>'Customer connection' is a term used in the Infrastructure Chapter (e.g. I-R2 New underground network utilities including customer connections) but is not defined.</p> <p>It is unclear to Top Energy what Council considers to comprise a 'customer connection' e.g., would it include a new transformer, and any new poles and cables required to connect to the grid? For certainty, Top Energy seeks that a definition for 'customer connection' be included in the Plan and suggests that the following components for connection are included: cabling, transformer and switch gear, poles, lines and pillars.</p> | Insert definition for 'customer connection' as follows (or wording to the same effect): Means any electricity infrastructure required to connect customers including cabling, transformers and switch gear, poles lines and pillars | | Accept |
| FS351.005 | A.W and D.M Simpson | | Oppose | This risks Top Energy being able to override all environmental, landowner rights, Māori cultural and human rights. | Disallow | Retain as is which requires Top Energy to properly engage and consult the land owners and mana whenua. | Reject |
| FS371.005 | Oromahoe 18R2B2B2 Trust and its associated Hapu, Ngati Kawa, Te Ngare Hauata, Te Matarahurahu, Te Whanaurara, Ngati Kaihoru, Ngati Rahiri | | Oppose | This risks Top Energy being able to override all environmental, landowner rights, Māori cultural and human rights. | Disallow | Retain as is which requires Top Energy to properly engage and consult the land owners and mana whenua. | Reject |
| FS449.005 | The Proprietors of Tapuaetahi Incorporation | | Oppose | This risks Top Energy being able to override all environmental, landowner rights, Māori cultural and human rights. | Disallow | Retain as is which requires Top Energy to properly engage and consult the land owners and mana whenua. | Reject |
| FS345.069 | 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 | Accept |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|-------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|--|--|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | | Limited in its submission (S483). | |
| S421.019 | Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Overview | Support in part | Federated Farmers recognises the importance for essential infrastructure to be able to be delivered safely and efficiently. However, it is important that the overview to the infrastructure chapter tells the whole story. The provision of essential infrastructure can create conflict between the infrastructure provider and the landowner whose property the infrastructure is going on or over. | Insert the following in the Overview: It is recognised that the provision of essential infrastructure can, at times, create conflict between the infrastructure provider and the landowner. Council is willing to provide support through facilitation as necessary where this occurs. or wording with similar intent | | Accept in part |
| FS78.024 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | | Oppose | It is not clear what this relief will require of the Far North District Council and it appears to go beyond the requirements of the RMA. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS570.1251 | 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 |
| FS346.253 | 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 |
| FS566.1265 | 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 |
| FS569.1287 | 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 |
| S331.011 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Overview | Support in part | The submitter supports in part the Overview section of the Infrastructure chapter however, the definition of 'infrastructure' does not include additional infrastructure (which includes educational facilities). Educational facilities are a crucial form of additional infrastructure | Amending the Overview section as follows: The district relies on the safe and efficient delivery of infrastructure and additional infrastructure as it is integral to | | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | <p>that is needed to support development. Coordinating educational facilities with the delivery of development will help meet the needs and demand of the local communities.</p> <p>The submitter highlights that Council has an obligation under the NPS-UD to ensure sufficient additional infrastructure (which includes social infrastructure such as educational facilities) is provided with development, and local authorities must be satisfied that additional infrastructure to service the development capacity is likely to be available (see Policy 10 and 3.5 of Subpart 1 of Part 3: Implementation, in particular).</p> | <p>community economic and social well-being. However, development, operation, maintenance and upgrading of infrastructure can give rise to adverse environmental effects. In enabling infrastructure (including additional infrastructure) and managing adverse environment effects, it is important to recognise the locational, operational functional needs and constraints of infrastructure. It is also important to recognise the public benefits associated with infrastructure in particular the benefits of regionally significant infrastructure, to enhance economic, cultural, environmental and social well-being in the district.</p> <p>Infrastructure, sometimes referred to as network utilities, is defined in the RMA and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. pipelines; ii. telecommunications iii. radiocommunications; iv. facilities for the generation of electricity, including lines and support structures; v. water supply, irrigation, drainage or sewerage; vi. systems structures for transport on land by cycleways, rail, roads, walkways, or any other means; vii. facilities for the loading or unloading of cargo or passengers; | |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|---------|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | <p>viii. airports; and ix. navigation.</p> <p>Additional infrastructure as defined under the National Policy Statement on Urban Development means:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Public open space b. Community infrastructure as defined in section 197 of the Local Government Act 2002 c. Land transport (as defined in the Land Transport Management Act 2003) that is not controlled by local authorities d. Social infrastructure, such as schools and healthcare facilities e. A network operated for the purpose of telecommunications (as defined in section 5 of the Telecommunications Act 2001) f. A network operated for the purpose of transmitting or distributing electricity or gas. <p>Regionally significant infrastructure is also defined in the Northland Regional Policy Statement (RPS) and includes important energy, water, communication, transport infrastructure and significant social and community facilities in the region. This chapter manages key infrastructure and additional infrastructure and general network utilities. Renewable electricity and transport are managed through the Renewable Electricity Generation and</p> | |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|---------|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | <p>Transport chapters. The provisions in this chapter are therefore specific to network utilities undertaken by a network utility operator (as defined in the RMA). The chapter also addresses amateur radio facilities as their activities involve radio-communication and amateur radio configurations that involve masts, aerials and supporting structures similar to other types of network utilities.</p> <p>There are responsibilities under the RMA, the National Policy Statement on Electricity Transmission 2008 and the RPS in relation to infrastructure. These responsibilities require Council to provide for the National Grid and regionally significant infrastructure and protect it from inappropriate land use and subdivision that could result in reverse sensitivity effects and undermine its effective operation, security or future expansion.</p> <p>The National Environmental Standards for Telecommunication Facilities 2016 (NES-TF) and National Environmental Standards on Electricity Transmission Activities 2009 (NES-ETA) provide a suite of nationally consistent rules specific to telecommunication facilities and electricity transmission activities.</p> <p>The District Plan does not apply to activities regulated under the NES-TF and NES-ETA but it does apply to any</p> | |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|------------|--|---|-------------------|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | telecommunication facility and electricity transmission activity not regulated by these environmental standards (e.g. new transmission lines, new telecommunication poles and antennas not in rural zone or road reserve). The District Plan also applies to telecommunication facilities located in areas subject to regulations 44-51 of the NES-TF (e.g. historic heritage, visual amenity landscapes). | | |
| FS354.053 | Horticulture New Zealand | | Oppose | The submitter seeks changes to the Infrastructure provisions through the inclusion of a definition of 'additional infrastructure' from the NPSUFD and applying proposed provisions for infrastructure to that 'additional infrastructure'. While the need to provide for educational facilities is recognised HortNZ does not support the approach as the definition of additional infrastructure involves more than educational facilities. | Disallow | Disallow S331.011 | Accept |
| S454.035 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | Overview | Not Stated | Transpower generally supports the introductory statement to the Energy, infrastructure and transport chapter of the FNPDP however it recommends some minor changes to ensure nationally significant infrastructure, such as the National Grid is also referenced, correct grammar and more clearly articulate what is included as infrastructure. Transpower also supports the direct reference to the NESETA but considers that references to NZECP 34:2001 and the Electricity (Hazards from Trees) Regulations 2003 and their relationship to the FNPDP would also provide helpful additional commentary in the introductory section of the chapter for plan users. | Amend the overview of the Energy infrastructure and transport chapter as follows: The District relies on the safe and efficient delivery of infrastructure as it is integral to community economic and social well-being. However, development, operation, maintenance and upgrading of infrastructure can give rise to adverse environmental effects. In enabling infrastructure and managing adverse environment effects, it is important to recognise the locational, operational and functional needs and constraints of infrastructure. It is also important to recognise the public benefits associated with infrastructure, in particular the benefits of nationally and regionally significant infrastructure, to enhance economic, cultural, environmental and social well-being in the district. Infrastructure, sometimes referred to as network utilities, is defined in the RMA and includes: | | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|---------|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. pipelines; ii. telecommunications; iii. radiocommunications iv. facilities for the generation and conveyance of electricity, including lines and support structures; v. water supply, irrigation, drainage or sewerage systems; vi. structures for transport on land by cycleways, rail, roads, walkways, or any other means; vii. facilities for the loading or unloading of cargo or passengers; viii. airports; and ix. navigation. <p>...The New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distances (NZECP 34:2001) contains restrictions on the location of buildings, structures, and activities in relation to the National Grid and electricity distribution lines. Buildings, structures, and activities in the vicinity of the National Grid or electricity distribution lines must comply with the NZECP 34:2001. Compliance with the rule requirements of the District Plan does not ensure compliance with NZECP 34:2001 or vice versa. Vegetation planted in the vicinity of the National Grid or electricity distribution lines must comply with the Electricity</p> | |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|------------|----------|---|---|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | (Hazards from Trees) Regulations 2003. | | |
| FS354.054 | Horticulture New Zealand | | Support | Recognition of NZECP34:2001 and the Hazard from Tree Regulations is supported. | Allow | Allow S454.035 | Reject |
| FS369.105 | Top Energy | | Support | Top Energy supports the recognition of the New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distances (NZECP 34:2001) and that National Grid or electricity distribution lines must comply with the Electricity (Hazards from Trees) Regulations 2003. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| S519.029 | Elbury Holdings | Objectives | Oppose | We seek some objectives under the District Plan for the existing mapped drainage district drains, as the Draft Management Plan 2017 and current bylaws are not being enforced for the drainage districts (inferred). | Amend the Infrastructure section, by adding objectives providing for existing mapped Council drainage district drains, to ensure the ability to clean, unblock access and service the drainage channels in the Kaitaia, Waiharara/Kaikino and Motutangi drainage areas, as defined in the Far North District Council Land Drainage Bylaw 2019 and the Draft Management Plan 2017. | | Reject |
| S358.024 | Leah Frieling | Objectives | Oppose | The current bylaws are not being enforced for the drainage districts. | Amend the Infrastructure section, by adding objectives providing for existing mapped Council drainage district drains, to ensure the ability to clean, unblock access and service the drainage channels in the Kaitaia, Waiharara/Kaikino and Motutangi drainage areas, as defined in the Far North Land Drainage Bylaw 2019. | | Reject |
| S356.020 | Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency | Objectives | Support | Not stated | Retain objectives as notified | | Accept in part |
| S512.012 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Objectives | Support | These objectives support the continued function of Fire and Emergency. Efficient and effective water supply infrastructure coordinated with land use and development is essential to minimise risk to property and life in the event of a fire. | Retain objectives | | Accept in part |
| S547.028 | LJ King Limited | Objectives | Oppose | We seek some objectives under the District Plan for the existing mapped drainage district drains, as the Draft Management Plan 2017 and current bylaws are not being enforced for the drainage districts (inferred). | Amend the Infrastructure section, by adding objectives providing for existing mapped Council drainage district drains, to ensure the ability to clean, unblock access and service the drainage channels in the Kaitaia, Waiharara/Kaikino and Motutangi drainage areas, as defined in the Far | | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|------------|-----------------|---|---|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | North District Council Land Drainage Bylaw 2019 and the Draft Management Plan 2017. | |
| S541.026 | Elbury Holdings | Objectives | Oppose | We seek some objectives under the District Plan for the existing mapped drainage district drains, as the Draft Management Plan 2017 and current bylaws are not being enforced for the drainage districts (inferred). | Amend the Infrastructure section, by adding objectives providing for existing mapped Council drainage district drains, to ensure the ability to clean, unblock access and service the drainage channels in the Kaitaia, Waiharara/Kaikino and Motutangi drainage areas, as defined in the Far North District Council Land Drainage Bylaw 2019 and the Draft Management Plan 2017. | Reject |
| FS155.33 | Fiona King | | Support | | Allow | Reject |
| S485.029 | Elbury Holdings | Objectives | Oppose | Seek some objectives under the District Plan for the existing mapped drainage district drains, as the Draft Management Plan 2017 and current bylaws are not being enforced for the drainage districts (inferred). | Amend the Infrastructure section, by adding objectives providing for existing mapped Council drainage district drains, to ensure the ability to clean, unblock access and service the drainage channels in the Kaitaia, Waiharara/Kaikino and Motutangi drainage areas, as defined in the Far North District Council Land Drainage Bylaw 2019 and the Draft Management Plan 2017. | Reject |
| FS155.34 | Fiona King | | Support | There are errors in the comments that need to be corrected . The bylaw does exist and is being used by FNDC. It is essential that the Land drainage schemes are in the plan . To much poor planning has created flooding and drainage problems. It should be recognized the same stormwater management. there are only 3 land drainage areas ,all in the TeHiku ward. The main one being Kaitaia which a lot of urban water flows into land drainage drains to get to rivers. | Allow | Reject |
| S472.024 | Michael Foy | Objectives | Support in part | We seek some rules under the District Plan for the existing mapped drainage district drains, as the current bylaws are not being enforced for the drainage districts. | Amend the Infrastructure section, by adding objectives providing for existing mapped Council drainage district drains, to ensure the ability to clean, unblock access and service the drainage channels in the Kaitaia, Waiharara/Kaikino and Motutangi drainage areas, as defined in the Far North Land Drainage Bylaw 2019. | Reject |
| FS259.3 | Leah Frieling | | Support | | Allow | Reject |
| S511.037 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection | Objectives | Not Stated | This chapter is confusing because it appears to use RSI and infrastructure in the objectives and policies interchangeably. In many instances under the RPS only RSI gains access to the mitigation hierarchy, not all | Insert objectives that separate out infrastructure from RSI. | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|-------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|--|-------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|
| | Society of New Zealand | | | infrastructure in general. The definition of RSI is already broad and bringing in all of infrastructure is not warranted. | | | |
| FS78.050 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | | Support | The submitter agrees that the chapter uses a number of related but different terms interchangeably. It would assist with implementation of the proposed plan if the use of different terms was clarified. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS164.037 | Scrumptious Fruit Trust | | Support | Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and secondly as passive recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area. | Allow | Amend HNC overlay to include Taupo Bay; Amend provisions to require strong wildlife protection; Amend provisions to require dogs on leash in beach areas; Adopt SNA and HNC provisions (inferred). | Reject |
| FS354.055 | Horticulture New Zealand | | Support | Clear differentiation between infrastructure and regionally significant infrastructure is supported. Allow S511.037. | Allow | Allow S511.037 | Reject |
| FS369.107 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy supports provision for Regionally Significant Infrastructure. | Allow in part | Allow in part the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS403.083 | Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora | | Support in part | Te Whatu Ora supports provision for Regionally Significant Infrastructure. | Allow in part | Te Whatu Ora supports provision for Regionally Significant Infrastructure. | Accept in part |
| FS570.1608 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission. | Reject |
| FS566.1622 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission. | Allow | Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission. | Reject |
| FS569.1644 | 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 | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|-------------------|--|------------|-----------------|---|---|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | | consistent with our original submission. | |
| S442.057 | Kapiro Conservation Trust | Objectives | Neutral | This chapter is confusing because it appears to use RSI and infrastructure in the objectives and policies interchangeably. In many instances under the RPS only RSI gains access to the mitigation hierarchy, not all infrastructure in general. The definition of RSI is already broad and bringing in all of infrastructure is not warranted. | Insert objectives that separate out infrastructure from RSI. | | Reject |
| FS369.106 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy supports provision for Regionally Significant Infrastructure. | Allow in part | Allow in part the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS403.082 | Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora | | Support in part | Te Whatu Ora supports provision for Regionally Significant Infrastructure. | Allow in part | Te Whatu Ora supports provision for Regionally Significant Infrastructure. | Accept in part |
| FS570.1754 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS346.668 | 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 | Reject |
| S464.030 | LJ King Ltd | Objectives | Support | Seek some objectives under the District Plan for the existing mapped drainage district drains, as the Draft Management Plan 2017 and current bylaws are not being enforced for the drainage districts (inferred). | Amend the Infrastructure section, by adding objectives providing for existing mapped Council drainage district drains, to ensure the ability to clean, unblock access and service the drainage channels in the Kaitaia, Waiharara/Kaikino and Motutangi drainage areas, as defined in the Far North District Council Land Drainage Bylaw 2019 and the Draft Management Plan 2017. | | Reject |
| FS566.1573 | 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 |
| S543.028 | LJ King Limited | Objectives | Oppose | We seek some objectives under the District Plan for the existing mapped drainage district drains, as the Draft Management Plan 2017 and current bylaws are not being enforced for the drainage districts (inferred). | Amend the Infrastructure section, by adding objectives providing for existing mapped Council drainage district drains, to ensure the ability to clean, unblock access and service the drainage channels in the Kaitaia, Waiharara/Kaikino and | | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|---|-----------|-----------------|---|--|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | Motutangi drainage areas, as defined in the Far North District Council Land Drainage Bylaw 2019 and the Draft Management Plan 2017. | | |
| FS566.2189 | 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 |
| S516.032 | Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland | I-O1 | Not Stated | Ngā Tai Ora support the provision of sustainable and safe water supply, wastewater and stormwater systems (three waters systems) are essential for the health and wellbeing of the Far North population. Adequate provision of and access to three waters systems plays a major role in everyday lives in enhancing well-being of communities, impact on quality of life and overall health. | Amend Objective I-O1 as follows: The District has sustainable , safe, efficient and resilient infrastructure that services the current and future needs of people and communities in the district. | | Reject |
| S331.012 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | I-O1 | Support in part | The submitter supports in part objective I-01 however, the definition of 'infrastructure' does not include additional infrastructure (which includes social infrastructure such as educational facilities). Educational facilities are a crucial form of social infrastructure that is needed to support local communities and their social and economic wellbeing. Under the NPS-UD, social infrastructure is included with the definition of 'additional infrastructure'. Council has an obligation under the NPS-UD to ensure sufficient additional infrastructure (which includes social infrastructure such as educational facilities) is provided in development and local authorities must be satisfied that additional infrastructure to service the development capacity is likely to be available. | Amend objective I-01 as follows: The District has safe, efficient and resilient infrastructure (including additional infrastructure) that services the current and future needs of people and communities in the district. | | Reject |
| FS78.008 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | | Oppose | The submitter is not opposed to the treatment of educational facilities as infrastructure within the proposed FNDP, however the proposed definition of additional infrastructure includes a network operated for the purpose of transmitting or distributing electricity. As a result, the National Grid would be identified as Regionally Significant Infrastructure, Infrastructure and Additional Infrastructure. This is likely to create confusion in interpreting the proposed FNDP. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Accept |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|--|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| FS354.056 | Horticulture New Zealand | | Oppose | HortNZ does not support inclusion of additional infrastructure as sought by the submitter. | Disallow | Disallow S331.012 | Accept |
| FS369.109 | Top Energy | | Oppose | Top Energy sought to retain this objective as notified but do not have any particular concern with this objective being expanded to include "additional infrastructure" such as educational facilities. However, it is concerned about the potential issues this will create in terms of interpretation given the existing definition of "infrastructure." | Disallow | Disallow in part the original submission | Accept |
| FS403.085 | Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora | | Support in part | Te Whatu Ora seeks to amend this objective to provide for sustainable infrastructure. | Allow in part | Te Whatu Ora seeks to amend this objective to provide for sustainable infrastructure. | Accept in part |
| S561.019 | Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities | I-O1 | Support | The objective provides the framework for ensuring infrastructure is in the right place, at the right time, to manage urban growth. | Retain I-O1 as notified. | | Accept |
| FS32.073 | Jeff Kemp | | Oppose | The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes. The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community 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. The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Reject |
| FS369.115 | Top Energy | | Support | Top Energy seek to retain this objective as notified. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|---|-----------|-----------------|--|---|---|-------------------------------|
| FS403.091 | Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora | | Oppose | Te Whatu Ora seeks to amend this objective to provide for sustainable infrastructure. | Disallow | Te Whatu Ora seeks to amend this objective to provide for sustainable infrastructure. | Reject |
| FS23.291 | 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 |
| FS47.033 | Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust | | Oppose | The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document. | Disallow | Disallow the entire original submission | Reject |
| FS348.106 | 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 |
| S165.005 | Arvida Group Limited | I-O1 | Support in part | The "statement of intent" contained in these objectives and policies needs to be linked to the FNDC Long Term Plan or other funding and delivery mechanisms so that the Council can enable the District's people and communities to provide for the own social and economic well-being. | Amend to Identify in the PDP those measures that the Council will take to lead and provide for infrastructure in a timely manner that will support and enable growth. | | Reject |
| FS369.108 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy supports provision of infrastructure in a timely manner. | Allow in part | Allow in part the original submission | Accept in part |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|--|--|-------------------------------|
| FS403.084 | Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora | | Support in part | Te Whatu Ora seeks to amend this objective to provide for sustainable infrastructure. | Allow in part | Te Whatu Ora seeks to amend this objective to provide for sustainable infrastructure. | Accept in part |
| S416.011 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | I-O1 | Support | KiwiRail support the objective for effective, efficient, resilient and safe infrastructure throughout the district. Recognising and providing for infrastructure in policy is supported by KiwiRail. KiwiRail support provision for operation, maintenance, repair, removal of infrastructure as well as upgrades to, and new infrastructure. | Retain Objective I-O1 | | Accept |
| FS369.110 | Top Energy | | Support | Top Energy seek to retain this objective as notified. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept |
| FS403.086 | Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora | | Oppose | Te Whatu Ora seeks to amend this objective to provide for sustainable infrastructure. | Disallow | Te Whatu Ora seeks to amend this objective to provide for sustainable infrastructure. | Reject |
| S421.020 | Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand | I-O1 | Support | Federated Farmers supports objectives I-O1, I-O2, I-O5 and I-O6 as they are currently worded. | Retain Objective I-O1 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent. | | Accept |
| FS369.111 | Top Energy | | Support | Top Energy seek to retain this objective as notified. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept |
| FS403.087 | Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora | | Oppose | Te Whatu Ora seeks to amend this objective to provide for sustainable infrastructure. | Disallow | Te Whatu Ora seeks to amend this objective to provide for sustainable infrastructure. | Reject |
| FS570.1252 | 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 |
| FS346.254 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection | | Oppose | The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|-------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|-------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|
| | Society of New Zealand Inc. | | | give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS. | | | |
| FS566.1266 | 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 |
| FS569.1288 | 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 |
| S454.036 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | I-O1 | Support | Transpower supports the inclusion of this objective in the FNPDP. | Retain I-O1. | | Accept |
| FS369.112 | Top Energy | | Support | Top Energy seek to retain this objective as notified. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept |
| FS403.088 | Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora | | Oppose | Te Whatu Ora seeks to amend this objective to provide for sustainable infrastructure. | Disallow | Te Whatu Ora seeks to amend this objective to provide for sustainable infrastructure. | Reject |
| S463.011 | Waiaua Bay Farm Limited | I-O1 | Support | In WBF's view, with climate change effects becoming more pronounced, it is critical to provide infrastructure that embeds resilience and anticipates that the district's infrastructure needs may change over time. | Retain Objective I-O1 | | Accept |
| FS369.113 | Top Energy | | Support | Top Energy seek to retain this objective as notified. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept |
| FS403.089 | Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora | | Oppose | Te Whatu Ora seeks to amend this objective to provide for sustainable infrastructure. | Disallow | Te Whatu Ora seeks to amend this objective to provide for sustainable infrastructure. | Reject |
| S489.011 | Radio New Zealand | I-O1 | Support | No Comment | Retain Objective I-O1 | | Accept |
| FS369.114 | Top Energy | | Support | Top Energy seek to retain this objective as notified | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept |
| FS403.090 | Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora | | Oppose | Te Whatu Ora seeks to amend this objective to provide for sustainable infrastructure. | Disallow | Te Whatu Ora seeks to amend this | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|---|-----------|-----------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | | objective to provide for sustainable infrastructure. | |
| S483.033 | Top Energy Limited | I-01 | Support | Top Energy supports this objective. | Retain Objective I-01 | | Accept |
| FS345.084 | Ngawha Generation Limited | | Support | NGL is a subsidiary of Top Energy Limited. NGL supports all submission points made by Top Energy. | Allow | Allow all of the relief sought by Top Energy Limited in its submission (S483). | Reject |
| S331.013 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | I-02 | Support in part | <p>The submitter supports in part objective I-02 however, the definition of 'infrastructure' does not include additional infrastructure (which includes social infrastructure such as educational facilities). Educational facilities are a crucial form of social infrastructure that is needed to support local communities and their social and economic wellbeing. Under the NPS-UD, social infrastructure is included with the definition of 'additional infrastructure'.</p> <p>Council has an obligation under the NPS-UD to ensure sufficient additional infrastructure (which includes social infrastructure such as educational facilities) is provided in development and local authorities must be satisfied that additional infrastructure to service the development capacity is likely to be available.</p> | Amend objective I-02 as follows: The economic and community benefits of infrastructure (including additional infrastructure) are recognised and provided for, including the benefits of regionally significant infrastructure to enhance economic, cultural, environmental and social well-being in the district. | | Reject |
| FS78.009 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | | Oppose | The submitter is not opposed to the treatment of educational facilities as infrastructure within the proposed FNDP, however the proposed definition of additional infrastructure includes a network operated for the purpose of transmitting or distributing electricity. As a result, the National Grid would be identified as Regionally Significant Infrastructure, Infrastructure and Additional Infrastructure. This is likely to create confusion in interpreting the proposed FNDP. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission. | Accept |
| FS354.057 | Horticulture New Zealand | | Oppose | HortNZ does not support inclusion of additional infrastructure as sought by the submitter. | Disallow | Disallow S331.013 | Accept |
| FS369.118 | Top Energy | | Oppose | Top Energy's submission seeks to amend this objective to capture the full range of benefits in alignment with the Strategic Direction Chapter. Top Energy do not have any particular concern with | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Accept |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|--|---|-------------------------------|
| | | | | <p>this objective being expanded to include "additional infrastructure" such as educational facilities.</p> <p>However, it is concerned about the potential issues this will create in terms of interpretation given the existing definition of "infrastructure."</p> | | | |
| S483.034 | Top Energy Limited | I-O2 | Support | <p>Top Energy support the acknowledgment of the benefits of infrastructure and regionally significant infrastructure but seek amendments to capture the full range of benefits in alignment with the Strategic Direction Chapter.</p> | <p>Amend Objective I-O2 as follows:</p> <p>The economic, cultural, environmental and community social benefits of infrastructure and regionally significant infrastructure are recognised and provided for, including the benefits of regionally significant infrastructure to enhance economic, cultural, environmental and social wellbeing in the district.</p> | | Accept in part |
| FS131.008 | Oromahoe Land Owners: AW and DM Simpson, R.A.S Ltd, Arran Trust, Garry Stanners, Errol McIntyre, SW Halliday, SJ and PM Boys, Oromahoe 18R2B2B2 Trust and Tapuaetahi Incorporation | | Oppose | <p>The submitter is concerned that the change of language removes the intent to balance infrastructure needs against the enhancement obligations to community and district well-being.</p> | Disallow | <p>Retain "...to enhance economic, cultural environmental and social well-being in the district" under I-O2 (inferred).</p> | Accept in part |
| FS345.085 | Ngawha Generation Limited | | Support | <p>NGL is a subsidiary of Top Energy Limited. NGL supports all submission points made by Top Energy.</p> | Allow | <p>Allow all of the relief sought by Top Energy Limited in its submission (S483).</p> | Accept in part |
| S421.021 | Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand | I-O2 | Support | <p>Federated Farmers supports objectives I-O1, I-O2, I-O5 and I-O6 as they are currently worded.</p> | <p>Retain Objective I-O2 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent.</p> | | Accept in part |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|---|--|-------------------------------|
| FS354.058 | Horticulture New Zealand | | Support | HortNZ supports I-02 being retained. | Allow | Allow S421.021 | Accept in part |
| FS369.120 | Top Energy | | Oppose | Top Energy's submission seeks to amend this objective to capture the full range of benefits in alignment with the Strategic Direction Chapter. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS570.1253 | 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 |
| FS346.255 | 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 |
| FS566.1267 | 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 |
| FS569.1289 | 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 |
| S158.007 | Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections | I-02 | Support | The infrastructure policy framework appropriately provides recognition of the benefits of, and protection for, regionally significant infrastructure (i.e. including Northland Regional Corrections Facility). | Retain Objective I-02 | | Accept in part |
| FS369.116 | Top Energy | | Oppose | Top Energy's submission seeks to amend this objective to capture the full range of benefits in alignment with the Strategic Direction Chapter. | Disallow in part | Disallow in part the original submission | Accept in part |
| S165.006 | Arvida Group Limited | I-02 | Support in part | The "statement of intent" contained in these objectives and policies needs to be linked to the FNDC Long Term Plan or other funding and delivery mechanisms so that the Council can enable the District's people and communities to provide for the own social and economic well-being. | Amend to Identify in the PDP those measures that the Council will take to lead and provide for infrastructure in a timely manner that will support and enable growth. | | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|--|---|--|-------------------------------|
| FS369.117 | Top Energy | | Oppose | Top Energy's submission seeks to amend this objective to capture the full range of benefits in alignment with the Strategic Direction Chapter. | Disallow in part | Disallow in part the original submission | Accept in part |
| S416.012 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | I-O2 | Support | KiwiRail supports the recognition of the benefits of rail in the district including its positive effects on economic and social well-being. | Retain Objective I-O2 | | Accept in part |
| FS369.119 | Top Energy | | Oppose | Top Energy's submission seeks to amend this objective to capture the full range of benefits in alignment with the Strategic Direction Chapter | Disallow in part | Disallow in part the original submission | Accept in part |
| S454.037 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | I-O2 | Support | Transpower supports the inclusion of this objective in the FNPDP. | Retain I-O2 | | Accept in part |
| FS369.121 | Top Energy | | Oppose | Top Energy's submission seeks to amend this objective to capture the full range of benefits in alignment with the Strategic Direction Chapter | Disallow in part | Disallow in part the original submission | Accept in part |
| S489.012 | Radio New Zealand | I-O2 | Support | RNZ supports recognition of infrastructure benefits, including specific inclusion of regionally significant infrastructure. | Retain Objective I-O2 | | Accept in part |
| FS369.122 | Top Energy | | Oppose | Top Energy's submission seeks to amend this objective to capture the full range of benefits in alignment with the Strategic Direction Chapter. | Disallow in part | Disallow in part the original submission | Accept in part |
| S489.013 | Radio New Zealand | I-O3 | Support | RNZ supports the objective to protect infrastructure from incompatible land use, including specific inclusion of reverse sensitivity effects. | Retain Objective I-O3 | | Accept in part |
| FS129.6 | Waste Management New Zealand Limited | | Support | | Allow | | Accept in part |
| FS369.127 | Top Energy | | Oppose | Top Energy seeks to amend this objective to include repair. | Disallow in part | Disallow in part the original submission | Accept in part |
| S159.031 | Horticulture New Zealand | I-O3 | Oppose | HortNZ opposes an objective of 'protection' as this is inconsistent with higher order documents such as the RPS and NPS-ET. | Amend Objective I-O3 as follows: Infrastructure is protected from Ensure that infrastructure is not compromised by incompatible land use, subdivision and development that may result in reverse | | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|--|---|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | sensitivity effects to ensure its effective operation, maintenance and upgrading. | | |
| FS151.187 | Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust | | Support | | Allow | | Reject |
| FS304.013 | Radio New Zealand | | Oppose | The submitter opposes the proposed amendments as they weaken the protection provided by the objective as notified. This is inappropriate for regionally significant infrastructure and lifeline utilities. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Accept |
| FS548.042 | Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc | | Support | Federated Farmers agrees with the submitter that the relevant higher order planning documents do not require the protection of infrastructure. The provisions in the Proposed District Plan need to be consistent with these higher order documents. | Allow | Grant the relief sought | Reject |
| FS369.123 | Top Energy | | Oppose | Top Energy seeks to amend this objective to include repair. | Disallow in part | Disallow in part the original submission | Accept |
| FS570.193 | 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 |
| FS566.207 | 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 |
| FS569.229 | 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 |
| S421.024 | Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand | I-O3 | Oppose | Objective I-O3 through its absolute protection of infrastructure will cause significant complications to our members, rural landowners, primary producers along with their everyday activities. | Delete Objective I-O3 | | Reject |
| FS78.025 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | | Oppose | Infrastructure such as the National Grid is critical for enabling people and communities to provide for their economic, social and cultural wellbeing. This is recognised through the objective and policies of the NPSET which requires (amongst other things) the management of activities to avoid reverse sensitivity effects on the electricity transmission network and to | Disallow | Disallow the original submission. | Accept |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|--|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | ensure that operation, maintenance, upgrading, and development of the electricity transmission network is not compromised. These objectives must be given effect to in the proposed FNDP, therefore the deletion of Objective I-O3 is inappropriate. | | | |
| FS369.125 | Top Energy | | Oppose | Top Energy seeks to amend this objective to include repair. | Disallow in part | Disallow in part the original submission | Accept |
| FS570.1256 | 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 |
| FS346.258 | 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 |
| FS566.1270 | 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 |
| FS569.1292 | 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 |
| S483.035 | Top Energy Limited | I-O3 | Support | This objective seeks to ensure that infrastructure is protected from incompatible land use and development. Top Energy supports this direction, but considers that the wording needs to capture operation, repair, maintenance and upgrading. This objective also refers to upgrading which Top Energy have sought a definition for in an earlier submission point. | Amend Objective I-O3 as follows: Infrastructure is protected from incompatible land use, subdivision and development that may result in reverse sensitivity effects to ensure its effective operation, repair , maintenance and upgrading. | | Accept |
| FS304.008 | Radio New Zealand | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept |
| FS345.086 | 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 |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|--|--|-------------------------------|
| S416.013 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | I-O3 | Support in part | The objective to protect infrastructure from adverse effects of subdivision, use and development, including reverse sensitivity, is supported by KiwiRail. KiwiRail supports this policy which should also include repair as an essential activity for functioning networks and for consistency with other plan provisions. | Amend Objective I-O3 as follows: Infrastructure is protected from incompatible land use, subdivision and development that may result in reverse sensitivity effects to ensure its effective operation, maintenance repair and upgrading . | | Accept |
| FS369.124 | Top Energy | | Oppose | Top Energy seeks to amend this objective to include repair. | Disallow in part | Disallow in part the original submission | Reject |
| S454.038 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | I-O3 | Support | Transpower supports the inclusion of this objective in the FNPD. | Retain I-O3 | | Accept in part |
| FS369.126 | Top Energy | | Oppose | Top Energy seeks to amend this objective to include repair. | Disallow in part | Disallow in part the original submission | Accept in part |
| S483.036 | Top Energy Limited | I-O4 | Support | Top Energy supports the direction to manage adverse effects of infrastructure in areas with historical and cultural values, natural values and coastal values, but considers it is important that the operational and functional need of infrastructure to locate in these areas is recognised and provided for. | Amend Objective I-O4 as follows: Adverse effects of infrastructure are managed through the design and location of infrastructure to minimise adverse effects on areas with historical and cultural values, natural values, and coastal values, while recognising and providing for the operational and functional need of infrastructure to locate in these areas. | | Accept in part |
| FS51.20 | Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga | | Oppose | HNZPT opposes the proposed amendment is unnecessary. The objective specifically addresses and recognises the potential for infrastructure causing adverse effects on areas with historic heritage & cultural values. | Disallow | | Accept in part |
| FS131.009 | Oromahoe Land Owners: AW and DM Simpson, R.A.S Ltd, Arran Trust, Garry Stanners, Errol McIntyre, SW Halliday, SJ and PM Boys, Oromahoe | | Oppose | The original submission appears to be seeking discretion to override existing constraints the proposed FNPD endeavours to use to protect such as historical, cultural natural and coastal values. The original submitter should be required to properly engage and consult the land owners and mana whenua. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission (inferred). | Accept in part |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|---|--|-------------------------------|
| | 18R2B2B2 Trust and Tapuaetahi Incorporation | | | | | | |
| FS346.057 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. | | Oppose | The amendment sought does not appropriately recognise and provide for s6(a)-(c) matters. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS345.087 | 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 |
| S463.012 | Waiaua Bay Farm Limited | I-O4 | Oppose | The locational, operational and functional needs of infrastructure can preclude the avoidance of adverse effects. In WBF's view it is appropriate therefore to provide for the "management" rather than avoidance of potential effects. However, the drafting of the objective is repetitive and therefore WBF suggests refinements. | Amend Objective I-O4 as follows: I-O4 Adverse effects of infrastructure are managed through The design and location of infrastructure is managed to minimise adverse effects on areas with historical and cultural values, natural values, and coastal values. | | Accept in part |
| FS51.135 | Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga | | Oppose | HNZPT considers the proposed amended text removes the necessary direction to ensure the giving effect to Part 2 of the RMA relating to historic heritage. | Disallow | | Accept in part |
| FS91.3 | Moana Kiff | | Oppose | We fully support the rule which emphasizes the management of adverse effects of infrastructure. This rule's focus on designing and locating infrastructure to minimize negative impacts on the areas with historical and cultural values, natural values, and coastal values aligns with our commitment to preserving these important aspects of our community and environment. By implementing this rule effectively, we can ensure that our infrastructure development is carried out responsibly and in a way that respects our cultural heritage and natural resources. | Disallow | | Accept in part |
| FS369.132 | Top Energy | | Oppose | Top Energy seeks to amend this objective to recognise the operational and functional need of infrastructure to locate in these areas. | Disallow in part | Disallow in part the original submission | Accept in part |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------|
| S421.025 | Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand | I-O4 | Support in part | Objective I-O4 needs to recognise land that contains highly productive soils and the economic values of these areas as well as the natural, cultural, and historic values currently specified. | Amend Objective I-O4 as follows: Adverse effects of infrastructure are managed through the design and location of infrastructure to minimise adverse effects on areas with historical and cultural values, natural values, economic values (including highly productive soils) , and coastal values. or wording with a similar intent. | | Reject |
| FS36.027 | Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency | | Oppose | Opposes the proposed amendments which includes 'economic value' which are unclear and undefined in the Resource Management Act and may constrain the provision of future infrastructure. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Accept |
| FS354.059 | Horticulture New Zealand | | Support | Recognition of highly productive land in the objective is supported. | Allow | Allow S421.025 | Reject |
| FS369.129 | Top Energy | | Oppose | Top Energy seeks to amend this objective to recognise the operational and functional need of infrastructure to locate in these areas. | Disallow in part | Disallow in part the original submission | Accept |
| FS570.1257 | 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 |
| FS346.259 | 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 |
| FS566.1271 | 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 |
| FS569.1293 | 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 |
| S511.039 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection | I-O4 | Support in part | The word 'minimise' is not appropriate and does not reflect the terminology used in RMA, s5 This chapter does not have any rules that address indigenous | Amend: " ... avoid, remedy or mitigate minimise ..." | | Accept in part |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|-------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|--|-------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|
| | Society of New Zealand | | | biodiversity. It may be that this objective is better reflected in the IB chapter. | | | |
| FS36.028 | Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency | | Oppose | Supports managing adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity but notes that infrastructure, such as transport corridors have a functional and operational need to be located in some sensitive locations to provide its function as a lifeline utility. The relief sought will make it increasingly difficult, and in some cases impossible, to provide, operate and maintain lifeline utilities for communities, and is inconsistent with NPS-IB. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS164.039 | Scrumptious Fruit Trust | | Support | Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and secondly as passive recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area. | Allow | Amend HNC overlay to include Taupo Bay; Amend provisions to require strong wildlife protection; Amend provisions to require dogs on leash in beach areas; Adopt SNA and HNC provisions (inferred). | Accept in part |
| FS548.151 | Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc | | Support in part | Federated Farmers suggested an amendment to objective I-O4 to include economic values which would also make the wording more consistent with s5 the Resource Management Act 1991. | Allow in part | Grant the relief sought along with the relief sought in Federated Farmers original submission. | Accept in part |
| FS369.133 | Top Energy | | Oppose | Top Energy seeks to amend this objective to recognise the operational and functional need of infrastructure to locate in these areas. | Disallow in part | Disallow in part the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS570.1610 | 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 |
| FS566.1624 | 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 |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|---|---|-------------------------------|
| FS569.1646 | 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 |
| S394.013 | Haitaitamarangai Marae Kaitiaki Trust | I-O4 | Support in part | In some instances, higher order instruments require avoidance, rather than minimisation of some adverse effects. There may also be instances where it is simply not appropriate or in line with sustainable management to allow adverse effects on vulnerable values. | Amend Objective I-O4 as follows: Adverse effects of infrastructure are managed through the design and location of infrastructure to avoid significant adverse effects or minimise adverse effects on areas with historical and cultural values, natural values, and coastal values. | | Accept in part |
| FS369.128 | Top Energy | | Oppose | Top Energy seeks to amend this objective to recognise the operational and functional need of infrastructure to locate in these areas. | Disallow in part | Disallow in part the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS363.013 | Liz Rowena Maki Hetaraka. | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS538.013 | Awhina Fiaui | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS537.013 | Maryanne June Harrison | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS536.013 | Bradley Tauhara Rupapera | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS535.013 | Dyrell Akavi | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS533.013 | Sidney John Rupapera | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS532.013 | Wiremu Hetaraka | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS531.013 | Phyllis Marie Hetaraka | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS530.013 | Norma Evans | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS529.013 | Aaron Rupapera | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | 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 |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| FS528.013 | Erana Samuels | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS527.013 | David Matiu | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS526.013 | Michelle Chase | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS525.013 | Vaughn Piripi Duvell Evans | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS524.013 | Tania Morunga | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS523.013 | Brett Larkin | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS522.013 | Stacey Matiu | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS521.013 | Marie Matiu | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS520.013 | Maureen Maheno | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS519.013 | Huia Solomon | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS518.013 | William Boyd Rupapera | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS517.013 | Mereana Alma Houkamau | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS516.013 | Rebecca Jan Stensness | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS515.013 | Anaru Poharama | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS514.013 | Robert Reihana | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS513.013 | Ester Rangi Doyle | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | 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 |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| FS512.013 | Ellen Appleby | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS511.013 | Cedric Lawrence | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS510.013 | Raniera Matiu | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS509.013 | Clinton Matiu | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS508.013 | Sana Ryan | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS507.013 | Te TeArani Lawrence | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS506.013 | Selwyn Reihana | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS505.013 | Thomson Lawrence | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS504.013 | Ngarei Reihana | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS503.013 | Nina Raharuhi | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS502.013 | Rebecca Rutene | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS501.013 | Patricia Ellen Buddy | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS500.013 | Whetu Rutene | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS499.013 | Paki Daniel Lawrence | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS498.013 | Aaron George Lawrence | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS497.013 | Tayla Bamber | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | 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 |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| FS496.013 | Cheryl Bamber | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS495.013 | Jasmine Cook | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS494.013 | Ian Ethan Bamber | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS493.013 | Albert Tawhio Cook | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS492.013 | Sarah Kati Cook | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS491.013 | Mark J Broad | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS490.013 | Julia Middleton | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS489.013 | Josephine Lawrence | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS487.013 | Timothy Matiu | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS486.013 | John Barry Horan | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS485.013 | Travis Horan | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS483.013 | Mate Simon Covich Horan | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS482.013 | Waikura Maungaia Marriott | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS481.013 | Peggy Joanne Matiu | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS480.013 | Cheryl Chase | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS479.013 | Jacob Hohaia | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | 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 |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| FS478.013 | Grayson Fleur Horan | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS477.013 | Chase McIndoe | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS476.013 | Jessica Solomon | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS475.013 | Marina Chase | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS474.013 | Steven Matiu | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS473.013 | Beryl Chase | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS472.013 | Krystal-Jade Matiu | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS471.013 | William Gary Butt | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS470.013 | Michael Matiu | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS469.013 | Anne-maree Morrissey | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS468.013 | Elias Reihana-Hetaraka | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS467.013 | Carol Matiu | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS466.013 | Janet Myra Bennett | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS465.013 | Rangimarie Muru | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS464.013 | Glennis Lawrence | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS463.013 | Jayden Murray | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | 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 |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| FS462.013 | Roharia Hepi | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS461.013 | Vincent C Matiu | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS460.013 | Tawhai Motu | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS459.013 | Maria Kim Hetaraka | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS458.013 | Alexander John Busby | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS457.013 | Ena Lesley Rupapera | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS456.013 | Rhys Alexander Lawrence-Busby | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS455.013 | Rangi Matthew Marriott | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS454.013 | Turei John Rupapera | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS453.013 | Marlaine Ulrich | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS452.013 | Reikura Joan Boyd | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS451.013 | Ariana Bellingham | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS450.013 | Georgina Laing | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS447.013 | Rangaunu Taua | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS440.013 | Hongi Laing | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS439.013 | Rahera Fiaui | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | 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 |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| FS436.013 | Parehuia Jane Williams | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS435.013 | George Hori Lawrence | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS434.013 | Anthony Murphy | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS433.013 | Christian Horan | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS432.013 | Makarita Rutene | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS431.013 | Valarie Rutene | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS430.013 | Kaeo Lawrence | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS429.013 | Cedric Rutene | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS428.013 | Shane Horan | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS427.013 | Jacey Horan | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS426.013 | Toni Maheno | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS425.013 | Florence Campbell | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS423.013 | Joseph Maheno | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS422.013 | Sharmaine Hepi | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS421.013 | Gia-Dene Gardiner | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS420.013 | Josephine Doyle | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | 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 |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| FS418.013 | Mary Watkins | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS417.013 | Maddison Lawrence | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS416.013 | Isobel Fitzgibbon | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS415.013 | Michelle Lawrence | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS408.013 | Jason Gardiner | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS388.013 | Crystal Myra Broad | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS387.013 | Aroha Whitinui | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS386.013 | Tynan Hokimate Mark | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS385.013 | Victoria Murphy | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS382.013 | Yvonne Meta Desmond | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS381.013 | Lorraine Joan Hetaraka | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS380.013 | Ashleigh Hetaraka-Tawhai | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS379.013 | Kaya Hetaraka-Tawhai | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS378.013 | Maanu Reihana | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS365.013 | Roberta Hetaraka | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS360.013 | Cameron Mccaskill | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | 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 |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| FS359.013 | Mark Brannen | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS358.013 | Kailah Raharuhi - Alatipi | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS357.013 | Raharuhi Fiaui | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS356.013 | Katharine Kino | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS568.013 | Bonnie Hepi | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS567.013 | Blaze Maraki | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS563.013 | Hohepa Fletcher | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS562.013 | Rhonda Raharuhi | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS561.013 | Ivan Wimoka Hetaraka | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS560.013 | Dylan Hetaraka | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS559.013 | Clinton Albert Doyle | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS558.013 | Timothy John Doyle | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS557.013 | Patricia Kate Broad | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS556.013 | Louis Aluishis Brabant | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS555.013 | Kelly Sharee Doyle | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS553.013 | Kenape Saupese | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | 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 |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|--|--|-------------------------------|
| FS552.013 | Barbara May Hetaraka | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS551.013 | Alamein Drummond | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS546.013 | Shona Hetaraka | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS545.013 | Peter Charles Rupapera | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS544.013 | Te Waata Lawrence Kara | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS178.013 | Hera Johns | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS413.013 | Charles Lawrence | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS588.013 | Ian Taylor Bamber | | Support | Support original submission to protect our wāhi tapu sites of significance and rights as tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission. | Accept in part |
| S442.059 | Kapiro Conservation Trust | I-O4 | Support in part | The word 'minimise' is not appropriate and does not reflect the terminology used in RMA, s5 This chapter does not have any rules that address indigenous biodiversity. It may be that this objective is better reflected in the IB chapter. | Amend: "...avoid, remedy or mitigate minimise ..." | | Accept in part |
| FS369.130 | Top Energy | | Oppose | Top Energy seeks to amend this objective to recognise the operational and functional need of infrastructure to locate in these areas. | Disallow in part | Disallow in part the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS570.1756 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS346.670 | 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 |
| S454.039 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | I-O4 | Support | Transpower supports the inclusion of this objective in the FNPDP. | Retain I-O4 | | Accept in part |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|---|--|-------------------------------|
| FS369.131 | Top Energy | | Oppose | Top Energy seeks to amend this objective to recognise the operational and functional need of infrastructure to locate in these areas. | Disallow in part | Accept in part | Accept in part |
| S454.040 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | I-O5 | Support | Transpower supports the inclusion of this objective in the FNPDP. | Retain I-O5 | | Accept |
| S483.037 | Top Energy Limited | I-O5 | Support | Top Energy supports this objective as proposed. | Retain Objective I-O5 | | Accept |
| FS448.003 | L & T Property Investments Limited | | Support | Objective I-O5 recognises infrastructure is to be integrated with land use (rather than the other way around) and that infrastructure is to be coordinated at the time of subdivision and development (and not the other way around). The wording as drafted reinforces that infrastructure is intended to provide for planned growth and development and the Further Submitter supports this accordingly. | Allow | Retain Objective I-O5 | Accept |
| FS345.088 | 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 |
| S138.005 | Kairos Connection Trust and Habitat for Humanity Northern Region Ltd | I-O5 | Support in part | <p>The adequacy of urban three waters infrastructure to service land use development in reticulated urban centres is critical to the realisation of FNDC's assessment of future urban residential land supply and assumptions about future housing yield. With respect to wastewater infrastructure, the Section 32 overview information appears to indicate that urban zones have been consolidated to include land that is currently able to be serviced or is within areas where there are planned services. However, this is not clear from either the subdivision or zone rules that require servicing capacity to be confirmed at the time of a subdivision or land use consent application.</p> <p>Concerned that if it is a developer's sole responsibility to confirm the capacity of a wastewater infrastructure and demonstrate to Council that a controlled or permitted activity housing proposal is capable of being serviced, that this uncertainty and investigation cost will be a disincentive to proceeding with a proposal. Kairos and Habitat seek that the Council publicise baseline</p> | Amend Objective I-O5 as follows: <i>The provision of infrastructure is integrated with Plan enabled subdivision and land use and is coordinated at the time of subdivision and development.</i> | | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|--|--|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | capacity information about its wastewater infrastructure in all of its urban centres and that proposed objectives and policies reflect the fact that it is the Council's responsibility to service urban development that is permitted in a zone. | | | |
| FS369.134 | Top Energy | | Oppose | Top Energy seeks to retain this objective as notified, and does not support the amendments sought by this submission. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Accept |
| S421.022 | Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand | I-O5 | Support | Federated Farmers supports objectives I-O1, I-O2, I-O5 and I-O6 as they are currently worded. | Retain Objective I-O5 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent. | | Accept |
| FS369.135 | Top Energy | | Support | Top Energy seeks to retain this objective as notified. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept |
| FS369.137 | Top Energy | | Oppose | Top Energy seeks to amend this objective to recognise the operational and functional need to locate in these areas. | Disallow in part | Disallow in part the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS570.1254 | 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 |
| FS346.256 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. | | Oppose | The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Reject |
| FS566.1268 | 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 |
| FS569.1290 | 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 |
| S561.020 | Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities | I-O6 | Support | The objective provides the framework to ensure large scale regional wide infrastructure does not compromise | Retain I-O6 as notified | | Accept in part |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|---|-----------|----------|---|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| | | | | the development potential of Maori land. Kāinga Ora support this planning approach. | | | |
| FS32.074 | Jeff Kemp | | Oppose | <p>The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes.</p> <p>The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts.</p> <p>The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.</p> | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Reject |
| FS23.292 | Des and Lorraine Morrison | | Support | <p>Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Maori land.</p> | Allow | Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission. | Accept in part |
| FS47.034 | Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust | | Oppose | <p>The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan.</p> <p>Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have</p> | Disallow | Disallow the entire original submission | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document. | | | |
| FS348.107 | 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 |
| S483.038 | Top Energy Limited | I-O6 | Not Stated | Top Energy supports the ability of tangata whenua to develop land in the Māori Purpose Zone or Treaty Settlement overlay. However, Top Energy considers that the bar of "does not constrain" is too high. The provision of infrastructure to support the development of that land may lead to some constraints (e.g., the provision of electricity lines to service development on that land may require building setbacks to comply with the necessary safe setback distances in NZECP 34:2001). There is also often an operational and functional need for infrastructure to be located in these areas that needs to be recognised and provided for. | Amend Objective I-O6 as follows: The location of infrastructure does not unduly constrain the ability of tangata whenua to develop land in the Māori Purpose zone or the Treaty Settlement overlay, while recognising and providing for the operational and functional need of infrastructure to locate in these areas. | | Reject |
| FS131.0010 | Oromahoe Land Owners: AW and DM Simpson, R.A.S Ltd, Arran Trust, Garry Stanners, Errol McIntyre, SW Halliday, SJ and PM Boys, Oromahoe 18R2B2B2 Trust and Tapuaetahi Incorporation | | Oppose | The submitter seeks discretion to interpret what "Does not constrain" means for their own interest. The original submitter should be required to properly engage and consult the land owners and mana whenua. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission (inferred). | Accept |
| FS345.089 | Ngawha Generation Limited | | Support | NGL is a subsidiary of Top Energy Limited. NGL supports all submission points made by Top Energy. | Allow | Allow all of the relief sought by Top Energy Limited in its submission (S483). | Reject |
| S454.041 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | I-O6 | Not Stated | Transpower supports the intent of this objective however it has some concerns regarding its potential impact on the National Grid. The existing KOE-MPE-A line crosses some areas of Māori Purpose - Rural zoned land. While Transpower supports planning provisions that enable tangata whenua to develop this land, there are locational, operational and functional | Amend I-O6 to allow for critical and necessary National Grid infrastructure; The location of infrastructure does not unnecessarily constrain the ability of tangata whenua to develop land in the Māori Purpose zone or the Treaty | | Accept in part |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|-------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | constraints that mean that certain developments and activities cannot occur in the vicinity of the National Grid. Transpower suggests an amendment to Objective I-O6 to ensure that this is clear and transparent. | Settlement overlay, while recognising the locational, operational or functional needs of infrastructure. | | |
| FS369.138 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy seeks to amend this objective to recognise the operational and functional need to locate in these areas. | Allow in part | Allow in part the original submission | Accept in part |
| S421.023 | Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand | I-O6 | Support | Federated Farmers supports objectives I-O1, I-O2, I-O5 and I-O6 as they are currently worded. | Retain Objective I-O6 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent. | | Accept in part |
| FS570.1255 | 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 |
| FS346.257 | 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 |
| FS566.1269 | 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 |
| FS569.1291 | 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 |
| S485.030 | Elbury Holdings | Policies | Oppose | Seek some Policies under the District Plan for the existing mapped drainage district drains, as the Draft Management Plan 2017 and current bylaws are not being enforced for the drainage districts. | Amend the Infrastructure section, by adding policies providing for existing mapped Council drainage district drains, to ensure the ability to clean, unblock access and service the drainage channels in the Kaitaia, Waiharara/Kaikino and Motutangi drainage areas, as defined in the Far North District Council Land Drainage Bylaw 2019 and the Draft Management Plan 2017. | | Reject |
| S358.025 | Leah Frieling | Policies | Oppose | The current bylaws are not being enforced for the drainage districts. | Amend the Infrastructure section, by adding policies providing for existing mapped Council | | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|---|---|
| | | | | | drainage district drains, to ensure the ability to clean, unblock access and service the drainage channels in the Kaitaia, Waiharara/Kaikino and Motutangi drainage areas, as defined in the Far North Land Drainage Bylaw 2019. | |
| S547.029 | LJ King Limited | Policies | Oppose | We seek some Policies under the District Plan for the existing mapped drainage district drains, as the Draft Management Plan 2017 and current bylaws are not being enforced for the drainage districts. | Amend the Infrastructure section, by adding policies providing for existing mapped Council drainage district drains, to ensure the ability to clean, unblock access and service the drainage channels in the Kaitaia, Waiharara/Kaikino and Motutangi drainage areas, as defined in the Far North District Council Land Drainage Bylaw 2019 and the Draft Management Plan 2017. | Reject |
| S541.027 | Elbury Holdings | Policies | Oppose | We seek some Policies under the District Plan for the existing mapped drainage district drains, as the Draft Management Plan 2017 and current bylaws are not being enforced for the drainage districts. | Amend the Infrastructure section, by adding policies providing for existing mapped Council drainage district drains, to ensure the ability to clean, unblock access and service the drainage channels in the Kaitaia, Waiharara/Kaikino and Motutangi drainage areas, as defined in the Far North District Council Land Drainage Bylaw 2019 and the Draft Management Plan 2017. | Reject |
| FS155.35 | Fiona King | | Support | Same as previous comments but wish to be heard on these submissions. | Allow | Reject |
| S519.030 | Elbury Holdings | Policies | Oppose | We seek some Policies under the District Plan for the existing mapped drainage district drains, as the Draft Management Plan 2017 and current bylaws are not being enforced for the drainage districts | Amend the Infrastructure section, by adding policies providing for existing mapped Council drainage district drains, to ensure the ability to clean, unblock access and service the drainage channels in the Kaitaia, Waiharara/Kaikino and Motutangi drainage areas, as defined in the Far North District Council Land Drainage Bylaw 2019 and the Draft Management Plan 2017. | Reject |
| FS155.36 | Fiona King | | Support | Same as previous comments. | Allow | Reject |
| S559.050 | Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rēhia | Policies | Support in part | The amendment is to ensure recharge is maintained. | Insert a policy into the PDP which requires low impact stormwater design for new development. | Reject |
| FS151.359 | Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust | | Support | | Allow | Reject |
| FS243.052 | Kainga Ora Homes and Communities | | Support in part | Kāinga Ora supports development aligned with the provision of climate-resilient services and infrastructure, however requiring low impact stormwater design for all | Allow | Insert a policy into the PDP which requires low impact stormwater Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|---|-----------|-----------------|---|--|---|-------------------------------|
| | | | | new development could create barriers to delivering affordable housing. | | design for new development. | |
| FS570.2240 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission. | Reject |
| FS348.077 | 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 |
| FS566.2254 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission. | Allow | Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission. | Reject |
| FS569.2276 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission. | Allow | Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission. | Reject |
| S472.025 | Michael Foy | Policies | Support in part | We seek some rules under the District Plan for the existing mapped drainage district drains, as the current bylaws are not being enforced for the drainage districts. | Amend the Infrastructure section, by adding policies providing for existing mapped Council drainage district drains, to ensure the ability to clean, unblock access and service the drainage channels in the Kaitaia, Waiharara/Kaikino and Motutangi drainage areas, as defined in the Far North Land Drainage Bylaw 2019. | | Reject |
| FS258.2 | Logan King | | Support | | Allow | | Reject |
| S511.042 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand | Policies | Not Stated | The policy does not give effect to the RPS, policies 5.3.3, 4.4.1(3) and 4.6.1. | Insert two new policies for Regionally Significant Infrastructure: Outside the coastal environment manage the effects of new and the re-consenting of existing Regionally Significant Infrastructure by: g. avoiding effects on historical and cultural values, significant natural areas, and outstanding natural features or landscapes to the extent practicable; | | Accept in part |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|---------|---|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | <p>h. minimising mitigating or remedying adverse effects on historical and cultural values, natural environment values that cannot be avoided;</p> <p>i. recognising the technical, operational and functional needs and constraints of infrastructure activities;</p> <p>j. Biodiversity offsetting more than minor residual adverse effects that cannot be avoided, remedied or mitigated; and</p> <p>k. If more than minor residual adverse effects remain after biodiversity offsetting then consider Environmental biodiversity compensation measures to ensure that any residual adverse effect is no more than minor.</p> <p>And then add a new policy to address maintenance, operation and upgrading of RSI.</p> <p>Outside the coastal environment manage the effects of operation, maintenance and upgrading of existing Regionally Significant Infrastructure by:</p> <p>a. Avoiding significant adverse effects and the adverse effects after the conclusion of the maintenance or upgrading or operation are the same or</p> | |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|--|---|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | similar to before the activity being undertaken; and b. Then consider offsetting and environmental compensation measures where there are more than minor residual adverse effects that cannot be avoided, remedied or mitigated. | | |
| FS36.029 | Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency | | Oppose | Opposes the inclusion of the two proposed policies introducing biodiversity as it would introduce unnecessary repetition (from the ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity chapter) and/or constrain the provision, operation and maintenance of Regionally Significant Infrastructure. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS78.052 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | | Oppose | The submitter opposes the inclusion of this policy because the definition of Regionally Significant Infrastructure in the RPSN includes the National Grid and this policy could therefore apply to the National Grid in the Far North, however the policy does not give effect to the NPSET. The submitter would prefer a standalone policy that relates to the National Grid. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS164.042 | Scrumptious Fruit Trust | | Support | Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and secondly as passive recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area. | Allow | Amend HNC overlay to include Taupo Bay; Amend provisions to require strong wildlife protection; Amend provisions to require dogs on leash in beach areas; Adopt SNA and HNC provisions (inferred). | Reject |
| FS354.065 | Horticulture New Zealand | | Support | The submitter seeks policies specifically for regionally significant infrastructure. However HPL should also be recognised in the policies. | Allow | Allow S511.042 but also include highly productive land as a matter to be protected. | Accept in part |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|---|-----------|-----------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------|
| FS369.144 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy seeks appropriate provision and enablement of Regionally Significant Infrastructure. | Allow in part | Allow in part the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS403.094 | Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora | | Support in part | Te Whatu Ora seek appropriate provision and enablement of Regionally Significant Infrastructure. | Allow in part | Te Whatu Ora seek appropriate provision and enablement of Regionally Significant Infrastructure. | Accept in part |
| FS404.092 | Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation | | Support | If policies addressing indigenous biodiversity remain in this chapter, the D-G supports proposed approach, including narrowing the application RSI and the directive to avoid on NZCPS Policy 11(a) values. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS570.1613 | 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 |
| FS566.1627 | 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 |
| FS569.1649 | 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 |
| S511.043 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand | Policies | Not Stated | <p>This policy elevates all infrastructure in the Far North to the status of RSI, National Grid, electricity transmission and renewable electricity generation activities. The definition for RSI is already far ranging and including all of infrastructure is a step to far and has no support from higher order planning documents.</p> <p>This policy does not meet the requirements of the NZCPS because it provides access to the effects mitigation hierarchy for all infrastructure in the Far North. This is contrary to the express requirements of the NZCPS in regards to ONLs, ONFs, and policy 11(a) matters. It also runs counter to RPS, policies 5.3.3, 4.4.1, 4.6.1 and 4.6.2. The RPS only provides access to the mitigation hierarchy for RSI not infrastructure as a whole in</p> | <p>Insert new policies reflecting direction operation, maintenance and upgrading of RSI as follows:</p> <p>In the coastal environment, manage the effects of the, operation, maintenance and upgrading of Regionally Significant Infrastructure activities by:</p> <p>a. avoiding adverse effects on the values, qualities and characteristics of:</p> <p>i. significant natural areas</p> <p>ii. The outstanding natural features or landscapes,</p> | Accept in part | |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|---------|---|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | <p>areas of outstanding natural character;</p> <p>b. Avoiding adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Indigenous taxa that are listed as threatened or at risk in the NZ Threat Classification System lists; and ii. Areas set aside for full or partial protection of indigenous biodiversity under other legislation <p>c. avoiding significant adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. other natural features and landscapes, and areas of natural character; ii. areas of predominantly indigenous vegetation; iii. Habitats of indigenous species important for recreational, commercial, traditional, or cultural purposes; iv. Indigenous ecosystems and habitats that are particularly vulnerable to modification, including estuaries, lagoons, coastal wetlands, dunelands, intertidal zones, rocky reefs systems, eelgrass, northern wet heathlands, coastal and | |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|--|--|---|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | <p>headwater streams, floodplains, margins of the coastal marine area and freshwater bodies, spawning and nursery areas and saltmarsh; and</p> <p>v. Historic heritage</p> <p>d. avoid, remedy, mitigate other adverse effects;</p> <p>e. recognising the technical, operational and functional needs and constraints of infrastructure activities; and</p> <p>f. where significant adverse effects are avoided and the adverse effects after the conclusion of the maintenance or upgrading or operation are the same or similar to before the activity being undertaken consider offsetting and environmental compensation measures where there are more than minor residual adverse effects that cannot be avoided, remedied or mitigated.</p> | | |
| FS36.030 | Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency | | Oppose | Opposes the relief sought as it would introduce unnecessary repetition and/or constrain the provision, operation and maintenance of Regionally Significant Infrastructure. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS164.043 | Scrumptious Fruit Trust | | Support | Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and secondly as passive recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring | Allow | Amend HNC overlay to include Taupo Bay; Amend provisions to require strong wildlife protection; Amend | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|-------------------|---|-----------|-----------------|---|--|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area. | | provisions to require dogs on leash in beach areas; Adopt SNA and HNC provisions (inferred). | |
| FS354.066 | Horticulture New Zealand | | Support | The submitter seeks policies specifically for regionally significant infrastructure. | Allow | Allow S511.043 | Accept in part |
| FS369.145 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy seeks appropriate provision and enablement of Regionally Significant Infrastructure. | Allow in part | Allow in part the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS403.095 | Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora | | Support in part | Te Whatu Ora seek appropriate provision and enablement of Regionally Significant Infrastructure. | Allow in part | Te Whatu Ora seek appropriate provision and enablement of Regionally Significant Infrastructure. | Accept in part |
| FS404.090 | Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation | | Support | If policies addressing indigenous biodiversity remain in this chapter, the D-G supports proposed approach, including narrowing the application RSI and the directive to avoid on NZCPS Policy 11(a) values. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS570.1614 | 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 |
| FS566.1628 | 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 |
| FS569.1650 | 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 |
| S511.038 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand | Policies | Not Stated | This chapter is confusing because it appears to use RSI and infrastructure in the objectives and policies interchangeably. In many instances under the RPS only RSI gains access to the mitigation hierarchy, not all infrastructure in general. The definition of RSI is | Insert policies that separate out infrastructure from RSI. | | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|-------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|--|-------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | already broad and bringing in all of infrastructure is not warranted. | | | |
| FS78.051 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | | Support | The submitter agrees that the chapter uses a number of related but different terms interchangeably. It would assist with implementation of the proposed plan if the use of different terms was clarified. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS164.038 | Scrumptious Fruit Trust | | Support | Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and secondly as passive recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area. | Allow | Amend HNC overlay to include Taupo Bay; Amend provisions to require strong wildlife protection; Amend provisions to require dogs on leash in beach areas; Adopt SNA and HNC provisions (inferred). | Reject |
| FS354.064 | Horticulture New Zealand | | Support | Clear differentiation between infrastructure and regionally significant infrastructure is supported. | Allow | Allow S511.038 | Reject |
| FS369.143 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy seeks appropriate provision and enablement of Regionally Significant Infrastructure. | Allow in part | Allow in part the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS403.092 | Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora | | Support in part | Te Whatu Ora seek appropriate provision and enablement of Regionally Significant Infrastructure. | Allow in part | Te Whatu Ora seek appropriate provision and enablement of Regionally Significant Infrastructure. | Accept in part |
| FS570.1609 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission. | Reject |
| FS566.1623 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission. | Allow | Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission. | Reject |
| FS569.1645 | 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 | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|------------|--|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | consistent with our original submission. | |
| S454.044 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | Policies | Not Stated | <p>Transpower seeks specific National Grid provisions to give effect to the NPSET. The need to operate, maintain, upgrade and develop the electricity transmission network is recognised as a matter of national significance through the NPSET. This significance applies universally across the country regardless of the nature of the specific National Grid asset. The NPSET Objective recognises that the network itself potentially gives rise to adverse effects, and that other activities can potentially adversely affect the network.</p> <p>The NPSET policies give direction on how to achieve the objective by providing for the recognition of the benefits of electricity transmission, as well as the management of the environmental effects of electricity transmission and the adverse effects of other activities on the transmission network. As such, the NPSET policies impose obligations on both decision-makers and Transpower itself. One of the aspects within the NPSET which must be given effect to in district plans is provisions relating to enabling the National Grid. Policies and plans must provide for the effective operation, maintenance, upgrading and development of the National Grid. The development of National Grid assets gives rise to the potential for adverse environmental effects. The development of the National Grid must therefore be managed to ensure the potential for adverse effects is appropriately managed while recognising its significance and the constraints under which it operates.</p> <p>The NPSET requires the District Plan to include objectives and policies that:- Allow for the consideration of the technical constraints and operational requirements under which the National Grid operates, for example the linear nature of the transmission lines.- Have regard to the extent to which adverse effects have been avoided, remedied or mitigated through the route, site and method selection.- Ensure new planning and development seeks to avoid adverse effects on more sensitive areas. Policies, plans and decision makers must take in to</p> | <p>Insert new policy as follows:</p> <p>I-Px Provide for the development of the National Grid by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In urban zoned areas, development should minimise adverse effects on urban amenity and should avoid material adverse effects on the Commercial and Mixed Use zones, and areas of high recreational or amenity value and existing sensitive activities. 2. Seek to avoid the adverse effects of the National Grid within areas identified in SCHED4 Significant Natural Areas, SCHED5 Outstanding Natural Landscapes, SCHED6 Outstanding Natural Features, SCHED7 High Natural Character, SCHED8 Outstanding Natural Character, outside the coastal environment. 3. Where the National Grid has a functional need or operational need to locate within the coastal environment, manage adverse effects by: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Seeking to avoid adverse effects on areas identified in SCHED4 Significant Natural | Accept in part |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|---|-------------------------------|
| | | | | <p>account the characteristics of the National Grid, its technical and operational constraints, and the route, site and method selection process when considering the adverse effects of new National Grid infrastructure on the environment. On this basis, Transpower supports a new policy specific to the development of the National Grid.</p> | <p>Areas, SCHED5 Outstanding Natural Landscapes, SCHED6 Outstanding Natural Features, SCHED7 High Natural Character, SCHED8 Outstanding Natural Character.</p> <p>b. Where it is not practicable to avoid adverse effects on the values of the areas in SCHED4 Significant Natural Areas, SCHED5 Outstanding Natural Landscapes, SCHED6 Outstanding Natural Features, SCHED7 High Natural Character, SCHED8 Outstanding Natural Character because of the functional needs or operational needs of the National Grid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects on those values;</p> <p>c. Seeking to avoid significant adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. other areas of natural character ii. natural attributes and character of other natural features and natural landscapes | |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|---------|---|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> iii. indigenous biodiversity values that meet the criteria in Policy 11(b) of the NZCPS 2010d. Avoiding, remedying or mitigating other adverse effects to the extent practicable; and e. Recognising there may be some areas within SCHED4 Significant Natural Areas, SCHED5 Outstanding Natural Landscapes, SCHED6 Outstanding Natural Features, SCHED7 High Natural Character, SCHED8 Outstanding Natural Character, where avoidance of adverse effects is required to protect the identified values and characteristics. 4. When considering the adverse effects in respect of 1-3 above; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Have regard to the extent to which adverse effects have been avoided, remedied or mitigated by the route, site and method selection; and | |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|---|---|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | <p>b. Consider the constraints arising from the operational needs or functional needs of the National Grid, when considering measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate any adverse effects. In the event that there is a conflict between this policy and any other policies in the Far North District Plan, this policy will prevail.</p> <p>Amend to include any consequential amendments to other objectives, policies and rules in the FNPDP that may be necessary to fully give effect to the NPSET and implement this new policy. Should a National Grid specific policy not be provided, Transpower seeks amendment to policies I-P2 and IP-P3 to give effect to the NPSET.</p> | | |
| FS548.132 | Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc | | Oppose | As the operator of the National Grid, the submitter is required to meet its obligations under the Resource Management Act 1991. These obligations are not negated by the National Policy Statement on Electricity Transmission. | Disallow | Decline the relief sought | Accept in part |
| FS354.060 | Horticulture New Zealand | | Support in part | The submitter seeks a separate policy for the National Grid. A separate policy is supported to the extent that it differentiates from other infrastructure due to the NPSET applying. However the policy sought makes no mention of rural areas over which much of the National Grid traverses. | Allow | Allow S454.044 to the extent of inclusion of specific policies for the National Grid but ensure that the policy framework appropriately recognises the areas which the National Grid is located in. | Accept in part |
| FS243.054 | Kainga Ora Homes and Communities | | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes elements of the proposed change sought that may be inconsistent with the NPSET. | Disallow | Insert new policy | Accept in part |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|---|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| FS346.024 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. | | Oppose | Amendment sought does not adequately recognise and provide for s6(a)-(c) matters. Also oppose the direction that this policy would have primacy over others in the plan. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS369.059 | Top Energy | | Support | Top Energy also supports the amendment of this definition. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS369.141 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy supports specific provisions to give effect to NPSET. | Allow in part | Allow in part the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS404.017 | Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation | | Oppose | The relief is inconsistent with, s6(b), s6(c) of the Act and the cascade of planning documents including but not limited to the NZCPS, NPS-IB, and the Northland Regional Policy Statement 2016. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Accept in part |
| S454.050 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | Policies | Not Stated | <p>Transpower seeks specific National Grid provisions in order to give effect to the NPSET. The primary concerns are:</p> <p>Policy I-P7 does not comprehensively address all activities which may compromise the National Grid. In addition to the health and safety issues of activities locating within proximity of the National Grid, the National Grid can be affected by other activities that establish beneath or in close proximity to its lines and/or structures. Such activities can generate reverse sensitivity effects where landowners/operators request a Council to impose constraints on existing infrastructure to manage effects such as noise, reduced visual amenity, radio and television interference, perceived Electric and Magnetic Field ('EMF') effects, or interference with business activities beneath the lines. The location of buildings and activities, particularly 'sensitive activities' such as schools and residential properties, beneath or in close proximity to lines and/or structures can also compromise Transpower's ability to maintain, upgrade and develop the National Grid.</p> <p>Additionally, the stability of National Grid lines can be affected by earthworks that destabilise support structures resulting in their need to be relocated.- NPSET Policies 10 and 11 are particularly relevant. These policies act as the primary guide to inform how</p> | <p>Insert a new Policy</p> <p>I-Py Protect the safe and efficient operation, maintenance and repair, upgrading, removal and development of National Grid from adverse effects by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Avoiding land uses (including sensitive activities) and buildings and structures within the National Grid Yard that may directly affect or otherwise compromise the National Grid; b. Avoiding reverse sensitivity effects on the National Grid. c. Only allowing subdivision within the National Grid Subdivision Corridor where it can be demonstrated that the National Grid will not be compromised taking into account: | | Accept in part |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | <p>adverse effects on the National Grid are managed. The policies seek to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoid sensitive activities near electricity transmission lines and infrastructure; • Manage other activities to avoid reverse sensitivity effects on the Grid; and • Manage activities to ensure the operation, maintenance, upgrading and development of the Grid is not compromised. <p>As proposed, Policy I-P7 does address any of the above adequately. On this basis Transpower seeks a separate policy framework for the National Grid.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The impact of the subdivision layout and design on the operation, maintenance, and potential upgrade and development of the National Grid, including the ability for physical vehicle access to existing transmission assets for maintenance, inspections and upgrading; ii. The ability of any potential future development to comply with NZECP 34.2001 New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safety Distances; iii. The extent to which the design and layout of the subdivision demonstrates that a suitable building platform(s) for a principal building or dwelling can be provided outside of the National Grid Yard for each new allotment; iv. The risk to the structural integrity of the National Grid; v. The extent to which the subdivision design and consequential development | |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|---------|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | <p>will minimise the risk of injury and/or property damage from the National Grid and the potential reverse sensitivity on and amenity and nuisance effects of the National Grid assets;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> vi. The nature and location of any proposed vegetation to be planted in the vicinity of the National Grid; vii. The outcome of any consultation with, and technical advice from, Transpower. <p>d. Only allowing earthworks within the National Grid Yard where it can be demonstrated that the safe and efficient functioning, operation, maintenance and repair, upgrading and development of the National Grid will not be compromised, taking into account:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The extent to which the earthworks may compromise the safe access to and operation, maintenance and repair, upgrading and | |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|--|--|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | <p>development of the National Grid;</p> <p>ii. The stability of land within and adjacent to the National Grid;</p> <p>iii. Risks relating to health or public safety, including the risk of property damage; and</p> <p>iv. Technical advice provided by the owner and operator of the National Grid.</p> <p>In the event that there is a conflict between this policy and any other policies in the Far North District Plan, this policy will prevail.</p> <p>Transpower also requests any consequential amendments to other objectives, policies and rules in the FNPDP that may be necessary to fully give effect to the NPSET and implement this new policy.</p> <p>Should a National Grid specific policy not be provided, Transpower seeks amendment to policy I-P7 to give effect to the NPSET.</p> | | |
| FS354.061 | Horticulture New Zealand | | Oppose | The submitter seeks a separate policy for the National Grid. A separate policy is supported to the extent that it differentiates from other infrastructure due to the NPSET applying. However the NPSET seeks to recognise and provide for the National Grid and any policy framework should implement that approach - not 'protection'. | Disallow | Disallow S454.050 to the extent that the wording sought for a new policy is inconsistent with the NPSET. | Accept in part |
| FS243.056 | Kainga Ora Homes and Communities | | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the decision sought on the basis that adverse effects from the national grid can be appropriately managed. Kāinga Ora opposes the amendment which is overly prescriptive. | Disallow | Insert a new Policy. | Accept in part |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|---|-----------|-----------------|---|---|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| | | | | Kāinga Ora opposes elements of the proposed change sought that may be inconsistent with the NPSET. | | | |
| FS369.142 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy supports specific provisions to give effect to NPSET. | Allow in part | Allow in part the original submission | Accept in part |
| S454.058 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | Policies | Support | Transpower supports the inclusion of this policy in the FNPDP. | Insert new policy: Ensure new sensitive activities are appropriately located and/or designed to minimise reverse sensitivity effects on National Grid infrastructure, including by requiring compliance with NZECP 34:2001. | | Accept in part |
| FS354.062 | Horticulture New Zealand | | Support | Recognition of reverse sensitivity from sensitive activities is appropriate. | Allow | Allow S454.058 | Accept in part |
| FS243.057 | Kainga Ora Homes and Communities | | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the decision sought on the basis that adverse effects from the national grid can be appropriately managed and the concept of reverse sensitivity is not supported. Kāinga Ora opposes the amendment which is overly prescriptive. Kāinga Ora opposes elements of the proposed change sought that may be inconsistent with the NPSET. | Disallow | Insert a new policy. | Accept in part |
| S522.032 | Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK) | Policies | Support in part | Having relevant infrastructure in place should be a prerequisite for future development. The provision of necessary infrastructure must be high priority in PDP policies/rules. Given the Council's funding constraints, we consider that developers should normally be required to provide the necessary infrastructure, including items such as on-site community wastewater systems. | Amend the policies to emphasise the requirement for developer input for infrastructure servicing private land use and subdivision. | | Reject |
| FS62.004 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 1 | | Support | It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns, such as Kerikeri, and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| | | | | <p>cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1001 DP 532487 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. • Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. • FNDC has recognised that: 'Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive' (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). • Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. • The farmland at Lot 1001 DP 532487 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. • Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. • In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site. There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and | | |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|-------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|--|--|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | <p>would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on neighbouring properties and lawfully established activities. Residential/urban development in this location would generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; one-lane bridge in Landing Road; large volumes of traffic; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values. | | | |
| FS566.1771 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| S442.058 | Kapiro Conservation Trust | Policies | Neutral | This chapter is confusing because it appears to use RSI and infrastructure in the objectives and policies interchangeably. In many instances under the RPS only RSI gains access to the mitigation hierarchy, not all infrastructure in general. The definition of RSI is already broad and bringing in all of infrastructure is not warranted. | Insert policies that separate out infrastructure from RSI. | | Reject |
| FS369.140 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy seeks appropriate provision and enablement of Regionally Significant Infrastructure. | Allow in part | Allow in part the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS403.093 | Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora | | Support in part | Te Whatu Ora seek appropriate provision and enablement of Regionally Significant Infrastructure. | Allow in part | Te Whatu Ora seek appropriate provision and enablement of Regionally Significant Infrastructure. | Accept in part |
| FS570.1755 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS346.669 | 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 | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|-------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|---|---|-------------------------------|
| S512.013 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Policies | Support | These objectives support the continued function of Fire and Emergency. Efficient and effective water supply infrastructure coordinated with land use and development is essential to minimise risk to property and life in the event of a fire. | Retain policies | | Accept in part |
| FS369.146 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy seeks amendments to the policies. | Allow | Allow in part the original submission | Accept in part |
| S338.009 | Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust | Policies | Not Stated | Having relevant infrastructure in place should be a prerequisite for future development. The provision of necessary infrastructure must be high priority in PDP policies/rules. Given the Council's funding constraints, we consider that developers should normally be required to provide the necessary infrastructure, including items such as on-site community wastewater systems. | Amend the policies to emphasise the requirement for developer input for infrastructure servicing private land use and subdivision. | | Reject |
| FS570.950 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS566.964 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS569.986 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| S359.002 | Northland Regional Council | Policies | Support in part | There are often difficulties in ensuring marine activities have the supporting land-based facilities required. | Amend the Plan to complement the cross-boundary matters section by incorporating policy in the coastal environment and infrastructure sections that seek subdivision, land use and development that is compatible with and where practicable complements use/activity in the coastal marine area. | | Accept in part |
| FS570.1038 | 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 |
| FS346.463 | 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 |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|---|--|-------------------------------|
| FS566.1052 | 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 |
| FS569.1074 | 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 |
| S529.009 | Carbon Neutral NZ Trust | Policies | Support in part | Having relevant infrastructure in place should be a prerequisite for future development. The provision of necessary infrastructure must be high priority in PDP policies/rules. Given the Council's funding constraints, we consider that developers should normally be required to provide the necessary infrastructure, including items such as on-site community wastewater systems. | Amend the policies to emphasise the requirement for developer input for infrastructure servicing private land use and subdivision. | | Reject |
| FS570.1899 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS566.1913 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS569.1935 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| S464.031 | LJ King Ltd | Policies | Oppose | Seek some Policies under the District Plan for the existing mapped drainage district drains, as the Draft Management Plan 2017 and current bylaws are not being enforced for the drainage districts. | Amend the Infrastructure section, by adding policies providing for existing mapped Council drainage district drains, to ensure the ability to clean, unblock access and service the drainage channels in the Kaitaia, Waiharara/Kaikino and Motutangi drainage areas, as defined in the Far North District Council Land Drainage Bylaw 2019 and the Draft Management Plan 2017. | | Reject |
| FS566.1574 | 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 |
| S543.029 | LJ King Limited | Policies | Oppose | We seek some Policies under the District Plan for the existing mapped drainage district drains, as the Draft | Amend the Infrastructure section, by adding policies providing for existing mapped Council drainage district drains, to ensure the ability to clean, unblock access and service the drainage | | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|-------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|--|--|---|
| | | | | Management Plan 2017 and current bylaws are not being enforced for the drainage districts. | channels in the Kaitaia, Waiharara/Kaikino and Motutangi drainage areas, as defined in the Far North District Council Land Drainage Bylaw 2019 and the Draft Management Plan 2017. | | |
| FS566.2190 | 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 |
| S449.010 | Kapiro Conservation Trust | Policies | Support in part | Having relevant infrastructure in place should be a prerequisite for future development. The provision of necessary infrastructure must be high priority in PDP policies/rules. Given the Council's funding constraints, we consider that developers should normally be required to provide the necessary infrastructure, including items such as on-site community wastewater systems. | Amend the policies to emphasise the requirement for developer input for infrastructure servicing private land use and subdivision. | | Reject |
| FS569.1809 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | Reject | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: General Submissions on Infrastructure Chapter |
| FS570.1826 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Reject | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: General Submissions on Infrastructure Chapter |
| S282.02 | Chorus New Zealand Limited, Spark New Zealand Trading Limited, Spark TowerCo Limited, Vodafone New Zealand Limited | I-P1 | Support | The policy recognises the need to provide for existing infrastructure. | Retain provision as notified | | Accept in part |
| S483.039 | Top Energy Limited | I-P1 | Support | Top Energy supports this policy but considers that the wording needs to also capture repair of infrastructure. This policy also refers to upgrading which Top Energy has sought a definition for in an earlier submission point. | Amend Policy I-P1 as follows: Provide for the continued operation, repair , maintenance, upgrading and replacement of existing infrastructure. | | Accept |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|---|-----------|----------|--|-------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|
| FS242.4 | Garry Stanners | | Oppose | 33 kW should not be classified as a Critical Electricity Line CEL so that it can then be mapped and afforded the same powers to constrain land owners in the uses of their properties. | Disallow | | Reject |
| FS351.011 | A.W and D.M Simpson | | Oppose | 33 kW should not be classified as a Critical Electricity Line CEL so that it can then be mapped and afforded the same powers to constrain land owners in the uses of their properties. | Disallow | Retain as originally notified or Top Energy should be required to compensate owners on the impacts this will have to property and its historical or potential development. | Reject |
| FS371.011 | Oromahoe 18R2B2B2 Trust and its associated Hapu, Ngati Kawa, Te Ngare Hauata, Te Matarahurahu, Te Whanaurara, Ngati Kaihoro, Ngati Rahiri | | Oppose | 33 kW should not be classified as a Critical Electricity Line CEL so that it can then be mapped and afforded the same powers to constrain land owners in the uses of their properties. | Disallow | Retain as originally notified or Top Energy should be required to compensate owners on the impacts this will have to property and its historical or potential development. | Reject |
| FS448.004 | L & T Property Investments Limited | | Support | L & T Property Investments Ltd supports this relief as it provides for the repair, maintenance and upgrading of infrastructure, which could indeed facilitate the undergrounding of electricity lines in order for development and infrastructure to give effect of the outcomes stated elsewhere in the Infrastructure chapter. | Allow | Amend Policy I-P1 | Accept |
| FS449.011 | The Proprietors of Tapuaetahi Incorporation | | Oppose | 33 kW should not be classified as a Critical Electricity Line CEL so that it can then be mapped and afforded the same powers to constrain land owners in the uses of their properties. | Disallow | Retain as notified | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|---|-----------|-----------------|--|--|--|-------------------------------|
| FS345.090 | 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 |
| S331.014 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | I-P1 | Support in part | <p>The submitter supports in part objective I-P1 however, the definition of 'infrastructure' does not include additional infrastructure (which includes social infrastructure such as educational facilities). Educational facilities are a crucial form of social infrastructure that is needed to support local communities and their social and economic wellbeing. Under the NPS-UD, social infrastructure is included with the definition of 'additional infrastructure'.</p> <p>Council has an obligation under the NPS-UD to ensure sufficient additional infrastructure (which includes social infrastructure such as educational facilities) is provided in development and local authorities must be satisfied that additional infrastructure to service the development capacity is likely to be available.</p> | Amend policy I-P1 as follows: Provide for the continued operation, maintenance, upgrading and replacement of existing infrastructure and additional infrastructure . | | Reject |
| FS78.0010 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | | Oppose | The submitter is not opposed to the treatment of educational facilities as infrastructure within the proposed FNDP, however the proposed definition of additional infrastructure includes a network operated for the purpose of transmitting or distributing electricity. As a result, the National Grid would be identified as Regionally Significant Infrastructure, Infrastructure and Additional Infrastructure. This is likely to create confusion in interpreting the proposed FNDP. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Accept |
| FS354.067 | Horticulture New Zealand | | Oppose | The addition of additional infrastructure is not supported for reasons set out above. | Disallow | Disallow S331.014 | Accept |
| FS369.149 | Top Energy | | Oppose | Top Energy seeks to amend this policy to include 'repair'. Top Energy do not have any particular concern with this objective being expanded to include "additional infrastructure" such as educational facilities. However, it is concerned about the potential issues this will create in terms of interpretation given the existing definition of "infrastructure." | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Accept |
| FS369.179 | Top Energy | | Oppose | Top Energy sought to retain this policy as notified but do not have any particular concern with this | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Accept |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|-------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|---|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | policy being expanded to include "additional infrastructure" such as educational facilities. However, it is concerned about the potential issues this will create in terms of interpretation given the existing definition of "infrastructure." | | | |
| S165.007 | Arvida Group Limited | I-P1 | Support in part | The "statement of intent" contained in these objectives and policies needs to be linked to the FNDC Long Term Plan or other funding and delivery mechanisms so that the Council can enable the District's people and communities to provide for the own social and economic well-being. | Amend to Identify in the PDP those measures that the Council will take to lead and provide for infrastructure in a timely manner that will support and enable growth. | | Reject |
| FS369.148 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy seeks to amend this policy to include 'repair'. | Allow in part | Allow in part the original submission | Accept in part |
| S356.021 | Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency | I-P1 | Support | Not stated | Retain I-P1 as notified | | Accept in part |
| FS369.150 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy seeks to amend this policy to include 'repair'. | Allow in part | Allow in part the original submission | Accept in part |
| S416.014 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | I-P1 | Support in part | The policy is supported with an amendment to add in the term 'repair' to provide consistency with other parts of the Plan. | Amend Policy I-P1 as follows: Provide for the continued operation, maintenance, repair , upgrading and replacement of existing infrastructure. | | Accept |
| FS369.151 | Top Energy | | Support | Top Energy seeks to amend this policy to include 'repair'. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept |
| S421.026 | Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand | I-P1 | Support | Federated Farmers supports Policies I-P1 to I-P6, and I-P8 to IP14 as they are currently worded. | Retain Policy I-P1 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent. | | Accept |
| FS369.152 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy seek to amend this policy to include 'repair'. | Allow in part | Allow in part the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS570.1258 | 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 |
| FS346.260 | Royal Forest and Bird | | Oppose | The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|---|-----------|-----------------|---|---|--|-------------------------------|
| | Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. | | | 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. | | | |
| FS566.1272 | 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 |
| FS569.1294 | 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 |
| S454.042 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | I-P1 | Support | Transpower supports the inclusion of this policy in the FNPDP. | Retain I-P1 | | Accept in part |
| FS369.153 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy seek to amend this policy to include 'repair'. | Allow in part | Allow in part the original submission | Accept in part |
| S489.014 | Radio New Zealand | I-P1 | Support | RNZ supports policy direction that provides for the continued operation, maintenance, upgrading and replacement of existing infrastructure. RNZ consider the policy should include reference to regionally significant infrastructure to recognise its importance to the District. | Amend Policy I-P1 as follows: "Provide for the continued operation, maintenance, upgrading and replacement of existing infrastructure, in particular regionally significant infrastructure. | | Reject |
| FS369.154 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy seek to amend this policy to include 'repair'. | Allow in part | Allow in part the original submission | Accept in part |
| S511.040 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand | I-P2 | Support in part | <p>There are no rules in this chapter that regulate the removal of indigenous biodiversity. For this reason this chapter may not be the most appropriate place for these policies. It means that plan users have to go to the IB chapter then if they are undertaking an infrastructure activity then they will need to go back to the Infrastructure chapter to pick up on these policies.</p> <p>This policy elevates all infrastructure in the Far North to the status of RSI, National Grid, electricity transmission and renewable electricity generation activities. The definition for RSI is already far ranging and including all of infrastructure is a step to far and has no support from higher order planning documents. This policy does not meet the requirements of the NZCPS because it</p> | <p>Amend: I-P2</p> <p>In the coastal environment, manage the effects of the development, operation, maintenance and upgrading of infrastructure and new Regionally Significant Infrastructure or re-consenting of existing of Regionally Significant Infrastructure activities by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. avoiding adverse effects on the values, qualities and characteristics of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. significant natural areas, | | Accept in part |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|---|-------------------------------|
| | | | | <p>provides access to the effects mitigation hierarchy for all infrastructure in the Far North. This is contrary to the express requirements of the NZCPS in regards to ONLs, ONFs, and policy 11(a) matters. It also runs counter to RPS, policies 5.3.3, 4.4.1, 4.6.1 and 4.6.2. The RPS only provides access to the mitigation hierarchy for RSI not infrastructure as a whole in certain circumstances. These suggested amendments reflect these restrictions.</p> <p>Further the RPS does not provide access to offsetting and compensation principles in the Coastal Environment for new or re-consenting of RSI under RPS, policy 5.5.3, 4.4.1 (1) and (2) The RPS, policy 5.5.3 only provides access to offsetting and compensation for maintenance, and upgrading of existing RSI, in the coastal environment. Under the RPS infrastructure in general must comply with RPS policies 4.4.1 and 4.6.1 and 4.6.2. No further policy direction is required for infrastructure in general and it should fall to the natural environment chapter objectives and policies to assist resource consent applications.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii. The outstanding natural features or landscapes, areas of outstanding natural character; b. Avoiding adverse effects on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Indigenous taxa that are listed as threatened or at risk in the NZ Threat Classification System lists; and ii. Areas set aside for full or partial protection of indigenous biodiversity under other legislation c. avoiding significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy, mitigate other adverse effects on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. other natural features and landscapes, and areas of natural character; ii. areas of predominantly indigenous vegetation; iii. Habitats of indigenous species important for recreational, commercial, traditional, or cultural purposes; iv. Indigenous ecosystems and habitats that are particularly vulnerable to modification, | |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|--|--|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | <p>including estuaries, lagoons, coastal wetlands, dunelands, intertidal zones, rocky reefs systems, eelgrass, northern wet heathlands, coastal and headwater streams, floodplains, margins of the coastal marine area and freshwater bodies, spawning and nursery areas and saltmarsh; and</p> <p>v. Historic heritage</p> <p>d. recognising the technical, operational and functional needs and constraints of infrastructure activities; and e. having regard to offsetting and environmental compensation measures where there are more than minor residual adverse effects that cannot be avoided, remedied or mitigated</p> | | |
| FS110.1 | Chorus New Zealand Limited, Spark New Zealand Trading Limited, Connexa Limited, Vodafone New Zealand Limited, and Aotearoa | | Oppose | The wording of I-P2 is supported as notified and it is considered appropriate to consider the technical, operation and functions needs and constraints of infrastructure activities. | Disallow | | Accept in part |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|--|-------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|
| | Towers Group T/A FortySouth | | | | | | |
| FS36.032 | Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency | | Oppose | Supports managing adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity but notes that infrastructure, such as transport corridors have a functional and operational need to be located in some sensitive locations to provide its function as a lifeline utility. The relief sought will make it increasingly difficult, and in some cases impossible, to provide, operate and maintain lifeline utilities for communities, and is inconsistent with NPS-IB. The relief is overly onerous and would result in duplication of issues covered elsewhere in the District Plan and significant constraints to the provisions of Regionally Significant Infrastructure. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS164.040 | Scrumptious Fruit Trust | | Support | Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and secondly as passive recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area. | Allow | Amend HNC overlay to include Taupo Bay; Amend provisions to require strong wildlife protection; Amend provisions to require dogs on leash in beach areas; Adopt SNA and HNC provisions (inferred). | Accept in part |
| FS369.165 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy seek to amend this policy to include 'repair'. | Allow in part | Allow in part the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS369.177 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy seek to amend this policy to include 'repair'. | Allow in part | Allow in part the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS369.187 | Top Energy | | Support | Top Energy seek to retain this policy as notified. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS369.230 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy considers that the policies can be applied in the round without inserting references. | Allow | Allow | Accept in part |
| FS404.089 | Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation | | Support | If policies addressing indigenous biodiversity remain in this chapter, the D-G supports proposed approach, including narrowing the application RSI and the directive to avoid on NZCPS Policy 11(a) values. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|---|-----------|-----------------|---|---|---|-------------------------------|
| FS570.1611 | 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 |
| FS566.1625 | 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 |
| FS569.1647 | 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 |
| S364.023 | Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation) | I-P2 | Support in part | The Director-General is generally supportive of Policy I-P2, however, notes that SNAs and the coastal environment have value in of itself, not just in characteristics and qualities and the wording should reflect this. | Amend the wording of Policy I-P2 as follows: In the coastal environment, manage the effects of the development, operation, maintenance and upgrading of infrastructure activities by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • avoiding adverse effects on the qualities and characteristics of significant natural areas, outstanding natural features or landscapes, areas of outstanding natural character; • avoiding significant adverse effects on other natural features and landscapes, and areas of natural character; • recognising the technical, operational and functional needs and constraints of infrastructure activities; and • having regard to offsetting and environmental compensation measures where there are more than minor residual adverse | | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|--|---|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | effects that cannot be avoided, remedied or mitigated. | | |
| FS36.031 | Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency | | Oppose | Opposes the removal of the wording 'the qualities and characteristics' of significant natural areas. The proposed amendment reduces the clarity and direction of the policy and is unnecessary. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Reject |
| FS339.043 | Haitaimarangi Marae Kaitiaki Trust | | Support | Avoiding adverse effects on significant natural areas, outstanding natural landscapes and outstanding natural features and considering functional need aligns with the NZCPS. Offsets and compensation relate to residual adverse effects. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS369.157 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy seek to amend this policy to include 'repair'. | Allow in part | Allow in part the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS570.1104 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission. | Reject |
| FS346.163 | 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 | Reject |
| FS566.1118 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission. | Allow | Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission. | Reject |
| FS569.1140 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission. | Allow | Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission. | Reject |
| S394.014 | Haitaimarangi Marae Kaitiaki Trust | I-P2 | Support in part | Protection of SNA, ONF and ONL is a starting point. Effects should not need to be significant to trigger avoidance. Requiring avoidance of significant adverse cultural effects reflects proper implementation of Part 2 RMA tangata whenua focused matters. | Ament Policy I-P2 as follows: In the coastal environment, manage the effects of the development, operation, maintenance and upgrading of infrastructure activities by... b. avoiding significant adverse effects on other natural features and | | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|---|---|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | landscapes, and areas of natural character; c. avoiding significant adverse effects on cultural values and remedying and mitigating other adverse cultural effects... | | |
| FS36.033 | Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency | | Support in part | Supports the protection of areas with high cultural significance. However, using the requirement to 'manage' rather than 'avoid' significant effects would improve the flexibility of the policy directive, allowing for the mitigation of adverse effects where appropriate. | Allow in part | Amend IP-2 effects hierarchy to refer to 'manage' rather than 'avoid' (inferred). | Accept in part |
| FS401.023 | Carrington Estate Jade LP and Carrington Farms Jade LP | | Oppose | The deletion of the word "significant" results in a policy which is undefined and would not allow any permitted activities to occur. The protection of those values sought in the new policy are already captured under the RMA and the PDP. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS369.158 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy seek to amend this policy to include 'repair'. | Allow in part | Allow in part the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS363.014 | Liz Rowena Maki Heteraka. | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS538.014 | Awhina Fiaui | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS537.014 | Maryanne June Harrison | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS536.014 | Bradley Tauhara Rupapera | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS535.014 | Dyrell Akavi | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS533.014 | Sidney John Rupapera | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS532.014 | Wiremu Heteraka | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS531.014 | Phyllis Marie Heteraka | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| FS530.014 | Norma Evans | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS529.014 | Aaron Rupapera | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS528.014 | Erana Samuels | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS527.014 | David Matiu | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS526.014 | Michelle Chase | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS525.014 | Vaughn Piripi Duvell Evans | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS524.014 | Tania Morunga | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS523.014 | Brett Larkin | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS522.014 | Stacey Matiu | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS521.014 | Marie Matiu | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS520.014 | Maureen Maheno | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS519.014 | Huia Solomon | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS518.014 | William Boyd Rupapera | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS517.014 | Mereana Alma Houkamau | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS516.014 | Rebecca Jan Stensness | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS515.014 | Anaru Poharama | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| FS514.014 | Robert Reihana | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS513.014 | Ester Rangi Doyle | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS512.014 | Ellen Appleby | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS511.014 | Cedric Lawrence | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS510.014 | Raniera Matiu | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS509.014 | Clinton Matiu | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS508.014 | Sana Ryan | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS507.014 | Te TeArani Lawrence | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS506.014 | Selwyn Reihana | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS505.014 | Thomson Lawrence | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS504.014 | Ngarei Reihana | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS503.014 | Nina Raharuhi | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS502.014 | Rebecca Rutene | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS501.014 | Patricia Ellen Buddy | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS500.014 | Whetu Rutene | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS499.014 | Paki Daniel Lawrence | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| FS498.014 | Aaron George Lawrence | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS497.014 | Tayla Bamber | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS496.014 | Cheryl Bamber | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS495.014 | Jasmine Cook | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS494.014 | Ian Ethan Bamber | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS493.014 | Albert Tawhio Cook | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS492.014 | Sarah Kati Cook | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS491.014 | Mark J Broad | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS490.014 | Julia Middleton | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS489.014 | Josephine Lawrence | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS487.014 | Timothy Matiu | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS486.014 | John Barry Horan | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS485.014 | Travis Horan | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS483.014 | Mate Simon Covich Horan | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS482.014 | Waikura Maungaia Marriott | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS481.014 | Peggy Joanne Matiu | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| FS480.014 | Cheryl Chase | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS479.014 | Jacob Hohaia | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS478.014 | Grayson Fleur Horan | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS477.014 | Chase McIndoe | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS476.014 | Jessica Solomon | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS475.014 | Marina Chase | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS474.014 | Steven Matiu | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS473.014 | Beryl Chase | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS472.014 | Krystal-Jade Matiu | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS471.014 | William Gary Butt | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS470.014 | Michael Matiu | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS469.014 | Anne-maree Morrissey | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS468.014 | Elias Reihana-Hetaraka | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS467.014 | Carol Matiu | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS466.014 | Janet Myra Bennett | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS465.014 | Rangimarie Muru | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| FS464.014 | Glennis Lawrence | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS463.014 | Jayden Murray | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS462.014 | Roharia Hepi | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS461.014 | Vincent C Matiu | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS460.014 | Tawhai Motu | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS459.014 | Maria Kim Hetaraka | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS458.014 | Alexander John Busby | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS457.014 | Ena Lesley Rupapera | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS456.014 | Rhys Alexander Lawrence-Busby | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS455.014 | Rangi Matthew Marriott | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS454.014 | Turei John Rupapera | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS453.014 | Marlaine Urlich | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS452.014 | Reikura Joan Boyd | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS451.014 | Ariana Bellingham | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS450.014 | Georgina Laing | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS447.014 | Rangaunu Taua | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| FS440.014 | Hongi Laing | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS439.014 | Rahera Fiaui | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS436.014 | Parehuia Jane Williams | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS435.014 | George Hori Lawrence | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS434.014 | Anthony Murphy | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS433.014 | Christian Horan | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS432.014 | Makarita Rutene | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS431.014 | Valarie Rutene | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS430.014 | Kaeo Lawrence | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS429.014 | Cedric Rutene | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS428.014 | Shane Horan | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS427.014 | Jacey Horan | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS426.014 | Toni Maheno | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS425.014 | Florence Campbell | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS423.014 | Joseph Maheno | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS422.014 | Sharmaine Hepi | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| FS421.014 | Gia-Dene Gardiner | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS420.014 | Josephine Doyle | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS418.014 | Mary Watkins | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS417.014 | Maddison Lawrence | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS416.014 | Isobel Fitzgibbon | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS415.014 | Michelle Lawrence | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS408.014 | Jason Gardiner | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS388.014 | Crystal Myra Broad | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS387.014 | Aroha Whitinui | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS386.014 | Tynan Hokimate Mark | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS385.014 | Victoria Murphy | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS382.014 | Yvonne Meta Desmond | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS381.014 | Lorraine Joan Hetaraka | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS380.014 | Ashleigh Hetaraka-Tawhai | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS379.014 | Kaya Hetaraka-Tawhai | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS378.014 | Maanu Reihana | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| FS365.014 | Roberta Hetaraka | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS360.014 | Cameron Mccaskill | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS359.014 | Mark Brannen | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS358.014 | Kailah Raharuhi - Alatipi | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS357.014 | Raharuhi Fiaui | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS356.014 | Katharine Kino | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS568.014 | Bonnie Hepi | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS567.014 | Blaze Maraki | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS563.014 | Hohepa Fletcher | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS562.014 | Rhonda Raharuhi | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS561.014 | Ivan Wimoka Hetaraka | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS560.014 | Dylan Hetaraka | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS559.014 | Clinton Albert Doyle | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS558.014 | Timothy John Doyle | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS557.014 | Patricia Kate Broad | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS556.014 | Louis Aluishis Brabant | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|--|---|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| FS555.014 | Kelly Sharee Doyle | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS553.014 | Kenape Saupese | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS552.014 | Barbara May Hetaraka | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS551.014 | Alamein Drummond | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS546.014 | Shona Hetaraka | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS545.014 | Peter Charles Rupapera | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS544.014 | Te Waata Lawrence Kara | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS178.014 | Hera Johns | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS413.014 | Charles Lawrence | | Support | I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS588.014 | Ian Taylor Bamber | | Support | Support original submission to protect our wāhi tapu sites of significance and rights as tangata whenua. | Allow | Allow the original submission. | Reject |
| S356.030 | Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency | I-P2 | Support in part | Clarity is sought that new infrastructure is included, and for avoidance of significant adverse effects to apply to areas of high natural character. | Amend as follows: In the coastal environment, manage the effects of the new development, operation, maintenance and upgrading of infrastructure activities by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. avoiding adverse effects on the qualities and characteristics of significant natural areas, outstanding natural features or landscapes, areas of outstanding natural character; b. avoiding significant adverse effects on other natural features | | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|--|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | and landscapes, and areas of high natural character;" | | |
| FS78.016 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | | Support | The submitter considers the plan should be as clear as possible. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS346.045 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. | | Oppose | Amendment sought is inconsistent with the NZCPS. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS369.156 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy seek to amend this policy to include 'repair'. | Allow in part | Allow in part the original submission | Accept in part |
| S454.043 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | I-P2 | Not Stated | <p>Transpower seeks specific National Grid provisions to give effect to the NPSET. While Transpower supports IP-2 in principle, it does not reflect or give effect to the NPSET and is not specific to the National Grid. It also does not provide the 'seek to avoid' approach required by Policy 8 of the NPSET for the more sensitive environments. This is also true for the policy framework for new development of the National Grid within such environments.</p> <p>The need to operate, maintain, upgrade and develop the electricity transmission network is recognised as a matter of national significance through the NPSET. This significance applies universally across the country regardless of the nature of the specific National Grid asset. The NPSET Objective recognises that the network itself potentially gives rise to adverse effects, and that other activities can potentially adversely affect the network. The NPSET policies give direction on how to achieve the objective by providing for the recognition of the benefits of electricity transmission, as well as the management of the environmental effects of electricity transmission and the adverse effects of other activities on the transmission network. As such, the NPSET policies impose obligations on both decision-makers and Transpower itself.</p> <p>One of the aspects within the NPSET which must be given effect to in district plans is provisions relating to</p> | <p>Amend to exclude the National Grid from policy I-P2 as follows: I-P2</p> <p>In the coastal environment, manage the effects of the development, operation, maintenance and upgrading of infrastructure activities (excluding the National Grid) by: ...</p> | Reject | |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| | | | | <p>enabling the National Grid. Policies and plans must provide for the effective operation, maintenance, upgrading and development of the National Grid. The development of National Grid assets gives rise to the potential for adverse environmental effects.</p> <p>The development of the National Grid must therefore be managed to ensure the potential for adverse effects is appropriately managed while recognising its significance and the constraints under which it operates. The NPSET requires the District Plan to include objectives and policies that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow for the consideration of the technical constraints and operational requirements under which the National Grid operates, for example the linear nature of the transmission lines. • Have regard to the extent to which adverse effects have been avoided, remedied or mitigated through the route, site and method selection. • Ensure new planning and development seeks to avoid adverse effects on more sensitive areas. | | | |
| FS548.131 | Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc | | Oppose | As the operator of the National Grid, the submitter is required to meet its obligations under the Resource Management Act 1991. These obligations are not negated by the National Policy Statement on Electricity Transmission. | Disallow | Decline the relief sought | Accept |
| FS346.023 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. | | Oppose | Amendment sought is inconsistent with the NZCPS. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Accept |
| FS369.163 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy seek to amend this policy to include 'repair'. | Allow in part | Allow in part the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS404.016 | Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation | | Oppose | The relief is inconsistent with, s6(b), s6(c) of the Act and the cascade of planning documents including but not limited to the NZCPS, NPS-IB, and the Northland Regional Policy Statement 2016. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Accept |
| S483.040 | Top Energy Limited | I-P2 | Support | Top Energy supports this policy, but considers that the wording needs to also capture repair. Top Energy also | Amend Policy I-P2 as follows: | | Accept in part |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | considers that I-P2c should be amended to "recognising and providing for". | In the coastal environment, manage the effects of the development, operation, repair , maintenance and upgrading of infrastructure activities by: c. recognising and providing for the technical, operational and functional needs and constraints of infrastructure activities; and ... | | |
| FS346.058 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. | | Oppose | The amendment sought does not appropriately recognise and provide for s6(a)-(c) matters. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS345.091 | 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 |
| S356.022 | Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency | I-P2 | Support | Not stated | Retain I-P2 as notified | | Reject |
| FS369.155 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy seek to amend this policy to include 'repair'. | Allow in part | Allow in part the original submission | Accept in part |
| S399.026 | Te Hiku Iwi Development Trust | I-P2 | Not Stated | For avoidance of doubt, we recommend inclusion of the word "biodiversity" before offsetting in these policies | Amend Policy I-P2 to include the words 'offsetting (including biodiversity offsetting)...' | | Reject |
| FS369.159 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy seek to amend this policy to include 'repair'. | Allow in part | Allow in part the original submission | Accept in part |
| S416.015 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | I-P2 | Support | Recognition that there are specific circumstances in which the upgrade of existing, or new, infrastructure may be appropriate in sensitive locations such as the coast is supported. In particular, that the policy links to the technical, operational and functional needs and constraints of infrastructure is supported. | Retain Policy I-P2 | | Accept in part |
| FS369.160 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy seek to amend this policy to include 'repair'. | Allow in part | Allow in part the original submission | Accept in part |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|-------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|---|--|-------------------------------|
| S421.027 | Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand | I-P2 | Support | Federated Farmers supports Policies I-P1 to I-P6, and I-P8 to IP14 as they are currently worded. | Retain Policy I-P2 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent. | | Accept in part |
| FS369.161 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy seek to amend this policy to include 'repair'. | Allow in part | Allow in part the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS369.271 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy seeks to amend this objective to provide for "repair" and "maintenance". | Allow in part | Amend | Accept in part |
| FS570.1259 | 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 |
| FS346.261 | 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 |
| FS566.1273 | 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 |
| FS569.1295 | 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 |
| S442.060 | Kapiro Conservation Trust | I-P2 | Support in part | There are no rules in this chapter that regulate the removal of indigenous biodiversity. For this reason this chapter may not be the most appropriate place for these policies. It means that plan users have to go to the IB chapter then if they are undertaking an infrastructure activity then they will need to go back to the Infrastructure chapter to pick up on these policies. This policy elevates all infrastructure in the Far North to the status of RSI, National Grid, electricity transmission and renewable electricity generation activities. The definition for RSI is already far ranging and including all of infrastructure is a step too far and has no support from higher order planning documents. | Amend: In the coastal environment, manage the effects of the development, operation, maintenance and upgrading of infrastructure and new Regionally Significant Infrastructure or re-consenting of existing of Regionally Significant Infrastructure activities by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. avoiding adverse effects on the values, qualities and characteristics of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. significant natural areas, ii. the outstanding natural features or landscapes, areas of outstanding natural character; | | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|---|-------------------------------|
| | | | | <p>This policy does not meet the requirements of the NZCPS because it provides access to the effects mitigation hierarchy for all infrastructure in the Far North. This is contrary to the express requirements of the NZCPS in regards to ONLs, ONFs, and policy 11(a) matters. It also runs counter to RPS, policies 5.3.3, 4.4.1, 4.6.1 and 4.6.2. The RPS only provides access to the mitigation hierarchy for RSI not infrastructure as a whole in certain circumstances. These suggested amendments reflect these restrictions. Further the RPS does not provide access to offsetting and compensation principles in the Coastal Environment for new or re-consenting of RSI under RPS, policy 5.5.3, 4.4.1 (1) and (2) The RPS, policy 5.5.3 only provides access to offsetting and compensation for maintenance, and upgrading of existing RSI, in the coastal environment. Under the RPS infrastructure in general must comply with RPS policies 4.4.1 and 4.6.1 and 4.6.2. No further policy direction is required for infrastructure in general and it should fall to the natural environment chapter objectives and policies to assist resource consent applications.</p> | <p>b. Avoiding adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Indigenous taxa that are listed as threatened or at risk in the NZ Threat Classification System lists; and ii. Areas set aside for full or partial protection of indigenous biodiversity under other legislation <p>c. avoiding significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy, mitigate other adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. other natural features and landscapes, and areas of natural character; ii. areas of predominantly indigenous vegetation; iii. Habitats of indigenous species important for recreational, commercial, traditional, or cultural purposes; iv. Indigenous ecosystems and habitats that are particularly vulnerable to modification, including estuaries, lagoons, coastal wetlands, dunelands, intertidal zones, rocky reefs systems, eelgrass, northern wet heathlands, coastal and headwater streams, | |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|-------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|---|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | <p>floodplains, margins of the coastal marine area and freshwater bodies, spawning and nursery areas and saltmarsh; and</p> <p>v. Historic heritage</p> <p>d. recognising the technical, operational and functional needs and constraints of infrastructure activities; and</p> <p>e. having regard to offsetting and environmental compensation measures where there are more than minor residual adverse effects that cannot be avoided, remedied or mitigated.</p> | | |
| FS369.162 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy seek to amend this policy to include 'repair'. | Allow in part | Allow in part the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS570.1757 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS346.671 | 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 | Reject |
| S463.013 | Waiaua Bay Farm Limited | I-P2 | Support | The drafting of this objective appropriately implements the directions of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement regarding natural features, landscapes and character, while also appropriately recognising the unique requirements of infrastructure at sub-clause (c). As such, sub-clause (d) is also appropriate. | Retain Policy I-P2 | | Reject |
| FS369.164 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy seek to amend this policy to include 'repair'. | Allow in part | Allow in part the original submission | Accept in part |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|---|-----------|----------|---|--|-------------------------------|
| S511.041 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand | I-P3 | Oppose | The policy does not give effect to the RPS, policies 5.3.3, 4.4.1(3) and 4.6.1. | <p>Amend I-P3</p> <p>Outside the coastal environment, manage the effects of the development, operation, maintenance and upgrading of infrastructure activities by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. avoiding effects on historical and cultural values, significant natural areas, and outstanding natural features or landscapes to the extent practicable; b. avoiding significant adverse effects on of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Areas of predominantly indigenous vegetation; b. Habitat of indigenous species that are important for recreational, commercial, traditional or cultural purposes; c. Indigenous ecosystems and habitats that are particularly vulnerable to modification, including wetlands, dunelands, norther wet heathlands, headwater streams, floodplains and margins of freshwater bodies, spawning and nursery areas; and d. Outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes and the natural character of freshwater bodies: | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|---|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | <p>c. minimising remedying or mitigating other adverse effects on historical and cultural values, natural environment values that cannot be avoided;</p> <p>d. recognising the technical, operational and functional needs and constraints of infrastructure activities; and</p> <p>d. considering where more than minor residual adverse effects remain from (c) biodiversity having regard to offsetting; and</p> <p>e. considering where more than minor residual adverse effects cannot be biodiversity offset in (e) an environmental biodiversity compensation measure where there are more than minor residual adverse effects that cannot be avoided, remedied or mitigated.</p> | | |
| FS36.034 | Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency | | Oppose | Supports managing adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity but notes that infrastructure, such as transport corridors have a functional and operational need to be located in some sensitive locations to provide its function as a lifeline utility. The relief sought will make it increasingly difficult, and in some cases impossible, to provide, operate and maintain lifeline utilities for communities, and is inconsistent with NPS-IB. The proposed wording will also reduce options to provide for infrastructure as a lifeline utilities, duplicates topics covered elsewhere in the proposed FNDP and will add unnecessary detail to the regard decision makers are directed to hold for environmental compensation. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission. | Accept |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|--|---|--|-------------------------------|
| FS164.041 | Scrumptious Fruit Trust | | Support | Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and secondly as passive recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area. | Allow | Amend HNC overlay to include Taupo Bay; Amend provisions to require strong wildlife protection; Amend provisions to require dogs on leash in beach areas; Adopt SNA and HNC provisions (inferred). | Reject |
| FS404.091 | Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation | | Support | If policies addressing indigenous biodiversity remain in this chapter, the D-G supports proposed approach, including narrowing the application RSI and the directive to avoid on NZCPS Policy 11(a) values. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS570.1612 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission. | Reject |
| FS566.1626 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission. | Allow | Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission. | Reject |
| FS569.1648 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission. | Allow | Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission. | Reject |
| S442.062 | Kapiro Conservation Trust | I-P3 | Neutral | The policy does not give effect to the RPS, policies 5.3.3, 4.4.1(3) and 4.6.1. | Amend, for Regionally Significant Infrastructure include the following two new policies: Outside the coastal environment manage the effects of new and the re-consenting of existing Regionally Significant Infrastructure by: g. avoiding effects on historical and cultural values, significant natural areas, and outstanding natural features or landscapes to the extent practicable; | | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|---------|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | <p>h. minimising mitigating or remedying adverse effects on historical and cultural values, natural environment values that cannot be avoided;</p> <p>i. recognising the technical, operational and functional needs and constraints of infrastructure activities;</p> <p>j. Biodiversity offsetting more than minor residual adverse effects that cannot be avoided, remedied or mitigated; and</p> <p>k. If more than minor residual adverse effects remain after biodiversity offsetting then consider Environmental biodiversity compensation measures to ensure that any residual adverse effect is no more than minor.</p> <p>And then add a new policy to address maintenance, operation and upgrading of RSI Outside the coastal environment manage the effects of operation, maintenance and upgrading of existing Regionally Significant Infrastructure by:</p> <p>a. Avoiding significant adverse effects and the adverse effects after the conclusion of the maintenance or upgrading or operation are the same or similar to before the activity being undertaken; and</p> | |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|-------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|--|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | b. Then consider offsetting and environmental compensation measures where there are more than minor residual adverse effects that cannot be avoided, remedied or mitigated. | | |
| FS36.035 | Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency | | Oppose | Supports managing adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity but notes that infrastructure, such as transport corridors have a functional and operational need to be located in some sensitive locations to provide its function as a lifeline utility. This relief sought will make it increasingly difficult, and in some cases impossible, to provide, operate and maintain lifeline utilities for communities, and is inconsistent with NPS-IB. The proposed relief is overly onerous and would result in duplication of issues covered elsewhere in the District Plan and significant constraints to the provisions of Regionally Significant Infrastructure. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission. | Accept |
| FS369.173 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy seek to amend this policy to include 'repair'. | Allow in part | Allow in part the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS570.1759 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS346.673 | 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 | Reject |
| S282.016 | Chorus New Zealand Limited, Spark New Zealand Trading Limited, Spark TowerCo Limited, Vodafone New Zealand Limited | I-P3 | Oppose | While it is considered the current wording of this policy will allow for certain infrastructure activities to be located in areas of historic/cultural values, significant natural areas, and outstanding natural features or landscapes, clause (d) appears to be overly restrictive in considering infrastructure activities (in particular telecommunication activities) noting that this clause appears to capture all adverse effects. These forms of infrastructure tend to be of a smaller footprint when compared to the likes of electricity distribution or pipeline networks and as such, environmental compensation or offsetting on top of restrictions within | Amend I-P3 by removing clause (d). | | Accept in part |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|---|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| | | | | these areas may not be entirely appropriate noting the scale of such activities and the benefit they provide to the district. It is considered that clauses (a) - (c) appropriately manage effects outside the coastal environment within areas of historic/cultural values, significant natural areas, and outstanding natural features or landscapes. IB-P4 is considered a more suitable method when addressing the likes of environmental offsetting or compensation and is consistent with the draft National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity | | | |
| FS78.003 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | | Support | The submitter supports the original submission for the reasons set out by the telecommunications companies. | Allow | Allow the original submission. | Accept in part |
| FS369.166 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy seek to amend this policy to include 'repair'. | Allow | Allow in par the original submission | Accept in part |
| S356.031 | Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency | I-P3 | Support in part | Waka Kotahi considers that this policy should be amended to be consistent with Policy I-P2 to focus on the qualities and characteristics of significant natural areas and outstanding natural features or landscapes. It should also be recognised that positive effects should not be avoided, and that this should only relate to adverse effects. Clarity is also sought, that new infrastructure is included. | Amend as follows: Outside the coastal environment, manage the effects of the new development, operation, maintenance and upgrading of infrastructure activities by: a. avoiding adverse effects on historical and cultural values, qualities and characteristics of significant natural areas, and outstanding natural features or landscapes to the extent practicable; ... | | Reject |
| FS78.017 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | | Support | The submitter supports this amendment for the reasons set out by Waka Kotahi. | Allow | Allow the original submission. | Reject |
| FS369.167 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy seek to amend this policy to include 'repair'. | Allow in part | Allow in part the original submission | Accept in part |
| S454.045 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | I-P3 | Not Stated | Transpower seeks specific National Grid provisions to give effect to the NPSET. While Transpower supports IP-2 in principle, it does not reflect or give effect to the | Amend to exclude the National Grid from policy I-P3 as follows: I-P3 | | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|---|-------------------------------|
| | | | | <p>NPSET and is not specific to the National Grid. It also does not provide the 'seek to avoid' approach required by Policy 8 of the NPSET for the more sensitive environments. This is also true for the policy framework for new development of the National Grid within such environments.</p> <p>The need to operate, maintain, upgrade and develop the electricity transmission network is recognised as a matter of national significance through the NPSET. This significance applies universally across the country regardless of the nature of the specific National Grid asset. The NPSET Objective recognises that the network itself potentially gives rise to adverse effects, and that other activities can potentially adversely affect the network. The NPSET policies give direction on how to achieve the objective by providing for the recognition of the benefits of electricity transmission, as well as the management of the environmental effects of electricity transmission and the adverse effects of other activities on the transmission network. As such, the NPSET policies impose obligations on both decision-makers and Transpower itself.</p> <p>One of the aspects within the NPSET which must be given effect to in district plans is provisions relating to enabling the National Grid.</p> <p>Policies and plans must provide for the effective operation, maintenance, upgrading and development of the National Grid. The development of National Grid assets gives rise to the potential for adverse environmental effects.</p> <p>The development of the National Grid must therefore be managed to ensure the potential for adverse effects is appropriately managed while recognising its significance and the constraints under which it operates. The NPSET requires the District Plan to include objectives and policies that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow for the consideration of the technical constraints and operational requirements under which the National Grid operates, for example the linear nature of the transmission lines. • Have regard to the extent to which adverse effects have been avoided, remedied or | <p>Outside the coastal environment, manage the effects of the development, operation, maintenance and upgrading of infrastructure activities (excluding the National Grid) by:</p> <p>...</p> | |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|--|---|---|-------------------------------|
| | | | | <p>mitigated through the route, site and method selection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure new planning and development seeks to avoid adverse effects on more sensitive areas. | | | |
| FS354.068 | Horticulture New Zealand | | Support in part | HortNZ supports separate policy framework for the National Grid to give effect to the NPSET but wording must be consistent with the NPSET. | Allow | Allow S454.045 to the extent that it gives effect to the NPSET. | Accept in part |
| FS346.025 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. | | Oppose | Amendment sought is inconsistent with the NZCPS. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Accept |
| FS369.174 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy seek to amend this policy to include 'repair'. | Allow in part | Allow in part the original submission | Accept in part |
| S483.041 | Top Energy Limited | I-P3 | Support | <p>Top Energy supports this policy, but considers that the wording needs to also include repair.</p> <p>Top Energy considers that outside of the coastal environment, clause I-P3b should also refer to mitigation of adverse effects, as minimisation and remedying might not be readily achievable in every instance, and the consideration of mitigation needs to also be provided for.</p> <p>Top Energy also consider that I-P3c should be amended to "recognising and providing for."</p> <p>This policy also refers to upgrading which Top Energy has sought a definition for in an earlier submission point.</p> | <p>Amend Policy I-P3 as follows: Outside the coastal environment, manage the effects of the development, operation, repair, maintenance and upgrading of infrastructure activities by:</p> <p>a...</p> <p>b. minimising, or remedying or mitigating adverse effects on historical and cultural values, natural environment values that cannot be avoided;</p> <p>c. recognising and providing for the technical, operational and functional needs and constraints of infrastructure activities; and ...</p> | | Accept in part |
| FS346.059 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection | | Oppose | The amendment sought does not appropriately recognise and provide for s6(a)-(c) matters. | 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 |
|-------------------|---|-----------|-----------------|---|--|--|-------------------------------|
| | Society of New Zealand Inc. | | | | | | |
| FS345.092 | 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 |
| S364.024 | Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation) | I-P3 | Support | The Director-General supports Policy I-P3 | Retain Policy I-P3 | | Reject |
| FS369.168 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy seek to amend this policy to include 'repair'. | Allow in part | allow in part the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS570.1105 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission | Reject |
| FS346.164 | 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 | Reject |
| FS566.1119 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission | Allow | Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission | Reject |
| FS569.1141 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission | Allow | Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission | Reject |
| S399.027 | Te Hiku Iwi Development Trust | I-P3 | Not Stated | For avoidance of doubt, we recommend inclusion of the word "biodiversity" before offsetting in these policies | Amend Policy I-P3 to include the words 'offsetting (including biodiversity offsetting)...' | | Reject |
| FS369.169 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy seek to amend this policy to include 'repair'. | Allow in part | Allow in part the original submission | Accept in part |
| S416.016 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | I-P3 | Support | Policy to enable the upgrading and development of infrastructure is supported by KiwiRail. In particular. that the policy links to the technical, operational and | Retain Policy I-P3 | | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|--|--|---|-------------------------------|
| | | | | functional needs and constraints of infrastructure is supported | | | |
| FS369.170 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy seek to amend this policy to include 'repair'. | Allow in part | Allow in part the original submission | Accept in part |
| S421.028 | Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand | I-P3 | Support | Federated Farmers supports Policies I-P1 to I-P6, and I-P8 to IP14 as they are currently worded. | Retain Policy I-P3 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent | | Accept in part |
| FS369.171 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy seek to amend this policy to include 'repair'. | Allow in part | Allow in part the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS570.1260 | 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 |
| FS346.262 | 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 |
| FS566.1274 | 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 |
| FS569.1296 | 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 |
| S442.061 | Kapiro Conservation Trust | I-P3 | Oppose | The policy does not give effect to the RPS, policies 5.3.3, 4.4.1(3) and 4.6.1. | Amend I-P3: Outside the coastal environment, manage the effects of the development, operation, maintenance and upgrading of infrastructure activities by: a. avoiding effects on historical and cultural values, significant natural areas, and outstanding natural | | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|---------|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | <p>features or landscapes to the extent practicable;</p> <p>b. avoiding significant adverse effects on of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Areas of predominantly indigenous vegetation; ii. Habitat of indigenous species that are important for recreational, commercial, traditional or cultural purposes; iii. Indigenous ecosystems and habitats that are particularly vulnerable to modification, including wetlands, dunelands, norther wet heathlands, headwater streams, floodplains and margins of freshwater bodies, spawning and nursery areas; and iv. Outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes and the natural character of freshwater bodies; <p>e. minimising remedying or mitigating other adverse effects on historical and cultural values, natural environment values that cannot be avoided;</p> | |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|--|--|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | <p>c. recognising the technical, operational and functional needs and constraints of infrastructure activities; and</p> <p>d. considering where more than minor residual adverse effects remain from (c) biodiversity having regard to offsetting; and</p> <p>e. considering where more than minor residual adverse effects cannot be biodiversity offset in (e) an environmental biodiversity compensation measure where there are more than minor residual adverse effects that cannot be avoided, remedied or mitigated.</p> | | |
| FS369.172 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy seek to amend this policy to include 'repair'. | Allow in part | Allow in part the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS570.1758 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS346.672 | 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 | Reject |
| S463.014 | Waiaua Bay Farm Limited | I-P3 | Support | WBF supports the focus on managing the effects of infrastructure development. This approach recognises that the avoidance of effects is not always possible or appropriate, given the locational, operational and functional needs that sometimes apply. | Retain Policy I-P3 | | Reject |
| FS369.175 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy seek to amend this policy to include 'repair'. | Allow in part | Allow in part the original submission | Accept in part |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|--|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| S489.015 | Radio New Zealand | I-P3 | Support | RNZ supports this policy, in particular the recognition of technical, operational and functional needs and constraints of infrastructure activities. | Retain Policy I-P3 | | Reject |
| FS369.176 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy seek to amend this policy to include 'repair'. | Allow in part | Allow in part the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS369.185 | Top Energy | | Support | Top Energy seek to retain this policy as notified. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS369.203 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy seeks to amend this policy to clearly differentiate between national, regional and local infrastructure and to provide for Critical Electricity Mapping. | Allow in part | Amend | Accept in part |
| S165.008 | Arvida Group Limited | I-P4 | Support in part | The "statement of intent" contained in these objectives and policies needs to be linked to the FNDC Long Term Plan or other funding and delivery mechanisms so that the Council can enable the District's people and communities to provide for the own social and economic well-being. | Amend to Identify in the PDP those measures that the Council will take to lead and provide for infrastructure in a timely manner that will support and enable growth. | | Reject |
| S158.008 | Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections | I-P4 | Support | The infrastructure policy framework appropriately provides recognition of the benefits of, and protection for, regionally significant infrastructure (i.e. including Northland Regional Corrections Facility). | Retain Policy I-P4. | | Accept in part |
| S489.016 | Radio New Zealand | I-P4 | Support | RNZ supports recognition of the benefits associated with regionally significant infrastructure. | Retain Policy I-P4 | | Accept in part |
| S463.015 | Waiaua Bay Farm Limited | I-P4 | Support | While WBF supports this policy in general terms, a minor amendment to sub-clause (a) would be appropriate given the benefits of regionally significant infrastructure are inherently "significant". | Amend Policy I-P4 as follows: I-P4 Provide for infrastructure where there are benefits such as: a. significant social, economic and cultural benefits associated with regionally significant infrastructure ... | | Accept |
| FS91.4 | Moana Kiff | | Oppose | Retaining the word "significant" helps maintain clarity effective resource allocation, and ultimately benefits the region by ensuring that the most impactful projects receive attention and investment, especially in our poorest communities. | Disallow | | Reject |
| FS369.184 | Top Energy | | Oppose | Top Energy opposes the amendments proposed as it seeks to retain this policy as notified. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|---|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| S331.015 | Ministry of Education Te Tahuu o Te Mātauranga | I-P4 | Support in part | The submitter supports in part policy I-P4 however, the definition of 'infrastructure' does not include additional infrastructure (which includes social infrastructure such as educational facilities). Educational facilities are a crucial form of social infrastructure that is needed to support local communities and their social and economic wellbeing. Under the NPS-UD, social infrastructure is included with the definition of 'additional infrastructure'. Council has an obligation under the NPS-UD to ensure sufficient additional infrastructure (which includes social infrastructure such as educational facilities) is provided in development and local authorities must be satisfied that additional infrastructure to service the development capacity is likely to be available. | Amend policy I-P4 as follows: Provide for infrastructure (including additional infrastructure) where there are benefits such as ... | | Reject |
| FS78.011 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | | Oppose | The submitter is not opposed to the treatment of educational facilities as infrastructure within the proposed FNDP, however the proposed definition of additional infrastructure includes a network operated for the purpose of transmitting or distributing electricity. As a result, the National Grid would be identified as Regionally Significant Infrastructure, Infrastructure and Additional Infrastructure. This is likely to create confusion in interpreting the proposed FNDP. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission. | Accept |
| FS354.069 | Horticulture New Zealand | | Oppose | The addition of additional infrastructure is not supported for reasons set out above. | Disallow | Disallow S331.015 | Accept |
| S282.021 | Chorus New Zealand Limited, Spark New Zealand Trading Limited, Spark TowerCo Limited, Vodafone New Zealand Limited | I-P4 | Support | The policy recognises the need to provide for infrastructure and associated benefits. | Retain provision as notified | | Accept in part |
| FS369.178 | Top Energy | | Support | Top Energy seek to retain this policy as notified. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| S356.023 | Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency | I-P4 | Support | Not stated | Retain I-P4 as notified | | Accept in part |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|--|--|---|-------------------------------|
| FS369.180 | Top Energy | | Support | Top Energy seek to retain this policy as notified. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS403.108 | Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora | | Support in part | Te Whatu Ora support amendment of this policy to provide for multi-modal transport methods. | Allow in part | Te Whatu Ora support amendment of this policy to provide for multi-modal transport methods. | Accept in part |
| S416.017 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | I-P4 | Support | KiwiRail supports the policy which sets out a range of quality of life and economic benefits from the provision of infrastructure. | Retain Policy I-P4 | | Accept in part |
| FS369.181 | Top Energy | | Support | Top Energy seek to retain this policy as notified. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| S421.029 | Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand | I-P4 | Support | Federated Farmers supports Policies I-P1 to I-P6, and I-P8 to IP14 as they are currently worded. | Retain Policy I-P4 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent | | Accept |
| FS369.182 | Top Energy | | Support | Top Energy seek to retain this policy as notified. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept |
| FS570.1261 | 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 |
| FS346.263 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. | | Oppose | The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Reject |
| FS566.1275 | 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 |
| FS569.1297 | 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 |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|--|--|-------------------------------|
| S454.046 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | I-P4 | Support | Transpower supports the inclusion of this policy in the FNPDP. | Retain I-P4 | | Accept in part |
| FS369.183 | Top Energy | | Support | Top Energy seek to retain this policy as notified. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| S483.042 | Top Energy Limited | I-P4 | Support | Top Energy supports this policy which provides for the benefits of infrastructure. | Retain Policy I-P4 | | Accept in part |
| FS345.093 | 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 |
| S138.006 | Kairos Connection Trust and Habitat for Humanity Northern Region Ltd | I-P5 | Support in part | <p>The adequacy of urban three waters infrastructure to service land use development in reticulated urban centres is critical to the realisation of FNDC's assessment of future urban residential land supply and assumptions about future housing yield. With respect to wastewater infrastructure, the Section 32 overview information appears to indicate that urban zones have been consolidated to include land that is currently able to be serviced or is within areas where there are planned services. However, this is not clear from either the subdivision or zone rules that require servicing capacity to be confirmed at the time of a subdivision or land use consent application.</p> <p>Concerned that if it is a developer's sole responsibility to confirm the capacity of a wastewater infrastructure and demonstrate to Council that a controlled or permitted activity housing proposal is capable of being serviced, that this uncertainty and investigation cost will be a disincentive to proceeding with a proposal. Kairos and Habitat seek that the Council publicise baseline capacity information about its wastewater infrastructure in all of its urban centres and that proposed objectives and policies reflect the fact that it is the Council's responsibility to service urban development that is permitted in a zone.</p> | Amend Policy I-P5 as follows: <i>Require the coordination of infrastructure planning and delivery at the time of Plan enabled land use, subdivision and development, so that land use and infrastructure is integrated, efficient and aligned.</i> | | Reject |
| FS36.036 | Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency | | Support | Supports the integrated provision of infrastructure and the definition of "plan enabled" as per the National Policy Statement Urban Development. | Allow | Allow the original submission. | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|---|-----------|-----------------|--|---|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| FS369.186 | Top Energy | | Support | Top Energy seek to retain this policy as notified. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| S331.016 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | I-P5 | Support in part | The submitter supports in part objective I-P5 however, the definition of 'infrastructure' does not include additional infrastructure (which includes social infrastructure such as educational facilities). Educational facilities are a crucial form of social infrastructure that is needed to support local communities and their social and economic wellbeing. Under the NPS-UD, social infrastructure is included with the definition of 'additional infrastructure'. Council has an obligation under the NPS-UD to ensure sufficient additional infrastructure (which includes social infrastructure such as educational facilities) is provided in development and local authorities must be satisfied that additional infrastructure to service the development capacity is likely to be available. | Amend policy I-P5 as follows: Require the coordination of infrastructure (including additional infrastructure) planning and delivery at the time of land use, subdivision and development so that land use and infrastructure is integrated, efficient and aligned. | | Reject |
| FS78.012 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | | Oppose | The submitter is not opposed to the treatment of educational facilities as infrastructure within the proposed FNDP, however the proposed definition of additional infrastructure includes a network operated for the purpose of transmitting or distributing electricity. As a result, the National Grid would be identified as Regionally Significant Infrastructure, Infrastructure and Additional Infrastructure. This is likely to create confusion in interpreting the proposed FNDP. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission. | Accept |
| FS354.070 | Horticulture New Zealand | | Oppose | The addition of additional infrastructure is not supported for reasons set out above. | Disallow | Disallow S331.016 | Accept |
| FS369.189 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy seek to retain this policy as notified. | Allow in part | Allow in part the original submission | Accept in part |
| S561.021 | Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities | I-P5 | Support | This policy enables I-O1 to be achieved. | Retain I-P5 as notified. | | Accept |
| FS32.075 | Jeff Kemp | | Oppose | The original submission seeks to amend the FNDP in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and 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 | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|---|-----------|-----------------|--|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| | | | | <p>benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes.</p> <p>The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts.</p> <p>The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.</p> | | | |
| FS369.193 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy sought to retain this policy as notified, however it supports the changes sought by Transpower (see S454.048). | Allow in part | Allow in part the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS369.210 | Top Energy | | Support | Top Energy seeks to retain this policy as notified. | Allow | Retain | Accept |
| FS23.293 | 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 |
| FS47.035 | Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust | | Oppose | <p>The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan.</p> <p>Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications.</p> | Disallow | Disallow the entire original submission | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|---|-----------|----------|--|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| FS348.108 | 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 |
| S483.043 | Top Energy Limited | I-P5 | Support | Top Energy supports this policy which requires the coordination of infrastructure. | Retain Policy I-P5 | | Accept |
| FS351.012 | A.W and D.M Simpson | | Oppose | Top Energy seeks to reserve the power to develop across whenua Maori for their own interests asides the plans intent to protect Whenua Maori. | Disallow | No change for amendments. Current wording is adequate and requires Top Energy to properly engage and consult the land owners and mana whenua otherwise. | Reject |
| FS371.012 | Oromahoe 18R2B2B2 Trust and its associated Hapu, Ngati Kawa, Te Ngare Hauata, Te Matarahurahu, Te Whanaurara, Ngati Kaihoru, Ngati Rahiri | | Oppose | Top Energy seeks to reserve the power to develop across whenua Maori for their own interests asides the plans intent to protect Whenua Maori. | Disallow | No change for amendments. Current wording is adequate and requires Top Energy to properly engage and consult the land owners and mana whenua otherwise. | Reject |
| FS448.005 | L & T Property Investments Limited | | Support | Policy I.P5 requires infrastructure to be delivered at the time of land use, subdivision and development so that land use and infrastructure is integrated, efficient and aligned. L & T Property Investments Ltd supports the policy as notified as it requires that development must also be efficient, therefore requiring infrastructure to facilitate and integrate, rather than "trump", the use, development and subdivision of land. This acknowledges that the overarching purpose of the infrastructure network is indeed to deliver and facilitate use and development, i.e. there is no need for the infrastructure network without land use. | Allow | Retain Policy I-P5. | Accept |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|--|--|---|-------------------------------|
| FS449.012 | The Proprietors of Tapuaetahi Incorporation | | Oppose | Top Energy seeks to reserve the power to develop across whenua Maori for their own interests asides the plans intent to protect Whenua Maori | Disallow | No change for amendments. Current wording is adequate and requires Top Energy to properly engage and consult the land owners and mana whenua otherwise. | Reject |
| FS345.094 | 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 |
| S282.022 | Chorus New Zealand Limited, Spark New Zealand Trading Limited, Spark TowerCo Limited, Vodafone New Zealand Limited | I-P5 | Support | The policy recognises the benefit in coordinating infrastructure delivery. | Retain provision as notified. | | Accept |
| FS369.188 | Top Energy | | Support | Top Energy seek to retain this policy as notified. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept |
| S356.024 | Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency | I-P5 | Support | Not stated. | Retain I-P5 as notified | | Accept |
| FS369.190 | Top Energy | | Support | Top Energy seek to retain this policy as notified. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept |
| S421.030 | Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand | I-P5 | Support | Federated Farmers supports Policies I-P1 to I-P6, and I-P8 to IP14 as they are currently worded. | Retain Policy I-P5 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent | | Accept |
| FS369.191 | Top Energy | | Support | Top Energy seek to retain this policy as notified. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept |
| FS570.1262 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Oppose | Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions. | Disallow | Disallow to the extent that the submission is | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|-------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | | inconsistent with our original submission | |
| FS346.264 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. | | Oppose | The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Reject |
| FS566.1276 | 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 |
| FS569.1298 | 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 |
| S454.047 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | I-P5 | Support | Transpower supports the inclusion of this policy in the FNPDP. | Retain I-P5 | | Accept |
| FS369.192 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy sought to retain this policy as notified, however it supports the changes sought by Transpower (see S454.048). | Allow in part | Allow in part the original submission | Accept in part |
| S483.044 | Top Energy Limited | I-P6 | Support | Top Energy supports this policy, in particular the qualifier at the start of "where practicable and appropriate for the type of infrastructure." This is important in order to recognise and provide for the operational and functional needs of infrastructure which may not be able to minimise adverse visual effects in every instance. | Retain Policy I-P6 | | Accept in part |
| FS351.013 | A.W and D.M Simpson | | Oppose | Top Energy seeks to impose obligations on FNDC and the rate payers to "...provide for..." " Recognition" alone is adequate and puts onus back on Top Energy to substantiate benefits over other interests. | Disallow | No change for amendments. Current wording is adequate. | Accept in part |
| FS371.013 | Oromahoe 18R2B2B2 Trust and its associated Hapu, Ngati | | Oppose | Top Energy seeks to impose obligations on FNDC and the rate payers to "...provide for..." " Recognition" alone is adequate and puts onus back on Top Energy to substantiate benefits over other interests. | Disallow | No change for amendments. Current wording is adequate | Accept in part |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------|
| | Kawa, Te Ngare Hauata, Te Matarahurahu, Te Whanaurara, Ngati Kaihoru, Ngati Rahiri | | | | | | |
| FS449.013 | The Proprietors of Tapuaetahi Incorporation | | Oppose | Top Energy seeks to impose obligations on FNDC and the rate payers to "...provide for..." "Recognition" alone is adequate and puts onus back on Top Energy to substantiate benefits over other interests. | Disallow | retain | Accept in part |
| FS345.095 | 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 |
| S356.025 | Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency | I-P6 | Support | Not stated | Retain I-P6 as notified | | Accept in part |
| FS369.194 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy sought to retain this policy as notified, however it supports the changes sought by Transpower (see S454.048). | Allow in part | Allow in part the original submission | Accept in part |
| S399.028 | Te Hiku Iwi Development Trust | I-P6 | Not Stated | There are some types of cultural site where location of services underground would be warranted and appropriate to avoid/minimise effects on cultural values. This is not specifically provided for by the policy. | Amend point e. of Policy I-P6 as follows: e. requiring the undergrounding of services when locating infrastructure in the coastal environment, a resource overlay, heritage area, or an area with high amenity value, or in the vicinity of culturally significant sites (where appropriate) | | Accept in part |
| FS369.195 | Top Energy | | Oppose | Top Energy sought to retain this policy as notified, however it supports the changes sought by Transpower (see S454.048). | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Accept in part |
| S421.031 | Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand | I-P6 | Support | Federated Farmers supports Policies I-P1 to I-P6, and I-P8 to IP14 as they are currently worded. | Retain Policy I-P6 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent | | Accept |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|--|--|---|-------------------------------|
| FS369.196 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy sought to retain this policy as notified, however it supports the changes sought by Transpower (see S454.048). | Allow in part | allow in part the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS570.1263 | 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 |
| FS346.265 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. | | Oppose | The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Reject |
| FS566.1277 | 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 |
| FS569.1299 | 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 |
| S454.048 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | I-P6 | Support in part | <p>Transpower supports the intent of this policy in the FNPPD, however the requirements for use of recessive colours and finishes in subclause c. and the undergrounding of services in sub clause e. are potentially problematic.</p> <p>The materials needed to construct, operate, maintain, repair and upgrade the National Grid can be quite specialised and may not necessarily be available in a range of recessive colours and finishes.</p> <p>Undergrounding of transmission lines and facilities is not always technically feasible and is very expensive. Underground transmission lines are also difficult to maintain and repair. In addition, if undergrounding of transmission assets is required in the Far North, these costs will ultimately be passed on to electricity users in the district which may be unaffordable.</p> <p>Transpower therefore proposes changes to the wording of the policy to ensure visual effects are considered and addressed without being unduly onerous or costly.</p> | <p>Amend I-P6 as follows: Where practicable and appropriate for the type of infrastructure, minimise the adverse visual effects of infrastructure by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. co-location or multiple use; b. removing redundant facilities or structures; c. using landscaping and/or recessive colours and finishes, if available; d. encouraging innovative design to maintain the character and amenity of the surrounding area by integrating infrastructure within the site and utilising existing built form and landform; and e. requiring considering the undergrounding of services when | | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | locating infrastructure in the coastal environment, a resource overlay, heritage area or an area with high amenity value. | | |
| FS369.197 | Top Energy | | Support | Top Energy support the changes sought by Transpower. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| S158.009 | Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections | I-P7 | Support | The infrastructure policy framework appropriately provides recognition of the benefits of, and protection for, regionally significant infrastructure (i.e. including Northland Regional Corrections Facility). | Retain Policy I-P7. | | Accept in part |
| S421.039 | Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand | I-P7 | Support in part | <p>Federated Farmers has concerns over policies that seek to restrict certain activities and farm practices on private property. Care needs to be taken when developing policies for district plans that the rights of private landowners to carry out lawful activities are not unnecessarily restricted or prohibited through the Council seeking to protect other land uses such as regionally significant infrastructure.</p> <p>Polices in the proposed district plan should be consistent with the policies contained in national policy instruments and national environment standards. The Council also needs to recognise that for infrastructure that goes across or is on private property, the infrastructure provider will have entered into discussions with the private landowner and the appropriate easements would normally have been registered on the relevant certificate/s of title. The easements provide the necessary level of protection needed for infrastructure to be operated and maintained on private property.</p> <p>As written, the proposed policy has the potential to create reverse sensitivity issues for private property where there is infrastructure located. The policy as drafted does not recognise the role that private property instruments such as easements play in ensuring that infrastructure is able to continue to be accessed and operated and be repaired, maintained, and upgraded. Proposed policy I-P7 also needs to recognise that every national gas network line has its own easement recorded on the appropriate Certificate/s of Title which</p> | <p>Amend Policy I-P7 as follows (inferred):</p> <p>Protect local, regionally and nationally significant infrastructure from the effects of incompatible land use and subdivision, including reverse sensitivity effects, which may compromise the operation and capacity of infrastructure by:</p> <p>a - d ...</p> <p>e. where there is no evidence of an appropriate easement on the relevant Certificate/s of Title, managing landuse and subdivision activities in proximity to Critical Electricity Lines to...</p> <p>f. where there is no evidence of an appropriate easement on the relevant Certificate/s of Title, managing land disturbance and activities sensitive to gas transmission to avoid, or mitigate potential adverse effects on, gas transmission pipelines; and</p> | | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|---|---|-------------------------------|
| | | | | legally defines the required setbacks and property specific restrictions. | g. where required , managing other activities, through the use of setbacks set-backs and appropriate design controls where necessary , to achieve the appropriate protection of local, regional and nationally significant infrastructure. or wording with similar intent. | | |
| FS24.7 | Lynley Newport | | Support in part | I agree with sentiment and have concerns in regard to infrastructure protection taking too much priority over operational aspects of farming, especially where the infrastructure network operator seldom provides compensation where their infrastructure prevents the use of land for other purposes. | Allow in part | | Reject |
| FS78.026 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | | Oppose | If I-P7 is to apply, or is intended to apply, to the National Grid, the proposed amendment does not give effect to Policies 10 and 11 of the NPSET. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission. | Accept |
| FS354.071 | Horticulture New Zealand | | Support in part | HortNZ has sought changes to I-P7 for similar reasons to Federated Farmers to ensure that landowners are not adversely affected by infrastructure that traverses private property. | Allow | Allow S421.039 where it is consistent with the changes sought by HortNZ in S159.032 | Reject |
| FS369.201 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy seeks to amend this policy to clearly differentiate between national, regional and local infrastructure and to provide for Critical Electricity Mapping. | Allow in part | Amend | Accept in part |
| FS570.1271 | 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 |
| FS346.273 | 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 |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|--|---|-------------------------------|
| FS566.1285 | 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 |
| FS569.1307 | 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 |
| S159.032 | Horticulture New Zealand | I-P7 | Oppose | HortNZ opposes a policy of 'protection' as this is inconsistent with higher order documents such as the RPS and NPS-ET. Neither Critical Electricity Lines or electricity distribution lines not defined or described. The policy relates to regionally significant infrastructure but clause g) includes local infrastructure. | Amend Policy I-P7 as follows: Protect Ensure that regionally significant infrastructure from the effects of is not compromised by incompatible land use and subdivision, use and development, including reverse sensitivity effects, which may compromise the operation and capacity of infrastructure by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. locating and designing noise sensitive activities to avoid potential reverse sensitivity effects on airports and State Highways; b. avoiding physical obstructions in take-off, approach, landing and departure paths and runway end protections areas; c. managing new noise sensitive activities within a defined air noise contour; d. managing access to the railway corridor, and local, regional and national road network; e. managing landuse and subdivision activities in proximity to Critical Electricity Lines to: | | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|---|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | 1. retain the ability for the network utility operator to access, operate, maintain, repair and upgrade the line recognising that some lines may cross private land ; 2. ensure that future buildings and building alterations, earthworks, planting tress construction activities do not compromise the effective operation of the electricity distribution network and maintain safe electrical clearance distances under all electricity distribution line operating conditions. f. managing land disturbance and activities sensitive to gas transmission to avoid, or mitigate potential adverse effects on, gas transmission pipelines; and g. managing other activities, through setbacks and design controls where necessary, to achieve appropriate protection of local, regional and nationally significant infrastructure. | |
| FS299.1 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | | Oppose | KiwiRail opposes the full suite of changes to I-P7 (g) and considers that the retention of the terms 'regionally and nationally significant infrastructure' is consistent with the RPS. | Disallow in part | Accept |
| FS151.188 | Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust | | Support | | Allow | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|--|---|---|-------------------------------|
| FS151.189 | Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust | | Support | | Allow | | Reject |
| FS304.014 | Radio New Zealand | | Oppose | The submitter opposes the proposed amendments as they weaken the protection provided by the policy as notified. This is inappropriate for regionally significant infrastructure. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission. | Accept |
| FS548.043 | Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc | | Support | Federated Farmers agrees with the submitter that the relevant higher order planning documents do not require the protection of infrastructure. The provisions in the Proposed District Plan need to be consistent with these higher order documents. | Allow | Grant the relief sought. | Reject |
| FS448.006 | L & T Property Investments Limited | | Support | L & T Property Investments supports the changes to Policy I-P7 as it recognises that in many instances, the Critical Electricity Line Overlay is located private land, and clarifies that the provisions only apply to regionally significant infrastructure. | Allow | Amend Policy I-P7 | Reject |
| FS570.194 | 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 |
| FS566.208 | 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 |
| FS569.230 | 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 |
| S483.045 | Top Energy Limited | I-P7 | Support | Top Energy supports policy I-P7, which seeks to protect regionally significant infrastructure from the effects of incompatible land uses and subdivision. In particular, Top Energy is interested in and supports the inclusion of clause I-P7e and I-P7g of this policy. In terms of the first sentence of the policy, Top Energy considers that it is important that this policy protects nationally and regionally significant infrastructure, and also local infrastructure. With regard to electricity distribution, the whole distribution network is important because the network operates as an electricity | Amend Policy I-P7 as follows: Protect nationally and regionally significant infrastructure and local infrastructure from the effects of incompatible land use and subdivision, including reverse sensitivity effects, which may compromise the operation and capacity of infrastructure by: | | Accept |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|-------------------------|--|-----------|------------------------|---|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | <p>ecosystem, which is reliant on all components of the network to ensure the safe and efficient provision of electricity to customers and communities. This is already acknowledged in clause g, but it is important that the leading sentence also acknowledges this.</p> <p>I-P7e addresses the management of landuse and subdivision activities near 'Critical Electricity Lines'. Top Energy provided feedback on the Draft FNDP seeking that some of the critical electricity distribution network be mapped. FNDC has included part of the area requested by Top Energy in the PDP as an Energy Infrastructure Overlay 'Critical Electricity Lines'. As addressed in earlier comments, the extent of mapping is more limited than that sought by Top Energy and only incorporates the 110kv line from Kaikohe to Kaitaia. Top Energy seeks that this be extended to also include the 33kv lines across the District. Top Energy also considers that I-P7e should be amended to include "the identification of critical electricity lines as a mapped overlay."</p> <p>Top Energy has suggested some minor grammatical changes to I-P7e.ii.</p> | <p>a-d ...</p> <p>e. Identifying Critical Electricity Lines as a mapped overlay and managing landuse and subdivision activities in proximity to Critical Electricity Lines to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. ... ii. ensure that future buildings and building alterations, earthworks, planting of tress and construction activities do not compromise the effective operation of the electricity distribution network and maintain safe electrical clearance distances under all electricity distribution line operating conditions... | |
| <p>FS114.3</p> | <p>Far North Holdings Limited</p> | | <p>Support in part</p> | <p>FNHL support the protection of Critical Infrastructure but seeks that the Critical Electricity overlay not apply to the Ngawha Innovation Park. The Park property includes both 110kV and 33kV lines and development to date has had some flexibility in both development and retention of electricity supply. The proposed protection measures make many of the approved and future development areas unable to be developed to their potential and removes potential alternative options to enable both development and the protection of the Critical Electricity Lines. FNHL would be interested in securing an MOU with Top Energy Limit for sites where the Critical Electricity Lines are located. This would be outside the district plan process.</p> | <p>Allow in part</p> | <p>Accept in part</p> |
| <p>I FS242.2</p> | <p>Garry Stanners</p> | | <p>Oppose</p> | <p>The full suite of effects management "offsetting or compensating" should be the local authorities instruments to utilise not a private company's to use as a lever to buy their way around the</p> | <p>Disallow</p> | <p>Reject</p> |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|-------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | PNP constraints. Top Energy state in their Summary 5 it is over and above what is provided for through existing regulations. | | | |
| FS351.014 | A.W and D.M Simpson | | Oppose | The full suite of effects management "offsetting or compensating" should be the local authorities instruments to utilise not a private company's to use as a lever to buy their way around the PNP constraints. | Disallow | No change to paragraph a. | Reject |
| FS371.014 | Oromahoe 18R2B2B2 Trust and its associated Hapu, Ngati Kawa, Te Ngare Hauata, Te Matarahurahu, Te Whanaurara, Ngati Kaihoru, Ngati Rahiri | | Oppose | The full suite of effects management "offsetting or compensating" should be the local authorities instruments to utilise not a private company's to use as a lever to buy their way around the PNP constraints. | Disallow | No change to paragraph a. | Reject |
| FS131.011 | Oromahoe Land Owners: AW and DM Simpson, R.A.S Ltd, Arran Trust, Garry Stanners, Errol McIntyre, SW Halliday, SJ and PM Boys, Oromahoe 18R2B2B2 Trust and Tapuaetahi Incorporation | | Oppose | 33 kW should not be classified as a Critical Electricity Line CEL so that it can then be mapped and afforded the same powers to constrain land owners in the uses of their properties. The original submitter should be required to compensate owners on the impacts this will have to property and its historical or potential development. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission (inferred). | Reject |
| FS448.007 | L & T Property Investments Limited | | Oppose | L & T Property Investments Ltd oppose the reference to the mapped Overlay in Policy I-P7. For completeness and with reference to the wider submission of Top Energy, L & T Property Investments does not support the inclusion of 33kv lines in the Critical Electricity Lines Overlay, either on the maps or by definition. It considers that site-by-site consideration of the integration of land use and infrastructure can be appropriate managed between the landowner and network utility provider, insofar as it relates to the | Disallow | Amend Policy I-P7 | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|---|-----------|-----------------|---|---|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | iterative undergrounding of the network as affected land is developed over time. | | | |
| FS449.014 | The Proprietors of Tapuaetahi Incorporation | | Oppose | The full suite of effects management "offsetting or compensating" should be the local authorities instruments to utilise not a private company's to use as a lever to buy their way around the PNP constraints. | Disallow | Retain | Reject |
| FS354.072 | Horticulture New Zealand | | Oppose | HortNZ has sought changes to I-P7 which are inconsistent with the changes sought by the submitter. In particular HortNZ does not support extending the policy to include local infrastructure or including maps of CEL through submissions as landowners are foreclosed on the opportunity to submit. | Disallow | Disallow S483.045 | Reject |
| FS345.096 | 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 |
| S489.017 | Radio New Zealand | I-P7 | Support in part | RNZ support a policy to protect regionally significant infrastructure from incompatible land use, however, at present the policy does not recognise infrastructure associated with network utilities. | Insert new point in Policy I-P7, after point e as follows (and renumber points f and g accordingly): f. managing land use and subdivision activities in proximity to network utilities, including radio communication transmitter sites, to: i. retain the ability for network utility operator to access, operate, maintain, repair and upgrade the infrastructure; ii. ensure that future buildings do not compromise the effective operation of the network utility. | | Reject |
| FS78.049 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | | Support | The submitter considers these are helpful additions to the policy. | Allow | Allow the original submission. | Reject |
| S416.018 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | I-P7 | Support in part | The policy is generally supported as it recognizes both reverse sensitivity effects, and the need to protect | Insert new criteria in Policy I-P7 as follows: | | Accept in part |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|---|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | <p>Regionally Significant Infrastructure with design and/or acoustic standards. The Plan recognizes that airport and road noise effects require management but omits to include railway noise and vibration, which requires a similar policy and rule regime to manage effects effectively.</p> <p>The policy should encourage the management of the rail/development interface. Other submissions seek to add a building or accessway setbacks and an acoustic/vibration standard. While the definition of noise includes vibration, it is highlighted here to support the specific rail vibration standard. Vibration from rail corridors can potentially give rise to adverse health and amenity effects on noise (and vibration) sensitive activities located nearby if not properly addressed and provided for. 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 required 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.</p> <p>Clause 'g' is supported with the proposed amendment as it supports the plans approach to actively managing the effects of adjacent development on infrastructure.</p> | <p>(x) locating and/or designing noise and vibration sensitive activities to avoid potential reverse sensitivity effects on railway corridors</p> <p>(y) managing new noise and vibration sensitive activities adjacent to railways to protect people's health and residential amenity while they are indoors.</p> <p>Amend subsection g. of Policy I-P7 as follows.</p> <p>g. managing other activities, through set-backs and design controls where necessary, to achieve appropriate protection of local, regional and nationally significant infrastructure.</p> <p>Or any such alternative relief to ensure that the rail related elements are appropriately addressed.</p> | | |
| FS243.055 | Kainga Ora Homes and Communities | | Support in part | Kāinga Ora opposes the decision sought on the basis that adverse effects from noise can be appropriately managed and the concept of reverse sensitivity is not supported. Kāinga Ora opposes the amendment which is overly prescriptive. | Disallow | Insert new criteria in Policy I-P7 as follows: | Accept in part |
| FS369.200 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy seeks to amend this policy to clearly differentiate between national, regional and local | Allow in part | Amend | Accept in part |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|--|---|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| | | | | infrastructure and to provide for Critical Electricity Mapping. | | | |
| S282.023 | Chorus New Zealand Limited, Spark New Zealand Trading Limited, Spark TowerCo Limited, Vodafone New Zealand Limited | I-P7 | Support | The policy recognises the role that regionally significant infrastructure plays and the need to protect such assets. | Retain provision as notified | | Accept in part |
| FS369.198 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy seeks to amend this policy to clearly differentiate between national, regional and local infrastructure and to provide for Critical Electricity Mapping. | Allow in part | Allow in part the original submission | Accept in part |
| S356.026 | Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency | I-P7 | Support | Not stated | Retain I-P7 as notified | | Accept in part |
| FS369.199 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy seeks to amend this policy to clearly differentiate between national, regional and local infrastructure and to provide for Critical Electricity Mapping. | Allow in part | Amend | Accept in part |
| S454.049 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | I-P7 | Not Stated | <p>Transpower supports the intent of this policy however it does not reflect or give effect to the NPSET.</p> <p>Transpower seeks specific National Grid provisions in order to give effect to the NPSET. The primary concerns are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The policy does not comprehensively address all activities which may compromise the National Grid. In addition to the health and safety issues of activities locating within proximity of the National Grid, the National Grid can be affected by other activities that establish beneath or in close proximity to its lines and/or structures. Such activities can generate reverse sensitivity effects where landowners / operators request a Council to impose constraints on existing infrastructure to manage effects such as noise, reduced visual amenity, radio and television interference, perceived Electric and Magnetic Field ('EMF') | Amend Policy I-P7 to exclude the National Grid as follows: I-P7 Protect regionally significant infrastructure (excluding the National Grid) from the effects of incompatible land use and subdivision, including reverse sensitivity effects, which may compromise the operation and capacity of infrastructure by ... | Reject | |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|--|-------------------------------|-------|-------------------------------|
| | | | | <p>effects, or interference with business activities beneath the lines. The location of buildings and activities, particularly 'sensitive activities' such as schools and residential properties, beneath or in close proximity to lines and/or structures can also compromise Transpower's ability to maintain, upgrade and develop the National Grid. Additionally, the stability of National Grid lines can be affected by earthworks that destabilise support structures resulting in their need to be relocated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NPSET Policies 10 and 11 are particularly relevant. These policies act as the primary guide to inform how adverse effects on the National Grid are managed. The policies seek to: Avoid sensitive activities near electricity transmission lines and infrastructure; Manage other activities to avoid reverse sensitivity effects on the Grid; and Manage activities to ensure the operation, maintenance, upgrading and development of the Grid is not compromised. <p>As proposed, Policy I-P7 does address any of the above adequately.</p> <p>On this basis Transpower seeks a separate policy framework for the National Grid.</p> | | | |
| FS369.202 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy seeks to amend this policy to clearly differentiate between national, regional and local infrastructure and to provide for Critical Electricity Mapping. | Allow in part | Amend | Accept in part |
| S282.024 | Chorus New Zealand Limited, Spark New Zealand Trading Limited, Spark TowerCo Limited, Vodafone New Zealand Limited | I-P8 | Support | The policy recognises that infrastructure meets the needs of the district. | Retain provision as notified | | Accept |
| FS369.204 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy seeks to amend this policy to clearly differentiate between national, regional and local | Allow in part | Amend | Accept in part |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|-------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|--|--|---|-------------------------------|
| | | | | infrastructure and to provide for Critical Electricity Mapping. | | | |
| S356.027 | Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency | I-P8 | Support | not stated | Retain I-P8 as notified | | Accept |
| FS369.205 | Top Energy | | Support | Top Energy seeks to retain this policy as notified. | Allow | Retain | Accept |
| FS369.223 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy seeks to amend this policy to apply the NZ standards for radiofrequency fields. and provide for offsetting or compensation. | Allow in part | Amend | Accept in part |
| S416.019 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | I-P8 | Support | The policy supports activities which maintain the resilience of the rail network, which is regionally significant infrastructure, and is therefore supported. | Retain Policy I-P8 | | Accept |
| FS369.206 | Top Energy | | Support | Top Energy seeks to retain this policy as notified | Allow | Retain | Accept |
| S421.032 | Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand | I-P8 | Support | Federated Farmers supports Policies I-P1 to I-P6, and I-P8 to IP14 as they are currently worded. | Retain Policy I-P8 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent | | Accept |
| FS369.207 | Top Energy | | Support | Top Energy seeks to retain this policy as notified | Allow | Retain | Accept |
| FS570.1264 | 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 |
| FS346.266 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. | | Oppose | The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Reject |
| FS566.1278 | 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 |
| FS569.1300 | 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 |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------|
| S454.051 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | I-P8 | Support | Transpower supports the inclusion of this policy in the FNPDP. | Retain I-P8 | | Accept |
| FS369.208 | Top Energy | | Support | Top Energy seeks to retain this policy as notified. | Allow | Retain | Accept |
| FS369.227 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy seeks to amend this policy to apply the NZ standards for radiofrequency fields and provide for offsetting or compensation. | Allow in part | Amend | Accept in part |
| S489.018 | Radio New Zealand | I-P8 | Support | RNZ support this policy. It is important to provide for infrastructure, particularly where it is regionally significant. | Retain Policy I-P8 | | Accept |
| FS369.209 | Top Energy | | Support | Top Energy seeks to retain this policy as notified. | Allow | Retain | Accept |
| S483.046 | Top Energy Limited | I-P8 | Support | Top Energy supports this policy which seeks to provide for resilient infrastructure. | Retain Policy I-P8 | | Accept |
| FS345.097 | 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 |
| S454.052 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | I-P9 | Support | Transpower supports the inclusion of this policy in the FNPDP. | Retain I-P9 | | Accept |
| S483.047 | Top Energy Limited | I-P9 | Support | Top Energy seeks amendment to this policy to ensure that the operational and functional needs of infrastructure are taken into account when encouraging new linear infrastructure to be located within roads. | Amend Policy I-P9 as follows: Taking into account the operational and functional needs of infrastructure, encourage new linear infrastructure to be located within roads and, where practicable, adjacent to the carriageway unless this would result in a risk to health and safety. | | Accept in part |
| FS448.008 | L & T Property Investments Limited | | Oppose | L & T Property Investments Ltd opposes the proposed changes as this appears to give priority to the network utility provider rather than to facilitate land use in a manner that is unencumbered by infrastructure. The road reserve is the appropriate location for new liner infrastructure. | 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 |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|--|---|---|-------------------------------|
| FS354.073 | Horticulture New Zealand | | Oppose | Linear infrastructure should be encouraged to be within road where practicable to avoid impacts on private property. | Disallow | Disallow S483.047 | Accept in part |
| FS345.098 | 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 |
| S356.028 | Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency | I-P9 | Support | Not stated | Retain I-P9 as notified | | Accept |
| FS369.211 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy seeks to amend this policy to take into account the operational and functional needs of infrastructure. | Allow in part | Amend | Accept in part |
| S421.033 | Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand | I-P9 | Support | Federated Farmers supports Policies I-P1 to I-P6, and I-P8 to IP14 as they are currently worded. | Retain Policy I-P9 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent. | | Accept |
| FS369.212 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy seeks to amend this policy to take into account the operational and functional needs of infrastructure. | Allow in part | Amend | Accept in part |
| FS570.1265 | 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 |
| FS346.267 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. | | Oppose | The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Reject |
| FS566.1279 | 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 |
| FS569.1301 | 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 |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|-------------------|---|-----------|-----------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------|
| S511.044 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand | I-P10 | Support in part | Recognize that National Grid is very important. | Amend I-P10 to reflect that there may be instances in the Coastal Environment where avoidance of indigenous biodiversity may be required. | | Reject |
| FS78.053 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | | Oppose | Policy 1-P10 relates to existing National Grid assets in the Far North. There are no existing National Grid assets in the coastal environment in the Far North so the relief requested is not relevant or necessary. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission. | Accept |
| FS164.044 | Scrumptious Fruit Trust | | Support | Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and secondly as passive recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area. | Allow | Amend HNC overlay to include Taupo Bay; Amend provisions to require strong wildlife protection; Amend provisions to require dogs on leash in beach areas; Adopt SNA and HNC provisions (inferred). | Reject |
| FS570.1615 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission | Reject |
| FS566.1629 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission | Allow | Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission | Reject |
| FS569.1651 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission | Allow | Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission | Reject |
| S483.048 | Top Energy Limited | I-P10 | Support | Top Energy supports recognition for the National Grid, which is fundamental to the electricity network, and assumes Transpower will address any issues with provisions relating to the National Grid. | Retain Policy I-P10 | | Accept in part |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|---|-----------|------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------|
| FS351.015 | A.W and D.M Simpson | | Oppose | There are a number of concerns with their proposal to assign discretionary activities status. The rule is there to regulate network utilities. | Disallow | Status Quo. No change to wording or PDP | Reject |
| FS371.015 | Oromahoe 18R2B2B2 Trust and its associated Hapu, Ngati Kawa, Te Ngare Hauata, Te Matarahurahu, Te Whanaurara, Ngati Kaihoru, Ngati Rahiri | | Oppose | There are a number of concerns with their proposal to assign discretionary activities status. The rule is there to regulate network utilities. | Disallow | Status Quo. No change to wording or PDP | Reject |
| FS449.015 | The Proprietors of Tapuaetahi Incorporation | | Oppose | There are a number of concerns with their proposal to assign discretionary activities status. The rule is there to regulate network utilities. | Disallow | Status Quo. No change to wording or PDP | Reject |
| FS345.099 | Ngawha Generation Limited | | Support | NGL is a subsidiary of Top Energy Limited. NGL supports all submission points made by Top Energy. | Allow | Allow all of the relief sought by Top Energy Limited in its submission (S483). | Awaiting recommendation |
| S454.053 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | I-P10 | Not Stated | Transpower supports the policy but suggests an amendment to ensure it covers all aspects of the National Grid. | Amend I-P10 as follows: Provide for the operation, maintenance, upgrade, relocation or and removal of the National Grid while having regard to the extent to which adverse effects have been avoided, remedied or mitigated through route, site and method selection. | | Accept in part |
| FS354.074 | Horticulture New Zealand | | Support | The wording sought better reflects the nature of the National Grid. | Allow | Allow S454.053 | Accept in part |
| FS346.026 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. | | Oppose | Amendment sought considerably widens the policy, which is inappropriate for new activities such as upgrading or relocation. | 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 |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|--|--|---|-------------------------------|
| FS369.214 | Top Energy | | Support | Top Energy sought to retain this policy as notified, but support Transpower's requested amendments outlined in this submission point. | Allow | Retain | Accept in part |
| S421.034 | Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand | I-P10 | Support | Federated Farmers supports Policies I-P1 to I-P6, and I-P8 to IP14 as they are currently worded. | Retain Policy I-P10 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent | | Accept in part |
| FS369.213 | Top Energy | | Support | Top Energy sought to retain this policy as notified, but support Transpower's requested amendments outlined in S454.053 below. | Allow in part | Amend | Accept in part |
| FS570.1266 | 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 |
| FS346.268 | 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 |
| FS566.1280 | 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 |
| FS569.1302 | 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 |
| S442.063 | Kapiro Conservation Trust | I-P10 | Support in part | Recognise the National Grid is very important. | Amend to reflect that there may be instances in the Coastal Environment where avoidance of indigenous biodiversity may be required | | Reject |
| FS570.1760 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS346.674 | 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 | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|------------|---|--|--|-------------------------------|
| S483.049 | Top Energy Limited | I-P11 | Not Stated | <p>Top Energy supports the ability of tangata whenua to develop land in the Māori Purpose Zone or Treaty Settlement overlay, however Top Energy opposes the avoidance directive in this policy. This is incongruous with the wording of objective I-O6 (including Top Energy's suggested amendments).</p> <p>Furthermore, Top Energy considers that the bar of "does not constrain" is too high. The provision of infrastructure to support the development of that land may lead to some constraints (e.g., the provision of electricity lines to service development on that land may require building setbacks to comply with the necessary safe setback distances in NZECP 34:2001). There is also often an operational and functional need for infrastructure to be located in these areas that needs to be recognised and provided for.</p> | <p>Amend Policy I-P11 as follows: Avoid-Manage new infrastructure where it will unduly compromise the ability to develop and use land in the Māori Purpose zone or in the Treaty Settlement overlay unless the owners of the land agree to the new infrastructure, while recognising and providing for the operational and functional need of infrastructure to locate in these areas.</p> | | Accept in part |
| FS131.012 | Oromahoe Land Owners: AW and DM Simpson, R.A.S Ltd, Arran Trust, Garry Stanners, Errol McIntyre, SW Halliday, SJ and PM Boys, Oromahoe 18R2B2B2 Trust and Tapuaetahi Incorporation | | Oppose | The original submission seeks to reserve the power to develop across whenua Maori for their own interests asides the plans intent to protect Whenua Maori. The current wording is adequate and requires the original submitter to properly engage and consult the land owners and mana whenua. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission (inferred). | Accept in part |
| FS304.009 | Radio New Zealand | | Support | The submitter supports recognition of the functional and operational needs of infrastructure in the policy. | Allow | Allow the original submission. | Accept in part |
| FS345.100 | Ngawha Generation Limited | | Support | NGL is a subsidiary of Top Energy Limited. NGL supports all submission points made by Top Energy. | Allow | Allow all of the relief sought by Top Energy Limited in its submission (S483). | Awaiting recommendation |
| S454.054 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | I-P11 | Not Stated | Transpower supports the inclusion of this policy in the FNPDP, however the policy needs to acknowledge that there may be some occasions where infrastructure can only be located in a particular location due to a functional or operational need. Transpower suggests the policy be amended to reflect this. | <p>Amend I-P11 as follows: Avoid new infrastructure where it will compromise the ability to develop and use land in the Māori Purpose zone or in the Treaty Settlement overlay unless the owners of the land</p> | | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|--|---|---|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | agree to the new infrastructure or there is a functional or operational need for the infrastructure to be located there. | | |
| FS304.002 | Radio New Zealand | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission. | Reject |
| FS369.217 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy seeks to amend this policy to 'manage' new infrastructure to support the development of Māori land. Top Energy supports the proposed amendments recognising a functional or operational need for the infrastructure to be located there. | Allow in part | Amend | Reject |
| S399.029 | Te Hiku Iwi Development Trust | I-P11 | Support | We support the intent of Policy I-P11 to avoid new infrastructure where it will compromise the ability to develop and use land in the Māori Purpose zone or in the Treaty Settlement overlay unless the owners of the land agree to the new infrastructure. | Retain Policy I-P11 | | Accept in part |
| FS369.215 | Top Energy | | Support | Top Energy seeks to amend this policy to 'manage' new infrastructure to support the development of Māori land. | Allow | Retain | Accept in part |
| S421.035 | Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand | I-P11 | Support | Federated Farmers supports Policies I-P1 to I-P6, and I-P8 to IP14 as they are currently worded. | Retain Policy I-P11 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent. | | Accept |
| FS369.216 | Top Energy | | Oppose | Top Energy seeks to amend this policy to 'manage' new infrastructure to support the development of Māori land. | Disallow | Amend | Reject |
| FS570.1267 | 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 |
| FS346.269 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. | | Oppose | The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|--|--|---|-------------------------------|
| FS566.1281 | 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 |
| FS569.1303 | 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 |
| S483.050 | Top Energy Limited | I-P12 | Support | Top Energy supports the recognition of the benefits of new infrastructure, but considers the wording should be "recognise and provide for." | Amend Policy I-P12 as follows: Recognise and provide for the benefits of new technology in infrastructure that ... | | Reject |
| FS131.013 | Oromahoe Land Owners: AW and DM Simpson, R.A.S Ltd, Arran Trust, Garry Stanners, Errol McIntyre, SW Halliday, SJ and PM Boys, Oromahoe 18R2B2B2 Trust and Tapuaetahi Incorporation | | Oppose | The original submission seeks to impose obligations on FNDC and the rate payers to "...provide for...". Recognition" alone is adequate and puts onus back on the original submitter to substantiate benefits over other interests. | Disallow | Retain notified wording of I-P12 (inferred). | Accept |
| FS345.101 | Ngawha Generation Limited | | Support | NGL is a subsidiary of Top Energy Limited. NGL supports all submission points made by Top Energy. | Allow | Allow all of the relief sought by Top Energy Limited in its submission (S483). | Reject |
| S282.025 | Chorus New Zealand Limited, Spark New Zealand Trading Limited, Spark TowerCo Limited, Vodafone New Zealand Limited | I-P12 | Support | The policy recognises that infrastructure technology continues to develop over time. | Retain provision as notified | | Accept |
| FS369.218 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy seeks to amend this policy to recognise "and provide" for the benefits of new technology. | Allow in part | Amend | Accept in part |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|-------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------|
| S356.029 | Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency | I-P12 | Support | Not stated | Retain I-P12 as notified | | Accept |
| FS369.219 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy seeks to amend this policy to recognise "and provide" for the benefits of new technology. | Allow in part | Amend | Accept in part |
| S416.020 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | I-P12 | Support | KiwiRail support policy that recognises the benefits that new technologies can bring to rail in terms of efficiency of the operation and safety and resilience of the network. | Retain Policy I-P12 | | Accept |
| FS369.220 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy seeks to amend this policy to recognise "and provide" for the benefits of new technology. | Allow in part | Amend | Accept in part |
| S421.036 | Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand | I-P12 | Support | Federated Farmers supports Policies I-P1 to I-P6, and I-P8 to IP14 as they are currently worded. | Retain Policy I-P12 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent | | Accept |
| FS369.221 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy seeks to amend this policy to recognise "and provide" for the benefits of new technology. | Allow in part | Amend | Accept in part |
| FS570.1268 | 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 |
| FS346.270 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. | | Oppose | The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Reject |
| FS566.1282 | 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 |
| FS569.1304 | 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 |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|--|--------|-------------------------------|
| S454.055 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | I-P12 | Support | Transpower supports the inclusion of this policy in the FNPDP. | Retain I-P12 | | Accept |
| FS369.222 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy seeks to amend this policy to recognise "and provide" for the benefits of new technology. | Allow in part | Amend | Accept in part |
| FS369.233 | Top Energy | | Support | Top Energy seeks to retain this policy as notified. | Allow | Retain | Accept |
| S356.032 | Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency | I-P13 | Support in part | Whilst Waka Kotahi is not opposed to managing adverse effects, it considers that the policy goes too far to include the "safe and efficient operation of" other infrastructure. | Amend as follows: Manage the adverse effects of infrastructure on the environment by: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. avoiding, remedying or mitigating the adverse effects of substantial upgrades to, or the development of new infrastructure, including effects on: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. natural and physical resources; ii. amenity values; iii. sensitive activities; iv. the safe and efficient operation of other infrastructure; | | Reject |
| S483.051 | Top Energy Limited | I-P13 | Support | <p>Top Energy supports this policy, but considers that the wording of clause IP13a should be amended to enable the full suite of effects management (e.g., including offsetting or compensating) for upgrades and new infrastructure.</p> <p>Top Energy also considers that clause IP13b needs to reference the specific standards and guidelines for electric and magnetic emissions that are considered "recognised standards." If not, Top Energy considers that this policy could be misused or misinterpreted to reference other standards or guidelines that are not actually the ones referenced in the Infrastructure rules.</p> <p>With regard to clause I-P13c, Top Energy has included three other factors that need to be considered in terms of determining whether undergrounding is the most appropriate method of installation of network utilities in the Urban Zones and Settlement zone.</p> | Amend Policy I-P13 as follows: Manage the adverse effects of infrastructure on the environment by: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. avoiding, remedying, or mitigating, offsetting or compensating the adverse effects of substantial upgrades to, or the development of new infrastructure, including effects on ... b. avoiding radio, electric and magnetic emissions that do not meet the recognised standards in New Zealand Standards NZS2772.1: 1999 Radiofrequency fields or guidelines in | | Accept in part |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|---------|---|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | <p>International Commission on Non-Ionising Radiation Protection Guidelines;</p> <p>c. requiring the undergrounding of network utilities in Urban zones and the Settlement zone where it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. it is technically feasible; and ii. it is justified by the extent of adverse visual effects; and iii. it provides for the safety of the community; or iv. it will not result in adverse effects on the environment that are greater than placing the infrastructure above; or there are not natural or physical features or structures that render underground placement impractical or undesirable; or v. there are not significant operational, functional, technical, cultural, historic heritage or economic reasons that require the infrastructure to be above ground. | |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|-------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|
| FS51.21 | Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga | | Oppose | HNZPT opposes the proposed amended relating to the introduction of the wording "offsetting or compensating". The direction through the RMA is for a proposal to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects. HNZPT considers 'offsetting' and 'compensation' are means of mitigation, therefore the addition of these works is considered as unnecessary. | Disallow in part | | Accept in part |
| FS131.014 | Oromahoe Land Owners: AW and DM Simpson, R.A.S Ltd, Arran Trust, Garry Stanners, Errol McIntyre, SW Halliday, SJ and PM Boys, Oromahoe 18R2B2B2 Trust and Tapuaetahi Incorporation | | Oppose | The full suite of effects management "offsetting or compensating" should be the local authorities instruments to utilise and not used by companies as a work around the proposed FNDP constraints. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission (inferred). | Accept in part |
| FS304.0010 | Radio New Zealand | | Support | The submitter supports the submission seeking reference to the recognised standards, noting that RNZ operations already comply with these standards. | Allow | Allow the original submission. | Accept in part |
| FS448.009 | L & T Property Investments Limited | | Oppose | L & T Property Investments Ltd opposes the proposed changes to clause (c) as this only relates to the undergrounding of infrastructure in Urban and Settlement zones, which does not include the Heavy Industry Zone, where the ungrounding of network utilities is equally as necessary in order to facilitate the safe and efficient use of the land and zone outcomes. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS346.060 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. | | Oppose | The amendment sought does not appropriately recognise and provide for s6(a)-(c) matters. | Disallow | Disallow | Accept in part |
| FS345.102 | 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 |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|---|-----------|-----------------|--|--|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| S489.019 | Radio New Zealand | I-P13 | Support | RNZ support this policy. It already complies with recognised standards and guidelines and it is important that all infrastructure providers do so. RNZ suggests it would be appropriate for this policy to recognise that technical, operational and function constraints may mean not all effects can be avoided, remedied or mitigated. Such recognition would align with the similar policy direction in I-P3. | Amend Policy I-P13 to include the following reference: recognising that technical, operational and function constraints may mean not all effects can be avoided, remedied or mitigated. | | Reject |
| FS36.037 | Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency | | Support | Supports recognition of the necessary operational and functional needs of infrastructure. | Allow | Allow the original submission. | Reject |
| FS369.229 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy seeks to amend this policy to apply the NZ standards for radiofrequency fields and provide for offsetting or compensating. Top Energy supports the recognition of the constraints of operational and functional needs. | Allow in part | Amend | Accept in part |
| S511.045 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand | I-P13 | Support in part | It is not clear what types of environments this policy is aimed at given that I-P2 and I-P3 already address the Coastal Environment and SNAs and other important natural and cultural matters outside the Coastal Environment. This policy should appropriately be aimed for infrastructure in general at values that are not covered by I-P2 and I-P3 (and those others recommended by Forest & Bird) Under the RPS infrastructure in general must comply with RPS policies 4.4.1 and 4.6.1 and 4.6.2 | Amend I -P13 Manage the adverse effects of infrastructure on the environment by: a. avoiding, remedying or mitigating the adverse effects of substantial upgrades to, or the development of new infrastructure, including effects on: i. natural and physical resources ; ii. amenity values; iii. sensitive activities; iv. the safe and efficient operation of other infrastructure; v. the health, well-being and safety of people and communities. | | Accept |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|-------------------|--|-----------|----------|--|---|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | b. avoiding radio, electric and magnetic emissions that do not meet the recognised standards or guidelines; c. requiring the undergrounding of network utilities in Urban zones and the Settlement zone where it: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. is technically feasible; ii. is justified by the extent of adverse visual effects; and iii. provides for the safety of the community. | | |
| FS164.045 | Scrumptious Fruit Trust | | Support | Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and secondly as passive recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area. | Allow | Amend HNC overlay to include Taupo Bay; Amend provisions to require strong wildlife protection; Amend provisions to require dogs on leash in beach areas; Adopt SNA and HNC provisions (inferred). | Reject |
| FS570.1616 | 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 |
| FS566.1630 | 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 |
| FS569.1652 | 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 |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|------------|---|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| S431.169 | John Andrew Riddell | I-P13 | Not Stated | Not stated | Amend Policy I-P13 to qualify that it is subject to policies I-P2, I-P3 and I-P6. | | Reject |
| FS332.169 | Russell Protection Society | | Support | The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS369.225 | Top Energy | | Oppose | Top Energy considers that the policies can be applied in the round without inserting cross references. | Disallow | Reject | Accept |
| FS404.059 | Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation | | Support | Improves clarity for plan users and subject to the drafting of I-P2, I-P3 and I-P6 will better align with the higher planning documents. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept |
| S454.056 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | I-P13 | Not Stated | <p>Transpower seeks specific National Grid provisions to give effect to the NPSET. While Transpower supports IP-13 in principle, it does not reflect or give effect to the NPSET and is not specific to the National Grid. It also does not provide the 'seek to avoid' approach required by Policy 8 of the NPSET for the more sensitive environments. The inclusion of National Grid specific policies as discussed in the submission point on I-P2 above provides a comprehensive policy approach that gives effect to the NPSET.</p> <p>For the reasons set out in the submission point on I-P2 above, Transpower supports the exclusion of the National Grid from I-P13 and a new policy specific to the development of the National Grid.</p> | <p>Amend I-P13 as follows: Manage the adverse effects of infrastructure, excluding the National Grid, on the environment by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. avoiding, remedying or mitigating the adverse effects of substantial upgrades to, or the development of new infrastructure, including effects on: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. natural and physical resources; ii. amenity values; iii. sensitive activities; iv. the safe and efficient operation of other infrastructure; v. the health, well-being and safety of people and communities. | | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|-------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|--|--|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | b. avoiding radio, electric and magnetic emissions that do not meet the recognised standards or guidelines; c. requiring the undergrounding of network utilities in Urban zones and the Settlement zone where it: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. is technically feasible; ii. is justified by the extent of adverse visual effects; and d. provides for the safety of the community. Should the National Grid not be excluded from I-P13, Transpower seeks amendment to the policy to give effect to the NPSET. | | |
| FS346.027 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. | | Oppose | Amendment does not clearly recognise and provide for s6(a)-(c) matters. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Accept |
| S421.037 | Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand | I-P13 | Support | Federated Farmers supports Policies I-P1 to I-P6, and I-P8 to IP14 as they are currently worded. | Retain Policy I-P13 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent. | | Accept in part |
| FS369.224 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy seeks to amend this policy to apply the NZ standards for radiofrequency fields and provide for offsetting or compensation. | Allow in part | Amend | Accept in part |
| FS570.1269 | 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 |
| FS346.271 | 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 |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|---|--|-------------------------------|
| FS566.1283 | 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 |
| FS569.1305 | 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 |
| S442.064 | Kapiro Conservation Trust | I-P13 | Support in part | It is not clear what types of environments this policy is aimed at given that I-P2 and I-P3 already address the Coastal Environment and SNAs and other important natural and cultural matters outside the Coastal Environment. This policy should appropriately be aimed for infrastructure in general at values that are not covered by I-P2 and I-P3 (and those others recommended by Forest & Bird) Under the RPS infrastructure in general must comply with RPS policies 4.4.1 and 4.6.1 and 4.6.2. | Amend I -P13 Manage the adverse effects of infrastructure on the environment by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. avoiding, remedying or mitigating the adverse effects of substantial upgrades to, or the development of new infrastructure, including effects on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. natural and physical resources; ii. amenity values; iii. sensitive activities; iv. the safe and efficient operation of other infrastructure; v. the health, well-being and safety of people and communities. b. avoiding radio, electric and magnetic emissions that do not meet the recognised standards or guidelines; c. requiring the undergrounding of network utilities in Urban zones and the Settlement zone where it: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. is technically feasible; | | Accept |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|--|---|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | ii. is justified by the extent of adverse visual effects; and iii. provides for the safety of the community. | | |
| FS369.226 | Top Energy | | Oppose | Top Energy considers that the policies can be applied in the round without inserting cross references. | Disallow | Reject | Reject |
| FS570.1761 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept |
| FS346.675 | 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 |
| S463.016 | Waiaua Bay Farm Limited | I-P13 | Support | WBF considers this policy provides appropriately balanced guidance for the management of effects associated with infrastructure development or upgrades. | Retain Policy I-P13 | | Accept in part |
| FS369.228 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy seeks to amend this policy to apply the NZ standards for radiofrequency fields and provide for offsetting or compensation. | Allow in part | Amend | Accept in part |
| S463.017 | Waiaua Bay Farm Limited | I-P14 | Oppose | Sub-clauses (a) to (m) are a list of assessment matters that are inappropriate to be included in a policy. They do not provide direction about how to achieve the overarching objectives (I-O4, I-O5). WBF recommends deletion of the policy and reliance on Policy I-P13 instead. If necessary, the assessment criteria can be relocated to rules and standards of the infrastructure chapter | Delete Policy I-P14 | | Reject |
| FS91.5 | Moana Kiff | | Oppose | "We strongly support the inclusion of policy I-P14 in the district plan. This policy is crucial in ensuring the infrastructure development is carefully managed to address the effects of activities requiring resource consent. It provides a comprehensive framework that considers critical factors such as environmental impacts and cultural values. Deleting this policy could lead to fragmentation and confusion in addressing these crucial matters." | Disallow | | Accept |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|------------|---|---|---|-------------------------------|
| FS369.234 | Top Energy | | Oppose | Top Energy seeks to retain this policy as notified. | Disallow | Retain | Accept |
| S454.057 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | I-P14 | Not Stated | <p>Transpower seeks specific National Grid provisions to give effect to the NPSET. While Transpower supports IP-13 in principle, it does not reflect or give effect to the NPSET and is not specific to the National Grid. It also does not provide the 'seek to avoid' approach required by Policy 8 of the NPSET for the more sensitive environments. The inclusion of National Grid specific policies as discussed in the submission point on I-P2 above provides a comprehensive policy approach that gives effect to the NPSET.</p> <p>For the reasons set out in the submission point on I-P2 above, Transpower supports the exclusion of the National Grid from I-P13 and a new policy specific to the development of the National Grid.</p> | <p>Amend I-P14 as follows: Manage infrastructure, excluding the National Grid, to address the effects of the activity requiring resource consent, including (but not limited to) consideration of the following matters where relevant to the application ...</p> | | Reject |
| FS346.028 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. | | Oppose | Forest & Bird seeks to ensure that effects on s6(a)-(c) matters are appropriately managed. It is not clear that the amendment sought will achieve that. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Accept |
| S356.033 | Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency | I-P14 | Oppose | It is unclear what this policy is setting out to achieve as it has been duplicated in I-P13 above. It is considered better that this be located within the rules or assessment criteria than as a policy. | Delete I-P14 | | Reject |
| FS369.231 | Top Energy | | Oppose | Top Energy seeks to retain this policy as notified. | Disallow | Retain | Accept |
| S421.038 | Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand | I-P14 | Support | Federated Farmers supports Policies I-P1 to I-P6, and I-P8 to IP14 as they are currently worded. | Retain Policy I-P14 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent. | | Accept |
| FS369.232 | Top Energy | | Support | Top Energy seeks to retain this policy as notified. | Allow | Retain | Accept |
| FS570.1270 | 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 |
| FS346.272 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection | | Oppose | The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|-------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|--|--|-------------------------------|
| | Society of New Zealand Inc. | | | give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS. | | | |
| FS566.1284 | 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 |
| FS569.1306 | 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 |
| S489.020 | Radio New Zealand | I-P14 | Support | RNZ supports this policy, particularly (m), (n) and (o). | Retain Policy I-P14 | | Accept in part |
| FS369.235 | Top Energy | | Support | Top Energy seeks to retain this policy as notified. | Allow | Retain | Accept in part |
| S483.052 | Top Energy Limited | I-P14 | Support | Top Energy supports this policy which provides clarity about some relevant matters to be considered in resource consent applications under the Infrastructure Chapter. | Retain Policy I-P14 | | Accept in part |
| FS345.103 | 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 |
| S358.026 | Leah Frieling | Rules | Oppose | The current bylaws are not being enforced for the drainage districts. | Amend the Infrastructure section, by adding rules: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> providing for existing mapped Council drainage district drains, to ensure the ability to clean, unblock access and service the drainage channels in the Kaitaia, Waiharara/Kaikino and Motutangi drainage areas, as defined in the Far North Land Drainage Bylaw 2019. to stop buildings being built within 10m of the drains as per the bylaws. | | Reject |
| S547.038 | LJ King Limited | Rules | Oppose | We seek some rules under the District Plan for the existing mapped drainage district drains, as the draft management plan 2017 and current bylaws are not being enforced for the drainage districts. And, rules within the bylaws should be included under drainage districts ie; 10 meter setback for buildings. | Amend the Infrastructure section, by adding rules: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> providing for existing mapped Council drainage district drains, to ensure the ability to clean, unblock access and | | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|---|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | <p>service the drainage channels in the Kaitaia, Waiharara/Kaikino and Motutangi drainage areas, as defined in the Far North Land Drainage Bylaw 2019.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> to stop buildings being built within 10m of the drains as per the bylaws. | |
| S541.028 | Elbury Holdings | Rules | Oppose | We seek some rules under the District Plan for the existing mapped drainage district drains, as the draft management plan 2017 and current bylaws are not being enforced for the drainage districts. And, rules within the bylaws should be included under drainage districts ie; 10 meter setback for buildings. | <p>Amend the Infrastructure section, by adding rules:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> providing for existing mapped Council drainage district drains, to ensure the ability to clean, unblock access and service the drainage channels in the Kaitaia, Waiharara/Kaikino and Motutangi drainage areas, as defined in the Far North Land Drainage Bylaw 2019. to stop buildings being built within 10m of the drains as per the bylaws. | Reject |
| FS155.37 | Fiona King | | Support | | Allow | Reject |
| S485.047 | Elbury Holdings | Rules | Oppose | Seek some rules under the District Plan for the existing mapped drainage district drains, as the draft management plan 2017 and current bylaws are not being enforced for the drainage districts. And, rules within the bylaws should be included under drainage districts ie; 10 meter setback for buildings. | <p>Amend the Infrastructure section, by adding rules:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> providing for existing mapped Council drainage district drains, to ensure the ability to clean, unblock access and service the drainage channels in the Kaitaia, Waiharara/Kaikino and Motutangi drainage areas, as defined in the Far North Land Drainage Bylaw 2019. to stop buildings being built within 10m of the drains as per the bylaws. | Reject |
| FS155.38 | Fiona King | | Support | | Allow | Reject |
| S472.026 | Michael Foy | Rules | Support in part | We seek some rules under the District Plan for the existing mapped drainage district drains, as the current bylaws are not being enforced for the drainage districts. | Amend the Infrastructure section, by rules providing for existing mapped Council drainage district drains, to ensure the ability to clean, unblock access and service the drainage channels in the Kaitaia, Waiharara/Kaikino and Motutangi drainage areas, as defined in the Far North Land Drainage Bylaw 2019. | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|---|-----------|-----------------|---|---|--|-------------------------------|
| FS258.3 | logan king | | Support | | Allow | | Reject |
| S521.010 | Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK) | Rules | Support in part | The PDP should require all new buildings to store/use roof water wherever possible, to avoid the need for expensive reticulation systems and reduce the need for water top-ups via water tankers. New buildings connected to a public water supply should be required to collect roof water in storage vessels to use for gardens and flushing toilets (at minimum) and contribute to other household water uses such as laundry connections. Water storage vessels do not need to be a traditional round tank - other useful shapes exist, such as rectangular upright vessels that are easy to install against the side of a house or garage, or short flat vessels designed to be completely buried underground or placed under the foundations of new builds. Greywater harvesting and re-use should also be required for new buildings. These types of water-saving measures would also reduce future Council infrastructure costs for additional water supplies and wastewater. | Amend PDP to require best practice water-sensitive, low-impact designs and measures for all stormwater and wastewater engineering, infrastructure and related development, to prevent problems associated with more extreme rainfall events in future, including provision to implement relevant parts of NPS-FM. | | Reject |
| FS196.16 | Joe Carr | | Support in part | I support this submission but want the word 'best' to be replaced with 'good'. | Allow in part | | Reject |
| FS566.1720 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| S472.027 | Michael Foy | Rules | Not Stated | We seek some rules under the District Plan for the existing mapped drainage district drains, as the current bylaws are not being enforced for the drainage districts | Insert rule (inferred) to stop buildings being built within 10m of the drains as per the bylaws. | | Reject |
| FS259.4 | Leah Frieling | | Support | | Allow | | Reject |
| FS542.052 | Foodstuffs North Island Limited | | Support in part | Foodstuffs supports amendments to provide for extensions and alterations. | Allow in part | Amend to provide for extensions and alterations. | Accept in part |
| S529.237 | Carbon Neutral NZ Trust | Rules | Not Stated | Stormwater and wastewater should be fully managed to avoid sediment/pollutants being carried to waterways and wetlands, especially during high rainfall events which are expected to become more extreme due to climate change. Under s7(i) of the RMA, councils must have particular regard to the effects of climate change. In general, water sensitive and low impact designs | Amend the plan so that water sensitive and low impact designs are a standard requirement. | | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|--|---|-------------------------------|
| | | | | should be a standard requirement, not just encouraged. For example, stormwater and water from wastewater disposal fields can carry pollutants and silt into waterways during high rainfall events. They should not be discharged directly into waterways but be retained in constructed wetlands (vegetated retention ponds) or other water sensitive and low impacts features. | | | |
| FS36.038 | Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency | | Support in part | Support water sensitive and low impact designs where possible, however request to be involved in the drafting of any additional rules to ensure rules are practicable and operationally achievable. | Allow in part | Waka Kotahi seeks to be involved in any redrafting of stormwater rules. | Accept in part |
| FS570.2124 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS566.2138 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS569.2160 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| S483.060 | Top Energy Limited | Rules | Not Stated | <p>Permitted activity status for the upgrade of existing above ground network utilities in all zones is supported by Top Energy. However, the rule contains a number of arbitrary numbers in performance standards making this rule of limited use in terms of enabling upgrades to existing above ground network utilities which are required to ensure this lifeline service to the communities is functional and resilient.</p> <p>On review of the s32 analysis for the Infrastructure Chapter, there is no assessment of the proposed rule framework or any justification for the thresholds, making it difficult to understand what has informed them, and what actual effect they are intended to manage. While it appears some changes may have been made to try and make this provision clearer, it is still cumbersome, non-sensical and unnecessarily restrictive.</p> <p>All of Top Energy's network utility infrastructure would either be captured as a structure or building under this rule as notified. To avoid confusion and unnecessary technical terminology, Top Energy considers that performance standards should be simplified and has</p> | <p>Delete Rule I-R3 and insert new rules as follows:</p> <p>Upgrading of existing above ground network utilities</p> <p>Activity status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>General</p> <p>PER-1</p> <p>The upgrade of network utility structures or buildings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> is within 5m of the existing alignment location of the original structure or building; does not increase the gross floor area by more than 30 | | Accept in part |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | <p>suggested wording primarily based on baseline thresholds for 'structures' and 'building' bottom lines in terms of overall degree of change noting that this rule relates to upgrades of existing infrastructure present on the landscape.</p> <p>Top Energy considers that the amendments sought remove some of the cross over between provisions (e.g. PER- 1, noting that all infrastructure referenced is manmade and fixed to land in some way) and streamlines the provisions to make it clearer to the user what is provided for.).</p> <p>For the same reasons as noted above, Top Energy considers the appropriate activity status for non-compliance with performance standards should be restricted discretionary as any adverse effects resulting from upgrades to existing infrastructure can readily be managed by well-considered matters of discretion, given that in the case of this rule, the activity already exists and given the threshold, upgrades will be minor in nature and largely relate to visual amenity.</p> <p>Top Energy considers that this amendment sought results in a more sensible approach (and better alignment) when considering that new overhead lines are provided for in some zones as a permitted activity (e.g., I-R6) and as a restricted discretionary activity in others (e.g., I-R15).</p> | <p>percent in a 10 year period if it is a building;</p> <p>3. complies with the zone's permitted setback standards if it is a building; and</p> <p>4. does not result in an increase to the diameter of a replacement pipe by more than 300mm.</p> <p>PER-2</p> <p>The activity complies with standards:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I-S1 Radio frequency fields; and 2. I-S2 Electric and magnetic fields. <p>Electricity</p> <p>PER-3</p> <p>In addition to PER 1 and PER 2, the upgrade of electricity network utilities structures or buildings must not result in:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Pole or tower height that exceeds 25m above ground level; 2. More than two additional poles; and 3. Additional towers. <p>PER-4</p> | |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|--|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | <p>1. Additional cross arms must not exceed a length of more than 4m;</p> <p>Gas</p> <p>PER-5</p> <p>In addition to PER 1 and PER 2, the realignment, relocation or replacement of a gas transmission line is within:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. an existing easement in favour of the pipeline; 2. 12m of the existing alignment or location <p>Telecommunications</p> <p>PER-6</p> <p>In addition to PER 1 and PER 2</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A replacement panel antenna does not increase the face area by more than 20 percent in a 10 year period. 2. A replacement dish antenna does not increase in diameter by more than 20 percent in a 10 year period. <p>Activity Status where compliance not achieved with PER 1, PER 3 - PER 6:</p> <p>Restricted Discretionary</p> | |
| FS242.3 | Garry Stanners | | Oppose | The case of this rule, the activity already exists and given the | Disallow | Accept in part |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|---|-----------|-----------------|--|--|---|-------------------------------|
| | | | | threshold, upgrades will be minor in nature and largely relate to visual amenity | | | |
| FS351.016 | A.W and D.M Simpson | | Oppose | Far to restrictive on existing building platforms and future developments this will ultimately result in major conflict | Disallow | Retain as notified by PDP and inline with WDP which Top Energy consistently refers back to. | Accept in part |
| FS371.016 | Oromahoe 18R2B2B2 Trust and its associated Hapu, Ngati Kawa, Te Ngare Hauata, Te Matarahurahu, Te Whanaurara, Ngati Kaihoru, Ngati Rahiri | | Oppose | Far too restricting on existing building platforms and future developments, ultimately resulting in conflict. | Disallow | Status Quo. No change to wording or PDP. | Accept in part |
| FS448.011 | L & T Property Investments Limited | | Oppose | L & T Property Investments Ltd opposes the proposed changes to I-R3. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS345.111 | 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 |
| S431.170 | John Andrew Riddell | Rules | Not Stated | The amendment is necessary in order to achieve the purpose of the Act. | Amend all infrastructure rules to provide for more stringent requirements where any of the matters of national importance in section 6 of the Act apply. | | Accept |
| FS332.170 | Russell Protection Society | | Support | The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept |
| FS404.060 | Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation | | Support in part | The D-G supports revision of these policies to better recognise and provide for the matters of national importance in section 6 of the Act, subject to the detailed drafting. | Allow | Allow in part the original submission | Accept in part |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|------------|--|---|-------------------------------|
| S331.017 | Ministry of Education Te Tahuu o Te Mātauranga | Rules | Not Stated | <p>The submitter requests that educational facilities are provided for within the district plan as a permitted activity in the Infrastructure Chapter (and subsequently removed from the relevant zoning chapters). The new provision would recognise that education is a fundamental human right and educational facilities are a crucial form of social infrastructure that is needed to support local communities and their social and economic wellbeing. Council has an obligation under the NPS-UD to ensure sufficient additional infrastructure (which includes social infrastructure like schools) is provided in development and local authorities must be satisfied that additional infrastructure to service the development capacity is likely to be available (see Policy 10 and 3.5 of Subpart 1 of Part 3: Implementation, in particular). Enabling educational facilities as a permitted activity will allow better servicing the growth of the Far North District and support the local communities' needs, particularly in residential areas.</p> <p>Furthermore, educational facilities should be provided for in the Rural Zones to allow the Ministry to provide schools to support existing rural communities. This will support active modes of transport and reduce trip lengths and times thereby reducing carbon emissions. They should be enabled in these zones as educational facilities are considered essential social infrastructure. Matters of discretion when the activity cannot comply with the permitted standards should be limited to matters of relevance.</p> | <p>Insert a new provision as follows:</p> <p>Educational Facilities</p> <p>Activity status: Permitted All zones</p> <p>Excludes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Light Industrial zone Heavy Industrial zone Natural Open Space zone Open Space zone Sport and Active Recreation zone Horticulture Processing Facilities zone <p>Advice note: rules related to the excluded zones are included in the relevant zoning chapter</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>PER-1 (1)</p> <p>The activity complies with the following relevant development standards for the underlying zone:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Noise b) Height in relation to boundary c) Setbacks <p>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-1: Restricted Discretionary</p> | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|--------------------|---|-----------|-----------------|---|--|---|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | <p>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Design and layout b) Transport safety and efficiency c) Scale of activity and hours of operation d) Infrastructure servicing e) Potential reverse sensitivity effects on rural production operations. | | |
| ThFS354.075 | Horticulture New Zealand | | Oppose | The submitter requests that educational facilities are provided for within the district plan as a permitted activity in the Infrastructure Chapter (and subsequently removed from the relevant zoning chapters). HortNZ opposes this approach as it is important that the effects of the activity in the context of each zone are considered. | Disallow | Disallow S331.017 | Accept |
| FS354.076 | Horticulture New Zealand | | Support in part | HortNZ supports a permitted activity rule for earthworks within the National Grid Yard that complies with NZECP34:2001 and a default to restricted discretionary. | Allow in part | Allow S454.103 and include a permitted activity rule for earthworks within the National Grid Yard that complies with NZECP34:2001 | Accept in part |
| FS369.236 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy acknowledges the importance of enabling the establishment of Transmission Lines and the National Grid. Top Energy sought to amend R15 to include Rural Lifestyle Zone. | Allow in part | Amend | Accept in part |
| S522.033 | Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK) | Rules | Support in part | Having relevant infrastructure in place should be a prerequisite for future development. The provision of necessary infrastructure must be high priority in PDP policies/rules. Given the Council's funding constraints, we consider that developers should normally be required to provide the necessary infrastructure, | Amend the rules to emphasise the requirement for developer input for infrastructure servicing private land use and subdivision. | | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|---|-----------|-----------------|---|---|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | including items such as on-site community wastewater systems | | | |
| FS403.027 | Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora | | Support in part | Te Whatu Ora support the review of the suite of commercial zones proposed and zoning that reflects commercial development. | Allow in part | Te Whatu Ora support the review of the suite of commercial zones proposed and zoning that reflects commercial development. | Accept in part |
| FS566.1772 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| S338.010 | Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust | Rules | Not Stated | Having relevant infrastructure in place should be a prerequisite for future development. The provision of necessary infrastructure must be high priority in PDP policies/rules. Given the Council's funding constraints, we consider that developers should normally be required to provide the necessary infrastructure, including items such as on-site community wastewater systems. | Amend the rules to emphasise the requirement for developer input for infrastructure servicing private land use and subdivision. | | Reject |
| FS570.951 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS566.965 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS569.987 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| S529.010 | Carbon Neutral NZ Trust | Rules | Support in part | Having relevant infrastructure in place should be a prerequisite for future development. The provision of necessary infrastructure must be high priority in PDP policies/rules. Given the Council's funding constraints, we consider that developers should normally be required to provide the necessary infrastructure, including items such as on-site community wastewater systems. | Amend the rules to emphasise the requirement for developer input for infrastructure servicing private land use and subdivision. | | Reject |
| FS570.1900 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|--|---|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| FS566.1914 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS569.1936 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| S529.240 | Carbon Neutral NZ Trust | Rules | Support in part | <p>The disposal of wastewater from sewage treatment plants into wetlands and water bodies has been a matter of concern to communities for some time. The Council's Infrastructure Committee requested further investigation of disposal-to-land options for several wastewater schemes, and requested a wastewater disposal-to-land workshop in late 2021 to cover methodologies and processes associated with establishing a disposal-to-land scheme</p> <p>The PDP should include provisions to encourage and progressively require disposal-to-land wastewater treatment methods (based on coagulation and flocculation) and ensure the responsible use of solid waste from treatment plants as fertilizer and the use of wastewater for irrigation purposes.</p> | Insert provisions to encourage and progressively require disposal-to-land wastewater treatment methods (based on coagulation and flocculation) and ensure the responsible use of solid waste from treatment plants as fertilizer and the use of wastewater for irrigation purposes. | | Reject |
| FS570.2127 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS566.2141 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS569.2163 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| S483.067 | Top Energy Limited | Rules | Support | <p>Top Energy supports the provision for substations in the Rural Production and Rural Lifestyle Zones as a permitted activity, but suggests the inclusion of an additional rule which provides for subdivisions in the Rural Production and Rural Lifestyle, where contained within a building that complies with the building and structure performance standards of the underlying zone.</p> <p>The reasoning for this is that where intensification is promoted, additional substations may be required in urban settings.</p> <p>The main concerns associated with substations relate to visual amenity, noise, radio frequency and electric</p> | Retain Rule R-10 as notified and include an additional rule for substations in zones other than Rural Production and Rural Lifestyle as a permitted activity where located within a building that complies with the relevant performance standards of the underlying zone, I-S1 and I-S2 and the thresholds contained within I-R10 PER-1. | | Accept in part |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|------------|--|--|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | and magnetic field. These days, it is common for modern substations to be fully housed in buildings that can be designed to be appropriate for an urban setting from a visual perspective. Noise would be managed through the District Wide Chapter, and compliance with I-S1 and I-S2 can be relied on to address any remaining potential effects. Given that these matters can be readily managed, an additional Rule providing for such an activity in zones other than Rural Production and Rural Lifestyle is considered to more appropriate than the discretionary status that would otherwise apply by default. | | | |
| FS345.118 | 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 |
| S483.075 | Top Energy Limited | Rules | Not Stated | <p>Top Energy seeks a restricted discretionary activity status for new above ground customer connections outside of those provided for as a permitted activity by I-R5 (as well as the additional zones noted in submission).</p> <p>There is no provision for this activity otherwise and assumedly, this results in a default to discretionary activity which does not align I-R15 which provides for new overhead lines in all zones other than Rural Production and Māori Purpose zone as a permitted threshold with no height limits.</p> | Insert an additional restricted discretionary activity rule for new above ground customer connections in all zones other than those covered in Rule I-R5. | | Accept in part |
| FS345.126 | 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 |
| S464.042 | LJ King Ltd | Rules | Oppose | Seek some rules under the District Plan for the existing mapped drainage district drains, as the draft management plan 2017 and current bylaws are not being enforced for the drainage districts and, rules within the bylaws should be included under drainage districts i.e. 10 meter setback for buildings. | <p>Amend the Infrastructure section, by adding rules providing for existing mapped Council drainage district drains, to ensure the ability to clean, unblock access and service the drainage channels in the Kaitaia, Waiharara/Kaikino and Motutangi drainage areas, as defined in the Far North District Council Land Drainage Bylaw 2019 and the Draft Management Plan 2017.</p> <p>Amend to stop buildings being built within 10m of the drains as per the bylaws.</p> | | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|--|---|---|-------------------------------|
| FS566.1585 | 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 |
| S543.038 | LJ King Limited | Rules | Oppose | We seek some rules under the District Plan for the existing mapped drainage district drains, as the draft management plan 2017 and current bylaws are not being enforced for the drainage districts and, rules within the bylaws should be included under drainage districts i.e. 10 meter setback for buildings. | Amend the Infrastructure section, by adding rules providing for existing mapped Council drainage district drains, to ensure the ability to clean, unblock access and service the drainage channels in the Kaitaia, Waiharara/Kaikino and Motutangi drainage areas, as defined in the Far North District Council Land Drainage Bylaw 2019 and the Draft Management Plan 2017. Amend to stop buildings being built within 10m of the drains as per the bylaws. | | Reject |
| FS566.2199 | 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 |
| S449.011 | Kapiro Conservation Trust | Rules | Support in part | Having relevant infrastructure in place should be a prerequisite for future development. The provision of necessary infrastructure must be high priority in PDP policies/rules. Given the Council's funding constraints, we consider that developers should normally be required to provide the necessary infrastructure, including items such as on-site community wastewater systems. | Amend the rules to emphasise the requirement for developer input for infrastructure servicing private land use and subdivision. | | Reject |
| FS569.1810 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | | Reject |
| FS570.1827 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | | Reject |
| S483.053 | Top Energy Limited | Notes | Not Stated | Clarity is needed within the Chapter in terms of what happens where there is overlap between chapters and how the chapter interacts with the Part 3 - Area Specific Matters. With regards to the sensitive environment overlays, the How the Plan Works Chapter indicates that if not specified, the activity is permitted unless otherwise stated. However, this is not made clear in the Chapter and given the importance of this (and for consistency), to assist Plan users, Note 1 | Amend to specify that this chapter supersedes/takes precedence over Part 3 - Area Specific Matters. | | Accept |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|--------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | should be extended to re-iterate this (see sub# 19 also). Top Energy also highlight that Note 5 means that I-R11, I-R12, and I-R13 would only apply to network utility operators and have commented on this in the submission. | | | |
| ConFS78.043 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | | Support | The submitter supports this submission because it will improve the clarity of the proposed plan. | Allow | Allow the original submission. | Accept |
| FS345.104 | 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 |
| S483.054 | Top Energy Limited | Notes | Not Stated | Clarity is needed within the Chapter in terms of what happens where there is overlap between chapters and how the chapter interacts with the Part 3 - Area Specific Matters. With regards to the sensitive environment overlays, the How the Plan Works Chapter indicates that if not specified, the activity is permitted unless otherwise stated. However, this is not made clear in the Chapter, and given the importance of this (and for consistency), to assist Plan users, Note 1 should be extended to re-iterate this (see sub# 19 also). Top Energy also highlight that Note 5 means that I-R11, I-R12, and I-R13 would only apply to network utility operators, and have commented on this in the submission. | Amend to specify that overlays only manage infrastructure building and structures and that the activities in the Infrastructure Chapter are permitted in the overlays except where more stringent building and structure controls apply subject to amendments sought in the overlays. | | Accept in part |
| FS78.044 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | | Support | The submitter supports this submission because it will improve the clarity of the proposed plan. | Allow | Allow the original submission. | Accept in part |
| FS345.105 | 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 |
| S511.046 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection | Notes | Support in part | Note 1 only refers to other District Wide Matters as potentially applying. It should say that Area Specific Matters may apply as well. | Amend to include reference "Area-Specific Matters Chapter". | | Accept in part |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|-------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|-------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|
| | Society of New Zealand | | | | | | |
| FS164.046 | Scrumptious Fruit Trust | | Support | <p>Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and secondly as passive recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery.</p> <p>The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.</p> | Allow | Amend HNC overlay to include Taupo Bay; Amend provisions to require strong wildlife protection; Amend provisions to require dogs on leash in beach areas; Adopt SNA and HNC provisions (inferred). | Accept in part |
| FS369.237 | Top Energy | | Support in part | <p>Top Energy considers that clarity is needed between District Wide Matters and Overlays in particular, the Infrastructure Notes should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specify that the Infrastructure chapter supersedes/takes precedence over Part 3 – Area Specific Matters. Specify that overlays only manage infrastructure buildings and structures. Specify that that the activities in the Infrastructure Chapter are permitted in the overlays except where more stringent building and structure controls apply (subject to amendments sought in the overlays). | Allow in part | Amend | Accept in part |
| FS570.1617 | 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 |
| FS566.1631 | 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 |
| FS569.1653 | 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 |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|-------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------|
| S442.065 | Kapiro Conservation Trust | Notes | Support in part | Note 1 only refers to other District Wide Matters as potentially applying. It should say that Area Specific Matters may apply as well. | Amend to include reference "Area-Specific Matters Chapter". | | Accept |
| FS570.1762 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept |
| FS346.676 | 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 |
| S416.021 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | I-R1 | Support | KiwiRail support the permitted activity status of the operation, maintenance, repair, and removal of existing rail infrastructure subject to standards. | Retain Rule I-R1 | | Accept |
| FS369.238 | Top Energy | | Support | Top Energy seeks to retain this rule as notified. | Allow | Retain | Accept |
| S454.059 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | I-R1 | Support | Although of limited relevance to Transpower given the NESETA, Transpower supports I-R1. | Retain I-R1 | | Accept |
| FS369.239 | Top Energy | | Support | Top Energy seeks to retain this rule as notified. | Allow | Retain | Accept |
| S489.021 | Radio New Zealand | I-R1 | Support | Although RNZ's activities are authorised by designations, RNZ support a permitted activity standard for existing above or underground network utilities. | Retain Rule I-R1 | | Accept |
| FS369.241 | Top Energy | | Support | Top Energy seeks to retain this rule as notified. | Allow | Retain | Accept |
| S483.057 | Top Energy Limited | I-R1 | Support | Top Energy supports the permitted activity status for operation, maintenance, repair and removal of existing above ground network utilities in all zones noting the amendments sought for noncompliance with I-S1 and I-S2 | Retain Rule I-R1 | | Accept |
| FS345.108 | 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 |
| S483.058 | Top Energy Limited | I-R2 | Support | Top Energy supports the permitted activity status for new underground network utilities, and upgrade to existing underground network utilities in all zones noting the previous submission point seeking a | Retain Rule I-R2 | | Accept |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|-------------------|--|-----------|------------|---|---|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | definition of customer connection be included and for non-compliance with I-S1 and I-S2. Top Energy also supports retaining rules pertaining to Notable Trees in the Notable Trees section noting comments made as part of this submission on the Notable Trees Chapter. Top Energy also support providing a clear link to relevant provisions within other chapters and considers that this is a useful inclusion for plan users, and helpful in terms of understanding integration of the Plan. Top Energy suggest that this approach be taken consistently throughout the plan. | | | |
| FS448.0010 | L & T Property Investments Limited | | Support | L & T Property Investments Ltd supports the permitted activity status for undergrounding infrastructure. | Allow | Retain Rule I-R2 | Accept |
| FS345.109 | 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 |
| S416.022 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | I-R2 | Support | KiwiRail support the ability to install new, and upgrade existing underground infrastructure as a permitted activity, subject to standards. | Retain Rule I-R2 | | Accept |
| FS369.242 | Top Energy | | Support | Top Energy seeks to retain this rule as notified. | Allow | Retain | Accept |
| S454.060 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | I-R2 | Support | Transpower supports the inclusion of this rule in the FNPDP. | Retain I-R2 | | Accept |
| FS369.243 | Top Energy | | Support | Top Energy seeks to retain this rule as notified. | Allow | Retain | Accept |
| S431.115 | John Andrew Riddell | I-R3 | Not Stated | The amendment is necessary in order to achieve the purpose of the Act. | Amend the rule so that any proposal to set a building or structure less than 20 metres back from the coastal marine area, or from rivers and banks is a non-complying activity. | | Reject |
| FS332.115 | Russell Protection Society | | Support | The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds. | Allow | Allow the original submission. | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|------------|--|---|-------------------------------|
| S483.059 | Top Energy Limited | I-R3 | Not Stated | <p>Permitted activity status for the upgrade of existing above ground network utilities in all zones is supported by Top Energy. However, the rule contains a number of arbitrary numbers in performance standards making this rule of limited use in terms of enabling upgrades to existing above ground network utilities which are required to ensure this lifeline service to the communities is functional and resilient.</p> <p>On review of the s32 analysis for the Infrastructure Chapter, there is no assessment of the proposed rule framework or any justification for the thresholds, making it difficult to understand what has informed them, and what actual effect they are intended to manage. While it appears some changes may have been made to try and make this provision clearer, it is still cumbersome, non-sensical and unnecessarily restrictive.</p> <p>All of Top Energy's network utility infrastructure would either be captured as a structure or building under this rule as notified. To avoid confusion and unnecessary technical terminology, Top Energy considers that performance standards should be simplified and has suggested wording primarily based on baseline thresholds for 'structures' and 'building' bottom lines in terms of overall degree of change noting that this rule relates to upgrades of existing infrastructure present on the landscape.</p> <p>Top Energy considers that the amendments sought remove some of the cross over between provisions (e.g. PER- 1, noting that all infrastructure referenced is manmade and fixed to land in some way) and streamlines the provisions to make it clearer to the user what is provided for.)</p> <p>For the same reasons as noted above, Top Energy considers the appropriate activity status for non-compliance with performance standards should be restricted discretionary as any adverse effects resulting from upgrades to existing infrastructure can readily be managed by well-considered matters of discretion, given that in the case of this rule, the activity already exists and given the threshold, upgrades will be minor in nature and largely relate to visual amenity.</p> | <p>Delete Rule I-R3 and insert new rules as follows:</p> <p>Upgrading of existing above ground network utilities</p> <p>Activity status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>General</p> <p>PER-1</p> <p>The upgrade of network utility structures or buildings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. is within 5m of the existing alignment location of the original structure or building; 2. does not increase the gross floor area by more than 30 percent in a 10 year period if it is a building; 3. complies with the zone's permitted setback standards if it is a building; and 4. does not result in an increase to the diameter of a replacement pipe by more than 300mm. <p>PER-2</p> <p>The activity complies with standards:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I-S1 Radio frequency fields; and 2. I-S2 Electric and magnetic fields. <p>Electricity</p> <p>PER-3</p> | Accept in part |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|--|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | <p>Top Energy considers that this amendment sought results in a more sensible approach (and better alignment) when considering that new overhead lines are provided for in some zones as a permitted activity (e.g., I-R6) and as a restricted discretionary activity in others (e.g., I-R15).</p> | <p>In addition to PER 1 and PER 2, the upgrade of electricity network utilities structures or buildings must not result in:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Pole or tower height that exceeds 25m above ground level; 2. More than two additional poles; and 3. Additional towers. <p>PER-4</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Additional cross arms must not exceed a length of more than 4m; <p>Gas</p> <p>PER-5</p> <p>In addition to PER 1 and PER 2, the realignment, relocation or replacement of a gas transmission line is within:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. an existing easement in favour of the pipeline; 2. 12m of the existing alignment or location <p>Telecommunications</p> <p>PER-6</p> <p>In addition to PER 1 and PER 2</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A replacement panel antenna does not increase the face area by more than 20 percent in a 10 year period. 2. A replacement dish antenna does not increase in diameter by more | |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | than 20 percent in a 10 year period. Activity Status where compliance not achieved with PER 1, PER 3 - PER 6: Restricted Discretionary | | |
| FS354.077 | Horticulture New Zealand | | Oppose | The standards for upgrades need to be clear and ensure that they will not adversely affect other parties. The changes sought do not appear to achieve those outcomes. | Disallow | Disallow S483.059 | Accept in part |
| FS345.110 | 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 |
| S416.023 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | I-R3 | Support | KiwiRail support the ability to upgrade existing infrastructure as a permitted activity, subject to standards. | Retain Rule I-R3 | | Accept in part |
| FS369.244 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy seeks to amend the rule to provide for upgrading as a permitted activity. | Allow in part | Amend | Accept in part |
| S454.061 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | I-R3 | Support | Although of limited relevance to Transpower given the NESETA, Transpower supports I-R3. | Retain I-R3 | | Accept in part |
| FS369.245 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy seeks to amend the rule to provide for upgrading as a permitted activity. | Allow in part | Accept in part | Accept in part |
| S489.022 | Radio New Zealand | I-R3 | Support | Although RNZ's activities are authorised by designations, RNZ support a permitted activity rule for upgrading existing above ground network utilities in the event new equipment not authorised by the designations is required. | Retain Rule I-R3 | | Accept in part |
| FS369.246 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy seeks to amend the rule to provide for upgrading as a permitted activity. | Allow in part | Amend | Accept in part |
| S483.061 | Top Energy Limited | I-R4 | Support | Top Energy supports this rule, noting sub#48 regarding activity status for noncompliance with I-S1 and I-S2. | Retain Rule I-R4 | | Accept |
| FS351.017 | A.W and D.M Simpson | | Oppose | Top energy is encroaching on land owners existing rights, especially for farmers, where structures may not require a building consent or have existing use rights. | Disallow | Do not include proposed amendment | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|---|-----------|------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | | of "is less than...height and". | |
| FS371.017 | Oromahoe 18R2B2B2 Trust and its associated Hapu, Ngati Kawa, Te Ngare Hauata, Te Matarahurahu, Te Whanaurara, Ngati Kaihoru, Ngati Rahiri | | Oppose | Top energy is encroaching on land owners existing rights, especially for farmers, where structures may not require a building consent or have existing use rights. | Disallow | Do not include proposed amendment of "is less than...height and". | Reject |
| FS449.016 | The Proprietors of Tapuaetahi Incorporation | | Oppose | Top energy is encroaching on land owners existing rights, especially for farmers, where structures may not require a building consent or have existing use rights. | Disallow | Do not include proposed amendment of "is less than...height and". | Reject |
| FS345.112 | 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 |
| S483.062 | Top Energy Limited | I-R5 | Not Stated | <p>Top Energy seeks that a definition of what comprises a 'customer connection' be included.</p> <p>In general, Top Energy continues to support the permitted activity status in the Rural Production, Māori Purpose, Rural Lifestyle, Horticulture and Kauri Cliffs Zone, and understands the rationale behind encouraging underground connections in the residential and industrial zones. However, Top Energy seeks that rule be extended to Ngawha Innovation and Enterprise Park and Rural Settlement Zones which are rural in nature. For all of these zones, given their isolation from urban areas, undergrounding electricity infrastructure would be cost prohibitive and unnecessary.</p> <p>Top Energy also seeks a restricted discretionary activity for non-compliance with PER -1, this results in better alignment with I-R15 which treats new overhead lines outside of these zones as a restricted discretionary activity with no height restrictions.</p> | Amend Rule 1-R5 as follows (or to same effect): | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include Ngawha Innovation Zone and Rural Settlement Zone; • Amend PER -1 to read as follows: The poles don't exceed a maximum of 25m in height above ground level; • Amend activity status for non-compliance with PER - 1 to restricted discretionary activity; and • Amend activity status for non-compliance with PER - 2 to discretionary. | Accept in part |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|---|-----------|----------|---|-----------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | Top Energy also seeks that PER - 1 be amended to specify above ground level, and that non-compliance with PER -2 be a discretionary activity as opposed to noncomplying. | | | |
| FS114.4 | Far North Holdings Limited | | Oppose | FNHL opposes the inclusion of the Ngawha Innovation and Enterprise Zone within I-R5 as proposed within the submission from Top Energy. While the location of the Park is surrounded by rural and rural residential activities, the Park has many urban elements particularly in the Innovation Hub. The Park also has a mixture of overhead and underground power supply depending on the onsite requirements for the development site. FNHL would prefer to see a MOU created or similar agreement which provides details, flexibility, and guidelines for future development within the Park and how electricity needs will be satisfied. | Disallow | | Reject |
| FS351.018 | A.W and D.M Simpson | | Oppose | Again, Top energy is encroaching on land owners existing rights and ability to manage their properties where there are lines. | Disallow | Status Quo. No change to wording or PDP. | Accept in part |
| FS371.018 | Oromahoe 18R2B2B2 Trust and its associated Hapu, Ngati Kawa, Te Ngare Hauata, Te Matarahurahu, Te Whanaurara, Ngati Kaihoro, Ngati Rahiri | | Oppose | Again, Top energy is encroaching on land owners existing rights and ability to manage their properties where there are lines. | Disallow | Status Quo. No change to wording or PDP. | Accept in part |
| FS449.017 | The Proprietors of Tapuaetahi Incorporation | | Oppose | Again, Top energy is encroaching on land owners existing rights and ability to manage their properties where there are lines. | Disallow | Status Quo. No change to wording or PDP. | Accept in part |
| FS345.113 | 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 |
| S282.005 | Chorus New Zealand Limited, Spark New | I-R5 | Oppose | The current rule only allows for new above ground customer connections in Rural zones however doesn't take into account subdivisions that are already serviced | Amend I-R5 to apply in all zones. | | Accept |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|---|-----------|-----------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------|
| | Zealand Trading Limited, Spark TowerCo Limited, Vodafone New Zealand Limited | | | by aboveground connections and as such this rule would require consents for new connections in these areas regardless of there being an existing overhead network. | | | |
| FS369.247 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy seeks to amend the rule to include Ngāwhā Innovation and Enterprise Park and Rural Settlement Zone, seeking a restricted discretionary activity status, including above ground level. | Allow in part | Amend | Awaiting recommendation |
| S483.063 | Top Energy Limited | I-R6 | Support | Top Energy supports this rule, but seeks that non-compliance with I-S1 and I -S2 be a discretionary activity for reasons identified in submission. | Amend activity status for non-compliance with Standards I-S1 and I -S2 in Rule I-R6 to discretionary. | | Reject |
| FS351.019 | A.W and D.M Simpson | | Oppose | "...for consistency..."Inadequate explanation as to why and how Rural Lifestyle should be included. | Disallow | Status Quo. No change to wording or PDP. | Accept |
| FS371.019 | Oromahoe 18R2B2B2 Trust and its associated Hapu, Ngati Kawa, Te Ngare Hauata, Te Matarahurahu, Te Whanaurara, Ngati Kaihoro, Ngati Rahiri | | Oppose | "...for consistency..."Inadequate explanation as to why and how Rural Lifestyle should be included | Disallow | Status Quo. No change to wording or PDP. | Accept |
| FS449.018 | The Proprietors of Tapuaetahi Incorporation | | Oppose | "...for consistency..."Inadequate explanation as to why and how Rural Lifestyle should be included | Disallow | Status Quo. No change to wording or PDP. | Accept |
| FS345.114 | Ngawha Generation Limited | | Support | NGL is a subsidiary of Top Energy Limited. NGL supports all submission points made by Top Energy. | Allow | Allow all of the relief sought by Top Energy Limited in its submission (S483). | Reject |
| S454.062 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | I-R6 | Support | Transpower supports the inclusion of I-R6 in the FNPDP. | Retain I-R6 | | Accept |
| FS369.248 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy seeks to amend the rule default to discretionary activity. | Allow | Amend | Accept |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|------------|--|--|--|-------------------------------|
| S483.064 | Top Energy Limited | I-R7 | Support | <p>This rule applies to the Rural Production, Rural Lifestyle and Māori Purpose Zones.</p> <p>Top Energy seeks that this be extended to Ngawha Innovation and Enterprise Park and Rural Settlement Zones.</p> <p>Top Energy seeks that PER 1 and PER 2 specify 'above ground'.</p> | <p>Amend Rule I-R7 as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include Ngawha Innovation Zone and Rural Settlement Zone. • Amend PER -1 to read as follows: The poles don't exceed a maximum of 25m in height above ground level. • Amend PER - 2 to read as follows: Towers do not exceed a height of 15m above ground level • Amend activity status for non-compliance with PER - 1 & 2 to restricted discretionary activity. | | Accept in part |
| FS114.5 | Far North Holdings Limited | | Oppose | <p>FNHL opposes the inclusion of the Ngawha Innovation and Enterprise Zone within I-R7 as proposed within the submission from Top Energy. While the location of the Park is surrounded by rural and rural residential activities the Park has many urban elements particularly in the Innovation Hub. FNHL would prefer to see a MOU created or similar agreement which provides detail and guidelines for future development within the Park.</p> <p>The Top Energy submission justification that NIEP is rural in nature is incorrect from an infrastructure perspective. Presently NIEP has ~3km of underground 11kV and 33kV lines, ~2km underground LV cables, and ~1km new above ground 11kV lines. Whether new lines are above or below ground within NIEP is essentially a situation dependent exercise and a blanket rule requiring all to be above ground is not considered to be appropriate.</p> | Disallow | | Reject |
| FS345.115 | Ngawha Generation Limited | | Support | <p>NGL is a subsidiary of Top Energy Limited. NGL supports all submission points made by Top Energy.</p> | Allow | Allow all of the relief sought by Top Energy Limited in its submission (S483). | Accept in part |
| S454.063 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | I-R7 | Not Stated | <p>Due to their linear nature and the legislative requirement for Transpower to connect new electricity generation to the National Grid, regardless of where the new generation facilities are located, transmission lines</p> | <p>Amend I-R7 as follows:</p> <p>New overhead lines and associated poles, telecommunication and attached antennas, or</p> | | Accept in part |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|--|---|-------------------------------|
| | | | | <p>may need to traverse any zone within the Far North District.</p> <p>Accordingly, Transpower considers that this rule should apply to all zones in the FNPDP and new facilities that do not comply with the performance standards should have restricted discretionary status.</p> | <p>towers Rural Production zone Rural Lifestyle zone Māori Purpose zone</p> <p>All zones</p> <p>Activity status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>PER-1 Poles or telecommunications poles and attached antenna do not exceed a height of 25m.</p> <p>PER-2 Towers do not exceed a height of 15m.</p> <p>PER-3 The activity complies with standards: I-S1 Radio frequency fields; and I-S2 Electric and magnetic fields.</p> <p>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-1 or PER-2:</p> <p>Restricted Discretionary</p> <p>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. the functional and operational needs of, and benefits from, the network utility; b. the potential impact on the levels of service or health and safety if the work is not undertaken; c. the bulk, height, location and design of the network utility, | |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|--|-------------------|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | <p>including any associated building(s) or structures;</p> <p>d. the impact on the character and qualities of the surrounding area; and</p> <p>e. any adverse effects on public health and/or safety.</p> <p>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-3: Non-complying</p> | | |
| FS354.078 | Horticulture New Zealand | | Oppose | HortNZ considers that new overhead lines and associated structures can have adverse effects on other parties. Therefore a discretionary activity status is supported. If a RD status is included then a matter of discretion should be the effects on other parties, including affected landowners. | Disallow | Disallow S454.063 | Accept in part |
| FS243.058 | Kainga Ora Homes and Communities | | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes elements of the proposed change sought that may be inconsistent with the NPSET. | Disallow | Amend I-R7 | Accept in part |
| FS369.250 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy seeks to amend the rule to include Ngāwhā Innovation and Enterprise Park and Rural Settlement Zone, seeking a restricted discretionary activity status, including above ground level. | Allow in part | Amend | Accept in part |
| S282.006 | Chorus New Zealand Limited, Spark New Zealand Trading Limited, Spark TowerCo Limited, Vodafone New Zealand Limited | I-R7 | Oppose | <p>The current rule only allows for new telecommunications infrastructure in three Rural zones however. the remainder of the Infrastructure section does not allow for new telecommunications infrastructure and as such, consents will be required for any new infrastructure not located within one of the three Rural zones captured by I-R7.</p> <p>As such, this severely limits the ability to deploy telecommunications infrastructure to effectively meet the needs of the district and provide services where required. It appears the applicability of the NES-TF has been misinterpreted in the proposed district plan as it not a catch-all document and relies heavily on an underlying rules framework in district plans to function effectively to allow for the provision of telecommunications infrastructure. This presents a</p> | Amend I-R7 to better align with the best practice guidance document for infrastructure activities. Refer to IE-R15. | | Accept in part |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | serious risk to provide for telecommunications infrastructure and as such, must be rectified. | | | |
| FS369.249 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy seeks to amend the rule to include Ngāwhā Innovation and Enterprise Park and Rural Settlement Zone, seeking a restricted discretionary activity status, including above ground level. | Allow in part | Amend | Accept in part |
| S483.065 | Top Energy Limited | I-R8 | Support | In general, telecommunication kiosks aren't of particular interest to Top Energy. However, it is noted that kiosks often colocate on other infrastructure such as electricity poles or towers. Accordingly, the height limit of 3.5m might be an issue and an exemption is sought where the kiosk is located on an existing pole or tower. | Amend Rule I-R8 to expressly enable the co-location of telecommunication kiosks on existing infrastructure. | | Reject |
| FS345.116 | Ngawha Generation Limited | | Support | NGL is a subsidiary of Top Energy Limited. NGL supports all submission points made by Top Energy. | Allow | Allow all of the relief sought by Top Energy Limited in its submission (S483). | Reject |
| S483.066 | Top Energy Limited | I-R10 | Support | Top Energy supports the provision for substations in the Rural Production and Rural Lifestyle Zones as a permitted activity, but suggests the inclusion of an additional rule which provides for subdivisions in the Rural Production and Rural Lifestyle, where contained within a building that complies with the building and structure performance standards of the underlying zone. The reasoning for this is that where intensification is promoted, additional substations may be required in urban settings. The main concerns associated with substations relate to visual amenity, noise, radio frequency and electric and magnetic field. These days, it is common for modern substations to be fully housed in buildings that can be designed to be appropriate for an urban setting from a visual perspective. Noise would be managed through the District Wide Chapter, and compliance with I-S1 and I-S2 can be relied on to address any remaining potential effects. Given that these matters can be readily managed, an additional Rule providing for such an activity in zones other than Rural Production and Rural Lifestyle is considered to more | Retain Rule R-10 as notified and include an additional rule for substations in zones other than Rural Production and Rural Lifestyle as a permitted activity where located within a building that complies with the relevant performance standards of the underlying zone, I-S1 and I-S2 and the thresholds contained within I-R10 PER-1. | | Accept in part |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|--|--|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | appropriate than the discretionary status that would otherwise apply by default. | | | |
| FS57.2 | Robert Sintes | | Support | Provision of power supply is integral to the ability of landowners to address intensification demands as populations increase and smaller lots required. Thus Top Energy must retain the capacity to deliver such services, whilst addressing any negative environmental and visual effects. | Allow | | Accept in part |
| FS57.4 | Robert Sintes | | Support | | Allow | | Accept in part |
| FS345.117 | 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 |
| S454.064 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | I-R10 | Not Stated | <p>Transpower is obligated by legislation to connect new electricity generation to the National Grid, regardless of where the new generation facilities are located. As a result, transmission facilities, including substations, may need to locate in any zone within the Far North District.</p> <p>While it is not necessarily appropriate for substations to be a permitted activity in all zones, they could be appropriately located within industrial zones. For this reason Transpower suggests the Rule be amended to include these zones.</p> | <p>Amend Rule I-10 as follows:</p> <p>I-R10 Substations Rural Production zone Rural Lifestyle zone Heavy Industrial zone Light Industrial zone</p> <p>Activity status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>PER-1</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The activity must be landscaped by a strip of vegetation which will screen any buildings or structures; The landscaped plants must achieve the continuous screening within five years and have a depth of 1.5m. <p>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-1: Discretionary</p> | | Accept in part |
| FS369.252 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy supports the provision of infrastructure within the Heavy and Light Industry Zones. However, it | Allow in part | Amend | Accept in part |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|---|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| | | | | seeks to ensure that substations within buildings in all zones are permitted. | | | |
| S421.041 | Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand | I-R11 | Support in part | <p>Federated Farmers has concerns that where any new buildings, structures, and extensions to existing buildings or structures, in the National Grid Yard do not comply with the defined performance standards have been classified as non-complying activities. The rule requires compliance with the safe distance requirements in the New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distances as well as the planting requirements from the Electricity (Hazards from Trees) Regulations 2003.</p> <p>The compliance requirements with the Code of Practice and the Regulations should be enough to ensure that that any structures that do not meet the performance standards are safe and do not interfere with the operation of the National Grid. It is unrealistic and creating unwarranted barriers and unnecessary costs for an activity to go directly to being non-complying from permitted.</p> <p>The Resource Management Act 1991 requires that activities avoid, remedy, or mitigate any effects on the environment. The proposed activity status appears to have assumed that activities which do not meet the permitted activity standards produce such severe effects that can only be dealt with through a non-complying resource consent process. This is inappropriate and contrary to Part 2 of the Resource Management Act 1991.</p> <p>Federated Farmers seeks that the activity status be reclassified from non-complying to restricted discretionary. This would make the rule consistent with Rule I-R12.</p> | Amend the activity status in Rule I-R11 from non-complying to restricted discretionary. | | Reject |
| FS24.8 | Lynley Newport | | Support | Agree a more sensible default in category of activity is required. | Allow | | Reject |
| FS78.027 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | | Oppose | The proposed relief does not give effect to the NPSET. The District Plan needs to give a clear signal that it does not contemplate buildings and structures have the potential to give rise to reverse sensitivity effects, compromise the National Grid or are sensitive activities in the National Grid Yard. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Accept |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|---|--|-------------------------------|
| FS369.253 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy considers that Transpower are best placed to comment on provisions relating to the National Grid and support the protection of these assets | Allow in part | Allow | Accept in part |
| FS570.1273 | 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 |
| FS346.275 | 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 |
| FS566.1287 | 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 |
| FS569.1309 | 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 |
| S159.035 | Horticulture New Zealand | I-R11 | Oppose | Seeks that there is specific provision for artificial crop protection structures in the National Grid Yard which Transpower has accepted in other plans. There may be situations where reticulation and storage of water for irrigation may need to pass through the National Grid Yard. The key issue is that the activity does not impede access to the National Grid infrastructure | Amend PER-2 of Rule I-R11 as follows: Under the National Grid Conductors (wires) the following can occur: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. a fence less than 2.5m in height; 2. an extension to existing buildings used for sensitive activities that do not increase the building envelope; 3. non habitable buildings ancillary to a farming activity, such as milking sheds, piggeries, poultry sheds, greenhouses and artificial crop protection structures protective canopies. Clarify that 'reticulation and storage of water for irrigation purposes carried out by a network utility operator' is provided as a permitted activity within the National Grid Yard. | | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|--|---|--|-------------------------------|
| FS151.193 | Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust | | Support | | Allow | | Reject |
| FS78.001 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | | Support | When managed, artificial crop protection structures and reticulation and storage of water for irrigation purposes will not compromise the National Grid. As such, the relief gives effect to Policy 10 of the NPSET. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS570.197 | 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 |
| FS566.211 | 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 |
| FS569.233 | 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 |
| S483.068 | Top Energy Limited | I-R11 | Support | <p>Top Energy considers that Transpower are best placed to comment of provisions relating to the national grid, but given the electricity distribution and transmission networks in the Far North are interdependent, Top Energy supports the protection of these assets.</p> <p>Top Energy also supports the explicit exemption from this rule for any part of electricity infrastructure that connects to the national grid.</p> <p>However, Top Energy notes that as per its comment above in regards to Note 5, these provisions would only apply to work undertaken to by network utility operators and consider that this rule also needs to be replicated within the Zones.</p> | Amend I-R11 to exempt work undertaken by the electricity network utility provided Review Plan and amend as necessary to ensure that the rule applies to all plan users, not just network utility providers. | | Accept in part |
| FS78.045 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | | Support | The submitter supports this submission because it will improve the clarity of the proposed plan. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS345.119 | 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 |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|------------|---|--|-------------------------------|
| S454.065 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | I-R11 | Not Stated | <p>Transpower supports the intent of I-R11 to allow some low-risk activities to occur within the National Grid Yard. However, it requires amendment to give full effect to Policy 10 and Policy 11 of the NPSET.</p> <p>In addition to the health and safety issues of locating activities within proximity of the National Grid, the National Grid can be affected by other activities that establish beneath or in close proximity to its lines and/or structures. Such activities can generate reverse sensitivity effects where landowners/ operators request a Council to impose constraints on existing infrastructure to manage effects such as noise, reduced visual amenity, radio and television interference, perceived Electric and Magnetic Field ('EMF') effects, or interference with business activities beneath the lines.</p> <p>The provisions sought in relation to the National Grid Yard are intended to allow for the reasonable use of land inside the transmission line corridor, with standards and rules imposed to ensure that any subdivision, land use and development that might compromise the National Grid is either managed or avoided.</p> <p>Specific to the 10-12 m 'National Grid Yard', Transpower is satisfied that there are some activities within the National Grid Yard that will not compromise the operation, maintenance or any upgrade of the network, due to their nature and small scale. Certain structures (such as rural hay barns, pump sheds and implement sheds) are less problematic within 12 m of the line (noting that they will still need to be set back 12 m from National Grid support structures and meet mandatory safety clearances stipulated in other regulations) on the basis they are unlikely to "build out" a transmission line. The access or use of these structures can be restricted without causing animal welfare or business disruption issues, and they do not introduce intensive uses or heavily frequented workplaces with long durations of exposure to risk.</p> <p>Conversely, examples of development that should be avoided within the National Grid Yard include sensitive activities, commercial buildings and intensive uses/development, dairy sheds, piggeries, poultry</p> | <p>Amend Rule 1-R11 as follows:</p> <p>I-R11 New building or structures, and extensions to existing buildings or structures, in the National Grid Yard</p> <p>All zones</p> <p>Activity status: Permitted</p> <p>PER-1</p> <p>No new building(s) or structures, and extensions shall be erected within 12m of any National Grid support structure, except for fences less than 2.5m in height and more than 5m from the support structure.</p> <p>PER-2</p> <p>Under the National Grid Conductors (wires) the following can occur:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. a fence less than 2.5m in height; 2. an extension to existing buildings used for sensitive activities that do not increase the building envelope; 3. non-habitable buildings ancillary to a farming activity, such as milking sheds, piggeries, poultry sheds, greenhouses and protective canopies. This rules does not apply to: network utilities within a transport corridor or any part of electricity infrastructure that connects the National Grid. <p>a. Alterations and additions to an existing building or structure for a sensitive activity that does not</p> | Accept in part |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|--|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | <p>sheds, and commercial greenhouses. The location of buildings and activities, particularly 'sensitive activities' such as schools and residential properties, beneath or in close proximity to lines and/or structures can also compromise Transpower's ability to maintain, upgrade and develop the National Grid. Additionally, the stability of National Grid lines can be affected by earthworks that destabilise support structures resulting in their need to be relocated.</p> <p>Of particular relevance in terms of the effects of activities on the National Grid are NPSET Policies 10 and 11. These policies act as the primary guide to inform how adverse effects on the National Grid are managed. The policies seek to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoid sensitive activities near electricity transmission lines and infrastructure • Manage other activities to avoid reverse sensitivity effects on the Grid; and • Manage activities to ensure the operation, maintenance, upgrading and development of the Grid is not compromised <p>Notwithstanding support for the rule, amendments are sought to insert lists of permitted activities and non-complying activities to make it clear to plan users those activities that are and are not permitted. This will assist with plan interpretation and application and given the national significance of the National Grid and non-complying activity status for those activities which are not appropriate in the National Grid Yard, will provide certainty for plan users.</p> | <p>involve an increase in the building height or footprint;</p> <p>b. Accessory buildings for sensitive activities located more than 12m from a National Grid support structure, that are no more than 2.5m in height and no more than 10m² in area;</p> <p>c. Network utilities as defined in section 166 of the RMA and electricity generation that connects to the National Grid;</p> <p>d. Fences located at least 5m from a National Grid support structure and no more than 2.5m in height;</p> <p>e. Ancillary stockyards and platforms, including those associated with milking sheds (relates to rural activities) located more than 12m from a National Grid support structure</p> <p>f. Uninhabited farm and horticultural buildings and structures located more than 12m from a National Grid support structure and alterations to these buildings and structures</p> <p>g. Artificial crop protection structures or crop support structures not exceeding 2.5 metres in height and located at</p> | |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|---------|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | <p>least 8 metres from a National Grid transmission line pole that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Are removable or temporary to allow a clear working space of 12 metres from the pole for maintenance; and ii. Allow all weather access to the pole and a sufficient area for maintenance equipment, including a crane; or iii. Meet the requirements of clause 2.4.1 of the New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Safe Electrical Distances <p>(NZECP34:2001)NOTES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) structures and activities located near transmission lines must comply with the safe distance requirements in the New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distances (NZECP34:2001). Compliance with this plan does not ensure | |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|---------|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | <p>compliance with NZECP34:2001;</p> <p>b) vegetation planted near the National Grid Yard should be selected and/or managed to ensure that it complies with the Electricity (Hazards from Trees) Regulations 2003.</p> <p>All Zones</p> <p>Activity status: Non-complying</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>a. The following activity, building or structure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. A change of use to a sensitive activity within existing buildings or structures; ii. The establishment of a sensitive activity; iii. Used for the handling or storage of hazardous substances (Hazardous Substances (Hazard Classification) Notice 2020) with explosive or flammable intrinsic properties (except this does not apply to the accessory use and | |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|---|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | <p>iv. storage of hazardous substances in domestic-scale quantities); or Wintering barns, Commercial greenhouses, Immovable protective canopies, Produce packing facilities, or Milking Sheds.</p> <p>v. All activity not listed as permitted, restricted discretionary or discretionary.</p> | | |
| FS548.133 | Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc | | Oppose | Federated Farmers submission sought an amendment to the rule to remove the non-complying activity status and replace it with a restricted discretionary activity status. While some of the proposed amendments sought are supported, some amendments are overly restrictive and would prove problematic for farmers to continue to carry out their everyday farming operations. | Disallow | Decline the relief sought | Accept in part |
| FS354.079 | Horticulture New Zealand | | Oppose | HortNZ has sought changes to I-R11 to ensure that horticultural activities are able to be undertaken in the National Grid Yard. | Allow in part | Allow S454.065 to the extent that horticultural activities in the National Grid Yard can be undertaken as sought in the HortNZ submission. | Accept in part |
| FS243.059 | Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities | | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the decision sought on the basis that adverse effects from the national grid can be appropriately managed. Kāinga Ora opposes the amendment which is overly prescriptive. Kāinga Ora opposes elements of the proposed change sought that may be inconsistent with the NPSET. | Disallow | Amend Rule 1-R11 | Accept in part |
| FS369.254 | Top Energy | | Support | Top Energy consider that Transpower are best placed to comment on provisions relating to the National Grid | Allow | Allow | Accept in part |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|--|---|-------|-------------------------------|
| | | | | and support the protection of these assets. | | | |
| FS369.259 | Top Energy | | Support | Top Energy considers that Transpower are best placed to comment with respect to the National Grid. Top Energy seek to exclude the Rural Lifestyle, Ngāwhā Innovation Zone and Rural Settlement Zones to be consistent. | Allow | Allow | Accept in part |
| S483.069 | Top Energy Limited | I-R12 | Support | <p>Top Energy generally supports the inclusion of provisions relating to the Critical Electricity Lines Overlay but seeks that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> wording is Included to exempt works with the CEL undertaken by the electricity network utility provider; that this rule should be applied to all plan users, not just network utility providers (the preference is that provisions that relate to CELS are contained within an overlay chapter for ease of reference); and 10m either side of the CEL is specified, or a figure is included (similar to Whangārei District Council's approach which specified the corridor width of 10m either side. | Amend Rule I-R12 to exempt works with the CEL undertaken by the electricity network utility provider. Review Plan and amend as necessary to ensure the rule applies to all plan users, not just network utility providers. | | Accept in part |
| FS57.1 | Robert Sintes | | Oppose | <p>Top Energy submissions (483) surrounding set backs under sections 1-R12(two areas trees and set backs) and SUB-R10 relating to subdivisions.</p> <p>There seems to be some confusion on the part of Top Energy in not delineating between overhead lines and underground lines located on Councils land and berm areas, and the set back rules applied for. Clearly with respect to underground cables located at the front of 90 Wiroa Road Kerikeri and located on Council land setbacks have no meaning or effect in terms of Top Energy's ability in later years to access and service those lines or indeed their concerns about trees planted on private land. If you look at the power overlay map along Wiroa Road Kerikeri, you will see these lines are underground and on councils land.</p> <p>My submission is that Top Energy and Council separately define rules surrounding the protection and servicing of overhead lines v/s underground lines, in dealing with building set backs and trees and the PDP.</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>With respect to subdivisions under SUB R-10. Again Council should note that with respect to land at 90 Wiroa Road Kerikeri power is already provided for subdivision purposes and installed and approved by Top Energy via a transformer and then underground power on site. Therefore in addressing the previously mentioned sections, there exist no meaningful reasons why a 32 metre set back rule should apply given as previously mentioned the existing line is underground on Council land and laid by Top Energy contractors (and in one area concrete capped) (Submitters note). The proposed set back rule of 32 metres might perhaps be sensible and applicable with respect to overhead lines, however appears to be meaningless with respect to underground cables on council land.</p> <p>Submitters resolution: DEFINE SEPERATE RULES DEPENDING ON FIRSTLY WHETHER THE LINES ARE OVERHEAD OR UNDERGROUND AND SECONDLY TAKE NOTE OF THE LOCATION OF UNDERGROUND SUPPLY LINES IN TERMS OF THE APPLICATION OF ANY SET BACK RULES.</p> | | | |
| FS78.046 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | | Support | The submitter supports this submission on the basis that it would allow it to undertake works on the National Grid where these occur in proximity to Critical Electricity Lines. The submitter also considers it would improve plan clarity if a definition of Critical Electricity Lines were included in the proposed plan, in light of the use of the phrase "Critical Infrastructure" and associated terms proposed in the Emergency Management Bill. | Allow | Allow the original submission. | Accept in part |
| FS351.020 | A.W and D.M Simpson | | Oppose | The current wording is clear and Top Energy is attempting to remove the directive by the PDP to avoid or minimise. Managing adverse effects is inappropriate and undermines the original intent. | Disallow | Status Quo. No change to wording or PDP. | Accept in part |
| FS371.020 | Oromahoe 18R2B2B2 Trust and its associated Hapu, Ngati Kawa, Te Ngare Hauata, Te Matarahurahu, | | Oppose | The current wording is clear and Top Energy is attempting to remove the directive by the PDP to avoid or minimise. Managing adverse effects is inappropriate and undermines the original intent | Disallow | Status Quo. No change to wording or PDP. | Accept in part |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|---|-----------|----------|--|--|--|-------------------------------|
| | Te Whanaurara, Ngati Kaihoro, Ngati Rahiri | | | | | | |
| FS448.012 | L & T Property Investments Limited | | Oppose | L & T Property Investments Ltd opposes the relief sought. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS449.019 | The Proprietors of Tapuaetahi Incorporation | | Oppose | The current wording is clear and Top Energy is attempting to remove the directive by the PDP to avoid or minimise. Managing adverse effects is inappropriate and undermines the original intent. | Disallow | Status Quo. No change to wording or PDP. | Accept in part |
| FS354.080 | Horticulture New Zealand | | Oppose | HortNZ has sought changes to I-R12 to ensure that horticultural activities are able to be undertaken in the near Critical Electricity Lines and seeks to ensure that the rule is based on meeting requirements in NZECP34:2001. | Disallow | Disallow S483.069 | Accept in part |
| FS345.120 | 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 |
| S483.071 | Top Energy Limited | I-R12 | Support | <p>Top Energy supports the inclusion of provisions relating to the Critical Electricity Lines Overlay. While Top Energy understands Council exemption for buildings or structures that do not require building consent to avoid unnecessary consenting requirements for smaller buildings and structures, Top Energy is concerned that this is too broad reaching.</p> <p>Accordingly, Top Energy seek that a height restriction be incorporated into PER 1</p> <p>Top Energy also:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seeks that wording is Included to exempt works with the CEL undertaken by the network utility provider; Notes that the Electricity (Hazard from Trees) Regulation 2003 is not linked; and As per the above comments in regards to Note 5, seeks that this rule be replicated in the Zones. | <p>Amend Rule I-R12-PER-1 as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The building or structure is less than 3m in height and does not require a building consent; or ... <p>Top Energy also seeks that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I-R12 be amended to exempt work undertaken by the electricity network utility provider I-R12 is replicated in Zones so the rule applies to all development. Reference to Electricity (Hazard from Trees) Regulations 2003 be included. | | Accept in part |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| FS57.3 | Robert Sintes | | Oppose | <p>Top Energy submissions (483) surrounding set backs under sections 1-R12 (two areas trees and set backs) and SUB-R10 relating to subdivisions.</p> <p>There seems to be some confusion on the part of Top Energy in not delineating between overhead lines and underground lines located on Councils land and berm areas, and the set back rules applied for. Clearly with respect to underground cables located at the front of 90 Wiroa Road Kerikeri and located on Council land setbacks have no meaning or effect in terms of Top Energy's ability in later years to access and service those lines or indeed their concerns about trees planted on private land. If you look at the power overlay map along Wiroa Road Kerikeri, you will see these lines are underground and on councils land.</p> <p>My submission is that Top Energy and Council separately define rules surrounding the protection and servicing of overhead lines v/s underground lines, in dealing with building set backs and trees and the PDP.</p> <p>With respect to subdivisions under SUB R-10. Again Council should note that with respect to land at 90 Wiroa Road Kerikeri power is already provided for subdivision purposes and installed and approved by Top Energy via a transformer and then underground power on site. Therefore in addressing the previously mentioned sections, there exist no meaningful reasons why a 32 metre set back rule should apply given as previously mentioned the existing line is underground on Council land and laid by Top Energy contractors...(and in one area concrete capped) (Submitters note). The proposed set back rule of 32 metres might perhaps be sensible and applicable with respect to overhead lines, however appears to be meaningless with respect to underground cables on council land.</p> <p>Submitters resolution DEFINE SEPERATE RULES DEPENDING ON FIRSTLY WHETHER THE LINES ARE OVERHEAD OR UNDERGROUND AND SECONDLY TAKE NOTE OF THE LOCATION OF UNDERGROUND SUPPLY LINES IN TERMS OF THE APPLICATION OF ANY SET BACK RULES.</p> | Disallow | Accept in part |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|--|--|---|-------------------------------|
| FS114.8 | Far North Holdings Limited | | Oppose | FNHL opposes the inclusion of the Ngawha Innovation and Enterprise Zone with respect to I-R12 - PER1. For the reasons as previously noted in respect to approved development areas and existing development areas. This potential conflict could be overcome by an MOU between both FNHL and Top Energy which ensures that key objectives for both parties are addressed with respect to future development and electricity line protection. | Disallow in part | | Reject |
| FS131.017 | Oromahoe Land Owners: AW and DM Simpson, R.A.S Ltd, Arran Trust, Garry Stanners, Errol McIntyre, SW Halliday, SJ and PM Boys, Oromahoe 18R2B2B2 Trust and Tapuaetahi Incorporation | | Oppose | The original submission is encroaching on land owners existing rights, especially for farmers, where structures may not require a building consent or have existing use rights. | Disallow | Reject the proposed amendment of "is less than...height and" under I-R12 as sought in the original submission (inferred). | Accept in part |
| FS448.013 | L & T Property Investments Limited | | Oppose | L & T Property Investments Ltd opposes the relief sought, and it considers the need for a building consent is an appropriate threshold. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS354.081 | Horticulture New Zealand | | Oppose | HortNZ has sought changes to I-R12 to ensure that horticultural activities are able to be undertaken in the near Critical Electricity Lines and seeks to ensure that the rule is based on meeting requirements in NZECP34:2001. | Disallow | Disallow S483.071 | Accept in part |
| FS345.122 | 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 |
| S159.036 | Horticulture New Zealand | I-R12 | Oppose | There are no provisions for artificial crop protection structures and a setback of 10m from a critical electricity line would compromise horticultural activities. If the activity complies with NZECP34:2001 then the activity should be permitted, not just when being undertaken by a network utility operation. | Amend PER-1 of Rule I-R12 as follows: PER-1 1. The building or structure does not require a building consent; or | | Accept in part |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|--|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | 2. The extension of the building or structure does not exceed the envelope or footprint of the existing building or structure 3. The building complies with NZECP34:2001 | | |
| FS151.194 | Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust | | Support | | Allow | | Accept in part |
| FS369.255 | Top Energy | | Oppose | Top Energy seeks to exempt works within the CEL when undertaken by the utility provider. | Disallow in part | Reject in part | Accept in part |
| FS570.198 | 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 |
| FS566.212 | 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 |
| FS569.234 | 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 |
| S483.070 | Top Energy Limited | I-R13 | Support | <p>Top Energy supports the inclusion of provisions relating to the Critical Electricity Lines Overlay (noting early comments regarding extent) but seek that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> wording is Included to exempt works with the CEL undertaken by the electricity network utility provider, as per the above comments re Note 5, this rule should be applied to all plan users, not just network utility providers. The preference is that provisions that relate to CELs are contained within an overlay chapter for ease of reference), wording is Included to exempt works with the CEL undertaken by the network utility provider. 10m either side of the CEL is specified, or a figure is included (similar to Whangārei District Councils | <p>Amend Rule I-R13 to exempt work undertaken by the electricity network utility provider.</p> <p>Review Plan and amend as necessary to ensure the rule applies to all Plan users, not just network utility providers.</p> <p>Include reference to Electricity (Hazard from Trees) Regulations 2003.</p> | | Accept in part |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| | | | | <p>approach which specified the corridor width of 10m either side.</p> <p>Top Energy also notes that the Electricity (Hazard from Trees) Regulation 2003 is not linked. As per the above comments in regards to Note 5, seek that this rule be replicated in the Zones.</p> | | |
| FS57.5 | Robert Sintes | | Oppose | <p>Top Energy submissions (483) surrounding set backs under sections 1-R12 (two areas...trees and set backs) and SUB-R10 relating to subdivisions.</p> <p>There seems to be some confusion on the part of Top Energy in not delineating between overhead lines and underground lines located on Councils land and berm areas, and the set back rules applied for. Clearly with respect to underground cables located at the front of 90 Wiroa Road Kerikeri and located on Council land setbacks have no meaning or effect in terms of Top Energy's ability in later years to access and service those lines or indeed their concerns about trees planted on private land. If you look at the power overlay map along Wiroa Road Kerikeri, you will see these lines are underground and on councils land.</p> <p>My submission is that Top Energy and Council separately define rules surrounding the protection and servicing of overhead lines v/s underground lines, in dealing with building set backs and trees and the PDP.</p> <p>With respect to subdivisions under SUB R-10 again Council should note that with respect to land at 90 Wiroa Road Kerikeri power is already provided for subdivision purposes and installed and approved by Top Energy via a transformer and then underground power on site. Therefore in addressing the previously mentioned sections, there exist no meaningful reasons why a 32 metre set back rule should apply given as previously mentioned the existing line is underground. On Council land and laid by Top Energy contractors (and in one area concrete capped) (Submitters note). The proposed set back rule of 32 metres might perhaps be sensible and applicable with respect to overhead lines, however appears to be meaningless with respect to underground cables on council land.</p> <p>Submitters resolution DEFINE SEPERATE RULES DEPENDING ON FIRSTLY WHETHER THE LINES ARE OVERHEAD OR UNDERGROUND AND</p> | Disallow | Accept in part |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|---|-----------|----------|---|-------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | SECONDLY TAKE NOTE OF THE LOCATION OF UNDERGROUND SUPPLY LINES IN TERMS OF THE APPLICATION OF ANY SET BACK RULES. | | | |
| FS114.6 | Far North Holdings Limited | | Oppose | FNHL opposes the inclusion of the Ngawha Innovation and Enterprise Zone with respect to I -R13. Landscaping (both core and amenity) form an important part of the Parks' design brief and design guidelines for the zone. This conflict could be overcome by an MOU between both FNHL and Top Energy which ensures that key objectives for landscaping and electricity line protection both parties are addressed. The provision as presented conflicts with consented landscaping, and also offset plantings for the Ngawha Innovation and Enterprise Park and the Matawii Dam. | Disallow in part | | Reject |
| FS78.047 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | | Support | The submitter supports this submission on the basis that it would allow it to undertake works on the National Grid where these occur in proximity to Critical Electricity Lines. The submitter also considers it would improve plan clarity if a definition of Critical Electricity Lines were included in the proposed plan, in light of the use of the phrase "Critical Infrastructure" and associated terms proposed in the Emergency Management Bill. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS351.021 | A.W and D.M Simpson | | Oppose | Unclear how maintenance doesn't capture repair unless repair is being used as a vehicle for upgrading. Top Energy seeks to mitigate when encroaching on others interests but seek to refuse others, generally the land owner, the same. | Disallow | Status Quo. No change to wording or PDP. | Accept in part |
| FS371.021 | Oromahoe 18R2B2B2 Trust and its associated Hapu, Ngati Kawa, Te Ngare Hauata, Te Matarahurahu, Te Whanaurara, Ngati Kaihoru, Ngati Rahiri | | Oppose | Unclear how maintenance doesn't capture repair unless repair is being used as a vehicle for upgrading. Top Energy seeks to mitigate when encroaching on others interests but seek to refuse others, generally the land owner, the same. | Disallow | Status Quo. No change to wording or PDP. | Accept in part |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|------------|--|--|--|-------------------------------|
| FS131.016 | Oromahoe Land Owners: AW and DM Simpson, R.A.S Ltd, Arran Trust, Garry Stanners, Errol McIntyre, SW Halliday, SJ and PM Boys, Oromahoe 18R2B2B2 Trust and Tapuaetahi Incorporation | | Oppose | Far too restricting on existing building platforms and future developments, ultimately resulting in conflict. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission (inferred) | Accept in part |
| FS448.014 | L & T Property Investments Limited | | Oppose | L & T Property Investments Ltd opposes the relief sought. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS449.020 | The Proprietors of Tapuaetahi Incorporation | | Oppose | Unclear how maintenance doesn't capture repair unless repair is being used as a vehicle for upgrading. Top Energy seeks to mitigate when encroaching on others interests but seek to refuse others, generally the land owner, the same. | Disallow | Status Quo. No change to wording or PDP. | Accept in part |
| FS345.121 | 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 |
| S483.072 | Top Energy Limited | I-R13 | Not Stated | Top Energy considers that clause PER-1 of this rule is confusing and ultimately unnecessary. Any tree planting should be captured by the Electricity Act and associated regulations. Whether it is for the purpose of a shelterbelt, plantation forestry or commercial horticultural operations is irrelevant. This rule should be redrafted to require that confirmation is provided of accordance with the Electricity Act and associated regulations. | Amend Rule I-R13 as follows: PER 1The planting of trees is not for the purpose of providing a shelterbelt, plantation forestry or commercial horticultural operations.PER 2:Activities that do not comply with PER 1 provided that: 1. prior to works notification being undertaken confirmation notification being undertaken confirmation is provided to Council and that and that the proposed | | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|--|---|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | activity is being carried out in accordance with the Electricity Act 1992 and associated regulations (NZECP 34:2001, the Electricity (Hazards from Trees) Regulations 2003 (SR 2003/375), and the Electricity (Safety) Regulations 2010). | | |
| FS114.9 | Far North Holdings Limited | | Oppose | FNHL opposes the inclusion of the Ngawha Innovation and Enterprise Zone with respect to the Critical Electricity Lines and the protection thereof. For the reasons as previously noted in respect to approved development areas and existing development areas. This potential conflict could be overcome by an MOU between both FNHL and Top Energy which ensures that key objectives for both parties are addressed. | Disallow | | Reject |
| FS131.018 | Oromahoe Land Owners: AW and DM Simpson, R.A.S Ltd, Arran Trust, Garry Stanners, Errol McIntyre, SW Halliday, SJ and PM Boys, Oromahoe 18R2B2B2 Trust and Tapuaetahi Incorporation | | Oppose | The original submission is encroaching on land owners existing rights, and ability to manage their properties where there are electricity lines. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission (inferred) | Accept |
| FS448.015 | L & T Property Investments Limited | | Oppose | L & T Property Investments Ltd opposes the relief sought as the edits do not refer to planting or landscaping but rather 'all works' - this catch all is not intended by I-R13. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Accept |
| FS354.082 | Horticulture New Zealand | | Oppose | The rule should only require that the regulations in the Hazard from Trees Regulations 2003 are met. | Disallow | Disallow S483.072 | Accept |
| FS541.001 | Errol James McIntyre | | Oppose | No mention made of naturally occurring vegetation. | Disallow | Naturally occurring vegetation be excluded from landowner obligations. | Accept |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------|
| FS345.123 | Ngawha Generation Limited | | Support | NGL is a subsidiary of Top Energy Limited. NGL supports all submission points made by Top Energy. | Allow | Allow all of the relief sought by Top Energy Limited in its submission (S483). | Reject |
| S421.043 | Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand | I-R13 | Support in part | <p>Federated Farmers supports the proposed setbacks for plantation forestry from a critical electricity lines overlay. There is a concern with the inclusion of shelterbelt in the rule. Riparian planting and low-lying hedging can be carried out for sheltering purposes from prevailing winds. It would be more appropriate if the rule referred to a maximum tree height so that landowners maintain the trees to a specified height or changes the types of trees they are using.</p> <p>Federated Farmers does not support performance standard 2 as it is currently drafted. The requirement to notify the Council prior to works being done is onerous and opens up landowners to committing technical non-compliances if they are simply trimming the height of trees to meet the requirements of the rule.</p> <p>The performance standard needs to be amended to remove the requirement to notify the Council so that it highlights the need to comply with the relevant legislation.</p> <p>The rule deals with tree planting within 20m of a Critical Electricity Lines Overlay. The district plan does not currently contain a definition for the term 'Critical Electricity Line/s'.</p> <p>As the term is used throughout the district plan, it is necessary that the term is defined. The definition should explain what is meant by the term means as well as what is encompassed by the term (e.g., are the National Grid lines considered to be critical electricity lines?).</p> | <p>Amend Rule I-R13 to read as follows:</p> <p>PER-1 The planting of trees which exceed XXX metres is not for the purpose of providing a shelterbelt, plantation forestry or commercial horticultural operations.</p> <p>PER-2: Activities that do not comply with PER-1 provided that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. prior to works notification is provided to Council and the proposed activity is being carried out in accordance with the Electricity Act 1992 and associated regulations (NZECP 34:2001, the Electricity (Hazards from Trees) Regulations 2003 (SR 2003/375), and the Electricity (Safety) Regulations 2010). <p>or wording with similar intent Insert a definition for 'Critical Electricity Line/s' in the Plan.</p> | | Accept in part |
| FS84.3 | Kaitaia Marae Incorporated (Margaret Thomas-Amani Vicechair) | | Oppose | Tree height distancing - Top Energy does not conduct a safe tree lopping service. It would be better if they requested owners clear their own trees instead of pretending they provide a service that is free but kills trees! Disgusting. They mutilated our Pohutukawa and Rimu trees dumped the heavy branches over our flax and killed it. I had to get an arborist in to fix the mess. | Disallow | | Accept in part |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|--|--|--|-------------------------------|
| FS369.257 | Top Energy | | Oppose | Top Energy seeks to amend the rule to apply to all plan users and cross reference the Electricity (Hazard from Trees) Regulations 2003. | Disallow in part | Amend | Accept in part |
| FS570.1275 | 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 |
| FS346.277 | 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 |
| FS566.1289 | 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 |
| FS569.1311 | 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 |
| S159.037 | Horticulture New Zealand | I-R13 | Oppose | Where tree planting complies with Electricity (Hazard from Trees) Regulations 2003, the activity should be permitted. | Amend PER-1 of Rule I-R13 as follows: PER-1 The planting of trees is not for the purpose of providing a shelterbelt, plantation forestry or commercial horticultural operations. Tree planting complies with Electricity (Hazard from Trees) Regulations 2003 | | Accept in part |
| FS151.195 | Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust | | Support | | Allow | | Accept in part |
| FS369.256 | Top Energy | | Oppose | Top Energy seeks to amend the rule to apply to all plan users and cross reference the Electricity (Hazard from Trees) Regulations 2003. | Disallow in part | Reject in part | Accept in part |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------|
| FS570.199 | 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 |
| FS566.213 | 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 |
| FS569.235 | 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 |
| S431.114 | John Andrew Riddell | I-R14 | Not Stated | The amendment is necessary in order to achieve the purpose of the Act. | Amend the rule so that any proposal to set a building or structure less than 20 metres back from the coastal marine area, or from rivers and banks is a non-complying activity. | | Reject |
| FS332.114 | Russell Protection Society | | Support | The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds. | Allow | Allow the original submission. | Reject |
| FS369.258 | Top Energy | | Oppose | Top Energy considers that non-complying activity is an onerous default in the context of Policy 6 of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement | Disallow | Reject | Accept |
| S454.066 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | I-R15 | Not Stated | Given the changes proposed to Rule I-R7, this rule is not required in regards to Transpower. Request amending to exclude the National Grid. | Amend Rule I-R15 New overhead lines and associated poles, telecommunication poles and attached antennas, or towers (excluding the National Grid) | | Accept in part |
| S483.073 | Top Energy Limited | I-R15 | Not Stated | Top Energy acknowledges that restricted discretionary activity status is appropriate for this type of new overhead infrastructure outside of the Rural Production and Māori Purpose Zone but considers that Rural Lifestyle should also be included for consistency with I-R7 (as well as the additional zones noted in submission). | Amend Rule I-R15 to exclude Rural Lifestyle, Ngawha Innovation Zone and Rural Settlement Zone. | | Accept in part |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|--|--|--|-------------------------------|
| FS114.7 | Far North Holdings Limited | | Oppose | FNHL opposes the inclusion of the Ngawha Innovation and Enterprise Zone within I -R15 as per the reasons in 483.64. | Disallow | | Accept in part |
| FS131.019 | Oromahoe Land Owners: AW and DM Simpson, R.A.S Ltd, Arran Trust, Garry Stanners, Errol McIntyre, SW Halliday, SJ and PM Boys, Oromahoe 18R2B2B2 Trust and Tapuaetahi Incorporation | | Oppose | There is an inadequate explanation as to why and how Rural Lifestyle should be included. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission (inferred) | Accept in part |
| FS345.124 | 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 |
| S489.023 | Radio New Zealand | I-R15 | Support | Although RNZ's activities are authorised by designations, RNZ support a permitted activity rule for new structures associated with network utilities in the event new equipment not authorised by the designations is required | Retain Rule I-R15 | | Reject |
| FS369.260 | Top Energy | | Support in part | Top Energy seeks to exclude the Rural Lifestyle, Ngāwhā Innovation Zone and Rural Settlement Zones to be consistent | Allow in part | Allow in part | Accept in part |
| S483.074 | Top Energy Limited | I-R16 | Support | Top Energy generally supports the provision for telecommunications infrastructure not permitted by the NES - TF as a restricted discretionary activity. | Retain Rule I-R16 | | Accept in part |
| FS345.125 | 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 |
| S516.033 | Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland | I-R17 | Not Stated | Ngā Tai Ora consider that this proposed rule will result in unnecessary cost and delay to the provision of public infrastructure, triggering all above ground three waters | Amend Rule I-R17 to provide for above ground three waters infrastructure as a permitted activity, outside of sensitive locations such as | | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|---|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | infrastructure to require resource consent as a restricted discretionary activity. | Outstanding Natural Landscapes, Outstanding Natural Features etc. | | |
| S512.014 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | I-R17 | Support in part | Fire and Emergency request that reference is also made to SNZ:PAS 4509:2008 New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice as it provides further detail on what is needed for suitable water supply. | Amend I- R17 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. the functional and operational needs of, and benefits from, the network utility; b. the potential impact on the levels of service or health and safety if the work is not undertaken; c. the bulk, height, location and design of the network utility, including any associated building(s) or structures; d. the impact on the character and qualities of the surrounding area; e. odour, noise, dust; f. for water supply, the impact on compliance with SNZ:PAS 4509:2008 New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice; and g. any adverse effects on public health and/or safety. | | Reject |
| FS243.186 | Kainga Ora Homes and Communities | | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes elements of the proposed change sought that may be inconsistent with NZ Standards and seeks further clarification/reasoning for the amended changes. | Disallow | A number of submission points and relief sought. | Accept |
| S529.176 | Carbon Neutral NZ Trust | I-R17 | Support | <p>The disposal of wastewater from sewage treatment plants into wetlands and water bodies has been a matter of concern to communities for some time. The Council's Infrastructure Committee requested further investigation of disposal-to-land options for several wastewater schemes, and requested a wastewater disposal-to-land workshop in late 2021 to cover methodologies and processes associated with establishing a disposal-to-land scheme.</p> <p>The Infrastructure chapter includes rule I-R17 on construction and upgrading of wastewater systems.</p> | Amend I-R17 to support future transition to disposal-to-land schemes. | | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|---|---|-------------------------------|
| | | | | However, the rule does not refer to the need to protect water and waterways from pollution due to discharge or disposal of treated wastewater. The PDP should support future transition to disposal-to-land schemes, which is anticipated to start within the life of the PDP. | | | |
| FS403.096 | Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora | | Oppose | Te Whatu Ora consider that this rule will result in unnecessary cost and delay for provision of public infrastructure and it should provide for three waters infrastructure outside of sensitive locations. | Disallow in part | Te Whatu Ora consider that this rule will result in unnecessary cost and delay for provision of public infrastructure and it should provide for three waters infrastructure outside of sensitive locations. | Accept in part |
| FS570.2064 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS566.2078 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| FS569.2100 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission | Reject |
| S454.067 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | I-R18 | Not Stated | It is not normally appropriate to locate sensitive activities with the National Grid Corridor. This rule should be deleted and all sensitive activities addressed through Rule I-R20. If the rule is to be retained, the title should refer to the National Grid Subdivision Corridor. | Delete Rule 1-R18 Or amend I-R18: New sensitive activity and any buildings used by a sensitive activity located in the National Grid Subdivision Corridor All zones Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion are restricted to where; ...Non-complying activity where within the National Grid Yard | | Accept |
| FS354.083 | Horticulture New Zealand | | Support in part | Amending the rule to apply to the National Grid Subdivision Corridor is supported but not the deletion of the restricted discretionary activity status. | Allow | Allow S454.067 to the extent of amending the rule to apply to the | Accept in part |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|------------|--|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | | National Grid Subdivision Corridor. | |
| FS243.060 | Kainga Ora Homes and Communities | | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the decision sought on the basis that adverse effects from the national grid can be appropriately managed. Kāinga Ora opposes the amendment which is overly prescriptive. Kāinga Ora opposes elements of the proposed change sought that may be inconsistent with the NPSET. | Disallow | Delete Rule 1-R18 Or amend I-R18 | Reject |
| S454.068 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | I-R20 | Not Stated | It is not normally appropriate to locate sensitive activities with the National Grid Yard or the National Grid Subdivision Corridor. Sensitive activities in these locations should be classified as non-complying activities. | Amend I-R20 as follows: Sensitive activity and any building used by a sensitive activity located within the National Grid Yard or National Grid Subdivision Corridor All zones Activity status: Non-complying | | Reject |
| FS354.084 | Horticulture New Zealand | | Oppose | The addition of the National Grid Subdivision Corridor is not supported as it is provided for in I-R18. | Disallow | Disallow S454.068 | Reject |
| FS243.061 | Kainga Ora Homes and Communities | | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the decision sought on the basis that adverse effects from the national grid can be appropriately managed. Kāinga Ora opposes the amendment which is overly prescriptive. Kāinga Ora opposes elements of the proposed change sought that may be inconsistent with the NPSET. | Disallow | Amend I-R20 | Reject |
| S159.038 | Horticulture New Zealand | I-R21 | Oppose | The reticulation and storage of water for irrigation purposes within the National Grid Yard is a non-complying activity. Such an approach is not effects based. The main issue is preventing access to the National Grid. | Amend Rule I-R21 to provide for irrigation and water storage where access to the National Grid is not impeded. | | Reject |
| FS151.196 | Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust | | Support | | Allow | | Reject |
| FS151.197 | Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust | | Support | | Allow | | Reject |
| FS78.002 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | | Support | When managed, reticulation and storage of water for irrigation purposes will not compromise the National Grid. | Allow | Allow the original submission. | Reject |
| FS548.044 | Northland Federated | | Support | The submitter is corrected when it states that the issue is ensuring access to the National Grid Yard is not | Allow | Grant the relief sought | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|--|--|--|-------------------------------|
| | Farmers of New Zealand Inc | | | impeded. It is access that should be focused on rather than unnecessary limiting activities with little or no effects on that access. | | | |
| FS570.200 | 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 |
| FS566.214 | 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 |
| FS569.236 | 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 |
| S454.069 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | I-R21 | Support | Transpower supports the inclusion of I-R21 (inferred) in the FNPDP. | Retain I-R21 (inferred) | | Reject |
| FS354.085 | Horticulture New Zealand | | Oppose | HortNZ seeks changes to I-R21. | Disallow | Disallow S454.069 | Accept |
| S483.055 | Top Energy Limited | I-S1 | Oppose | Top Energy seeks a discretionary activity status where compliance isn't achieved with I-S1 and I-S2. While non-compliance with these standards is unlikely, in the event that they are breached, it will more likely than not be a operational or functional requirement necessary to ensure distribution of electricity and telecommunications to the District which are lifeline utilities. Given that this rule only applies to network utilities, Top Energy considers discretionary activity status for non-compliance with I-S1 and IS2 to be appropriate and enable adequate assessment of adverse effects. | Amend activity status for non-compliance with Standard I-S1 throughout the Infrastructure Chapter from non-complying to discretionary. | | Reject |
| FS131.015 | Oromahoe Land Owners: AW and DM Simpson, R.A.S Ltd, Arran Trust, Garry Stanners, Errol McIntyre, SW Halliday, SJ | | Oppose | There are a number of concerns with the request sought to assign discretionary activity status. The rule is there to regulate network utilities. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission (inferred). | Accept |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|--|--|--|-------------------------------|
| | and PM Boys, Oromahoe 18R2B2B2 Trust and Tapuaetahi Incorporation | | | | | | |
| FS448.016 | L & T Property Investments Limited | | Support | L & T Property Investments Ltd opposes the relief sought as the edits do not refer to planting or landscaping but rather 'all works' - this catch all is not intended by I-R13. | Allow | Amend activity status for non-compliance with Standard I-S1 throughout the Infrastructure Chapter from non-complying to discretionary. | Reject |
| FS345.106 | Ngawha Generation Limited | | Support | NGL is a subsidiary of Top Energy Limited. NGL supports all submission points made by Top Energy. | Allow | Allow all of the relief sought by Top Energy Limited in its submission (S483). | Reject |
| S489.024 | Radio New Zealand | I-S1 | Support | RNZ already comply with I-S1 and support its inclusion in the Proposed Plan. | Retain Standard I-S1 | | Accept |
| FS369.261 | Top Energy | | Oppose | Top Energy seeks to amend the standard to default to a discretionary activity status. | Disallow in part | Amend | Reject |
| S483.056 | Top Energy Limited | I-S2 | Oppose | Top Energy seeks a discretionary activity status where compliance isn't achieved with I-S1 and I-S2. While non-compliance with these standards is unlikely, in the event that they are breached, it will more likely than not be a operational or functional requirement necessary to ensure distribution of electricity and telecommunications to the District which are lifeline utilities. Given that this rule only applies to network utilities, Top Energy considers discretionary activity status for non-compliance with I-S1 and IS2 to be appropriate and enable adequate assessment of adverse effects. | Amend activity status for non-compliance with Standard I-S2 throughout the Infrastructure Chapter from non-complying to discretionary. | | Reject |
| FS131.033 | Oromahoe Land Owners: AW and DM Simpson, R.A.S Ltd, Arran Trust, Garry Stanners, Errol McIntyre, SW Halliday, SJ | | Oppose | There are a number of concerns with the request sought to assign discretionary activity status. The rule is there to regulate network utilities. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission (inferred). | Accept |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|-------------------|---|-----------|----------|--|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| | and PM Boys, Oromahoe 18R2B2B2 Trust and Tapuaetahi Incorporation | | | | | | |
| FS448.017 | L & T Property Investments Limited | | Support | L & T supports the Discretionary activity status as sought. | Allow | Amend activity status for non- compliance with Standard I-S2 throughout the Infrastructure Chapter from non complying to discretionary. | Reject |
| FS345.107 | 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 (\$483). | Reject |
| S421.044 | Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Overview | Support | Federated Farmers supports the overview as it is currently drafted in the proposed district plan. | Retain the Overview | | Accept in part |
| FS570.1276 | 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 |
| FS346.278 | 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 |
| FS566.1290 | 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 |
| FS569.1312 | 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 |
|------------------|--|------------|-----------------|--|--|--|---------------------------------|
| S483.106 | Top Energy Limited | Objectives | Not Stated | Include a new objective to recognise and provide for the operation of operation, maintenance, repair and upgrading the appropriate provision of infrastructure within the transport network, in particular the roading corridor. | Insert a new objective in the Transport Chapter as follows (or wording to the same effect): Recognise and provide for the operation, maintenance, repair and upgrading of other infrastructure including electricity and telecommunications infrastructure within the transport network, in particular the roading corridor. | | Reject |
| FS346.069 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. | | Oppose | Upgrading can have adverse effects on natural values, and it is not appropriate for provisions to enable this activity as a permitted activity. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Accept |
| FS345.157 | Ngawha Generation Limited | | Support | NGL is a subsidiary of Top Energy Limited. NGL supports all submission points made by Top Energy. | Allow | Allow all of the relief sought by Top Energy Limited in its submission (S483). | Reject |
| S483.104 | Top Energy Limited | Policies | Not Stated | The Transport Chapter is not of significant interest to Top Energy. However, it is important that recognition is made for the appropriate provision of infrastructure (e.g., electricity and telecommunications) in the transport network, in particular the roading corridor, as often this infrastructure is located within it. Rather than making detailed submissions on the chapter, Top Energy seek that this is adequately addressed across the objectives, policies and rules in this chapter. | Amend the transport provisions to provide for objectives, policies and rules that enable the operation, maintenance, repair and upgrading the appropriate provision of infrastructure within the transport network, in particular the roading corridor. | | Accept in part |
| FS196.19 | Joe Carr | | Support in part | A RELIABLE ROAD NETWORK THAT HAS SECURITY FROM OBSTRUCTION BY FLOODING SHOULD BE OF PARAMOUNT IMPORTANCE TO TOP ENERGY. After cyclone Gabrielle Top Energy could not service much of the network because they were either flooded out or in. | Allow in part | | Accept in part |
| FS345.155 | Ngawha Generation Limited | | Support | NGL is a subsidiary of Top Energy Limited. NGL supports all submission points made by Top Energy. | Allow | Allow all of the relief sought by Top Energy Limited in its submission (S483). | Reject <u>Accept in part</u> |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|-------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|--|--|--|-------------------------------|
| S483.107 | Top Energy Limited | Policies | Not Stated | Include a new policy to recognise and provide for the operation of operation, maintenance, repair and upgrading the appropriate provision of infrastructure within the transport network, in particular the roading corridor by enabling these activities as a permitted activity. | Insert a new policy in the Transport Chapter as follows (or wording to the same effect): Recognise and provide for other infrastructure by enabling the operation, maintenance, repair and upgrading of infrastructure in the transport network as a permitted activity. | | Reject |
| FS196.197 | Joe Carr | | Support | | Allow | | Reject |
| FS346.070 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. | | Oppose | Upgrading can have adverse effects on natural values, and it is not appropriate for provisions to enable this activity as a permitted activity. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Accept |
| FS345.158 | Ngawha Generation Limited | | Support | NGL is a subsidiary of Top Energy Limited. NGL supports all submission points made by Top Energy. | Allow | Allow all of the relief sought by Top Energy Limited in its submission (S483). | Reject |
| S421.179 | Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand | SUB-R9 | Support in part | Federated Farmers seeks recognition in rule SUB-R9 that subdivision within the rural production zone is different to that of other zones in respect of the effects on the national grid corridor. Many farmers in the rural production zone have areas of national grid running through and when subdividing their property into 40ha or 20ha allotments there is still substantial land available for both development and the national grid corridor. | Amend Rule SUB-R9 to provide for subdivision in the Rural Production zone as a controlled activity. | | Reject |
| FS196.143 | Joe Carr | | Support | Tautoko | Allow | | Reject |
| FS570.1411 | 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 |
| FS346.413 | 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 |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------|
| FS566.1425 | 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 |
| FS569.1447 | 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 |
| S454.095 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | SUB-R9 | Not Stated | Transpower supports the inclusion of this subdivision rule in the FNPDP as it gives effect to the NPSET but considers that the matters of discretion could be redrafted to provide improved clarity and certainty for the plan user. | <p>Amend the title of the rule and replace the matters of discretion as follows: SUB-R9 Subdivision of a site within the National Subdivision Grid Corridor All zones ... Matters over which discretion is restricted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The extent to which the subdivision allows for earthworks, buildings and structures to comply with the safe distance requirements of the New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Safe Electrical Distances (NZECP 34:2001). b. The provision for the on-going efficient operation, maintenance, development and upgrade of the National Grid, including the ability for physical vehicle access to existing transmission lines and support structures for maintenance, inspections and upgrading. | | Accept in part |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|--|---|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> c. The extent to which potential adverse effects (including visual and reverse sensitivity effects) are mitigated through the location of building platforms. d. The extent to which the design and construction of the subdivision allows for activities to be setback from the National Grid to ensure adverse effects on, and from, the National Grid and on public safety and property are appropriately avoided, remedied or mitigated, for example, through the location of roads and reserves under the transmission lines. e. The nature and location of any proposed vegetation to be planted within the National Grid Yard. f. The outcome of any consultation with, and technical advice from, Transpower. g. The extent to which the subdivision plan clearly identifies the National Grid and proposed building platforms. | | |
| FS243.079 | Kainga Ora Homes and Communities | | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the decision sought on the basis that adverse effects from the national grid can be appropriately managed. Kāinga Ora opposes the amendment which is overly prescriptive. | Disallow | Amend the title of the rule and replace the matters of discretion. | Accept in part |
| FS369.445 | Top Energy | | Support | Top Energy supports the amendments to improve clarity for the plan user. | Allow | | Accept in part |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|--|--|--|-------------------------------|
| FS369.469 | Top Energy | | Support | Top Energy supports amendments to give effect to the NPSET. | Allow | | Accept in part |
| S483.167 | Top Energy Limited | SUB-R9 | Support | Top Energy supports the protection of the National Grid from inappropriate development and considers that ensuring this at the time of subdivision is critical to the resilience of the wider network | Retain Rule SUB-R9 | | Accept in part |
| FS345.218 | 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 |
| S368.034 | Far North District Council | SUB-R9 | Support in part | Spelling error: (except where the allotments are for roads, esplanades, accessways and infrastructure). | Amend SUB-R9 RDIS- 1 Proposed building platforms are identified for each allotment and located wholly outside of the National Grid Yard (except where the allotments are for roads, esplanades, accessways and infrastructure). | | Accept |
| FS369.444 | Top Energy | | Support | Top Energy supports the amendment of a spelling error. | Allow | | Accept |
| S483.168 | Top Energy Limited | SUB-R10 | Support | Top Energy supports the inclusion of a provision requiring the protection of the CELS. However Top Energy consider that the rule needs to be amended to be effective. Where compliance with this cannot be achieved, the activity should become non-complying as is the case for SUB-R9. | Amend the wording of Rule SUB - R10 to: SUB -R10 Subdivision of a site within 32m of the centre line of Critical Electricity Line Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: PER -1 The proposed building platforms are identified outside of a 32m setback from the centre line of a CEL. Activity Status where not achieved: Non-complying | | Accept in part |
| FS24.57 | Lynley Newport | | Oppose | Too restrictive both in terms of suggested setback and category of activity default. | Disallow | | Accept in part |
| FS131.029 | Oromahoe Land Owners: AW and DM Simpson, R.A.S | | Oppose | It is extremely restrictive, and excessive to have 32 meters. In addition to a building envelope. Whangarei District Council (inferred) has 20m and current practice for electrical safe distance for building is 6m to 9m. | Disallow | Amend SUB-R10 to require building platforms to be setback 20 from CELs | Accept in part |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|---|------------|-----------------|---|--|--|-------------------------------|
| | Ltd, Arran Trust, Garry Stanners, Errol McIntyre, SW Halliday, SJ and PM Boys, Oromahoe 18R2B2B2 Trust and Tapuaetahi Incorporation | | | | | and reject amendment to activity status where not achieved: non-complying as sought in the original submission (inferred). | |
| FS448.018 | L & T Property Investments Limited | | Oppose | L & T supports the Discretionary activity status as notified and seeks to reduce the 32m setback as the rationale for this distance is undefined. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Accept in part |
| FS345.219 | 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 |
| S282.003 | Chorus New Zealand Limited, Spark New Zealand Trading Limited, Spark TowerCo Limited, Vodafone New Zealand Limited | Objectives | Support | The strategic objectives for infrastructure, risk and resilience set an appropriate overall direction for important infrastructure in the district. They recognise the benefits provided by infrastructure while minimising associated adverse effects through design and location. | Retain objectives I-O1, I-O2, I-O3, I-O4 and I-O5 | | Accept in part |
| S282.017 | Chorus New Zealand Limited, Spark New Zealand Trading Limited, Spark TowerCo Limited, Vodafone New Zealand Limited | Objectives | Support | The benefits of infrastructure are recognised, provided for and protected. | Retain provision as notified | | Accept in part |
| S302.004 | Kristine Kerr | Rules | Support in part | Do not need 10m flag lights. Apply dark sky guidelines and create more pleasant night environment for the enjoyment of rural communities / rural coastal location. | Amend rules to apply dark sky guidelines. | | Reject |
| S282.029 | Chorus New Zealand Limited, Spark New | Rules | Support in part | The general intent of the section is supported in enabling and protecting infrastructure to serve the district while managing adverse effects through the | Retain enabling provisions of infrastructure however increase scope to allow for | | Accept |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-------------------------|-----------------|--|---|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| | Zealand Trading Limited, Spark TowerCo Limited, Vodafone New Zealand Limited | | | design and location of such. The section does however require amending to ensure that infrastructure can be delivered in areas where it is required and as currently drafted there is limited scope to deliver infrastructure, for example within urban areas where there is currently no scope to deliver new overhead lines or telecommunications infrastructure as permitted. | infrastructure activities in areas where there is currently no provision. | | |
| FS78.005 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | | Support | The submitter has supported a number of enabling provisions in the infrastructure section of the FNDP and as the owner of the National Grid has an interest in ensuring the development, operation upgrade, repair and maintenance of that critical infrastructure is able to occur as efficiently as possible. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept |
| S282.028 | Chorus New Zealand Limited, Spark New Zealand Trading Limited, Spark TowerCo Limited, Vodafone New Zealand Limited | Rules | Oppose | The current rules framework in the Infrastructure section does not provide for temporary infrastructure activities. It is noted that such activities may need to be deployed during emergencies to continue to provide services to the communities throughout the District. | Amend rules to allow for temporary infrastructure activities as permitted over a 12 month period. Refer to IE-R6 of the attached best practice guidance document for infrastructure activities. | | Accept in part |
| FS304.018 | Radio New Zealand | | Support | | Allow | Allow the original submission. | Accept in part |
| S282.004 | Chorus New Zealand Limited, Spark New Zealand Trading Limited, Spark TowerCo Limited, Vodafone New Zealand Limited | Notes | Support in part | While these notes are generally supported, there is no mention that the following rules override zone level provisions. As currently drafted the Infrastructure section rules work as an overarching framework to zone level provisions in relation to infrastructure activities throughout the district however this is not made clear. In addition, Note 3 implies that the NES-TF applies to all telecommunication activities that are not within a rural zone or a subpart 5 area however the NES-TF applies to new and existing facilities in road reserve and rural zones, and existing facilities in all zones. | Insert note to advise plan users that zone level provisions do not apply to infrastructure activities. Amend Note 3 to properly advise users on NES-TF applicability. | | Accept |
| S485.031 | Elbury Holdings | General / Miscellaneous | Oppose | Mapping of the drainage district drains should be included in the District Plan. | Amend planning maps to include the location of drainage channels in the Kaitaia, Waiharara/Kaikino and Motutangi drainage areas, as defined in the Draft Management Plans and Far North District Council Land | | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-------------------------|------------|--|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | Drainage Bylaw 2019 and the draft management plan 2017. | |
| S358.027 | Leah Frieling | General / Miscellaneous | Oppose | Mapping of the drainage district drains and overland flow paths in urban areas should be included in the District Plan. | Add to the Planning Maps, maps indicating location of drainage channels in the Kaitaia, Waiharara/Kaikino and Motutangi drainage areas, as defined in the Draft Management Plans and Far North Land Drainage Bylaw 2019. and include overland flow paths in urban areas. | Reject |
| S357.024 | Sean Frieling | General / Miscellaneous | Oppose | We seek some rules under the District Plan for the existing mapped drainage district drains, as the current bylaws are not being enforced for the drainage districts. Mapping of the drainage district drains and overland flow paths in urban areas should be included in the District Plan. | Amend the Infrastructure section, by adding objectives, policies and rules providing for existing mapped Council drainage district drains, to ensure the ability to clean, unblock access and service the drainage channels in the Kaitaia, Waiharara/Kaikino and Motutangi drainage areas, as defined in the Far North Land Drainage Bylaw 2019. And stop buildings being built within 10m of the drains as per the bylaws. Amend to add to the Planning Maps, maps indicating location of drainage channels in the Kaitaia, Waiharara/Kaikino and Motutangi drainage areas, as defined in the Draft Management Plans and Far North Land Drainage Bylaw 2019. and include overland flow paths in urban areas. | Reject |
| S472.028 | Michael Foy | General / Miscellaneous | Not Stated | Mapping of the drainage district drains and overland flow paths in urban areas should be included in the District Plan. | Insert to the Planning Maps, maps indicating location of drainage channels in the Kaitaia, Waiharara/Kaikino and Motutangi drainage areas, as defined in the Draft Management Plans and Far North Land Drainage Bylaw 2019. and include overland flow paths in urban areas. | Reject |
| S547.030 | LJ King Limited | General / Miscellaneous | Oppose | Mapping of the drainage district drains and overland flow paths in urban areas should be included in the District Plan. | Amend to add maps indicating location of drainage channels in the Kaitaia, Waiharara/Kaikino and Motutangi drainage areas, as defined in the Draft Management Plans and Far North District Council Land Drainage Bylaw 2019 and the Draft Management Plan 2017 and include overland flow paths in urban areas. | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-------------------------|------------|--|---|-------------------------------|
| S516.081 | Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland | General / Miscellaneous | Not Stated | Ngā Tai Ora, consider that it is important to ensure provision of sustainable and safe water supply, wastewater and stormwater systems (three waters systems), which are essential for the health and wellbeing of the Far North population. In particular protection of water supply catchments, both agricultural and drinking water to prevent the degradation of both quality and quantity of water to for extraction. Protection of waste water treatment plant locations to prevent encroachment and provide sufficient area for future expansion. | Insert a Special Purpose Zone to provide for the identification and protection of critical infrastructure. | Reject |
| S541.029 | Elbury Holdings | General / Miscellaneous | Oppose | Mapping of the drainage district drains and overland flow paths in urban areas should be included in the District Plan. | Amend to add maps indicating location of drainage channels in the Kaitaia, Waiharara/Kaikino and Motutangi drainage areas, as defined in the Draft Management Plans and Far North District Council Land Drainage Bylaw 2019 and the Draft Management Plan 2017 and include overland flow paths in urban areas. | Reject |
| FS155.87 | Fiona King | | Support | Development is happening so fast in the Far North and encroaching into rural areas and planning has not been considering the management of the drains , the size of outlets or capacity of drains when approving subdivisions to occur, Thus creating flooding and ponding of water in both the urban and rural land. There are only 3 land drainage areas in the Tehiku ward . Kaitaia being the most effected by urban sprawl. These land drainage maps need to be part of the district Plan. | Allow | Reject |
| S519.031 | Elbury Holdings | General / Miscellaneous | Oppose | We seek some rules under the District Plan for the existing mapped drainage district drains, as the draft management plan 2017 and current bylaws are not being enforced for the drainage districts. And, rules within the bylaws should be included under drainage districts i.e.; 10 meter setback for buildings. | Amend the Infrastructure section, by adding rules providing for existing mapped Council drainage district drains, to ensure the ability to clean, unblock access and service the drainage channels in the Kaitaia, Waiharara/Kaikino and Motutangi drainage areas, as defined in the Far North District Council Land Drainage Bylaw 2019 and the Draft Management Plan 2017. Amend to stop buildings being built within 10m of the drains as per the bylaws. | Reject |
| FS155.88 | Fiona King | | Support | Development is happening so fast in the Far North and encroaching into rural areas and planning has not been | Allow | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|---|-------------------------|------------|---|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | considering the management of the drains , the size of outlets or capacity of drains when approving subdivisions to occur, Thus creating flooding and ponding of water in both the urban and rural land. There are only 3 land drainage areas in the Tehiku ward, Motatangi, Waiharahara / Kakino and Kaitaia. Kaitaia being the most effected by urban sprawl. These land drainage maps need to be part of the district Plan. The bylaws 2019 are in place and are being used by FNDC. Who says they are not? | | |
| S519.032 | Elbury Holdings | General / Miscellaneous | Oppose | Mapping of the drainage district drains and overland flow paths in urban areas should be included in the District Plan. | Amend to add maps indicating location of drainage channels in the Kaitaia, Waiharara/Kaikino and Motutangi drainage areas, as defined in the Draft Management Plans and Far North District Council Land Drainage Bylaw 2019 and the Draft Management Plan 2017 and include overland flow paths in urban areas. | Reject |
| FS155.89 | Fiona King | | Support | Development is happening so fast in the Far North and encroaching into rural areas and planning has not been considering the management of the drains , the size of outlets or capacity of drains when approving subdivisions to occur, Thus creating flooding and ponding of water in both the urban and rural land. There are only 3 land drainage areas in the Tehiku ward, Motatangi, Waiharahara / Kakino and Kaitaia. Kaitaia being the most effected by urban sprawl. These land drainage maps need to be part of the district Plan. The bylaws 2019 are in place and are being used by FNDC. Who says they are not? | Allow | Reject |
| S425.009 | Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust | General / Miscellaneous | Not Stated | As a primary submission, PHTTCCT continues to seek that the Trail be mapped in the plan and re-submits the Pou Herenga Tai Cycle Trail Overlay Chapter (see Attachment 2) which includes provisions that seek to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognise and provide for the Trail in acknowledgement of the social, economic and environmental benefits it provides to the District as acknowledged by its classification as regionally significant infrastructure; | Insert Pou herenga Tai Trail in the district plan as an overlay. | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-------------------------|-----------------|---|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enable appropriate activities, including the maintenance, operation, and upgrade of the Trail; and • Manage reverse sensitivity effects. <p>PHTTCCT considers that this request is appropriate for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Given the regionally significant economic, social, and environmental benefits associated with the Pou Herenga Tai Trail which are further set out in section 2.1.1 and 2.1.2, mapping it in the Plan with an associated suite of provisions (as provided in Attachment 2 or to same effect) would be the most efficient and effective way to ensure these benefits are protected, continued and enhanced; • The overlay and associated provisions promote the sustainable management of the physical resources; • The overlay and associated provisions are consistent with Part 2 of the RMA; • The overlay and associated provisions are appropriate in terms of section 32 of the RMA; • The overlay and associated provisions represent an efficient use and development of physical resources which have received significant investment; • The overlay and associated provision sought appropriately avoids, remedies or mitigates adverse effects on the environment; and • The overlay and associated provision are consistent with the balance of the PDP, in particular the Strategic Direction section of the Plan. | | |
| FS299.2 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | | Oppose | Please see separate submission | Disallow | Accept |
| S359.014 | Northland Regional Council | General / Miscellaneous | Support in part | Any zoning without three waters infrastructure is an issue in the long term - retrofitting networks to service such sites can be problematic and more costly than establishment at the 'greenfield' stage. This is especially so where existing development has already established on-site services but would need to pay to | Retain zoning for more intensive development where three waters infrastructure is provided (inferred). | Accept in part |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|--|-------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | connect to new network services. Without access to appropriate servicing there are major limitations on the density and type of urban development which can be accommodated in these zones. | | | |
| FS25.080 | Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited | | Support | Greenfield development is a more appropriate and more cost-effective way of meeting housing demands. Retrofitting networks to service infill development can be problematic and costly, particularly where existing development has already established infrastructure. | Allow | Allow original submission to the extent that hazard prone areas are correctly identified and mapped and that there are appropriate consent triggers that enable more detailed assessment in appropriate circumstances. | Accept in part |
| FS23.101 | Des and Lorraine Morrison | | Oppose | While recognizing that it is important that each lot has access to 3 waters infrastructure, where this is not able to be provided by the Council, provision should be able to be made for this to occur on-site. This could be required to be done in such a way that it does not foreclose joining public connections in the future. Restricting development to only where public infrastructure is available would unnecessarily constrain the ability to provide much needed housing | Disallow | Disallow the relief sought to the extent it seeks to not permit onsite provision for 3 waters infrastructure. | Accept in part |
| FS243.004 | Kainga Ora Homes and Communities | | Support in part | Kāinga Ora generally supports the enablement of development where it is aligned with the provision of climate-resilient services and infrastructure. | Allow | Retain zoning for more intensive development where three waters infrastructure is provided. | Accept in part |
| FS325.054 | Turnstone Trust Limited | | Support | TT further submits that greenfield development is a more appropriate and more cost-effective way of meeting housing demands. Retrofitting networks to service infill development can be problematic and costly, particularly where existing development has already established infrastructure. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept in part |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|--|-------------------------|----------|--|---|--|-------------------------------|
| FS570.1050 | 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 |
| FS346.475 | 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 |
| FS566.1064 | 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 |
| FS569.1086 | 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 |
| S464.032 | LJ King Ltd | General / Miscellaneous | Oppose | Mapping of the drainage district drains and overland flow paths in urban areas should be included in the District Plan. | Insert planning maps and maps indicating location of drainage channels in the Kaitaia, Waiharara/Kaikino and Motutangi drainage areas, as defined in the Draft Management Plans and Far North District Council Land Drainage Bylaw 2019 and the draft management plan 2017. Include overland flow paths in urban areas. | | Reject |
| FS566.1575 | 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 |
| S543.030 | LJ King Limited | General / Miscellaneous | Oppose | Mapping of the drainage district drains and overland flow paths in urban areas should be included in the District Plan. | Amend to add maps indicating location of drainage channels in the Kaitaia, Waiharara/Kaikino and Motutangi drainage areas, as defined in the Draft Management Plans and Far North District Council Land Drainage Bylaw 2019 and the Draft Management Plan 2017 and include overland flow paths in urban areas. | | Reject |

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Hearings Panel Recommendation |
|------------------|---|-------------------|-----------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------|
| FS566.2191 | 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 |
| S454.021 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | SUPPORT STRUCTURE | Support | Transpower supports the inclusion of this definition in the FNPDP. | Retain the definition of SUPPORT STRUCTURES. | | Accept |
| S502.012 | Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited | SUPPORT STRUCTURE | Support in part | There is no provision for street lighting. We seek relief that this be included | Amend the definition of Support Structure: means any pole, mast or building designed or used for bearing the weight of or keeping a safe distance above the ground any aerial, sign, scaffolding, or reticulation network owned or operated by a network utility operator, and includes any support structures necessary for lighting and for the transformation, transmission or distribution of electricity, including bridges, power poles, lines, conductors and transformers. | | Reject |