



website: www.carbonneutraltrust.org.nz

email: carbonneutraltrust@gmail.com

FNDC PDP Hearing 15D Statement Oct 8, 2025

Statement on behalf of submitter s529 Carbon Neutral NZ Trust

Inge Bremer – Trustee

At Natural Hazards Hearing 13 we already provided an overview of massive flooding risks for the Waipapa and Kerikeri area, which need to be addressed urgently vis-a-vis increasing serious weather events that can bring 300, 400, or even 500 mm of rainfall within 24 hours. Such “weather bombs” already happened in 1823, 1981, 2007 and milder ones more recently. With Global Warming and Climate Change progressing they can re-occur any time as we see frequently all over the world. Fred Terry talked about as well.

A new weather bomb must be expected to incur dramatic damage to properties, roads and human life especially west of the SH10, but also further downstream.

As mentioned, several options have been presented to mitigate such flooding risk:

- the NRC Kerikeri River Working group suggests a K3A dam 2.7km upstream from Waipapa.
- PK Engineering presented a visionary Blueprint One concept for a 110ha Waipapa Lake with various features like safety, hydro-electric and solar generation, town- and irrigation-water storage, aquatic life, recreational activities, and others
- KFO offered building a 120m wide flood-channel through their property to enable their development project

Obviously, as lay-people, we cannot judge the best solution for these flooding risks, possibly a combination of various methods.

These plans have been presented to FNDC, NRC, and MPs, but no action has been taken, despite the urgent need to address the tremendous risk.

We principally support the precautionary approach outlined in the PDP, but we also believe that immediate action is needed to address these risks. The updated LiDAR results and modelling will be presented to the NRC Kerikeri River Working Group tomorrow, and to include and analyse the results, we have postponed the presentation of our detailed findings to Hearing 16 or 17.

Consequently, once the flooding risks are mitigated, there will be positive consequences for continued development in Waipapa and east of SH10.

Based on this vision, together with other community groups and members, we strongly supported and still support the KFO development (called Option F in the Spatial Plan process). The KFO development is now earmarked as a ‘Contingent Future Growth Area’ in the Spatial Plan adopted by Council. We support the rezoning of KFO as a future urban

zone, as outlined in the statement of evidence of Ms Katerina Dvorakova today, with a list of appropriate conditions which include a solution for the flooding risks.

‘Ms Tinder’s Section 42A Report states various points from Mr Reuben, which are incorrectly concluding that the consulted “hybrid option D+E” in the South of Kerikeri and in Waipapa combined with more density-infill would provide growth that is appropriate for market demand. Also, as we and other submitters had explained during the Spatial Plan Hearings, the consultation was initiated without Option F and was thus seriously flawed. making the results irrelevant.’

The initial support from the combined Hapu for Option D+E originated on the consultation without Option F, which was then added with very one-sided arguments. Upon receipt of the actual Option F benefits, Ngati Rehia and Ngati Hineira supported the inclusion of Option F, while the other Hapu representatives at the Hearing did not oppose it, but requested more information and inclusion.

Having realised all this, Councillors agreed to include the Option F area with a list of conditions.

Furthermore, Mr McIlrath highlights that housing affordability is a critical issue: we think the KFO project provides the opportunity of lower cost housing. In contrast, in-fill in Waipapa and Kerikeri is much more expensive due to high land prices and Council would have to arrange the required infrastructure at ratepayers’ or developers’ expense, making it less attractive.

And furthermore, Kerikeri’s expansion on high-quality land with irrigation in the south of Kerikeri does not make sense: waste of valuable and expensive horticultural land. Additionally, it would worsen the traffic situation of Kerikeri Road with the many cul-de-sac junctions.

Ms Tinder’s claim that KFO’s proposal lacks sufficient detail to justify the re-zoning request seems at odds with all the details we have seen: the plan includes required land for affordable housing and a hotel, on low-quality land, urgently need additional transport options with roads, cycling and pedestrian tracks to connect Kerikeri and Waipapa, protection of wetlands and native bush and many more. Additionally, KFO is offering to arrange and fund the infrastructure at no cost to Council. It is obvious, that upon the required zone change as the first step, KFO will have to further specify their plans to gain resource and building consents. Thus, the risks for Council, which Ms Tinder mentions, seem exaggerated.

To make it very clear again: We principally support the precautionary approach regarding development in areas with flood risks. However, those risks must be mitigated -urgently- not only for the additional KFO land, but especially on the wider scale of Waipapa and downstream Kerikeri - including the historic Mission House and Stone Store. At the Spatial Hearing we proposed a moratorium for further FNDC resource and building consents in the Waipapa flood zone until the flood risks are solved.

Thank you.